

# **CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

## **Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**

### **Page 1**

A regular meeting of the Carson City Board of Supervisors was scheduled for 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, May 5, 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  
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**

(8:30:35) – Mayor Bagwell called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. Ms. Warren called roll and noted the presence of a quorum. Airport Road Church of Christ Minister Bruce Henderson provided the invocation. At Mayor Bagwell's request, Mr. Yu led the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

(8:32:31) – Mayor Bagwell entertained public comments. Carson City Elections Chief Deputy Clerk Miguel Camacho introduced himself and provided the following information regarding the June 14, 2022 primary election:

- Sample ballots would be mailed on Friday, May 6, 2022.
- Mailed ballots would be mailed out on the week of May 16, 2022.
- The deadline for in-person registration is May 17, 2022 and mailed applications must be postmarked by that date as well.
- Online voter registrations would be accepted from May 18, 2022 until May 31, 2022 through the Secretary of State’s website. Voter registration beginning on June 1, 2022 must be done in person at the polling location and registrants must have valid identification to register.

Mr. Camacho also noted that several events have been scheduled at Mills Park and the Community Center during early voting and advised taking that into consideration.

## **CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

### **Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**

#### **Page 2**

(8:35:46) – Nathan Harrison spoke in favor of item 18.B, the proposed acquisition of 81.55 acres of privately owned property in Ash Canyon. He believed that it would be “beneficial to the community as a whole.”

(8:37:58) – Pete Doenges introduced himself as a Carson City resident and the trails coordinator for Muscle Powered. Mr. Doenges urged the Board to approve the property acquisition agenda item 18.B and believed it would help with the economic development in the area. He also emphasized the community’s efforts in assisting with the building of the trails.

(8:41:14) – Chris Carver introduced himself as a Carson City resident and spoke in opposition to item 14.A, noting that it would not benefit the public but believed that “commissions and the Planning Department are frustrated with the individual citizens and community advocates that slow the process of bureaucracy down.” He urged the Board to reject the proposed ordinance.

(8:44:09) – Bob Buttner introduced himself as a lifetime resident of Carson City. Mr. Buttner agreed with Mr. Carver’s comments and questioned whether the District Attorney had spent time researching Nevada Supreme Court decisions “looking into the rights of citizens to be involved to discuss, to appeal...issues in their communities.” He believed that the Nevada Supreme Court had ruled that public opinions mattered.

(8:45:44) – Lisa Taylor introduced herself as the University of Nevada Extension Educator in Carson City which included fire education. Ms. Taylor thanked the City for their ongoing partnership to educate the community and spoke in support of the upcoming proclamation (agenda item 7.D) and provided education materials for business owners and citizens.

(6:47:26) – Doreen Mack thanked the Board for “doing a really good job and I really know how difficult this position can be.” However, she noted that they were not an elite group, that they represented the community, and that they had been voted into office. She urged the Board to reject the ordinance proposed in agenda item 14.A.

(8:48:20) – Johanna Foster introduced herself as an ecologist and a retired biology professor. She spoke in favor of agenda item 18.B. She explained that she had spoken at an event regarding Muscle Powered and Carson City’s Open Space [Program] providing Carson City nationwide attention for its open space achievements. She also provided anecdotal information regarding visitors who come to access the City’s trails.

(8:51:20) – Robert Harris thanked the City for its efforts to shield the noise of the air conditioning units near Fleischmann Way. Mr. Harris also informed the Board that a recent dust storm at the Anderson Ranch project had caused breathing issues and some damage to cars due to the heavy winds. He urged the citizens to notify the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) about the high wind and dust issues.

(8:53:20) – Juan Guzman introduced himself as a Muscle Powered board member and noted that the acquisition of the Ash Canyon property (agenda item 18.B) would benefit the City’s water system and control the access to Ash Canyon. He also was in favor of having residents enjoy “our beautiful landscape.”

(8:56:48) – Kathleen Franco Simmons also spoke in favor of item 18.B and welcomed the opportunity to have new open space properties. She also stated that she had addressed the Open Space Advisory Committee and had recommended the acquisition of the property “at the bend of the Carson River near Highway 50 which is for sale.”

**CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**

**Page 3**

**6. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF MINUTES – APRIL 7, 2022.**

(8:58:08) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and entertained comments or corrections and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

**(8:58:20) – Supervisor Giomi moved to approve the minutes of the April 7, 2022 Board of Supervisors meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Supervisor White and carried 5-0-0.**

**7. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS**

**7.A PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING MAY 2022 AS NATIONAL DRUG COURT MONTH.**

(8:58:53) – Mayor Bagwell read into the record a proclamation, incorporated into the record, recognizing May 2022 as National Drug Court Month. Judge Tom Armstrong who presides over the Misdemeanor Treatment Court thanked the Board and the supporting community services, public and private, and noted the importance of the Drug Courts and their impact on the participants. He also congratulated Anisa Mendoza who was the 100<sup>th</sup> graduate of the Misdemeanor Treatment Court program and praised her exceptional efforts to complete the program perfectly in one year. Ms. Mendoza called the opportunity she had “amazing.” Mayor Bagwell congratulated Ms. Mendoza and invited her to join the Board along with Judge Kristin Luis (Mental Health Court), Judges Peter Breen and Archie Blake (Western Regional DUI Court and Drug Court), and Juvenile Magistrate Kimberly Okezie (Juvenile Drug Court) for a commemorative photograph.

**7.B PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION TO RECOGNIZE THE MONTH OF MAY AS HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL AWARENESS MONTH, AND PRESENTATION OF THE 2022 HISTORIC PRESERVATION AWARD.**

(9:07:44) – Mayor Bagwell invited Historic Resources Commission Chairperson Mike Drews and read a proclamation, incorporated into the record, proclaiming the month of May as Historic Preservation and Archaeological Awareness Month. Mayor Bagwell and Mr. Drews presented the 2022 Historic Preservation Award to the Nevada Builders Alliance for their preservation of the Bank Saloon. Nevada Builders Alliance Chief Executive Officer Aaron West thanked the City, the community, and the Historic Resources Commission for their support.

**7.C PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING MAY 15 - MAY 21, 2022 AS NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK.**

(9:15:12) – Mayor Bagwell invited Public Works Director Darren Schulz to join her and read a proclamation, incorporated into the record, recognizing May 15 – May 21, 2022 as National Public Works Week. She also invited members of the Public Works Department to join her and the Board for a commemorative photograph.

**7.D PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING MAY-OCTOBER 2022 AS THE NEVADA WILDFIRE AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.**

## **CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

### **Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**

#### **Page 4**

(9:18:25) – Mayor Bagwell read a proclamation, incorporated into the record, in support of the Nevada Wildfire Awareness Campaign from May through October 2022. Carson City Fire Chief Sean Slamon and Mayor Bagwell encouraged citizens to visit <https://www.livingwithfire.com/> to learn about fire safety, including making their homes fire safe, and preparing for evacuations. He also recommended calling the Carson City Fire Department should they need assistance. The fire prevention team joined the Board for a commemorative photograph.

#### **7.E PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING MAY 2022 AS BIKE MONTH.**

(9:21:46) – Muscle Powered members joined Mayor Bagwell while she read a proclamation, incorporated into the record, to recognize May 2022 as Bike Month in Carson City. The team joined the Board for a commemorative photograph. Muscle Powered's Donna Inversin invited everyone to a Celebrity Bike Ride along the Blue Line featuring community leaders on Fri, May 13, 2022, 11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. Mr. Guzman invited everyone to join them at the Gear Swap event on Saturday, May 7, 2022, 10:30 a.m. – 2:30 pm. He also thanked Carson City Safe Routes to School Coordinator Scott Bohemier who announced Bike to School day events in Carson City and advised the public to drive safely while students biked to school. The team joined the Board for a commemorative photograph.

#### **8. CITY MANAGER**

##### **8.A FOR DISCUSSION ONLY: DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATION REGARDING NEVADA LEAGUE OF CITIES' STRATEGIC PLAN AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE "ONE NEVADA PLAN."**

(9:30:43) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Wesley Harper, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities (NLC), presented NLC's 2022 Strategic Plan and the implementation of the One Nevada Plan, both of which are incorporated into the record, and were ratified on January 31, 2022, by the Board of Directors. He also responded to clarifying questions. Mr. Harper explained that he had addressed Mayor Bagwell as “Vice President” since she held that title at the NLC.

#### **CONSENT AGENDA**

(9:41:35) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and inquired whether the Board wished to pull items from the Consent Agenda. When none were forthcoming, she entertained a motion.

(9:41:50) – Supervisor Giomi moved to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of items 9.A, 9.B, 10.A (Resolution No. 2022-R-12), 11.A, 11.B, and 12.A as published. Supervisor White seconded the motion.

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



**CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**

**Page 5**

**9. FINANCE**

**9.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 APRIL 22, 2022, PER NRS 251.030 AND NRS 354.290.**

**9.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION TO REMOVE \$8,249.55 IN UNCOLLECTIBLE ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE FROM THE RECORDS OF THE CARSON CITY LANDFILL, GENERAL FUND.**

**10. PUBLIC WORKS**

**10.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A PROPOSED RESOLUTION AND AGREEMENT (“RESOLUTION”) FOR THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (“NDOT”) TO RELINQUISH AND TRANSFER TO CARSON CITY PORTIONS OF CUL-DE-SACS AT MONK COURT AND HOSPITALITY WAY THAT FALL WITHIN OR ABOUT CARSON CITY ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 002-763-01.**

Resolution No. 2022-R-12 was approved via the Consent Agenda.

**11. PURCHASING AND CONTRACTS**

**11.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A DETERMINATION THAT SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION, INC. (“SNC”) IS THE LOWEST RESPONSIVE AND RESPONSIBLE BIDDER PURSUANT TO NEVADA REVISED STATUTES (“NRS”) CHAPTER 338 AND WHETHER TO AWARD CONTRACT NO. 21300283 FOR THE ASPHALT PATHWAYS MAINTENANCE PROJECT (“PROJECT”) TO SNC FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$126,507.71.**

**11.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CONTRACT NO. 21300262 (“CONTRACT”) WITH H+K ARCHITECTS TO PROVIDE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICE FOR THE CARSON CITY SENIOR CITIZENS CENTER (“SENIOR CENTER”) FACILITIES REMODEL PROJECT (“PROJECT”), FOR A NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT OF \$142,000 THROUGH DECEMBER 1, 2023.**

**12. SHERIFF**

**12.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPROVAL TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDING FROM THE FY2023 UNITED WE STAND GRANT, FOR FISCAL YEAR (“FY”) 2023 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$32,000.**

**END OF CONSENT AGENDA**

**ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, AND OTHER ITEMS**

**CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**  
**Page 6**

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

No items were pulled from the Consent Agenda.

