

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Board of Supervisors was scheduled for 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, January 20, 2022 in the Community Center Robert “Bob” Crowell Boardroom, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT:

Mayor Lori Bagwell
Supervisor Stacey Giomi, Ward 1
Supervisor Maurice White, Ward 2
Supervisor Stan Jones, Ward 3
Supervisor Lisa Schuette, Ward 4

STAFF:

Nancy Paulson, City Manager
Aubrey Rowlett, Clerk-Recorder
Dan Yu, Assistant District Attorney
Stephanie Hicks, Deputy City Manager
Tamar Warren, Senior Public Meetings 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. All meeting minutes are available for review at: <https://www.carson.org/minutes>.

1 - 4. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, INVOCATION, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(8:30:58) – Mayor Bagwell called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. Ms. Rowlett called roll and noted the presence of a quorum. Calvary Chapel Pastor Pat Propster provided the invocation. Supervisor Giomi led the Pledge of Allegiance.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(8:33:22) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and reminded everyone to visit <https://gethealthycarsoncity.org/> to request COVID-19 test appointments and obtain additional COVID-19 information. She also entertained public comments. Lea Case introduced herself via telephone and thanked the Mayor and the Board for considering her application for reappointment to the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission (item 17.A). Kathleen Franco Simmons spoke in support of Staff’s recommendation to change the Master Plan designation of the Empire Cemetery to Open Space which is outlined in her written public comment (attached). She wished to zone it Public Regional, to match the zoning of Lone Mountain Cemetery. Ms. Simmons also reiterated her previous requests such as removing slaughterhouse and stockyard from the Carson City Municipal Code and sending public notices electronically. Dr. Jennifer Verive, whose written public comments are incorporated into the record, introduced herself, and requested the removal of the term slaughterhouse from the General Industrial (GI) zoning and referenced the reasons she had cited in her written comments.

6. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF MINUTES – DECEMBER 16, 2021 AND DECEMBER 30, 2021.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 2

(8:41:56) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and entertained a motion.

(8:42:26) – Supervisor Giomi moved to approve the minutes of the December 16, 2021 and December 30, 2021 Board of Supervisors meetings, with the corrections provided as late material. The motion was seconded by Supervisor Schuette and carried 5-0-0.

7. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

7.A PRESENTATION OF LENGTH OF SERVICE CERTIFICATES TO CITY EMPLOYEES.

(8:42:55) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and presented a five-year service certificate to Lizzeth Granata, Deputy Sheriff, and a twenty-year service certificate Jeff Pullen, Deputy Sheriff, who was accompanied by K9 Officer Blue. Carson City Fire Department Office Specialist Shelby Price was awarded a five-year service certificate and Court Administrator Maxine Cortes received her 15-year service award certificate. Mayor Bagwell invited the service award recipients to join her and the Board for a commemorative photograph.

7.B PROCLAMATION AND PRESENTATION OF THE EMPLOYEE-OF-THE-QUARTER AWARD TO RAY MURRAY, ELECTRICAL INSTRUMENTATION AND CONTROLS TECHNICIAN.

(8:46:53) – Mayor Bagwell read the Employee of the Quarter award certificate, incorporated into the record, and presented it to Electrical Instrumentation and Controls Technician Ray Murray. She credited Mr. Murray for integrating the Diffused Air Flotation process at Public Works and for saving the City \$200,000. She also presented him with a \$200 check. Mr. Murray joined the Board and the Mayor for a commemorative photograph.

8. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

8.A FOR DISCUSSION ONLY: DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATION REGARDING SALES DATA FOR VARIOUS AREAS OF CARSON CITY FROM THE PAST SEVEN YEARS (2014-2020).

(8:50:14) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. University of Nevada Center for Regional Studies Project Manager Brian P. Bonnenfant presented sales data for various areas of the City from the past seven years, which is incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions. Mayor Bagwell explained that non-profit organizations and thrift stores are exempt from sales tax. Discussion also ensued regarding the reporting of sales taxes generated by online sales. This item was agendaized for discussion only.

CONSENT AGENDA

(9:09:44) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and entertained items to be pulled from the agenda. When none were forthcoming, she entertained a motion.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 3

(9:09:51) – Supervisor Giomi moved to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of items 9.A, 10.A, 11.A, 12.A, 12.B (Resolution No. 2022-R-1), 13.A, 14.A (Resolution No. 2022-R-2), 14.B, 14.C, 14.D, 15.A, and 15.B. Supervisor White seconded the motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Giomi
SECONDER:	Supervisor White
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, White, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

9. CITY MANAGER

9.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RATIFYING THE APPROVAL OF BILLS AND OTHER REQUESTS FOR PAYMENTS BY THE CITY MANAGER FOR THE PERIOD OF DECEMBER 3, 2021 THROUGH JANUARY 7, 2022.

10. FINANCE

10.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE REPORT ON THE CONDITION OF EACH FUND IN THE TREASURY AND THE STATEMENTS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES THROUGH JANUARY 7, 2022, PER NRS 251.030 AND NRS 354.290.

11. PARKS, RECREATION & OPEN SPACE

11.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A MUTUAL GRANT OF NON-EXCLUSIVE EASEMENTS (“EASEMENTS”) BETWEEN CHRISTIAN MANNSFELD AND CARSON CITY THROUGH WHICH MR. MANNSFELD WILL GRANT THE CITY A NON-EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT ON APN 007-061-02 FOR A RECREATIONAL TRAIL, AND THE CITY WILL GRANT MR. MANNSFELD A NON-EXCLUSIVE ACCESS EASEMENT ACROSS AN EXISTING DIRT ROAD ON APNS 007-061-25, 007-061-81, 007-071-01 AND 007-071-05.

12. PUBLIC WORKS

12.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A GRANT OF HIGHWAY EASEMENT DEED (“EASEMENT”) AT NO COST FROM THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ACTING BY AND THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (“FHWA”), TO CARSON CITY FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.24 ACRES WITHIN APN 007-061-26 THAT IS NECESSARY FOR THE KINGS CANYON ROAD AND TRAILHEAD FEDERAL LANDS ACCESS PROGRAM (“FLAP”) PROJECT (“PROJECT”).

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 4

12.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A PROPOSED RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY DESIGNATED AS CARSON CITY ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER ("APN") 010-763-01 AND ALSO KNOWN AS PORTIONS OF BANNER PEAK DRIVE, WHEELER PEAK DRIVE AND CHALK BLUFF DRIVE, AS OFFERED FOR DEDICATION BY THE FINAL MAP FOR SCHULZ RANCH PHASE 5, RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CARSON CITY CLERK-RECORDER AS DOCUMENT NO. 514324, MAP NO. 3001 ON DECEMBER 18, 2020.

Resolution No. 2022-R-1.

13. PURCHASING AND CONTRACTS

13.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CONTRACT NO. 21300227 WITH RH BORDEN AND COMPANY LLC ("RH BORDEN") TO PERFORM A CONDITION ASSESSMENT FOR A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF CARSON CITY'S SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM, FOR A NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT OF \$143,750.

14. SHERIFF

14.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A PROPOSED RESOLUTION UNDER NRS 277.050 DECLARING THE CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISOR'S INTENT TO AMEND THE OCTOBER 15, 2015 LEASE OF APPROXIMATELY 2,330 SQUARE FEET OF SPACE IN THE CARSON CITY SHERIFF'S OFFICE ("CCSO") FACILITY, LOCATED AT 911 EAST MUSSER STREET, CARSON CITY, NEVADA, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER ("APN") 004-174-09, TO THE STATE OF NEVADA'S PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION AS THE LESSEE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY'S NEVADA HIGHWAY PATROL ("NHP") AS THE TENANT FOR \$2,912.50 PER MONTH FOR FISCAL YEAR ("FY") 2023 (JULY 1, 2022 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2023), AND FOR \$3,029.00 PER MONTH FOR FYS 2024 AND 2025 (JULY 1, 2023 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2025).