**14. DISTRICT ATTORNEY**

**14.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO INTRODUCE, ON FIRST READING, A PROPOSED ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING VARIOUS PROVISIONS GOVERNING ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS RELATED TO LAND USE AND ZONING.**

(9:42:27) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Carson City District Attorney Jason Woodbury provided background and noted that the proposed ordinance would address the lack of clarity in the existing ordinance and improve the process. He reviewed the agenda materials (highlighting that the Growth Management Commission had been added to the bodies the decisions of which would be appealed), specifically addressed the definition of “an aggrieved party,” and explained: “my role in this process is to provide you with an ordinance that is clear. Your role is to tell me what to be clear about.” Mr. Woodbury reviewed the proposed ordinance, pointing out the differences between the existing and the proposed ordinance, and responded to clarifying questions.

(10:09:19) – Mayor Bagwell addressed the written and verbal public comments, specifically “the accusation [that] we want to stomp on the voice of the public.” She provided the example of Planning Commission hearings where any member of the public could voice an opinion verbally or in writing, for or against an agenda item. Mr. Woodbury clarified that everyone may provide input; however, to appeal a decision, the appellant must meet the criteria outlined in the ordinance. Discussion ensued regarding the definition of “aggrieved party.” Supervisor Giomi addressed certain public comments, explaining that when an item has been placed on an agenda, “it doesn’t mean that a decision has been reached. It means that we are going to deliberate on a decision because the five of us can’t discuss any item that is before us” outside this forum. He also highlighted Section 3 of the proposed ordinance which offered assistance to appellants with incomplete applications. He believed that those residing or owning a business in Carson City could be considered appellants.

(10:25:27) – Supervisor White explained that the decision to have this discussion had been made in a public meeting and that it was not “a shady, backdoor attempt to suppress civil rights.” He also believed that out-of-state property and business owners in Carson City should be allowed to appeal. Supervisor Jones was informed that there had been five appeals in the last six years. He was also “comfortable” with the existing ordinance. Mr. Yu explained that a revision of the Carson City Municipal Code would be done; however, Title 18 had been selected to be completed first. He also clarified that the Nevada Supreme Court case involving Douglas County and referenced in written public comments was “the Court’s recognition that it was okay for the governing body of a local government to consider public comment, and that was it. There’s nothing in this ordinance that deviates from that proposition of law that’s been issued by the Nevada Supreme Court.” Mayor Bagwell suggested reviewing each page and recommending changes. The following were recommended:

- *Section 2.c: Adding an email address to the submission methods and having all submissions by 5:00 pm. – at the close of business.*

## CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

### Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting

#### Page 7

- *Section 7.a: Clarifying that in the Mayor's absence, the presiding officer would provide direction on the consolidation of appeals.*
- *Adding Section 9.c to clarify the scope of the appellate body's review to be restricted to an analysis of whether the underlying decision is: (1) Arbitrary; (2) Capricious; (3) A manifest abuse of discretion; or (4) Based on a conclusion that is not supported by substantial evidence (or similar language).*
- *Having one source to instruct the public on how to file an appeal.*

(10:45:04) – Mayor Bagwell entertained public comments. Paula Peters introduced herself as a Carson City resident and noted that she had “a letter all prepared, but as you can see, I changed it during the meeting, so, I’m glad that the meeting is going the way that it’s going.” Ms. Peters, whose written public comment is incorporated into the record, recommended allowing any Carson City resident, regardless of their address, to become an aggrieved party.

(10:47:34) – Mary Bowers introduced herself as a Carson City resident since 2001. Ms. Bowers noted that “we the people” had elected the Board and explained that she believed the existing ordinance was in need of updating. She also believed that the proposed ordinance was related to the slaughterhouse project. Mayor Bagwell clarified that the slaughterhouse “had nothing to do with it.” She explained that this revision had been planned prior to that particular appeal and that Title 18 had been chosen for an update as it was the most relevant to the public. Mr. Yu also clarified that the proposed ordinance was unrelated to the slaughterhouse and would only have an impact on future appeals.

(10:53:06) – Kathleen Franco Simmons noted her objections to Sections 7 and 12. She also read excerpts from a prepared statement, incorporated into the record in the form of written public comment, including scenarios that the ordinance would disenfranchise Carson City residents.

(10:56:40) – Robyn Orloff introduced herself as a Carson City resident and noted that by commenting after the Board’s discussion, her opinions had been “modified.” She also thanked the Supervisors who had responded to her comments and for acknowledging that the community as a whole would be considered an aggrieved party. She also referenced her written public comments which are incorporated into the record.

(10:59:04) – Doreen Mack thanked Mr. Woodbury and believed that changes [to the ordinance] must be kept simple. She also objected to the \$250.00 cost to appeal, noting it had been lower. She also wished to see business owners considered appellants “with standing.”

(11:01:00) – Mayor Bagwell entertained additional Board discussion. Supervisor Giomi was in favor of having the appellants present their issues at the Planning Commission meeting first. He also agreed with the noticing requirements outlined in Section 1 and believed that appellants should include property owners, residents, and business owners (in lieu of Section 2). Discussion ensued regarding the consideration of “personal property owners;” however, it was determined to be “too broad” of a term. Mayor Bagwell entertained additional discussion and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

**CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**

**Page 8**

**(11:08:43) – Supervisor Giomi moved to direct the District Attorney’s Office to return with another first reading of the proposed ordinance at the next meeting, after incorporating the changes as discussed on the record. The motion was seconded by Supervisor Schuette.**

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

(11:09:44) – Mayor Bagwell thanked Mr. Woodbury and the members of the public who participated in testimony or provided written public comments regarding agenda item 14.A. Supervisor White encourage the television viewers to also “chime in.” Mayor Bagwell recessed the meeting.

(11:20:05) – Mayor Bagwell reconvened the meeting. A quorum was still present.

**15. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT-PLANNING**

**15.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AUTHORIZATION FOR THE MAYOR TO SIGN A LETTER ACKNOWLEDGING AND SUPPORTING AN APPLICATION FROM NORTHERN NEVADA COMMUNITY HOUSING TO THE STATE OF NEVADA FOR THE USE OF HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP FUNDS AS PART OF THE FINANCING FOR THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST AND SOUTHEAST CORNERS OF THE INTERSECTION OF NORTH ROOP STREET AND NORTHRIDGE DRIVE (APNS 002-104-01 AND 002-101-77), AND FURTHER ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THE HOME FUNDS PARTICIPATION WILL TRIGGER A PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION.**

(11:20:07) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan introduced the subject property and provided background, noting that the Planning Commission had approved a Special Use Permit for a 126-unit, multi-family, affordable housing project on a 4.73-acre property at the intersection of Roop Street and Northridge Drive. She referenced a letter, incorporated into the record, requested by Northern Nevada Community Housing to be signed by the Mayor in support of the project.

(11:21:09) – Lisa Dayton, Affordable Housing Project Manager at Dayton and Associates, LLC, explained that as the Development Consultant for Northern Nevada Community Housing, she planned to pursue “a variety of affordable housing finance funds” many of which would require acknowledgment from cities that they are aware of the project, and in case of the HOME funds, the letter would serve as an acknowledgment that the property would qualify for a tax exemption. Mayor Bagwell entertained questions or a motion with a date correction.

**(11:22:28) – Supervisor Schuette moved to approve, and authorize the Mayor to sign, the letter with the corrected date. Supervisor Giomi seconded the motion.**

**CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**

**Page 9**

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

**16. HUMAN RESOURCES**

**16.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PROPOSED HEALTH, DENTAL AND LIFE INSURANCE CONTRACTS FOR CARSON CITY TO PROVIDE BENEFITS COVERAGE TO CITY EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES WITH THE FOLLOWING PROVIDERS: (1) HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS THROUGH ANTHEM AS A ONE-YEAR CONTRACT RENEWAL WITH A 10.23% RATE INCREASE FOR THE PPO PLAN AND A 9.10% RATE INCREASE FOR THE HIGH DEDUCTIBLE PLAN, WITH MONTHLY CONTRIBUTIONS TO HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS FOR EMPLOYEES IN THE AMOUNTS OF \$195.29 (EMPLOYEE ONLY), \$297.85 (EMPLOYEE PLUS SPOUSE), \$285.00 (EMPLOYEE PLUS CHILDREN) AND \$403.62 (EMPLOYEE PLUS FAMILY); (2) DENTAL INSURANCE BENEFITS THROUGH RENAISSANCE AS A TWO-YEAR CONTRACT WITH NO RATE INCREASE OVER THE RATES PRESENTLY CHARGED BY CIGNA AS THE CITY'S CURRENT PROVIDER; AND (3) LIFE INSURANCE BENEFITS THROUGH KANSAS CITY LIFE AS A TWO-YEAR CONTRACT RENEWAL WITH NO RATE INCREASE.**

(11:23:00) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Human Resources Director Melanie Bruketta introduced Kevin Monaghan of LP Insurance Services. Mr. Monaghan reviewed the medical, dental, and life insurance renewals, incorporated into the record. He recommended the following plans:

- Maintaining the health insurance benefits through Anthem as a one-year contract renewal with a 10.23% rate increase for the PPO plan and a 9.10% rate increase for the high deductible plan, with monthly contributions to health savings accounts for employees in the amounts of \$195.29 (employee only), \$297.85 (employee plus spouse), \$285.00 (employee plus children) and \$403.62 (employee plus family).
- Providing dental insurance benefits through Renaissance as a two-year contract with no rate increase over the rates presently charged by Cigna as the City's current provider.
- Continuing the life insurance benefits through Kansas City Life as a two-year contract renewal with no rate increase.

(11:25:07) – Supervisor Schuette received confirmation that the out-of-network dental services would be covered at 100 percent of the average customary rate. Mayor Bagwell entertained a motion.

**(11:26:03) – Supervisor Schuette moved to approve the benefits contracts as presented. Supervisor Jones seconded the motion.**

**CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**

**Page 10**

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

**17. FINANCE**

**17.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE ADOPTION OF A PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES OF \$399,864 IN TOTAL FUNDS FROM COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES GRANTS ("CSSG") AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE INITIATIVE TO NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ("FY") 2023.**

(11:26:25) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and entertained disclosures. Supervisor Giomi read into the record a prepared disclosure statement, advised of a disqualifying conflict of interest, and stated that he would not participate in discussion and action.

(11:27:39) – Grants Administrator Mirjana Gavric presented the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, which included the review criteria by the Application Review Workgroup, and provided its recommendation to the Board. Mayor Bagwell noted that she had requested this item be placed on a future Board Retreat agenda for discussion. She also clarified for Supervisor Jones that the unused funds would revert to the General Fund.

(11:31:43) – Supervisor Schuette moved to adopt Resolution No. 2022-R-13 as presented. Supervisor Jones seconded the motion.