Resolution No. 2022-R-2.

14.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, 2021 EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$55,000 TO FUND A BEHAVIORAL HEALTH PEACE OFFICER POSITION.

14.C FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$149,690.49 FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE, NORTHERN AND MIDDLE STATES RURAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 5

14.D FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, 2021 EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM, FOR THE TRINET NARCOTICS TASK FORCE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$95,000, AND A PROPOSED INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN CARSON CITY AND DOUGLAS COUNTY TO PASS \$41,000 IN THE GRANT FUNDS TO DOUGLAS COUNTY FOR THE TRINET NARCOTICS TASK FORCE.

15. TREASURER

15.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE TREASURER'S MONTHLY STATEMENT OF ALL MONEY ON DEPOSIT, OUTSTANDING CHECKS AND CASH ON HAND FOR DECEMBER 2021, SUBMITTED PER NEVADA REVISED STATUTES ("NRS") 354.280.

15.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST TO CORRECT AND ADJUST THE SECURED AND UNSECURED TAX ROLLS FOR FISCAL YEAR ("FY") 2020/2021 PER NRS 361.765 TO 361.768, INCLUSIVE, ON MULTIPLE PROPERTIES RESULTING IN A REDUCTION OF \$9,108.40 FROM THE SECURED TAX ROLL AND AN ADDITION OF \$88,814 TO THE UNSECURED TAX ROLL, AND WHETHER TO AUTHORIZE THE CARSON CITY TREASURER TO REFUND ANY OVERASSESSMENTS/PENALTIES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$368.93, REMOVE UNSECURED TAX PENALTIES DUE TO BILLING ERRORS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$19,685.72 AND COLLECT ADDITIONAL TAXES DUE.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, AND OTHER ITEMS

16. ITEM(S) PULLED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA WILL BE HEARD AT THIS TIME

No items were pulled for discussion from the Consent Agenda.

17. CITY MANAGER

17.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE APPOINTMENT OF THREE MEMBERS TO THE CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION, EACH FOR A FOUR-YEAR TERM ENDING ON JANUARY 1, 2026.

(9:10:33) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and noted that three candidates had applied for reappointment. She was also informed that new applicant George Butler was not present for an interview. Mayor Bagwell entertained a motion.

(9:11:33) – Supervisor Giomi moved to reappoint Lea Case, Kurt Meyer and Dave Whitefield, each for a four-year term ending on January 1, 2026 to the Parks and Recreation Commission. Supervisor Jones seconded the motion.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 6

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Giomi
SECONDER:	Supervisor Jones
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, White, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

17.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE APPOINTMENT OF UP TO FOUR MEMBERS TO THE 9-1-1 SURCHARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ("COMMITTEE"), WITH ONE APPOINTMENT AS THE REPRESENTATIVE OF A LOCAL EXCHANGE CARRIER FOR A FULL TERM EXPIRING IN DECEMBER 2023, TWO APPOINTMENTS EACH FOR A TERM EXPIRING IN DECEMBER 2023 AND ONE APPOINTMENT TO FILL A PARTIAL TERM EXPIRING IN DECEMBER 2022.

(9:11:57) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and noted that the Board normally would not appoint first time applicants without a discussion. She also clarified that a sixth appointment was not required for this Committee as it required at least five members, but no more than seven. Supervisor Giomi expressed support for the two reappointment candidates, who he believed had served well. He also suggested a motion.

(9:12:58) – Supervisor Giomi moved to appoint Bryson Gordon as the representative for a local exchange carrier for a term expiring in December 2023. He also moved to reappoint Mary Katherine Durbin and Denise Bauer, each to fill a term expiring in December 2023. The motion was seconded by Supervisor Jones.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Giomi
SECONDER:	Supervisor Jones
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, White, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

18. FINANCE

18.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO INTRODUCE, ON FIRST READING, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE BY CARSON CITY OF ITS "GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) WATER AND REFUNDING BONDS (ADDITIONALLY SECURED BY PLEDGED REVENUE), SERIES 2022A" IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$16,690,000.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 7

(9:13:35) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. JNA Consulting Group, LLC Vice President and Carson City Municipal Advisor John Peterson introduced himself and provided background on the proposed Ordinance, incorporated into the record. Mr. Peterson anticipated possible \$750,000 in savings for the City due to better interest rates, which he recommended locking in as soon as possible. There were no Board questions or comments; therefore, Mayor Bagwell entertained a motion.

(9:16:57) – Supervisor Giomi moved to approve, on first reading, Bill No. 101. Supervisor Schuette seconded the motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Giomi
SECONDER:	Supervisor Schuette
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, White, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

18.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO INTRODUCE, ON FIRST READING, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE BY CARSON CITY OF ITS "GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) WASTEWATER REFUNDING BONDS (ADDITIONALLY SECURED BY PLEDGED REVENUE), SERIES 2022B" IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,895,000.

(9:17:16) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Mr. Peterson estimated that like item 17.A, the estimated savings in this case would be around \$121,000. Mayor Bagwell entertained a motion.

(9:18:26) – Supervisor Schuette moved to approve, on first reading, Bill No. 102. Supervisor White seconded the motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Schuette
SECONDER:	Supervisor White
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, White, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

18.C FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO INTRODUCE, ON FIRST READING, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE BY CARSON CITY OF ITS "GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS (ADDITIONALLY SECURED BY PLEDGED REVENUE), SERIES 2022C" IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$8,100,000.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 8

(9:18:45) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Mr. Peterson gave background, including a review of the timeline contained in the Staff Report. There were no Board questions; therefore, Mayor Bagwell entertained a motion.

(9:18:26) – Supervisor Giomi moved to approve, on first reading, Bill No. 103. Supervisor White seconded the motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Giomi
SECONDER:	Supervisor White
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, White, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

18.D FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PREPARATION, DISTRIBUTION, USE OF AND EXECUTION OF ONE OR MORE PRELIMINARY OFFICIAL STATEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE SALE AND ISSUANCE OF THE CITY'S GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) WATER AND REFUNDING BONDS (ADDITIONALLY SECURED BY PLEDGED REVENUES), SERIES 2022A, IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$16,690,000, GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) SEWER REFUNDING BONDS (ADDITIONALLY SECURED BY PLEDGED REVENUES), SERIES 2022B, IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,895,000, AND GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS (ADDITIONALLY SECURED BY PLEDGED REVENUES), SERIES 2022C, IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$8,100,000.

(9:20:07) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Mr. Peterson explained that the proposed resolution would allow the publication and distribution of a preliminary official statement for the proposed bonds “a little bit earlier.” Mayor Bagwell entertained a motion.

(9:21:07) – Supervisor Schuette moved to approve Resolution No. 2022-R-3. Supervisor White seconded the motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Schuette
SECONDER:	Supervisor White
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, White, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 9

(9:21:34) – Chief Financial Officer Sheri Russell thanked Mr. Peterson and Bond Counsel Ryan Henry of Sherman & Howard L.L.C.

18.E FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RESOLUTION TO AUGMENT AND AMEND THE CARSON CITY FISCAL YEAR 2021-22 BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF \$106,761,099.

(9:21:56) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Ms. Russell clarified that this item reflected the rolling forward of the unspent FY 2021 funds into FY 2022 and making them available in the current budget. She also wished to see the Ending Fund Balance increased to 10 percent, and responded to clarifying questions by the Board. Mayor Bagwell entertained a motion.

(9:28:33) – Supervisor Schuette moved to approve Resolution No. 2022-R-4. Supervisor Giomi seconded the motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Schuette
SECONDER:	Supervisor Giomi
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, White, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

19. RECESS AS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

(9:28:53) – Mayor Bagwell recessed the Board of Supervisors meeting.

REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

20. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL - REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

(9:29:00) – Chairperson Bagwell called the Redevelopment Authority meeting to order. Ms. Rowlatt called roll and noted the presence of a quorum.

21. PUBLIC COMMENT

(9:29:14) – Chairperson Bagwell entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

22. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF MINUTES - NOVEMBER 4, 2021

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 10

(9:29:30) – Chairperson Bagwell introduced the item and read into the record a statement noting that the minutes would be approved beyond the 30-day window required by the Open Meeting Law; however, good cause had been shown to consider the approval of these minutes today. She also entertained changes or a motion.

(9:30:20) – Vice Chair Giomi moved to approve the November 4, 2021 Redevelopment Authority meeting minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Member Schuette and carried 5-0-0.

23. FINANCE

23.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RESOLUTION TO AUGMENT AND AMEND THE CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY FISCAL YEAR 2021-22 BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,284,646.

(9:30:43) – Chairperson Bagwell introduced the item. Chief Financial Officer Sheri Russell explained that the proposed augmentation was primarily due to the carryover of program costs from the prior year's budget, Redevelopment Authority actions, and unanticipated sources of revenue. Chairperson Bagwell entertained a motion.

(9:31:18) – Member Jones moved to approve Resolution No. 2022-RA-R-1. Member White seconded the motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Member Jones
SECONDER:	Member White
AYES:	Members Jones, Schuette, White, Vice Chair Giomi, and Chair Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

24. PUBLIC COMMENT

(9:31:40) – Chairperson Bagwell entertained final public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

25. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO ADJOURN AS THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

(9:31:55) – Chairperson Bagwell adjourned the Redevelopment Authority meeting at 9:31 a.m.

26. RECONVENE AS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

(9:31:59) – Mayor Bagwell reconvened the Board of Supervisors meeting.

27. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 11

27.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO INTRODUCE, ON FIRST READING, AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A CHANGE OF ZONING FROM GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”) TO LIMITED INDUSTRIAL (“LI”) FOR A PARCEL LOCATED AT 900 FAIRVIEW DRIVE, APN 009-551-08.

(9:32:03) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Planning Manager Heather Ferris provided background and presented the Staff Report with supporting documents, all of which are incorporated into the record. She highlighted the recommendation of the Planning Commission which was to leave APN 009-551-31 (788 Fairview Drive) zoned General Commercial (GC), because APN 009-551-31 was the subject of a recent application for a special use permit for a congregate care facility for the residential treatment of substance abuse, a permitted use of a GC parcel with a special use permit. The special use permit had been approved by the Planning Commission; therefore, the use was entitled. Ms. Ferris also responded to clarifying questions.

(9:35:38) – Supervisor Giomi received clarification that the congregate care facility would be located at the former school site and was owned by Community Counseling Center. Mayor Bagwell expressed concern regarding inconsistency in the proposed rezoning. Ms. Ferris noted that a non-conforming use would allow Community Counseling Center to expand in the future, with a Special Use Permit. Community Development Director Hope Sullivan cited a previously-heard case for the Montessori School located in an industrial zone. She stated that the businesses around it wished for the Industrial zoning because of needs such as truck traffic. Supervisor Schuette was also concerned about the one lot remaining GC zoned. Supervisor White was in favor of creating consistency and stability with the Master Plan; however, he believed this item would not do that. Ms. Sullivan explained to Supervisor Giomi that she was not in favor of allowing congregate care in a Limited industrial zone. She also clarified that a Special Use Permit had been obtained for the care facility. Supervisor Giomi understood the need for Limited Industrial zones in the City; however, he believed that the need Community Counseling Center would fill was important as well. He recommended waiting until a need for Limited Industrial zoning arose. Mayor Bagwell recommended tabling the issue and the Board concurred.

27.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ADOPT, ON SECOND READING, BILL NO 118, AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A CHANGE OF ZONING FROM GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”) TO MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENTS (“MFA”) FOR PARCELS CREATED AS PART OF THE SUNDANCE RIDGE SUBDIVISION AND EDMONDS INDUSTRIAL PARK, LOCATED ON LEPIRE DRIVE, CASSIDY COURT, AND ETTA PLACE, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBERS (“APNS”) 010-351-06, 010-351-07, 010-351-14, 010-351-15, 010-351-95, 010-351-96, 010-651-14 THROUGH -22, 010-651-23, 010-651-29 THROUGH -50; AND FROM GC TO PUBLIC (“P”) FOR PARCELS LOCATED ON ETTA PLACE AND CASSIDY COURT, APNS 010-351-94 AND 010-651-24.

(9:50:58) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Ms. Ferris noted that there were no changes since the first reading, except the APN number correction which had been noted during the first reading. Mayor Bagwell entertained comments/questions and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(9:51:50) – Supervisor Giomi moved to adopt, on second reading, Ordinance No. 2022-1. Supervisor Jones seconded the motion. Mayor Bagwell entertained discussion.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 12

(9:52:09) – Supervisor White reiterated the concern he had raised during the first reading of the proposed Ordinance noting that he preferred “to keep as much commercial property as we possibly can.” Mayor Bagwell called for the vote.

RESULT:	APPROVED (4-1-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Giomi
SECONDER:	Supervisor Jones
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	Supervisor White
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

27.C FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ADOPT, ON SECOND READING, BILL NO 119, AN ORDINANCE CHANGING THE ZONING FROM SINGLE-FAMILY 12,000 (“SF12”), GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”), AND GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (“GI”) TO GC FOR THE ENTIRE PARCEL LOCATED AT 4619 HIGHWAY 50 EAST, APN 008-283-04.

(9:52:43) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and Ms. Ferris noted that there were no changes to the Bill since the first reading. Mayor Bagwell called for the vote.

(9:53:09) – Supervisor Giomi moved to adopt, on second reading, Ordinance No. 2022-2. The motion was seconded by Supervisor White.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Giomi
SECONDER:	Supervisor White
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, White, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

27.D FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP FOR A COMMON OPEN SPACE DEVELOPMENT KNOWN AS EAST ROBINSON STREET AND NORTH SALIMAN ROAD – BLACKSTONE RANCH NORTH TO CREATE 137 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS ON A ±41.07 ACRE PORTION OF A ±78.81 ACRE SITE WITHIN THE LOMPA RANCH NORTH SPECIFIC PLAN AREA ON PROPERTY ZONED MULTI-FAMILY DUPLEX (“MFD”), MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENTS (“MFA”), AND GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”), LOCATED WEST OF INTERSTATE 580, NORTH AND EAST OF ROBINSON STREET, AND SOUTH OF EAST WILLIAM STREET, APNS 010-041-39 AND 010-041-52.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 13

(9:53:42) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and noted that this item was continued from the last meeting. Associate Planner Heather Manzo gave background and reviewed the Staff Report and supporting materials. She also highlighted a typographical error in Condition No. 21 and the following changes in italics to Condition No. 28:

28. Cast in place manholes shall not be allowed, regardless of depth of new sewer mains, and riser depths shall meet Carson City standard details. If sewage pumping is required, lift stations shall be privately owned and operated. *If private lift stations or other private sewer infrastructure are required, the homeowner's association ("HOA") required in Condition No. 38 shall be responsible to fund, in perpetuity, 100% of the cost to maintain and operate any private sewer infrastructure necessary to serve the development. The declaration forming the HOA must list the private sewer lift station and private sewer infrastructure as common elements for which the HOA is responsible for 100% of the cost for maintenance and repair. The declaration must also state that the declaration's provisions concerning the sewer lift station and private sewer infrastructure may not be amended without the approval of the Carson City ~~Public Works Director~~ Board of Supervisors. A separate deed restriction must be recorded contemporaneously with the declaration providing that if the HOA ceases to exist or fails to properly maintain and operate the private lift station and private sewer infrastructure, all parcels subject to the HOA consent to Carson City's formation of an assessment district; increase in sewer fees; or any other available method of assessment or collection of fees, for 100% of the costs to operate and maintain the private lift station and private sewer infrastructure to permit Carson City to maintain and operate the private lift station and private sewer infrastructure. The deed restriction language shall be subject to review and approval by the Public Works Director prior to recordation.*

(9:55:38) – Mayor Bagwell acknowledged the presence of the applicant in the room and his approval of the proposed changes. She also entertained a motion. Supervisor White thanked Staff for the amendments to Condition No. 28; however, he requested clarification on the declaration approval by the Carson City Public Works Director. Ms. Sullivan explained that the statement ensured that “no change can be made without the approval of the most knowledgeable person in the City.” The Board confirmed that the approval would be beyond the Planning Commission’s purview. Mayor Bagwell received confirmation from applicant representative Mike Railey of the Christie Corporation that he would be amenable to change the approval from the Public Works Director to the Board of Supervisors [as reflected in the above paragraph].