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

**18. PARKS AND RECREATION**

**18.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PROPOSED UPDATES TO THE FUJI PARK MASTER PLAN.**

## CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

### Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting

#### Page 11

(11:32:17) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Parks Project Manager Nick Wentworth gave background and reviewed the proposed update to the Fuji Park Master Plan, including the artist’s renderings, all of which are incorporated into the record. Mr. Wentworth also responded to clarifying questions. Mayor Bagwell clarified that the previous Board of Supervisors had requested an updated Master Plan prior to allocating funds to Fuji Park renovations. Discussion ensued regarding the expansion of the fairgrounds area to ensure revenue generation. Mayor Bagwell entertained public comments.

(11:45:51) – Candy Roper introduced herself as the President and Show Chairman of the Bonanza Kennel Club, an organization that hosts dog shows at Fuji Park. Ms. Roper highlighted the revenue generated by dog shows, which according to the American Kennel Club (AKC) was \$685 per person in 2016. She noted that their shows attracted between 1,500 and 1,700 people per show, generating over \$1 million per show. Ms. Roper also stated that the Bonanza Kennel Club had donated funds towards the early sprinkler system, the planting and reseeding of the grass areas, purchasing garbage cans, and providing a drainage system. She noted that show attendees love Fuji Park; however, she explained that they would lose overnight parking of recreational vehicles (RVs) with the proposed Master Plan, adding that they had accommodated between 80 and 100 hundred RVs in the past. She explained that the open space areas and the dog park take “a considerable amount of space,” recommending moving the playground to allow for additional exhibiter and show space. Ms. Roper offered to work with Staff and regretted the loss of the gazebo and reiterated the issue of inadequate parking. She invited everyone to attend their shows to understand their concerns.

Ms. Roper also expressed concern that the entry gates to the park were located directly across from the restrooms, a heavy traffic area for show exhibitors and participating dogs. She believed it was common for those bringing their dogs to the dog park to let them exit the vehicles without a leash and was concerned that they would run towards “hundreds of dogs that are in the park during a dog show.” Ms. Roper also recommended a wind break on the west side of the pavilion for protection from the wind. Mr. Wentworth explained that Ms. Roper had provided input as a stakeholder and believed the show rings could fit in the park. He also believed that the RVs would fit in the parking lot and would have access to electricity and water. Mayor Bagwell clarified that the City does not allow overnight parking at City parks and that they are only permitted for special events for vendor use.

(11:57:55) – Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Department Director Jennifer Budge explained that the funds were not available to complete the entire plan at once and emphasized that they would not disrupt all the users. She acknowledged that the Board wished to prioritize the arena first. Mr. Wentworth noted that they planned to work with the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) to coordinate corridor improvement plans as they come up. Ms. Orloff praised the plan and recommended an observation bridge near Clear Creek in addition to an OHV area. She was also informed that the dog park would have grass. Mayor Bagwell entertained a motion.

**(12:03:35) – Supervisor Schuette moved to approve the updates to the Fuji Park Master Plan as discussed. Supervisor White seconded the motion.**

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

**CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**

**Page 12**

(12:04:01) – Mayor Bagwell thanked Ms. Roper for her input and expressed confidence that Staff would work with her to ensure the shows continue at Fuji Park.

**18.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING DIRECTION TO STAFF ON THE INITIATION OF DUE DILIGENCE AND THE COMMENCEMENT OR COMPLETION OF ANY OTHER PREPARATORY TASKS FOR THE ACQUISITION OF 81.55 ACRES OF PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY IN ASH CANYON, APN 007-091-28 (“PROPERTY”) FOR OPEN SPACE AND PASSIVE RECREATION PURPOSES, AND A PROPOSED RESOLUTION RELATED TO AN OFFER TO PURCHASE THE PROPERTY.**

(12:04:23) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Open Space Manager Lyndsey Boyer thanked members of the public for their support in the form of public comment. She also reviewed a presentation that introduced the subject property, identified by Staff as a high priority for the City's Open Space program for acquisition based on important natural resource values such as wildlife habitat, watershed protection, water quality protection, and trail connectivity. She noted that the 81.55-acre property, which was surrounded by City-owned and public lands, was currently owned by the Carson Lodge #1, and was listed on the open market for \$750,999. Ms. Boyer indicated that they had just been informed that the property was under contract with an expected escrow close at the end of June; however, the sellers were willing to entertain a backup offer from Carson City, not to exceed the appraised value for the Property, and if approved, funds for the fee title acquisition would come from the Quality of Life - Open Space budget. Ms. Boyer also responded to clarifying questions. She confirmed for Supervisor Giomi that the City was in “second position” at this time; however, she wished to be prepared because “anything can happen.” She explained that under the Conservation Reserve (CR) zoning, one dwelling is allowed for every 20 acres. Mayor Bagwell inquired about the cleanliness of the trails and was informed that trail management would be funded through the maintenance line item of the Open Space budget, adding that a volunteer coordinator would also be hired to work with partners. Ms. Boyer also clarified for Supervisor White that the Quality of Life – Open Space budget was charged \$10,750 annually to contract with the Nevada Division of Forestry for wildfire prevention and fuel reduction of Open Space properties. Mayor Bagwell entertained public comments and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

**(12:15:15) – Supervisor Giomi moved to adopt Resolution No. 2022-R-14. Supervisor White seconded the motion.**

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



# **CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

## **Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**

### **Page 13**

(12:15:32) – Mayor Bagwell clarified for the record that since the property was under contract, additional funds would not be spent on appraisals unless “the deal falls out.”

#### **19. 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**

(12:16:02) – Mayor Bagwell entertained Board reports. Ms. Paulson announced that the next Board meeting will be held on May 19, 2022 and a public hearing to finalize the FY 2023 budget will be agendized for that date, adding that no special meeting would be required this year.

(12:16:35) – Supervisor White announced that the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) Public Lands and Natural Resources Subcommittee was informed that 13 Nevada counties had been declared as federal disaster areas due to the drought which had excluded Carson City. However, because Carson City was contiguous to the other counties, it would be eligible for disaster funds for farmers and ranchers. Supervisor White also noted that Endangered Species Act Protection would be sought for the Pinion Jay and the Nevada Railroad Valley Toad.

(12:19:07) – Supervisor Schuette praised Public Works staff members Randy Rice and Darren Anderson for conducting the William Street Project public hearing. She believed the turnout was “really good” and she was pleased to see the interaction with the community. Supervisor Schuette encouraged everyone to visit the project website at: <http://carsonproud.com/east-william-complete-streets-project/>.

#### **CLOSED NON-MEETING TO CONFER WITH MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES AND COUNSEL**

Mayor Bagwell announced that this item would be discussed after adjournment.

#### **20. PUBLIC COMMENT**

(12:20:23) – Mayor Bagwell entertained final public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

#### **21. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO ADJOURN AS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

(12:20:40) – Mayor Bagwell adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

**CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Meeting**  
**Page 14**

The Minutes of the May 5, 2022 Carson City Board of Supervisors meeting are so approved on this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2022.

  
LORI BAGWELL, Mayor

ATTEST:

  
AUBREY ROWLATT, Clerk-Recorder

Attachments: written public comments

**LATE MATERIAL**

Item#: Public Comment - mostly in relation to 14 & 18b

Meeting Date: 05/05/2022

**From:** [Elizabeth Haase](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Acquire Ash Canyon  
**Date:** Friday, April 29, 2022 2:54:36 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I strongly support acquiring the Ash Canyon acreage. Too much open land in Carson is already under development, changing the rural beauty, overloading the water table, and other negative impacts. Acquiring this property will ensure the hills surrounding Carson remain able to provide water, accessible to all residents, and preserve the vistas that make this such a very special place to live.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Haase, MD

**From:** [Adam Woodrum](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** May 5, 2022 meeting  
**Date:** Friday, April 29, 2022 3:20:25 PM

---

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

I want to offer my support for acquisition of the Ash Canyon property.  
(Item 18.B)

Thanks,

Adam Woodrum

**From:** [jsgallegos@charter.net](mailto:jsgallegos@charter.net)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Municipal Ordinance Change  
**Date:** Monday, May 2, 2022 7:30:15 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 Board and DA

Please do not change the municipal ordinance to limit the power of all citizens to fully voice their opposition to decisions made by the planning commission and other commissions beyond the three-minute public comment period. Citizen groups and citizens of the community that are affected by these decisions should have the ability to appeal decisions as long as there is merit and reasonable community support for the appeal. This check and balance mechanism is a critical part of the public hearing process for a community like Carson City and it is vitally important to me and my family. We expect to have our voice heard in more than one way as a part of this community – to maintain the quality of life we expect our leaders to not only uphold but improve.

**Jim Gallegos**  
**1000 Kingsley Lane**  
**Carson City, NV 89701**

**From:** [Laura Lawrence](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** RE: District Attorney's proposed municipal ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, May 2, 2022 9:05:54 AM

---

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

---

I oppose the District Attorney's proposed municipal ordinance to limit a citizen's right to appeal decisions made by the Planning Director, the Planning Commission, the Historical Commission, or the Growth Management Commission to our Board of Supervisors. The DA's proposal is not in the best interest of any voter, citizen or resident of our community. It is through appeals made by local citizens that these elected and/or appointed officials hear the voters and citizens that make up our community. Appeals are a system of checks and balances for these officials that allow another "perspective" to an issue that may have been overlooked due to ignorance, political bullying, or misinformation.

Laura Lawrence  
1163 W. Fifth Street  
Carson City

**From:** [Villa Sierra MHP](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda item 14A  
**Date:** Monday, May 2, 2022 9:31:28 AM

---

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

---

Hello, I would like my comment to go on record opposing any change that will limit grievances by the public to only property owners. The proposed changes to CCMC 18.02.060 limits the ability of voters and residents of Carson City to redress their grievances. By narrowing the definition of "aggravated party" to only people with "real property" rights you are preventing a large number of the population more directly affected by questionable decisions made by the planning board. This is a violation of our rights as a community to voice our concerns I ask that you please vote no to these changes.

Thank you,

Charlotte Stewart  
4999 US HWY 50 E #1  
Carson City NV 89701  
(775) 431-2148

**From:** [Robert Buttner](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** The proposed "Standing" ordinance.  
**Date:** Monday, May 2, 2022 10:43:19 AM

---

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

---

Please vote **No** on this suppression of our communities right to have a voice in the type of community we want to live in.

The District Attorney proposal will effectively limit our right: to redress by placing limits on our free speech, and this will give even more power to our city government to squash any opposition. This comes on the heels of the Planning Commission decision to approve a slaughter house on highway 50 despite overwhelming public opposition. Three courageous citizens filed appeals to the Board of Supervisors. At the meeting, the former President of the Planning Commission argued that the Board of Supervisors should reject the community opposition and support the Planning Commission's decision. Really: our planning commissioner essentially stated "Listen to us, not the community."