(10:00:34) – Supervisor White moved to approve the tentative subdivision map, incorporating the recommended changes to the conditions of approval including the typographical correction in Condition No. 21 and the modification of Condition No. 28 as reflected above. The motion was seconded by Supervisor Jones.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor White
SECONDER:	Supervisor Jones
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, White, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 14

(10:01:35) – Mayor Bagwell recessed the meeting.

(10:11:15) – Mayor Bagwell reconvened the meeting. A quorum was still present.

27.E FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE CARSON CITY MASTER PLAN ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

(10:11:28) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan referenced the agenda materials and reviewed the City's land development, focusing on the 204 housing starts. She reviewed the status of the new housing projects coming to Carson City in 2022, noting that a key challenge to completing the homes was material and workforce availability. Ms. Sullivan also presented the annual review of the Master Plan which had been approved for recommendation to the Board by a 5-0-0 (with two absent) vote. When discussing the Master Plan Draft Action Plan and implementation strategies, Ms. Sullivan recommended making all City parks public. She also noted that an update to the City's Master Plan would be completed in 2025. Ms. Sullivan responded to Board questions and recapped the direction she received from the Board as follows:

- Making Title 18 revisions a priority.
- Outsourcing or internally compiling a comprehensive list of the mapping inconsistencies.
- Prioritizing the V&T Specific Plan items 1.2 and 1.4.

Mayor Bagwell entertained a motion.

(10:53:46) – Supervisor Giomi moved to accept the Master Plan report from the Planning Commission and to direct Staff to carry out the provisions in accordance to the discussion on the record in this meeting. Supervisor White seconded the motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Giomi
SECONDER:	Supervisor White
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, Schuette, White, and Mayor Bagwell
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

27.F FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTERS 18.02 TO 18.05, INCLUSIVE, CHAPTER 18.13 AND DIVISIONS 1 TO 4, INCLUSIVE, OF TITLE 18 APPENDIX OF THE CARSON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE ("CCMC"), WHICH SET FORTH VARIOUS LOCAL ORDINANCE PROVISIONS GOVERNING LAND USE, ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS IN CARSON CITY.

(10:54:20) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and acknowledged that the Board members had received ample public comment which they had provided to Staff. She also noted that the discussion on this item was not to

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 15

finalize any decisions, but was to provide high-level direction to Staff. The Board discussed each section separately and gave feedback to Ms. Sullivan. This discussion and the Board meeting are available on the City's website on: https://carsoncity.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=1965. The item was not agendized for action.

28. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

NON-ACTION ITEMS:

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

STATUS REVIEW OF PROJECTS

INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

CORRESPONDENCE TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

STAFF COMMENTS AND STATUS REPORT

(12:27:15) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Ms. Paulson announced that the slaughterhouse appeal would be heard as a time specific item, and would be agendized for 5 p.m. at the next Board meeting on February 3, 2022. She also thanked all the City departments for keeping the operations running despite being affected by COVID-19. Supervisor Giomi updated the Board on the Carson Water Subconservancy District meeting and congratulated Bruce Scott who had received the 2022 Andy Aldax Carson River Watershed Award for Exemplary Service in Conservation and Protection of the Carson River Watershed.

CLOSED NON-MEETING TO CONFER WITH MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES AND COUNSEL

(12:29:25) – Mayor Bagwell announced that this item would be discussed after the adjournment of the Board meeting.

29. PUBLIC COMMENT

(12:29:30) – Mayor Bagwell entertained final public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

30. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO ADJOURN

(12:29:50) – Mayor Bagwell adjourned the meeting at 12:29 p.m.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Meeting
Page 16

The Minutes of the January 20, 2022 Carson City Board of Supervisors meeting are so approved on this 17th day of February, 2022.


LORI BAGWELL, Mayor

ATTEST:


AUBREY ROWLATT, Clerk – Recorder

Attachments: written public comments

Public Comment
1/20/22 BOS mtg
Item 5

January 19, 2022

Carson City Mayor and Board of Supervisors,

RE: Public Comments for January 20, 2022, Board of Supervisors Agenda

Consent Calendar Items 11 & 12 (Easements for a recreational trail to connect Carson City with the Lake Tahoe Basin / Kings Canyon Road and Trailhead)

- I wholeheartedly support these proposed trail easements. My husband and I look forward to the completion of these trails. Kudos to staff for their hard work facilitating the continued development, connectivity and completion of these and other trails.

Item 27.F (Title 18 amendments)

1. **CCMC 18.04.150 and 18.04.152** (Commercial and Industrial Use Tables by Use Type and Industrial Use Tables): I am requesting removal of "slaughterhouse" and "stockyard" as a conditional use (special use permit) for General Industrial (GI) and General Industrial Airport (GIA) zones in Title 18 of the Carson City Municipal Code. I and my family are in full agreement with our neighbor, Dr. Jennifer Verive, who articulated the reasons for this in her letter and attachment submitted for Public Comment for this 1/20/2022 BOS meeting. Obviously, "slaughterhouse" and "stockyard" should never be a primary permitted uses near residential neighborhoods, schools, parks, recreational and open space.
2. **CCMC 18.02.045 Notice of public hearings:**
 - a. **Section 2.e.:** I am requesting that the revised text which reads: "*Required public hearing notices shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation and mailed to surrounding property owners not less than 10 days before the public hearing*" include other methods of notification in addition to publication in the Nevada Appeal. Please add electronic means by which residents can electronically and/or automatically receive public hearing notices such as via email subscriptions, posting public notices on the City's website, and use of social media such as NextDoor.
 - b. **Section 2.e.:** I am requesting that the notification period be changed from 10 to 14 days to allow additional time for residents to research and prepare public testimony.
 - c. **Section 1.a and 3:** The proposed amendments remove the text in Section 1.a. reading: "*An application for variance, special use permit, zoning map amendment, tentative map, planned unit development map, master plan amendment such as a land use map amendment or element text amendment, appeal of administrative decision or commission decision, or appeal of an administrative permit.*" I am requesting the above text relating to public notices for variances, special use permits, etc. as currently listed

in 1.a. to be retained or to be specifically listed in Section 3, and that the noticing areas be expanded to 2,000 feet or one-fourth of a mile.

3. **CCMC 18.02.080, 8.c:** The proposed amendment to the sentence which currently states: "*The Commission may approve additional extensions of time subject to the consideration of the continued appropriateness of the Special Use Permit and may be subject to the imposition of additional conditions by the Commission to ensure that the activity permitted by the Special Use Permit does not adversely impact other properties in the area or the public interest*" proposes to delete the text: "*does not adversely impact other properties in the area or the public interest*" and replace it with generalized text reading: "continues to meet the required findings for approval of a Special Use Permit." I am requesting reinstatement of the text: "*does not adversely impact other properties in the area or the public interest.*"
4. **CCMC 18.02.095, 1.(c)** (Notice of show cause hearing): I am requesting that notices of this type also be provided to property owners, neighbors and residents pursuant to CCMC 18.02.045 (Notice of public hearings).

Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations.

Respectfully,

Kathleen Franco Simmons
2108 Utah Street
Carson City, NV 89701



Kathleen Franco Simmons <kfrancosimmons@gmail.com>

BoS Agenda 1-20-2022 - Items 27.E and 27.F - Master Plan and Title 18 amendments

1 message

Kathleen Franco Simmons <kfrancosimmons@gmail.com>

Wed, Jan 19, 2022 at 11:25 AM

To: publiccomment@carson.org

Cc: cceo@carson.org

January 19, 2022

Carson City Mayor and Board of Supervisors,

Items 27.E and 27.F of the January 20, 2022, Board of Supervisors Agenda relating to the Carson City Master Plan annual report and Title 18 amendments includes recommendations for rezoning Empire Cemetery.

I have addressed both the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission in the past few months regarding my family's concerns about several issues with Empire Cemetery. Three or four successive generations of my family are buried at Empire Cemetery, and several living members of two succeeding generations have an expectation of being buried there. We would like to see Carson City make every effort to protect Empire Cemetery in perpetuity.

I support and applaud the staff recommendation of changing the Master Plan designation to Open Space, and the rezoning away from General Industrial (GI). However, I am disappointed in the staff recommendation for the zoning change to Conservation Reserve (CR). I would like to request consideration of rezoning Empire Cemetery to match the zoning designation given to Lone Mountain Cemetery.

Conservation Reserve (CR) (18.04.165) is described as follows: *"The purpose of the CR district is to identify the outlying lands that may be developed in the future when water supply, roads, schools, sewer and other public facilities and services are provided for potential development and lands with environmental constraints."*

Lone Mountain Cemetery is zoned Public Regional (PR) (18.04.185), which is described as: *"PR means Federal, state and city facilities and uses whose main purpose is to sustain wide regional needs."* Some of the conditional uses permitted in the PR District include Archaeological heritage/cultural resource, Cemetery, Historical site, Open space, Wilderness area, Wildlife park/preserves/habitat area.

Please consider rezoning Empire Cemetery to the same zoning map designation that applies to Lone Mountain Cemetery to ensure protection of this historic and meaningful cemetery in perpetuity.

Respectfully,

Kathleen Franco Simmons
2108 Utah Street
Carson City, NV 89701

From: [Jennifer Verive](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Fwd: Proposed slaughterhouse -- Appeal of Planning Commission's approval of a SUP
Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 1:21:14 PM
Attachments: [33 Reasons Why Building a SH in Carson City is a Bad Idea.pdf](#)

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Dear Madam Mayor and Supervisors:

As you may know, Bob Buttner and I, as individuals and as members of the Coalition of Citizens for Peaceful Enjoyment (CCPE), have filed to appeal the decision made by the Planning Commission on 12/15/21 to approve a Special Use Permit for a slaughterhouse facility.

We have 33 research-based reasons why the proposed project is a bad idea for our families, neighborhoods, and community. (document attached)

We continue to stand strong. We have nearly 800 signatures on our petitions. About 70% of the public comments submitted to Planning opposed the facility.

We offer these facts:

- The proposed slaughterhouse facility is THREE TIMES the size of Wolf Pack Meats. UNR-run Wolf Pack Meats slaughters 20 animals a week. CVM Inc. proposes to slaughter 60 animals a week. Up to 120 per week during a "special event".
- The proposed slaughterhouse is TOO CLOSE -- unlike Wolf Pack Meats whose closest residence is two miles away (that's over 10,500 feet), the proposed SH will be located within 500 feet of a mobile home park, 1,000 feet of a residential subdivision, 1,000 feet of our beautiful Carson River, and within a 1/2 mile of additional subdivisions, golf courses, ball parks, and tennis courts.

We believe that the proposed slaughterhouse violates the Master Plan and will negatively affect our Quality of Life -- negating much of your hard work to date.

As an award-winning researcher who has published in peer-reviewed journals, I make sure to gather information from all 'sides' of an issue. My research, and that of other CCPE supporters, comes from diverse sources -- including the meat processing industry itself.

As needed as slaughterhouses might be in general, none of the 2,100 pages of research we submitted to our Planning Commission indicate that it's beneficial to locate a slaughterhouse near where people live, work, and recreate. Not one page. Not one data point. Not one source. In fact, people who run slaughterhouses are aghast when we tell them about the proposed location and how close it is to homes, businesses, and recreational areas.

Our research shows that slaughterhouses near places where people live, work, and recreate have harmed people, property values, and the quality of life in the community overall.

Mr. Park's slaughterhouse in Douglas County is a go. Our 4-H youth and few local ranchers will be well-served.

We appreciate the opportunity we will have at the 2/3/22 BOS Meeting to address you directly and 'make sense' of our research and concerns.

We urge you to not accept the Planning commission's recommendation and instead, reject the SUP request for the proposed slaughterhouse.

Thank you for your time and attention to this very serious matter. Thank you for all you do for our City.

Most Sincerely,
Dr. Jennifer Verive

Here are 33 Reasons why building a slaughterhouse in Carson City is bad for Neighbors, Businesses, the Carson River, Tourists, and Our Community Overall

The support “for” the proposed SH is support for a “meat processing” plant in general. HOWEVER, the proposal is a request for a Special Use Permit (SUP) to operate such a business on a particular lot in our city. Whether a slaughterhouse is “good” is not relevant. The question at hand is whether a SUP should be granted to put such a business in a particular LOCATION. We assert that there are 33 reasons why a SUP for this particular location should be denied.

1. **There is NO NEED for this facility.** There is no market data to support the need for meat processing in Carson City. Especially with a facility being built on Buckeye Road in Gardnerville.
2. **The Carson City community does NOT support this facility.** We have over 700 signatures from Carson City residents on our petition to oppose the location of the proposed SH.
3. **Carson City is an URBAN County.** Carson is a designated US Metropolitan Statistical Area and is described by the NNDA as “the regional retail and commercial center for Northwestern Nevada”.
4. **It’s TOO CLOSE to residences and businesses.** It’s ONLY 400 feet from the property line of the proposed facility to the property line of the nearest residential neighborhood.
5. **CVM does NOT have “the right” to build a SH in a GI zone.** This PARTICULAR GI Zone is unsuitable for a slaughterhouse because it is located near places people live, work, and recreate. Those uses were there first.
6. **It Violates Master Plan Principal 9: Stable, Cohesive Neighborhoods Offering a Mix of Housing Types.** The city has set the goal to work to maintain the quality and character of established neighborhoods and ensure that infill and redevelopment is designed in a manner that minimizes impacts on existing neighborhoods
7. **It Violates Master Plan Goal 9.3b: Maintain the quality and character of established neighborhoods.** Any way you measure it...the proposed facility violates the city goal to maintain the quality and character of established neighborhoods. The facility will negatively affect the neighborhoods of Empire Ranch, August Dr./Sunrise Dr., and Villa Sierra Mobile Home Park, as well as 2 major golf courses, several ball fields and tennis courts, and recreating on the Carson River.
8. **It Violates Master Plan Goal 9.3 2.1d: Land Use Friction Zones Discourage rezoning of properties that create “friction zones” between land uses.** The GI zone was designated AFTER neighborhoods were well-established. This GI Zone is not suitable for a slaughterhouse.
9. **It Violates Master Plan Goal 9.3 5.7f: Property Value Retention/Enhancement.** Home and property values in the area will be significantly adversely affected. (Greenfield, Toronto, Zillow Home Database)

10. **It will decrease Tourism as the Slaughterhouse Stigma permeates the Eastern Gateway to our City.** There will be a negative impact on tourists visiting Virginia City, and on people commuting to Dayton, Fallon, and the Tahoe Regional Industrial Center.
11. **It will adversely affect the use and peacefulness of historic sites.** Peaceful enjoyment of Empire Ranch Cemetery and historical markers will be impeded.
12. **It is detrimental to Peaceful Enjoyment: Noxious Odors from living animals. 60 to 120 animals produce, literally, tons of manure.** There is no mitigation of this in an outdoor corral, and no evidence that an indoor corral will prevent or mitigate it. (Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, MIU Extension, RGJ 2021)
13. **It is detrimental to Peaceful Enjoyment: Noxious Odors from animal waste & carcasses.** 60 to 120 animals will produce, literally, tons of blood and disemboweled animal parts. There is no mitigation of this in an outdoor corral, and no evidence that an indoor corral will prevent or mitigate it. (Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, MIU Extension, RGJ 2021)
14. **It is detrimental to Peaceful Enjoyment: Air Pollution.** The application describes NO air filtration system for living animals nor for harvesting activities. There is no mitigation of this in an outdoor corral, and no evidence that an indoor corral will prevent or mitigate it.
15. **It is detrimental to Peaceful Enjoyment: Objectionable Noise from living animals.** Hungry, stressed animals vocalizing loudly – bellowing, bleating, and squealing. There is no mitigation of this in an outdoor corral, and no evidence that an indoor corral will prevent odors, noise, flies, or air pollution
16. **It is detrimental to Peaceful Enjoyment: Objectionable Noise from animals being slaughtered.** Animals “scream” from stress during the harvesting process. The application describes no noise abatement methods.
17. **It is detrimental to Peaceful Enjoyment: Physical Activity.** Noxious odors, noise, and air pollution, and swarms of flies will prohibit or severely curtail river-related recreation
18. **It will create traffic, increase vehicular accidents.** The applicant says that this is a regional issue – thus traffic on Hwy 50 (“Death Hwy”) will significantly increase from all directions.
19. **It will harm the health and general welfare of neighbors and people throughout the County.** *“Meat processing facilities face an enormous risk when it comes to bacterial growth and contamination, as well as pests such as flies and other insects.”* (foodsafedrains.com)
20. **There will be swarms of flies, mice, and coyotes. There is no vermin/pest management control described in the application (other than use of denature after harvest).** *“With all the safety issues and concerns that come with operating a successful meat-processing plant, the last thing a processor wants to worry about is an infestation of the four-or-more-legged variety. Mice, flies, roaches or any other kind of pest can lower the sanitary conditions of a facility, pose a risk to employee and food safety and generally make for an unpleasant working environment.”* (from The National Provisioner website)

21. **The application is woefully inadequate: incomplete, vague, and missing key components that address the Findings.** Passing the buck to other City departments is untenable given the well-documented harms attributed to slaughterhouses, even “boutique” ones.
22. **It will likely use over 15,000 gallons of water every “special event” day, and possibly on a regular harvest day as well.** The application appears to use a substandard ratio of gallons of water/pound of animal thereby significantly underestimating its water usage. *“Consider you will be using a lot, and I mean A LOT, of water per carcass.”* (Fuller, 2012, p.9)
23. **It will put a burden on our City sewer system.** There is NO description of wastewater treatment in the application (only casual mention of “detention ponds”). *“Also, make sure that your filters/traps will be able to catch **most** of the blood, hair and fat heading down the drain.”* (Fuller, 2012, p. 10) *“Untreated slaughterhouses waste entering into a municipal sewage purification system may create severe problems, due to the very high biological oxygen demand (BOD) and chemical oxygen demand (COD).”* (Bazrafshan et al. 2012)
24. **It will not bring “economic vitality” or jobs to our area. The application mentions a max of 5 employees.** SH employees have a “tendency towards violence” and self-report a myriad of mental health issues. Arrest rates for sexual assault and family violence are statistically higher in communities with SHs. (Slade & Alleyne, 2021; Fitzgerald et al., 2009)
25. **Wolf Pack Meats (East Reno) is a terrible comparison – we do not want to be like the area around WPM!** There are no residential neighborhoods near WPM. East Reno crime rates are 19% higher than the Reno average and 27% higher than national average. East Reno has nearly twice the number of rapes than the national average. (crimegrade.org; ADT Security; AreaVibes.com)
26. **Having USDA certification does NOT mitigate harms.** The USDA is overworked and unable to adequately provide proper oversight. There is legislation to exempt boutique SHs from USDA oversight. (Bruggers, 2014; Linnekin, 2017).
27. **The proposed site is adjacent to an Earthquake Fault!** There is no description of what, if any, design moderations have been made to accommodate earthquake impact on the building and especially on the drainage structures.
28. **The proposed site is currently classified as a SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREA – HIGH RISK.** The application does not provide detail on how wastewater will be treated nor provide data to support the adequacy of the proposed design given the site being located in a HIGH RISK FLOOD PLAIN.
29. **Unprotected Wetlands will be altered or destroyed.** The proposed plans will change the natural drainage patterns of the land, eliminating or severely altering an unprotected Wetland.
30. **There is inadequate information on Water Pollution Control, and the need for a 404 permit.** A 404 permit requires the FILLING of the wetlands to have a level surface on which to build.

31. **Meats from boutique slaughterhouses costs more; it will not lower meat prices.** In some cities, meat from boutique SHs is twice the cost per pound then meat from the grocery store. (Segerstrom, 2020)
32. **There are no indications that animals will be treated humanely.** Although animal welfare is not specifically addressed in the application, the applicant has stated that they will use “Temple Grandin” methods. However, there is no evidence of such methodology described in the application. The use of an indoor corral is inconsistent with the Grandin methodology. (Grandin, 2005)
33. **A REGIONAL approach to the proposed project may locate a more suitable site.** Best practices include doing a feasibility study to collect data on market, location, and operational needs. A UNR Feasibility study concluded that the best site to build a new slaughterhouse in Northern Nevada would be Silver Springs. Land is available in Silver Springs.

From: [Laura Lawrence](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: RE: opposition to slaughterhouse
Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 4:23:50 PM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Dear Mayor and Board Supervisors,

I am writing to oppose the Special Use Permit granted to Carson Valley Meats (CVM) by the Carson City Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission has received numerous data from the opposition as to reasons why the location of the proposed slaughterhouse does not positively service our community, follow the vision of the Carson City Masterplan, or adhere to Guiding Principle 3: Stewardship of the Natural Environment. Yet, despite over 700 resident signatures, health and environmental concerns, and significant quality of life negative implications, they still approved the Special Use Permit albeit with 31 conditions.

I don't understand why the onus is on the residents to "prove" that the proposed slaughterhouse is hazardous and harmful and NOT on the Planning Commissioners to "prove" that it is necessary, safe, and positive for our city.

Considering the large resident opposition, isn't it prudent to conduct feasibility studies that research market demand, operational needs, and location suitability first? Isn't it prudent to have an Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Statement prepared as outlined in Nevada Planning Guide 2017?

As residents, we expect the Planning Commissioners to act reasonably. However, granting a Special Use Permit to CVM does not appear to be reasonable considering the lack of research conducted. In fact, it is a failure to act reasonably and carefully resulting in possible injury or harm; it constitutes negligence.

I believe the Planning Commissioners initially were making a decision that they believed was fair and prudent. Since the initial application, numerous caveats have arisen that need to be addressed and this should not be left to the applicant who cannot be unbiased. When I attended the last meeting on December 15th, I found the Planning Commissioners responses and body language to be uncompromising and apathetic. It appeared that their decision for approval had been made before the meeting. The new and valid data and comments presented by residents were blatantly disregarded.

We all make decisions that seem reasonable at the time. We all make mistakes though and realize subsequently that our decisions were faulty. Please take a new perspective on this issue, do the necessary research, and take the time to listen to your constituents and revoke the Special Use Permit for Carson Valley Meats to build a slaughterhouse on Detroit Road and Route 50.