Every citizen should have the right to appeal a decision by an appointed board (an **ADVISORY** board) if they feel their issue has sufficient merit. We do not live in a Kingdom of Oligarchs and the very 1st responsibility of our elected officials should be to listen to the Majority of the citizens they represent.

Respectfully submitted

Robert R. Buttner  
4966 August Dr.  
Carson City, Nv.  
Native Nevada &  
Resident since 1960



**From:** [Russ Wilson](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Carson City Proposed Slaughterhouse Opposition - DA Proposal to Limit Responses  
**Date:** Monday, May 2, 2022 11:10:05 AM

---

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

---

To Whom It May Concern,

I am greatly concerned about the District Attorney proposal to include an amendment to CCMC that will limit the public's voice when addressing and appealing Planning Commission decisions.

Any attempt to stifle the citizens of Carson City in their rights to address issues within the city must be stopped. By limiting those only that those with "standing" as defined by the city's DA's office, "possess a real or personal property right that has been adversely affected by the decision..." First, the definition is vague of "standing". Who decides who is the possess a real or personal property right that has been adversely affected by the decision? Not every decision made by the city only affect those directly adjacent, but those decisions can have a cascading effect to all Carson City residents.

I do not support any attempt to limit the citizens of Carson City to have a voice and appeal decisions. This is a legal slippery slope, ill-defined and an ill-advised attempt to stifle public input and interest. This is exactly the kind of thing that makes citizens distrust government and push citizens to question, "why be involved if my voice will never be heard"? This is especially egregious because it involves a singular controversial topic (the building of a slaughterhouse on Hwy 50) that Mayor Bagwell has been quite vocal in supporting.

This proposal has the look and feel of a direct attempt for elected officials to get their way, not matter the citizen input. The citizens clearly did the right thing, in the right way and won – and now that victory is attempting to be taken away from them by changing the rules after the fact. As elected government employees there is a duty to remember that they are servants to their citizens and they are demanding that the slaughterhouse not be located on the proposed Hwy 50 site. This is more than just a slaughterhouse – this move by the DA is about the fundamental right of citizens to have their voices heard and actions taken to keep overreaching government entities in check.

Thank you,

Russ Wilson  
2074 Divot Road  
Carson City  
505-239-2622 (cell)

**From:** [Barney Rabold](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Public input  
**Date:** Monday, May 2, 2022 11:39:17 AM

---

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

---

On Thursday the board of supervisors will consider a municipal ordinance that will drastically change the ability of citizens to voice their opposition to decisions made by the planning commission.

I find this ordinance to be improper and I object to limiting our community to participate in the decision process for planning our community. All citizens should have the opportunity and right to be heard at public meetings for our community.

I strongly object to this ordinance and urge the board of supervisors to reject this ordinance.

Barney Rabold  
778 Buzzys Ranch Rd  
Carson City

[publiccomment@carson.org](mailto:publiccomment@carson.org)  
<mailto:publiccomment@carson.org>

**From:** [Charles Macquarie](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Cc:** [Anne Macquarie](#); [Peter Doenges](#)  
**Subject:** May 5, 2022 BOS Agenda Item 18.B: Possible acquisition of 81.55 acres of privately owned property in Ash Canyon, APN 007-091-28.  
**Date:** Monday, May 2, 2022 2:23:27 PM

---

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

---

Dear Supervisors,

We strongly support acquisition of this parcel for open space and passive recreation. This parcel is key to the completion and connectivity of the Ash Canyon trail system. This trail system is very popular with walkers and bike riders and sees extensive use on a daily basis year-round. The City's agreement with Muscle Powered for trail maintenance will ensure that the trails are well maintained without costing the City additional time and money in trail maintenance. And the sheep will keep the cheat grass under control :).

Regards,

Chas and Anne Macquarie  
Carson City

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

**From:** [Sue Robertson](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** keep Ash Canyon our Recreational activities Paradise  
**Date:** Monday, May 2, 2022 3:03:55 PM

---

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

---

Vote to purchase on May 5, as this area is vital to people in Carson City seeking an outdoor lifestyle. So many folks use this area every day to recreate on trails and wild animals need this habitat to forage and survive. Don't let development be the the only use for our precious lands..vote yes!

**From:** [Paul Esswein](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Masonic Lodge property acquisition  
**Date:** Monday, May 2, 2022 3:40:23 PM

---

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

---

I strongly support Carson City's acquisition of this property for inclusion in the city's Open Space Program. Development of this parcel would be detrimental to the recreational opportunities, wildlife habitat, and the city services necessary should this land be developed.

Please preserve this valuable Open Space resource.

Paul Esswein

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

**From:** [Peter Smith](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** BOS 5/5 - Open Space  
**Date:** Monday, May 2, 2022 4:25:17 PM

---

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

---

I support to purchase of the Masonic Lodge property in Ash Canyon, for all the normal reasons which you all will hear about from others.

Thanks,  
P.

+++++

Peter J. Smith, Esq.  
775-882-9441

*NOTICE:* This communication is confidential. If you receive this communication in error please reply so we will know and please delete your copy. Also, afaik there is no real guarantee of confidentiality for emails. Gmail, Yahoo and AOL are all reported to search and share your content, there are probably others.

**From:** [Jennifer Verive](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [Stacey Giomi](#)  
**Cc:** [Bob Buttner](#); [Kathleen Franco Simmons](#); [Doreen Mack](#)  
**Subject:** Public comment for 5/5/22 BOS meeting re Item 14A on proposed ordinance by DA  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 8:25:20 AM

---

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

---

Dear Supervisor Giomi:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed ordinance, submitted by our Carson City District Attorney, to "establish various provisions governing administrative appeals related to land use and zoning" (Agenda Item 14A).

This unneeded ordinance appears to curtail the ability of the residents of our small community to participate in the design, development, and growth of the place we all call Home. Contrary to the arguable contentions made to bolster the proposed ordinance, current best practices for community development are to have a process that is a collaboration between elected and appointed officials, city staff, and the public. We need to make decisions together. The Supreme Court of the State of Nevada has made it clear that the public's voice is a necessary and relevant one that must be heard in all community decisions.

Thus, I am shocked and saddened that our District Attorney has proposed an ordinance that makes it more difficult for the public to participate in the decision-making process. This is especially surprising given the extremely broad latitude that the Board of Supervisors has in the appeals process. While working through the recent appeal that I made to the BOS (regarding a proposed slaughterhouse), I learned that the BOS may determine the timing of appeals, the content of the appeals, the format of the appeals, the way appeals are organized, and pretty much everything else related to the appeals process. I was appreciative of the generosity the BOS showed me and my co-appellant, Bob Buttner, in this process and felt it was a fair and accurate hearing of our "side" of the matter at hand.

Given the extraordinary flexibility and control over the appeals process, there is simply no need to limit or curtail the ability of the residents of our small community to appeal decisions made by our boards and committees. In my view, the proposed ordinance is unnecessary and harmful to our community. It does not reflect the values of fair play and a willingness to listen to one another that are fundamental to how we do business.

If our DA wishes to clarify the definition of an aggrieved party, then there are ways to do so that are better aligned with our community values and best practices. Clarification does not require changing the definition. Instead, providing step-by-step clarity to the appeals process to make it more accessible and inclusive would be surely more effective in creating a "transparent" process that increases trust in our city government.

I urge you to not accept/approve this ordinance. Thank you for your consideration and for all that you do for our community.

Most Sincerely,

Dr. Jennifer Verive



**From:** [Wilson, Kendra L](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Aggrieved Party  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 9:22:41 AM

---

Hi there,

I'd like to document my dissatisfaction with the proposed changes to who can be considered an "aggrieved party" set for discussion on May 5<sup>th</sup>. As representatives, I hope all of our Board believes in a robust democracy. Government works best when many people can participate, in my opinion. This proposal takes power and voice AWAY from the people and I hope you will all reject it.

Thank you,

**[Kendra L Wilson, ChFC®](#)**  
**Financial Advisor**  
☎: 775-392-4477  
FAX: 855-790-1399  
[Kendra.Wilson@EdwardJones.com](mailto:Kendra.Wilson@EdwardJones.com)  
**EdwardJones**  
MAKING SENSE OF INVESTING

---

Kendra Wilson  
Financial Advisor  
Edward Jones  
937 Mica Dr Suite 16 A  
Carson City, NV 89705-7267  
(775) 392-4477  
[www.edwardjones.com](http://www.edwardjones.com)

If you are not the intended recipient of this message (including attachments) or if you have received this message in error, immediately notify us and delete it and any attachments.

If you do not wish to receive any email messages from Edward Jones, excluding administrative communications, please email this request to [Opt-Out@edwardjones.com](mailto:Opt-Out@edwardjones.com) from the email address you wish to unsubscribe.

For important additional information related to this email, visit [www.edwardjones.com/disclosures/email.html](http://www.edwardjones.com/disclosures/email.html). Edward D. Jones & Co., L.P. d/b/a Edward Jones, 12555 Manchester Road, St. Louis, MO 63131 © Edward Jones. All rights reserved.

**From:** [lisa harris](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Anderson Ranch Non Compliance Dust Control  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 11:14:16 AM  
**Attachments:** [IMG\\_2088.MOV](#)

---

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

---

---

I submit the following for public comment for the Board of Supervisors Meeting on 5/4/22  
Can the City help enforce the contractor's permit with regard to dust control and wind erosion? The contractor is non compliant with EPA requirements. I am tired of dealing with excess dust in my house, cars and nose. Yesterday was exceptionally bad due to the high winds. See the attached video. You can hear my truck being pelted with dust from the project site. Dust blew in my house through closed windows and my backyard looked like a scene from the Wizard of Oz. There is dust inside all of my cars. Who is going to clean this mess up and pay for new paint jobs? Their lack of dust control is causing physical damage to vehicles and property of Carson City residents. This was not an issue prior to construction and ground disturbance. I called the number posted on the sign yesterday and was told by the contractor they had water trucks on site. That was a lie. I didn't see any. I went back to the site about an hour later and saw 1 water truck. That's like trying to put out a structure fire with a spray bottle. This is not sufficient for the magnitude of the site or prevailing weather conditions. The contractor is responsible for the soil disturbance on their site. They needed a dust palliative for areas where they are not currently grading and several water trucks on site at all times. Please fine them and shut the job down until they can comply with the law. Obviously, they don't bother to check weather reports and the wind should not have been a surprise. I have already called and filed a complaint with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection but would appreciate some backup.  
Carson City Resident

**From:** [Francis Flaherty](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 18(B) - May 5, 2022 BOS Meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 1:40:23 PM

---

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

---

---

Honorable Members of the Board,

Regarding Agenda Item 18(B), I write in support of acquisition of 81.55 acres of privately owned property in Ash Canyon, APN 007-091-28 ("Property") for open space and passive recreation purposes, and a proposed resolution related to an offer to purchase the Property. The Property is a high priority for Carson City's Open Space program based on important natural resource values such as wildlife habitat, watershed protection, water quality protection and trail connectivity. I often use the property while hiking and/or riding my mountain bike.

The trails around town are one of the things that makes Carson City a great place to live!

Thank you for your attention and careful consideration.

Frank Flaherty  
2528 Simons Court  
Carson City, NV 89703

**From:** [Kathryn Smith](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Anderson Ranch  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 3:05:00 PM

---

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

---

Our house backs up to the Anderson Ranch project. The dust on windy days is unbelievable. We understand that development is inevitable on private land such as this but we feel our elected officials have gone about this all wrong. The people who live around the perimeter of this former meadow are left to deal with the city's greed by allowing this developer to move forward and not demanding certain criteria be met. We are inundated with dirt, noise, and workers looking in our backyards on a daily basis. Shouldn't there have been some sort of wall like those surrounding all the other newer developments in this town? It would not solve all the issues but it would have helped. Why are we left to solve these problems on our own when the developer stands to make millions of dollars at our expense?

Kathryn and Gary Smith

**From:** [K Franco Simmons](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [CCEO](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Board of Supervisors meeting 5-5-2022, Item 14A  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 5:35:38 PM

---

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

---

---

May 3, 2022 – For the Board of Supervisors Agenda of May 5, 2022

Subject: Item 14A – First Reading of proposed ordinance establishing various provisions governing administrative appeals related to land use and zoning

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

**I am writing to OPPOSE the draft ordinance establishing various provisions governing administrative appeal related to land use and zoning.**

Currently, the Municipal Code allows any decision to be appealed to the board by the applicant, "any aggrieved party", or any member of the board. The new ordinance would require that a person may only be considered to be an "aggrieved party" as follows:

12. For purposes of this section, a person is deemed to be aggrieved by a decision if the person:

- (a) Submitted an application for a property pursuant to the provisions of this title which was denied by the decision; or
- (b) Appeared, in person, through an authorized representative or in writing, before the person or entity from whom the decision which is the basis of the appeal was issued and who satisfies one of the following conditions:
  - (1) Received, or should have received, a notice of public hearing required by CCMC 18.02.045; or
  - (2) Possesses a real or personal property right that has been adversely affected by the decision which is the basis of the appeal in a manner substantially different from any right of the general public.

**This change to the Carson City Municipal Code will have an impact on all Carson City residents who expect to have a say in what is and is not allowed with land use in our city. It will prevent most, if not all concerned residents from appealing bad decisions of the Planning Commission and other commissions. It will effectively remove an inherent right from most citizens and residents.**

Several examples in which this new ordinance will disenfranchise residents include:

- A person with severe asthma who lives 10 feet beyond the public noticing zone for a special use permit where the applicants are proposing to use noxious aerosols for example, would not be deemed "an aggrieved party" with standing to file an appeal.
- A group of residents who want to appeal a special use permit to mine lithium in an environmentally sensitive area would not be deemed "an aggrieved party" with standing to file an appeal.
- A family who are trying to protect the integrity of a local cemetery from encroachment by conflicting uses such as cell towers or noisy industrial uses would not be deemed "an aggrieved

party" with standing to file an appeal.

- A neighborhood group who do not like the impact to their property values and quality of life that a new high-density apartment complex nearby but outside of the public noticing requirement will not be deemed "an aggrieved party" with standing to file an appeal.

I am sure you can think of other examples that you have personally observed in your time on the Board.

The staff report claims that *"this proposed ordinance resets - for the benefit of the public and without altering the original intent of CCMC..."* and that *"this proposed ordinance incorporates the following substantive changes which are intended to foster the public trust by increasing governmental transparency..."* No description in layman's terms as to how this ordinance meets those statements was provided in the staff report. **In removing an inherent right of the public to engage and participate in local government decision-making, this ordinance does NOT benefit the public, it DOES alter the original intent of a clear reading of the CCMC, and it DOES NOT foster the public trust by increasing governmental transparency.**

This proposed ordinance includes other additions to the CCMC to purportedly clarify and *"provide procedural exactness."* In providing for "procedural exactness" the text of the ordinance makes substantive changes that disenfranchise the public. It appears to have the intent of making the jobs of staff, the District Attorney, and the Board easier by restricting the public's rights to appeal bad decisions of our commissions. It does not have the interests of the public at heart, which should be first and foremost.

**Please vote to OPPOSE this proposed draft ordinance and do not advance it to a second reading.**

Respectfully,

Kathleen Franco Simmons  
2108 Utah Street  
Carson City, NV 89701

**From:** [Kat M](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Against  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 6:48:30 PM

---

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

---

Dear Supervisor Giomi:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed ordinance, submitted by our Carson City District Attorney, to "establish various provisions governing administrative appeals related to land use and zoning" (Agenda Item 14A). This is a disgrace to the citizens and community of Carson City!!!

This unneeded ordinance appears to curtail the ability of the residents of our small community to participate in the design, development, and growth of the place we all call Home. Contrary to the arguable contentions made to bolster the proposed ordinance, current best practices for community development are to have a process that is a collaboration between elected and appointed officials, city staff, and the public. We need to make decisions together. The Supreme Court of the State of Nevada has made it clear that the public's voice is a necessary and relevant one that must be heard in all community decisions.

Thus, I am shocked and saddened that our District Attorney has proposed an ordinance that makes it more difficult for the public to participate in the decision-making process. This is especially surprising given the extremely broad latitude that the Board of Supervisors has in the appeals process. While working through the recent appeal that I made to the BOS (regarding a proposed slaughterhouse), I learned that the BOS may determine the timing of appeals, the content of the appeals, the format of the appeals, the way appeals are organized, and pretty much everything else related to the appeals process. I was appreciative of the generosity the BOS showed me and my co-appellant, Bob Buttner, in this process and felt it was a fair and accurate hearing of our "side" of the matter at hand.

Given the extraordinary flexibility and control over the appeals process, there is simply no need to limit or curtail the ability of the residents of our small community to appeal decisions made by our boards and committees. In my view, the proposed ordinance is unnecessary and harmful to our community. It does not reflect the values of fair play and a willingness to listen to one another that are fundamental to how we do business.

If our DA wishes to clarify the definition of an aggrieved party, then there are ways to do so that are better aligned with our community values and best practices. Clarification does not require changing the definition. Instead, providing step-by-step clarity to the appeals process to make it more accessible and inclusive would be surely more effective in creating a "transparent" process that increases trust in our city government.

I urge you to not accept/approve this ordinance. Thank you for your consideration and for all that you do for our community.

Thank you!!

Sincerely,

Kathleen McFarlin and Barbara Barton

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)



**From:** [Merlyn Paine](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [CCEO](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 14A  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 9:51:49 PM

---

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

---

Board of Supervisors:

I adamantly support those comments written to you by Kathleen Simmons and Jennifer Cerive.

I also wish to add that my impression of this new ordinance proposal is that it is extremely similar to the efforts nationwide that are carefully and deliberately constructed to "disenfranchise" many of the legal voters of this country and the various states. You too, as representatives of the residents of Carson City, voted in to represent and work for the benefit of our City population as a whole, are apparently doing the same thing. It is a contradiction that you are considering eliminating many of your constituency from voicing their opinion on proposed City actions. It appears that you are responding to political pressure from economic entities which have proposed at least one controversial and inappropriate facility within the City limits.

Rather than pass a new ordinance further restricting the public input, it would make more sense and earn you more admiration, if you corrected the original ordinance to be less restrictive and thus avoid this type of controversy and political pressure. You might be aware that the national laws endorse public input as part of our right as citizens. For example, the National Environmental Policy Act requires extensive public input and official response to those comments. Any facility with even one cent of federal money must follow the NEPA requirements including wide public input requirements. Rather than restricting public input, NEPA and the Federal policy institutes a very specific and wide range of public input. The Code of Federal Regulations is very clear as to the intent of developing facilities not only require but encourage public input. It is a guide to operating an enlightened government.

This proposed ordinance does the complete opposite.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,  
Merlyn Paine

**From:** [Brett Long](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** B.O.S. agenda item #18.B and the acquisition of APN 007-091-28  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 10:03:21 PM  
**Attachments:** [image.png](#)

---

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

---

Dear Supervisors,

Regarding the May 5<sup>th</sup> B.O.S. agenda item #18.B and the acquisition of the 80.55 acre property APN 007-091-28 in Ash Canyon; I'm writing you in support of the purchase of the property.

Thank You to the Freemasons who have granted access to the trails on this land over the years for the use of the citizens. This section of property is a critical component necessary for the sustainability of the habitat of Ash Canyon. Additionally, this property is essential for the connectivity of the trails developed over the years which contribute to the health and wellbeing of the citizens of Carson City.

Carson City has realized the benefits of the investment into the Ash to Kings trail and the acquisition of the Ham property. With the Freemason property now available, it's crucial Carson City secures this land for preservation, connectivity, and the benefit of the citizens.

I appreciate your consideration and urge you to approve the purchase of APN 007-091-28.

Sincerely,



Brett Long

**From:** [marcia.cuccaro@yahoo.com](mailto:marcia.cuccaro@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [Public Comment; CCEO](#)  
**Subject:** Subject: Item14A  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 10:45:14 PM

---

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

---

I would like to voice my opinion in totally supporting the public comments made by Kathleen Franco Simmons. If I could have written an opinion as eloquently as Ms. Simmons did, I would have submitted an original opinion, but she said it all!

Please vote to OPPOSE this proposed draft ordinance and DO NOT advance it to a second reading.

Sincerely  
Marcia Bernard Cuccaro

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

**From:** [Rene Don PIZZO](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [CCEO](#)  
**Subject:** May 5, 2022, reading of ordinance regarding aggrieved parties -- 14.A in the agenda  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 11:20:30 PM

---

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

---

Board of Supervisors:

Please OPPOSE the proposed ordinance changes regarding what an aggrieved party is and how they can appeal put forth in DA Jason Woodbury's memo. His changes remove some of the fairness in allowing ordinary people to appeal a decision. His changes place a burden on people who are not lawyers to try and understand the legalese for what is required to make an appeal as well as their ability to be considered an aggrieved party. There is already a large financial burden as well as a time constraint for people to appeal, and he proposes to make it even more difficult.

These types of ordinance changes should be collaborative. Look for ordinary citizens to be on a committee with Mr. Woodbury or his designee, write something in plain English, keep it short, and make the process to appeal easier and more fair rather than more difficult for the citizens of Carson City.

Thank you.

Rene Pizzo  
c/o The Howards  
4990 August Drive  
Carson City, NV 89706

(I sent this same email via the Contact Us webpage, too, but wanted to ensure you received my request for opposing this change.)

**From:** [Carson City](#)  
**To:** [CCEO](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed changes to CCMC Title 18  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 5:29:48 AM

---

Message submitted from the <Carson City> website.