Sincerely,
Laura Lawrence
1163 W. Fifth Street
Carson City

From: akaspuds@charter.net
To: Public Comment
Subject: Slaughterhouse
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 8:47:42 AM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Carson City Supervisors

I oppose the Hwy 50 location for the slaughterhouse.

I am a Carson City resident and I live about 1/2 mile as the crow flies from the Hwy 50 location for the proposed slaughterhouse. We just received information that the Supreme Court of Nevada denied the appeal by Carson Valley Meats to allow them in Douglas County.

The judge had this to say:

"The (board) received dozens of verbal and written comments from concerned individuals against the meat processing facility that expressed one or more of the following concerns: noise, odors, wastewater disposal, bugs and pests, loss of property value, historical clouding of the area and air quality," the decision filed Thursday said, concluding that substantial evidence supported the decision."

<https://www.recordcourier.com/news/2022/jan/14/supreme-court-panel-upholds-slaughterhouse-denial/>

When this was before our Planning Commission all of these same concerns the residents presented were treated as not valid. Yet the court realized they were, but not our Planning Commission.

As this matter is going to come before you in February 2022, I would like to add my comments. Over 20 years ago the city made a decision to allow a residential mobile home park to be built near this location. Have any of you gone to that location and talked to the residents? You should. I have. You will find it is a Hispanic community and many of them will not even answer their doors. We were able to talk with them as we had a person that was fluent in Spanish, and we had a park resident go with us. This community is 700 feet from the slaughterhouse. Would you support it if it were being built 700 feet from your home? I doubt it. If any of you would like to go to the mobile home park, I would be willing to arrange a time and go over there with you if you want me to. You can see just how close 700 feet is.

I would encourage you watch the recording of the PC meeting. You will see the majority were against the location. Please note almost everyone in favor were from out of town. Some out of state. So why is it that the Carson City residents are pushed aside and the big money developers and ranchers from other areas (not Carson City) are able to get approval over the objections of the residents who live locally and near the site? I have been involved in the Special Use Permit process before and it seems like the same thing happens over and over again. Give weight to the developer and treat the residents like they have no voice. One PC member stated they went to Reno to visit a slaughterhouse there. As he stated nothing was going on that day and he did not take the time to speak with any of the residents. Seems like a wasted trip unless it wasn't going to matter what the

residents had to say.

The exact reasons the court considered denial is the same reasons the Carson City residents gave. Yet we were ignored. 700 feet, really? You as our City leadership have to live with the fact that this small residential community is there. What of the Master Plan? At this point, as I see it, you might as well tear it up. The Master Plan is always used conveniently by the developer under the heading of "Mixed Land Use" while all the other protections for residents in the Master Plan are ignored. The Master Plan says decisions will be made on the compatibility with established neighborhoods. Approving this means a slaughterhouse is compatible with this neighborhood? Would it be compatible with yours? When will the residents input have any meaning? So far, I haven't seen it. Just the developers are heard. In all fairness we did have one PC member agree with us and vote against it. The Master Plan also states: The City will also work to maintain the quality and character of "established neighborhoods". If the Master Plan is used as a complete document, then this location should be denied. Developers and the PC should not pick and choose parts of the Master Plan to use. The entire document should be considered.

I would ask that you deny this permit based off the Master Plan protections offered established neighborhoods and for all the concerns the "residents" have as stated above by the judge.

Sincerely,
Glenn Conant
Empire Ranch
775-430-6455

From: [Kathleen Franco Simmons](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Cc: [CCEQ](#)
Subject: BoS Agenda 1-20-2022 - Items 27.E and 27.F - Master Plan and Title 18 amendments
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 11:25:29 AM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

January 19, 2022

Carson City Mayor and Board of Supervisors,

Items 27.E and 27.F of the January 20, 2022, Board of Supervisors Agenda relating to the Carson City Master Plan annual report and Title 18 amendments includes recommendations for rezoning Empire Cemetery.

I have addressed both the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission in the past few months regarding my family's concerns about several issues with Empire Cemetery. Three or four successive generations of my family are buried at Empire Cemetery, and several living members of two succeeding generations have an expectation of being buried there. We would like to see Carson City make every effort to protect Empire Cemetery in perpetuity.

I support and applaud the staff recommendation of changing the Master Plan designation to Open Space, and the rezoning away from General Industrial (GI). However, I am disappointed in the staff recommendation for the zoning change to Conservation Reserve (CR). I would like to request consideration of rezoning Empire Cemetery to match the zoning designation given to Lone Mountain Cemetery.

Conservation Reserve (CR) (18.04.165) is described as follows: ***"The purpose of the CR district is to identify the outlying lands that may be developed in the future when water supply, roads, schools, sewer and other public facilities and services are provided for potential development and lands with environmental constraints."***

Lone Mountain Cemetery is zoned Public Regional (PR) (18.04.185), which is described as: *"PR means Federal, state and city facilities and uses whose main purpose is to sustain wide regional needs."* Some of the conditional uses permitted in the PR District include Archaeological heritage/cultural resource, Cemetery, Historical site, Open space, Wilderness area, Wildlife park/preserves/habitat area.

Please consider rezoning Empire Cemetery to the same zoning map designation that applies to Lone Mountain Cemetery to ensure protection of this historic and meaningful cemetery in perpetuity.

Respectfully,

Kathleen Franco Simmons
2108 Utah Street
Carson City, NV 89701

From: [Jennifer Verive](#)
To: [CCEQ](#); [Public Comment](#); [Lori Bagwell](#)
Cc: [Bob Buttner](#); [Kathleen Franco Simmons](#); [Doreen Mack](#)
Subject: Public Comment for 1/20/22 BOS meeting
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 1:34:34 PM
Attachments: [The Case to Support Removing SH from Title 18.pdf](#)

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Hello Madam Mayor and Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to remove "slaughterhouses" and meat processing facilities in general as a conditional use for GI Zones in Title 18 or our Carson City Municipal Code.

This is needed because most GI zones in our city are located close to residential subdivisions that pre-date the current code or have already been granted exceptions from the code -- because housing is crucial to our economic vitality.

Meat processing facilities have well-known negative impacts on the public's health and general welfare, and on the peaceful enjoyment of their neighbor's properties. They have a negative impact on tourism. They use a tremendous amount of water.

Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, Carson City residents, taxpayers, home-owners, and visitors do not want such a facility located near people's homes. We have nearly 800 signatures on our petitions attesting to this sentiment.

Best Practices for building such a facility involve doing in-depth feasibility studies to gather ample objective data about the impacts the location, design, and operations of these facilities will have on neighbors and the community overall. These data are then used by decision-makers. For example, one such study was done by UNR and resulted in the decision to not expand Wolf Pack Meats, the current small slaughterhouse (slaughtering 20 animals per week) and instead develop a robust mobile slaughter operation. Additional studies for the UNR Mobile Slaughter Project are currently being conducted by Staci Emm, Professor and Extension Educator, with a report issued in March 2021.

Please see the attached document for the case to support removing slaughterhouses as a conditional use from our CCMC, along with citations and web links. Also included is an overview of the negative impacts of slaughterhouses and a Table of Contents page from a feasibility study done for a meat processing co-op in Vermont.

Slaughterhouses as a conditional use within a GI Zone is no longer acceptable for our City. Meat processing facilities do not belong near places where people live, work, and recreate.

Sincerely,
Dr. Jennifer Verive

--

Jennifer M. Verive, Ph.D.

Mobile: 775.315.4748

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/jenniferverive>

*she/her/hers

The Case to Support Excluding Slaughterhouses as Conditional Uses of GI Zones in Carson City

1. The community does not support such a facility.

At the 12/15/21 Planning Commission meeting 70% of the public comments were in opposition to such a facility proposed for a GI zone in East Carson. We have over 800 signatures on our petitions – the majority from Carson City residents, with many from locals (nearby counties) and tourists.

2. Such facilities are better located in an agricultural areas.

Locating such a facility in an agricultural zone will put less constraint on water usage, move product closer to market source, reduce stress for the animals, and significantly reduce the factors contributing to objectional noise, odors, dust, and physical activity.