**Site Visitor Name:** Donna Gray  
**Site Visitor Email:** donnamgray@aol.com

I am opposed to the proposed changes. Instead of "fostering public trust" as a stated objective, many of the changes restrict public involvement in issues that potentially effect the public and thereby decrease public trust in their city representatives. Please vote against these changes.  
Thank you.

**From:** [Laura Richards](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Support for Ash Canyon acquisition  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 8:35:27 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support the Ash Canyon acquisition, a valuable addition for the residents of Carson City for open space and recreation.

Thank you,

Laura Richards

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [barbara asp](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** COMPLETELY opposed to proposed ordinance by Jason Woodbury  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 8:52:34 AM

---

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

---

I am completely opposed to the proposed ordinance submitted by our Carson City District Attorney, to "establish various provisions governing administrative appeals related to land use and zoning" (Agenda Item 14A).

All this ordinance will do is take away more of the voice of we the people and keep it with the elected officials. Shame on Jason Woodbury for proposing this ordinance. I hope a slaughterhouse isn't ever proposed 900 feet away from your house!

Because so many people are affected by operations like the slaughterhouse that was proposed, MANY people want to share their opposition to it, whether it personally affects their property value, health or well-being etc. or not. This proposed ordinance won't allow as many people to voice their opinions. And as Charles Borders pleaded with the Board of Supervisors to "give us the confidence that we would do 'the right thing.' Stick with us. I think that the community will learn to TOLERATE it." No, Mr. Borders, and any other elected official who is trying to support taking away the voice of we the people, we will NOT learn to TOLERATE it, and we have the right to fight decisions / proposals /etc. that we don't support that our elected officials want to force on our community.

The DA's proposal IS NOT in the best interests of any voter, citizen or resident of our community. It will actually take away our voice!!

Please vote to OPPOSE this ordinance and do not advance it to a second reading!

Sincerely, Barb Mathers, mother of 2 homeschooled children

5/4/2022

Carson City Board of Supervisors

Subject: Board of Supervisors Meeting 5/5/2022; Agenda Item 14 - Ordinance  
Pertaining to Appeals; Definition of an "Aggrieved Person"

I request that you reject the proposed ordinance offered by the District Attorney which seeks to define an "Aggrieved Person" by limiting the scope to those who are an applicant or were required to be noticed, or "Possesses a real or personal property right adversely affected by the decision..."<sup>1</sup> made by "the Director of the Community Development Department, Hearing examiner, Historic Resources Commission, Growth Management Commission, and the Planning Commission."<sup>2</sup>

Carson City residents are the stakeholders in every issue brought before the associated entities cited above. But, these entities are not chosen by the citizens, they are appointed (or hired) to them. But all of them, and specifically the Director of the Community Development Department, are public servants. This proposed ordinance removes accountability to the very people these entities are supposed to serve. Moreover, it prevents the community at large from seeking redress before it's elected representatives.

Every member of our community has a right to be and "aggrieved person" to every decision made on their behalf by the above entities. We are the taxpayers who fund these issues, we are the community in which they are located, and we are the voters that charge you, our Mayor and Board of Supervisors, with the responsibility of protecting our interests.

Contrary to the statement of the DA, this ordinance does not benefit the public; it does benefit the bureaucracy that is our city government by denying the community the right to speak on an issue before its elected representatives. Why would you deny this right to your constituents?

This city has benefited greatly from the influence of concerned citizens and community advocates. Without them, projects like the corridor improvements, downtown, and many others would not be what they are today. Yet, this proposed ordinance would eliminate the ability of these very people to bring matters to your attention. Instead, it would allow the Community Development Department and the various commissions to operate with impunity and without real accountability.

Additionally, this ordinance gives too much authority to the Director of Community Management who expended substantial effort to limit community dissent against the slaughterhouse project and squash the appeals. Giving authority to the Director to consolidate appeals, especially when they have unique arguments, effectively denies an appellant their individual due process.



I suspect this ordinance revision is in response to the slaughterhouse issue. As our elected representatives, you should take note that the arguments made before you on this issue by the community were a reflection that the community was not treated with respect. Apparently the Community Development Department would like to avoid the work of dealing with the community over controversial issues. (The very purpose this department exists.) But it is a false premise to believe that the community would benefit if they were unable to be involved as an "aggrieved person."

There may be some value to defining an "aggrieved person" as a resident of Carson City or giving more weight to public opinion when deciding controversial issues but preventing any member of our community from seeking redress before the Board of Supervisors is immoral and unethical.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris Carver". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Chris" and last name "Carver" clearly distinguishable.

Chris Carver

---

<sup>1</sup> 05-05-22 AGENDA WITH SUPPORTING MATERIALS, ITEM 14

<sup>2</sup> 05-05-22 AGENDA WITH SUPPORTING MATERIALS, ITEM 14

**From:** [David Francel](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** The Masonic Lodge property  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 9:55:03 AM

---

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

---

I'm asking the Carson City board of Supervisors consider approving the agenda item regarding the Masonic Lodge property on Thursday May 5, 2022. CCPROS is seeking approval from the BOS to obtain a property appraisal and submit a bid based on the appraised amount. This is item 18b on the agenda.

The Masonic Lodge #1 is selling their 82-acre parcel of land in Ash Canyon. This property is an instrumental acquisition piece for Muscle Powered and Carson City Parks, Recreation and Open Space (CCPROS) to continue our trail connectivity efforts in Ash Canyon. Several well loved trails such as the Creek trail, Kay's trail and the Baldy Green trail all exist nearby and the Eagle Valley Open Space is adjacent to the property.

In addition to the trail connectivity importance, the property has notable natural resource attributes, such as wildlife habitat, watershed protection and water quality protection.

I hike and mountain bike the locate Ash Canyon area, volunteer with Mountain Power to help build and maintain trails, and live were my house views this lovely area.

Thank you for your consideration  
David W Francel  
2183 Cnterbury Lane  
Carson City, NV 89703  
(775) 220-6057

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

**From:** [Philip Gardner](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Carson City Open Space - Ash Canyon  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 10:14:05 AM

---

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

---

---

To whom it may concern-

I am writing in support of the Carson City Open Space program being given the opportunity of purchasing the 82-acre privately owned property that just went for sale in Ash Canyon to preserve it as open space. The existing open space and trail development that has occurred in this area are one of the things that make Carson City such a desirable place to live. As I understand it, this property remaining as open space is critical to the trail development master plan.

Sincerely,  
Philip Gardner

**From:** [marcia.cuccaro@yahoo.com](mailto:marcia.cuccaro@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Subject: Item14A  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 10:26:37 AM

---

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

---

I would like to voice my opinion in totally supporting the public comments made by Kathleen Franco Simmons. If I could have written an opinion as eloquently as Ms. Simmons did, I would have submitted an original opinion, but she said it all!

Please vote to OPPOSE this proposed draft ordinance and DO NOT advance it to a second reading.

Sincerely  
Marcia Bernard Cuccaro

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

**From:** [Anita Whitmore](#)  
**To:** [Stacey Giomi](#)  
**Cc:** [Public Comment](#); [CCEO](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 14A  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 10:43:18 AM

---

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

---

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed ordinance, submitted by our Carson City District Attorney, to "establish various provisions governing administrative appeals related to land use and zoning" (Agenda Item 14A).

This unneeded ordinance appears to curtail the ability of the residents of our small community to participate in the design, development, and growth of the place we all call Home. We need to make decisions together. The Supreme Court of the State of Nevada has made it clear that the public's voice is a necessary and relevant one that must be heard in all community decisions.

Given the extraordinary flexibility and control over the appeals process, there is simply no need to limit or curtail the ability of the residents of our small community to appeal decisions made by our boards and committees.

I urge you to not accept/approve this ordinance. Thank you for your consideration and for all that you do for our community.

Sincerely,

Anita Whitmore

**From:** [David Peterson](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Support for Agenda Item 18.B on the May 5, 2022 BOS Agenda  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 10:55:32 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Good Morning Madam Mayor and Fellow Board of Supervisor Members,

For the record, David Peterson, Executive Director, Visit Carson City. My public comments are in support of agenda item 18.B regarding the direction to staff on the initiation of due diligence and the commencement or completion of any other preparatory tasks for the acquisition of 81.55 acres of privately owned property in Ash Canyon, APN 007-091-28 ("Property") for open space and passive recreation purposes, and a proposed resolution related to an offer to purchase the Property.

I would start by saying this is a wonderful opportunity that has presented itself for the board's consideration. One that doesn't come along very often. I will keep my comments related to the incredible impact that this potential land purchase will have from a tourism standpoint, although such a purchase certainly has a direct impact on the quality of life and arguably, maybe more importantly, the quality of place for the residents of Carson City as well.

As you all know, recreational tourism is a significant component of the overall tourism industry. To put this in perspective for Carson City, the total visitor spending for calendar year 2019, the last pre-pandemic data available, was \$206.4M. Recreation, on a category level, represented \$42.1M or 20.4% of the total visitor spending. On a statewide basis, recreation represented around 13% of total spending in 2019. What does this mean for Carson City from a tourism perspective, you may ask? It means that people who visit Carson City are engaging with our outdoor recreation attractions, facilities, trails, open space, you name it, they are taking advantage of it.

Adding this additional open space will only help to add new open space, trails and wildlife areas for not only our visitors but also the Carson City community! And in the process, checking off three of Visit Carson City's brand pillars: Room to Discover and Wander, Family Friendly and An Inclusive Community.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this agenda item as you all are looking to the future of Carson City!



**DAVID PETERSON, CPM**  
**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

(o) 775-283-7681

[dpeterson@visitcarsoncity.com](mailto:dpeterson@visitcarsoncity.com) | [visitcarsoncity.com](http://visitcarsoncity.com)

716 North Carson Street, Carson City, NV 89701

*"This message, together with any attachment, is intended only for the addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient or an authorized representative of the intended recipient, I did not intend to waive and do not waive any privilege or the confidentiality of the message and any attachment. If you receive this communication in error, please notify me immediately by email and delete the message and any attachment from your computer and network. Thank you."*



**From:** [Larry Marinel](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Acquisition of Masonic Land in Ash Canyon  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 11:10:58 AM

---

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

---

My name is Larry Marinel, Carson City resident, Trail Crew Leader for Muscle Powered, and trail system user. I am writing in support of the proposal to purchase the 82 acres in Ash Canyon. The purchase will protect the land from commercial development, and make it officially a part of Carson City's Open Space. There are already "Social Trails" on the property which could become official trails in our Ash Canyon trail system. This is a great area for public bicycling, walking, and hiking.

Thank You  
Larry Marinel  
530-788-6274



**From:** [Carson City](#)  
**To:** [CCEO](#)  
**Subject:** Acquisition of Masonic Land in Ash Canyon  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 11:12:23 AM

---

Message submitted from the <Carson City> website.

**Site Visitor Name:** Larry Marinel  
**Site Visitor Email:** larryamarinel@gmail.com

My name is Larry Marinel, Carson City resident, Trail Crew Leader for Muscle Powered, and trail system user. I am writing in support of the proposal to purchase the 82 acres in Ash Canyon. The purchase will protect the land from commercial development, and make it officially a part of Carson City's Open Space. There are already "Social Trails" on the property which could become official trails in our Ash Canyon trail system. This is a great area for public bicycling, walking, and hiking.

Thank You  
Larry Marinel  
530-788-6274

**From:** [Jim Racobs](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [CCEO](#)  
**Subject:** Item 14, Board of Supervisors Agenda of May 5, 2022  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 11:24:04 AM

---

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

---

Dear Supervisors,

We oppose the proposed ordinance to amend administrative appeals. Basically, it is a solution in search of a problem. We are not aware that unwarranted appeals have been a difficulty for the city.

Rather, we fear that the proposed ordinance provides a tool to restrict public participation in city affairs. It appears to be motivated by an aversion by the planning commission and staff to public opposition to planning decisions. It specifically appears to be in reaction to the public's rejection of the slaughterhouse proposal.

In fact, at the hearings on the slaughterhouse proposal, we noticed that the commissioners and the supervisors allowed comments by people from outside Carson City. They considered comments by people from Douglas County, Washoe Valley, and an out-of-state college. That is not consistent with this sudden sensitivity about standing to appeal.

Carson City already requires a person to pay \$250 to file an appeal. That is more than sufficient to ensure that an appeal is not frivolous and the person filing is genuinely affected by a decision.

Moreover, notice of planning proceedings and other city proceedings is not particularly robust. In regard to the slaughterhouse proposal, planning staff initially failed to provide proper notice to the nearby mobile homes even though it was specifically required. If someone does not give input before a decision is made, they were likely not even aware of the proceeding. When they learn of a troubling decision, they should not be prevented from filing a timely appeal.

Consequences from a planning decision can extend well beyond locations near the site of a project. Traffic congestion has ramifying effects. Odors and sounds carry far. And the image and reputation of our city are important to every person in Carson City.

Do not restrict public participation in our local government. Thank you.

Jim Racobs  
Yukiko Hayashi  
1763 Bliss Ct, Carson City, NV 89701  
[jracobs@gmail.com](mailto:jracobs@gmail.com)

**From:** [Paula Peters](#)  
**To:** [Lori Bagwell](#); [Lisa Schuette](#); [Stan Jones](#); [Maurice White](#); [Stacey Giomi](#); [CCEO](#); [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** For the Board of Supervisors Agenda of May 5, 2022 - Subject: Item 14A  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 11:47:14 AM

---

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

---

Subject: Item 14A – First Reading of proposed ordinance establishing various provisions governing administrative appeals related to land use and zoning

Dear Mayor Bagwell and Supervisors,

**I am writing to OPPOSE the draft ordinance establishing various provisions governing administrative appeal related to land use and zoning.**

District Attorney Jason Woodbury is proposing an ordinance to severely limit who is allowed to appeal a decision made by the Planning Commission. We elected him to serve US, and now he wants to restrict US from participating in the appeals process.

We all remember the slaughterhouse appeal. My take from that final Board of Supervisor's meeting was that many present agreed that the Planning Commission did not have all the information and tools to justify their approving the project.

Three of the five Board of Supervisors voted in favor of the appeal. They earned my respect by doing so, as many of the involved parties were upset that they did not support the Planning Commission's decision, regardless of whether it was a good decision. It was a bad decision on many counts but primarily that it concerned itself with zoning and failed to consider important aspects of our Master Plan. I left the meeting discouraged thinking that many people involved in our city government do not respect the reason that the appeals process exists.

Rather than making changes to ensure that the Planning Commission has all the information they need to make good decisions in the future, which would reduce the need to file appeals, Mr. Woodbury now wants to limit the appeals process. He proposes that the only individuals whose properties are directly affected by the proposed matter should have the right to appeal a decision.

What if I live on the north side of town but I am concerned about a hypothetical project on the south side of town. This project will dramatically increase traffic and the risk of traffic accidents. The Planning Commission approves the project without requiring a traffic study or feasibility study and is not requiring the developer to make any road improvement to accommodate the increase in traffic. All the Planning Commissioners can vote on this project regardless of where they live, but citizens who don't live on the south side of town will not have access to the appeal process even though they may regularly drive within the vicinity of the project.

If the proposed ordinance will restrict citizens based on where they live, that reasoning should be applied to all the Carson City agencies and the Board of Supervisors. They would all be restricted from voting on issues that are not in their ward.

The proposed ordinance will also prevent group advocates from filing an appeal unless their personal property is affected. Many people in our community are busy raising families and working full time and they appreciate the fact that some community leaders will spend their time on issues and speak on their behalf.

I do not understand why our District Attorney wants to restrict our involvement in the appeals process. It is our community, and it is our right to be involved. Most local governments encourage their citizens to be involved. Please do not support this ordinance.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,  
Paula L. Peters  
Carson City Resident

**From:** [Robyn Orloff](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Cc:** [Lori Bagwell](#); [Stacey Giomi](#); [Stan Jones](#); [Lisa Schuette](#); [Maurice White](#)  
**Subject:** For BOS meeting 5/5/22: general public comment  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 12:14:39 PM

---

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

---

Good day Mayor Bagwell,

I am requesting that you publish clear and transparent notification — on the BOS Agenda and any BOS news bulletins — re current BOS meeting public comment protocol.

I appreciate your reinstatement of public comment after each Agenda Item (announced at the BOS meeting, 2/17/22 — following the Governor's lifting of the mask mandate 2/10/22 ).

**However the Agenda and news bulletins for that meeting did not advise the Public of the change. Nor have subsequent Agendas or public announcements updated the meeting protocol** — per the NV Appeal 4/20/22, pg A24 — and the current Agenda excerpt below:

**May 5, 2021: \*\*PUBLIC COMMENT LIMITATIONS - The Mayor and Supervisors meet at various times as different public bodies: the Carson City Board of Supervisors, the Carson City Liquor and Entertainment Board, the Carson City Redevelopment Authority, and the Carson City Board of Health. Each, as called to order, will provide at least two public comment periods in compliance with the minimum requirements of the Open Meeting Law prior to adjournment.**

As such, Citizens reading the Agenda and NV Appeal and Carson Now, would not be informed of the new policy. If they had not attended meetings (or viewed livestream/video) — or heard 'word of mouth' — they would not be aware that the BOS policy had changed (3 months ago) from the minimum-per-OML-2 public comment allowed.

And, Citizens new to participating in BOS meetings (relying on Agenda/public announcements for their information) would assume there would be only the 2 public comment

opportunities indicated -- not knowing of the change until the beginning of the first BOS meeting they attend (in person or livestream).

For us citizens who aren't great at public speaking, clear public notification allows us to know ahead of time what to expect and plan our statements accordingly.

Kudos to the Planning Commission for re-instituting (and encouraging) public comment after each Agenda Item (since mid-2021 and ongoing) — AND noting that specifically/clearly in their Agenda, as soon as the change was instituted.

**\*\*PUBLIC COMMENT LIMITATIONS - The Planning Commission will provide at least two public comment periods prior to adjournment in compliance with the minimum requirements of the Open Meeting Law. In addition, it is the Planning Commission's aspirational goal to also provide for item-specific public comment. In order for members of the public to participate in the Planning Commission's consideration of an agenda item, the public is strongly encouraged to comment on an agenda item**

when called for by the Chair or Vice-Chair during the item itself.

Perhaps the BOS can take this as an example?

In summary:

1). IMHO, the BOS Agenda is playing “I’ve got a secret” by not being clear re the public comment opportunity — which IMHO affects (inhibits) public participation.

It is my hope that the BOS Agenda and their news bulletins will finally indicate clearly that public comment is allowed after each Agenda Item.

2). In that spirit of promoting — vs inhibiting — public comment, it is my hope that **ALL City meetings will reinstate public comment after each Agenda Item — and include that protocol specifically in their Agendas and in any and all public announcements prior to the meetings --- AND add discussion opportunity (which per the OML, is allowed at the discretion of the Chairperson).**

3). To extrapolate further: Let’s do all we can —in all City meetings and policies --- to promote public participation, not inhibit it (with attempts to inhibit further -- per BOS Agenda Item 14A today).

Robyn Orloff  
Carson City, NV

To the Carson City Board of Supervisors,

I would like to voice my support for Carson City Parks, Recreation, and Open Space in their proposal to obtain a property appraisal and submit a bid for the 82-acre lot (APN 007-091-28) in Ash Canyon being placed for sale.

My wife and I are life-long residents of Carson City. We have grown up with recreation access to the west side of Carson City being an instrumental part of our lives. I have been a regular user of the road and trail access across the west side of Carson since I was a child, and my use has only increased over the years. We frequently utilize the trail systems in Kings and Ash Canyons for hiking and mountain biking. I am extremely grateful for the tremendous expansion in trail access in recent years that has made recreating in this area more accessible and enjoyable. We are fortunate to have a 6-month-old daughter that I cannot wait to share this beautiful aspect of Carson City with as she grows older.

I believe that maintaining the open space and recreation access on the west side of Carson City is crucial to preserving the character of Carson City. Not only does increased recreation access to this beautiful part of our community make it a more enjoyable place to live for residents, but it also attracts tourists and events such as the Carson City Off-Road mountain bike race. I fully support Carson City Parks, Recreation, and Open Space's proposal to acquire the 82-acre lot to help maintain and improve access to one of the most important features of Carson City.

Thank you,

Chris Kuhn

**From:** [JOHANNA FOSTER](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Proposal to bid on Ash Canyon property  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 12:59:30 PM

---

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

---

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am Johanna Foster, an ecologist and retired biology professor, a hiker, and volunteer trail builder for Muscle Powered. Carson City's open spaces are major contributors to why our quality of life is high. These spaces are 'in our backyard', and are easy to access within minutes. Free access makes outdoor recreation available to all residents: a win for everyone.

In 2019, an ecologist colleague invited me to speak in the session she was chairing at the Ecological Society of America (ESA) annual meeting. That year it was in Louisville, KY. Approximately 6,000 people regularly attend each year, so it is an honor to be an invited speaker for a session.

My session's chair *specifically* invited me to describe how Muscle Powered successfully collaborates with Carson City to build public awareness (and therefore, increase public interest in habitat preservation) with state and national entities. My audience included ecologists from a variety of non-profit, state, and federal institutions; and public officials, from Chicago, New York, and Atlanta. I received many positive comments about Carson City and Muscle Powered.

Thus, *Carson City received nationwide attention for its open space achievements.*

While maintaining and building trails as Muscle Powered members, my husband and I often encounter hikers, bikers, and runners who thank us for our work. Many times, we discover that the users came *specifically to Carson City due to its reputation for trails.*

Indeed, just last week we helped a visitor figure out his desired path for a late afternoon bike ride. That young man was from a small California town *7 hours' drive south of Carson City. He drove specifically to Ash Canyon.* What better marketing do we need than that?