Slaughterhouses are not compatible with our current and planned City development goals. Carson City is the third largest metropolitan center in the state of Nevada, a designated U.S. Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), and described by the Northern Nevada Development Authority as “the regional retail and commercial center for Northwestern Nevada”.

3. In our city today, GI zones are too close to residential and recreational areas.

Building this type of facility in a GI zone violates Master Plan Goal 9.3 – to maintain the quality and character of established neighborhoods. For example, the proposed facility approved by our Planning Commission is with 400 feet of the nearest residences, 1,000 feet from a major subdivision, and within a half mile of multiple golf courses, tennis courts, and ball fields. It's less than 200 feet from popular Carson River recreational areas.

4. In our city today, many GI zones are along major traffic corridors. Allowing a slaughterhouse facility will negatively impact Tourism & Hospitality – key desirable Carson City industries.

5. City Staff in the departments which would review slaughterhouse designs and SUP requests are not experts in slaughterhouse design, operations, or known adverse impacts.

6. Courts across the country have acknowledged the evidence-based negative impacts of such facilities, such as objectionable noise, odors, and fumes, and a decrease in property values.

- **Nevada High Court Panel OKs Slaughterhouse Denial**

<https://www.nevadaappeal.com/news/2022/jan/14/supreme-court-panel-upholds-slaughterhouse-denial/>

- **Judge rules against chicken slaughterhouse in Paterson neighborhood**

<https://www.northjersey.com/story/news/paterson-press/2021/09/14/proposed-paterson-nj-slaughterhouse-approvals-nullified-lawsuit/8319510002/>

- **Franklin residents opposing Strauss Brands proposed slaughterhouse get a win. A judge ordered a new Common Council hearing on the plan.**

<https://www.jsonline.com/story/money/real-estate/commercial/2021/11/17/franklin-residents-fighting-strauss-brands-slaughterhouse-get-win/8655149002/>

- **Developer drops plans to build slaughterhouse in Big Rock.**

<https://www.audacy.com/wbbm780/news/local/developer-drops-plans-to-build-slaughterhouse-in-big-rock>

7. Such facilities take “a lot of water, and I mean A LOT, of water per carcass”.

[From:<https://www.meatchris.com/blog/2012/8/20/five-mistakes-to-avoid-in-your-meat-processing-business-open.html>, p.9]

8. Best practices are to do a feasibility study to understand market and operational needs. This is what communities across the country now do.

There are consultants that do this well. One such study done for UNR indicated that the best place for a REGIONAL slaughterhouse would be Silver Springs.

- The UNR citation: Cowee, M., Curtis, K., Harris, T., and Lewis, S., 2008, Financial Potential for Livestock Slaughter and Processing in Nevada, University of Nevada Cooperative Extension
- For examples of such reports & communities:
<https://www.nichemeatprocessing.org/meat-processing-feasibility-studies/>

Industry-Known Harmful Effects of Any Sizes Slaughterhouses

Property Values will be adversely affected:

- Research shows that property values decline when they are located near SHs – from 26% to 80% for adjunct properties.
- Rents in a Toronto neighborhood were 10 to 20% lower because there was an SH in the area.
- Residential property values near Wolf Pack Meats are lower than the average Carson City East Side home value

There will be no “peaceful enjoyment” of homes, properties, and outdoor recreation.

- There will be substantial air pollution from tons of manure and tons of blood and animal waste (50% of a cow is waste) -- the air will be filled with fecal matter, blood and animal bits.
- There will be substantial and objectionable noise 24/7 from to-be-harvested animals bellowing, neighborhood dogs barking in response, and the noise of animals being harvested.
- There will be increased flies, rodent infestations, and predators.
- Flies normally do not stay inside slaughter-house buildings but tend to congregate on nearby vegetation.

The health and welfare of citizens is adversely impacted by the air and water pollution.

- Slaughterhouse wastes are “a potential reservoir of bacterial, viral, prion and parasitic pathogens, capable of infecting both animals and humans.” (Franke-Whittle & Insam, 2013).
- Leading health authorities, including the WHO and CDC, are sounding the alarm that emerging zoonotic pandemics, caused by meat processing, is beyond and far worse than COVID-19.
- Slaughterhouses commonly violate nuisance, sanitation, zoning, environmental and public health laws.
- Denature chemicals are toxic; the proposed location is on a Flood Plain.
- SH employees have a “tendency towards violence” and self-report a myriad of mental health issues.
- Arrest rates for sexual assault and family violence are statistically higher in communities with SHs. (Fitzgerald)
- East Reno, where Wolf Pack Meats is located, has violent crime rates that are 97% higher than national average.

Animals are often not ethically and humanely treated.

- The applicants have verbally indicated that they will use “Temple Grandin” methods, yet there is no evidence of such methodology described in the application.
- The applicant voluntarily offered to enclose the holding corral; this is at odds with the “Temple Grandin” methodology.
- In 2019 the USDA shut down Wolf Pack Meats in Reno for a short time due to “an egregious act of inhumane handling of animals in connection with slaughter”
- The manager of Wolf Pack Meats states that “human error” resulting in inhumane handling is commonplace in the industry.

SOURCES: Environmental Integrity Project, 2018; Kirkpatrick, 2015; Indiana Business Research Center, 2008; Easton Courier, 2021; Center for Biological Diversity, 2019; White, 2020; Killough, 2020; Murray, 2017; Fitzgerald et al., 2009; Toronto news report, 2012; Carapetian, 2018; Ghandi, 2017; Harris, 2021; Sinclair Farms Newsletter, 2013; Northern Nevada Development Authority website; Cities Index; Nevada’s Plan for Recovery & Resilience from the Governor’s website; Penrose, 2019; KTVN, 2021; Franke-Whittle & Insam, 2013; Pestman website; Walker & Stachecki; Guide to Designing a Small Red Meat Plant; Standard Plans for a Small Abattoir and Meat Market; Slade & Alleyne, 2021; Food Northwest; Standard Plans; Fuller 2012; USGS; crimegrade.org; ADT Security; AreaVibes.com; Zillow Home Values database; Jones, 2016; Bruggers, 2014; Gazdziak, 2007; Bah et al., 2013; Grandin, 2005; The Counter.org, 2017.

This is an example of the kinds of data collected by a Feasibility Study. This is a best practice followed by most communities.

SLAUGHTERHOUSE FEASIBILITY REPORT / Page iii **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Executive Summary</u>	i
<u>Acknowledgements</u>	ii
<u>Background</u>	1
<u>Project Parameters</u>	1
<u>Criteria</u>	1
<u>Regulatory Issues</u>	3
<u>Food Safety and Labeling</u>	3
<u>Water Supply</u>	4
<u>Environmental Considerations</u>	4
<u>Mobile Facilities</u>	5
<u>Business Feasibility</u>	6
<u>Mission</u>	6
<u>Business Description</u>	6
<u>Products and Services</u>	6
<u>Market</u>	6
<u>Existing Facilities and Competition</u>	9
<u>General Environment</u>	9
<u>Existing Facilities</u>	9
<u>Operational Challenges</u>	11
<u>Potential Options</u>	11
<u>Purchasing Brault's or another slaughterhouse</u>	12
<u>Build a new facility</u>	12
<u>Build a mobile facility</u>	12
<u>Develop commercial fabrication facility</u>	13
<u>Contract for services</u>	14
<u>Join with Vermont Quality Meats</u>	15
<u>Recommendations</u>	21
<u>Appendix A – Resources Consulted</u>	22
<u>Appendix B – Washington Mobile Slaughtering Unit Info</u>	24
<u>Appendix C – Sample Layout of Cut Shop</u>	25
<u>Appendix D – Processing Facility Capital Budget</u>	26
<u>Appendix E – Sample Operating Budget</u>	28