Even though I've lived in Carson City six years, I still often stop and exclaim how lucky I am to live in Carson City and have access to public land. I am in support of Carson City using Quality of Life tax funds for purchase of the Masonic property located in Ash Canyon.

Thank you,



Johanna Foster  
775 350-0992

**From:** [Robyn Orloff](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Cc:** [Lori Bagwell](#); [Stacey Giomi](#); [Stan Jones](#); [Lisa Schuette](#); [Maurice White](#)  
**Subject:** For BOS meeting 5/5/22, Agenda Item 14.A  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 1:35:07 PM

---

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

---

RE: [14.A For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action to introduce, on first reading, a proposed ordinance establishing various provisions governing administrative appeals related to land use and zoning.](#)

**I am writing to OPPOSE the draft ordinance establishing various provisions governing administrative appeal related to land use and zoning.**

**I oppose the change in definition of 'aggrieved party', i.e. who has standing to file an appeal.**

In my humble opinion, **any** Citizen of Carson City should be allowed (have standing) to appeal a SUP decision. A SUP can affect any/all of our community. Especially a commercial proposal, on a commercial street (esp on the gateway to our City). As such, IMO, SUPs should be subject to full public scrutiny and an appeal process, by **any** city citizen — independent of how many feet they live from the project. These decisions affect **all of us who live here**.

Don't we aspire to be a cohesive community that will support and back up our neighbors and fellow citizens? Personally, I want the right to stand up for what I feel is right for our community, whether it is in my own neighborhood — or my fellow citizen's. And especially when the majority of the citizens within the notification distance are clearly/publicly opposed to the proposed project — I want to be able to support them in any and all ways I can. As I would appreciate support, for a quality of life concern 'popping up' in my neighborhood. And isn't our entire City, our neighborhood? One decision can affect us ALL.

I wonder why this Ordinance is being proposed so quickly after the Slaughterhouse Appeal? I find this unsettling. Especially when other Ordinance concerns (specifically 13.06) can't seem to get any traction, after **years** of discussion in many OSAC meetings. Open Space/OSAC can't get ordinances in place that protect our Open Space property (as 13.02 protects our Parks) — but the above 14.A is an attempt to quickly snuff out public participation and public voice, by restricting the appeal process. Seems like this 14.A Ordinance came in on the 'fast track'. The goal in my opinion, is to allow the escalating and at times indiscriminate (inconsiderate to our citizens) development going on around all of us, to prevail -- while limiting the right of us public to defend our quality of life.

I wonder if 14.A. was initiated because of the Slaughterhouse Appeal favoring the Appellants? Why not use your time and money to change the Ordinances/SUPs to promote commercial and residential building in more appropriate locations?

Thank you for listening,  
Robyn Orloff  
Carson City, NV

**From:** [Kathy Schwerin](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Masonic lodge property  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 1:45:17 PM

---

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

---

I am a member of Muscle Powered because it has over the years provided inestimable value to Carson City. That is why I believe that MP's recommendation that the city buy the Masonic Lodge property should be supported.

with best regards,  
Kathy Schwerin

**From:** [Peter Doenges](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Cc:** [Vicki Doenges](#)  
**Subject:** BOS Meeting May 5, 2022, Agenda 18.B, possible private land acquisition  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 2:05:40 PM

---

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

---

Dear Supervisors,

My wife Vicki and I strongly support attempted acquisition of the Mason's land parcel in Ash Canyon adjoining Eagle View Open Space. We consider the Ash Canyon and Eagle View trail system as a crown jewel in Carson City's Open Space program of foothill and mountain trails. It is popular with and heavily used by locals plus regional and national visitors. Ash Canyon needs to be made whole. Mason's land and Eagle View Open Space need to be one. If the land can be acquired at necessary cost even in alliance with additional funding sources, this investment is smart.

We see numerous dividends stemming from this potential land acquisition:

### **User Experience**

- Making more truly open space
- Sustaining Ash Canyon popularity as-is
- Preserving public "view shed" up into Ash Canyon
- Helping trail users get into nature without barriers

### **Public Ownership Benefits**

- Absorbing Mason's land into established EVOS land
- Preventing private development and potential trail use cessation
- Preventing "walled city" with fencing that hampers wildlife movement
- Ensuring habitat and watershed protection by keeping trail users on designated trails
- Locking in multiple trail-only access to Ash to Kings, Capital to Tahoe, and Tahoe Rim Trails

### **Fostering Quality, Connected Trails**

- Integrating trail signage versus current "dead-ends" toward private land
- Allowing MP maintenance and public trails stewardship on Mason's trail segments
- Supporting CCPROS and MP relationship with free, integrated trail design and maintenance
- Adding an important trail network to the connectivity of local and regional trail systems
- Supporting trail users with active and paper maps that can show all there really is to use

### **Economic Benefits, Building Community**

- Boosting recreational trails tourism and competitive racing with unified trails system
- Rallying community interest to make Carson City more bike and hike friendly
- Building gratitude among wide community and visiting trail users that pays back

I happen to be Trails Coordinator for Muscle Powered, following in the footsteps of the inimitable father of our trails system, Jeff Potter. I love Carson City for many reasons, including its sense of community growing around trails and the happy encounters with the huge diversity of grateful trail users. I coordinate planning, design, construction and maintenance of single-track, natural-surface trail projects on Carson's west side, Prison Hill and Centennial Park. I serve as crew or crew lead on our trails in construction and maintenance roles. I experience many trails.

Ash Canyon and EVOS trails are a jewel. Ash Canyon includes trail segments off-limits to MP maintenance or improvement and at the whim of generous trail users who might venture out to fix things. As historical artifacts the Mason's land accumulated key trail segments built early by users as social trails that now connect into our public trails. These include Ash Creek, Kay's, Deer Run, Baldy Green, and Four Day Trails with segments inside the Mason's land. The richness of experiencing the full run of these trails from jungle-like to foothill high-desert can't be exaggerated. Unification of these trail pieces under City management would ensure long-term user access to all.

If you can, please make Ash Canyon whole, and thank you.

Best regards,

Pete & Vicki Doenges  
Carson City

**From:** [Chelsea Kincheloe](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 18b: Proposed Purchase of Carson Lodge #1 Property  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 2:06:26 PM

---

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

---

Dear City Supervisors,

On behalf of the Muscle Powered board, we unequivocally support Carson City Parks, Recreation and Open Space pursuing the purchase of the 81-acre Carson Lodge #1 property located in Ash Canyon. This purchase is a critical component to continue providing quality multi-use trails to non-motorized recreation users in an already recreation dominant area.

Carson City can create a truly unique opportunity for recreationalist through the acquisition of this property. The Ash to Kings trail spanned from an individual's dream and invigorated our organization and partners to dream of the possibilities and connectivity from Ash Canyon to trails throughout Carson City and later this year, connect them directly with the Tahoe Rim Trail with the completion of the Capitol to Tahoe trail.

Muscle Powereds' trail building efforts in partnership with local, state, and federal organizations has placed Carson City at the forefront of non-motorized multi-use recreation in northern Nevada. Our organization is beyond proud of our accomplishments and know the acquisition of the Carson Lodge #1 property is essential to continuing our burgeoning name as a recreation hub.

Thank you for your time.



Chelsea Kincheloe  
President Muscle Powered  
[ckincheloe@musclepowered.org](mailto:ckincheloe@musclepowered.org)  
[www.musclepowered.org](http://www.musclepowered.org)  
Mobile: 970-889-0921

**From:** [Dan Thornton](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** In regards to Agenda Item 18.B (acquisition of 81.55 acres of privately owned property in Ash Canyon)  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 2:11:02 PM

---

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

---

Dear Carson City Supervisors,

My name is Dan Thornton, and I am a resident of Carson City. I am writing in favor of Carson City moving forward with purchasing the 81.55 acres being sold by Carson Lodge #1.

The Board of Supervisors staff summary on page 6 of the Wednesday, May 5th, 2022, agenda states that:

"The Property has been identified as a high priority by the City's Open Space program for acquisition based on important natural resource values such as wildlife habitat, watershed protection, water quality protection, and trail connectivity."

Our family uses the trails in Ash Canyon to walk, hike, mountain bike, or run daily. We have noticed more and more users in the last few years, and Carson City has been gaining notice in the outdoor recreation world as a trail-friendly town.

Aside from those benefits, significant studies have shown the economic benefits of local trail systems and the associated visitation they help create.

Please do your part to help provide crucial access and connectivity to our local trail system and keep our community moving in a healthy direction.

Sincerely,  
Dan Thornton  
Carson City, NV



**From:** [Zack Blumberg](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** 05-05-22 AGENDA Item 18.B - Purchase of APN 007-091-28  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 2:19:08 PM

---

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

---

Dear Carson City Supervisors,

My name is Zack Blumberg, and I am a resident of Carson City. I am writing in favor of Carson City purchasing the 81.55 acres being sold by Carson Lodge #1 (APN 007-091-28).

The Board of Supervisors staff summary on page 6 of the Wednesday, May 5th, 2022, agenda states that:

"The Property has been identified as a high priority by the City's Open Space program for acquisition based on important natural resource values such as wildlife habitat, watershed protection, water quality protection, and trail connectivity."

My family, friends, and I use the trails in Ash Canyon (and the rest of Carson City) to recreate every day. We have noticed more and more users in the last few years, and Carson City has been gaining notice in the outdoor recreation world as a trail-friendly town.

Aside from those benefits, significant studies have shown the economic benefits of local trail systems and the associated visitation they help create.

Please do your part to help provide crucial access and connectivity to our local trail system and keep our community moving in a healthy direction.

Thank you very much!

Zack Blumberg  
Carson City, NV

**From:** [Paula Peters](#)  
**To:** [Maurice White](#)  
**Cc:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Re: For the Board of Supervisors Agenda of May 5, 2022 - Subject: Item 14A  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 2:58:16 PM

---

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

---

Dear Supervisor White,

Thank you for your reply. May I be bold and suggest that tomorrow after the DA presents his proposed ordinance that you, or another supervisor, comment that you've received input from the community and the majority have expressed outrage that citizen participation in the appeals process would be severely limited. Then suggest that he consider deleting the 5<sup>th</sup> substantive change [5) the criteria pursuant to which a person is deemed to be a person aggrieved by a decision for the purpose of establishing legal standing] from his proposed ordinance. I doubt any citizen, if they were aware of the proposed ordinance, would approve of their access to the appeals process being severely limited.

I am confident that the public would be in favor of his proposed administrative changes 1-4 as they will increase efficiency without infringing on our rights like change 5.

Regards,  
Paula L. Peters

---

**From:** Maurice White <mwhite@carson.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 4 May 2022 12:23 PM  
**To:** Paula Peters <ppeterscpa@hotmail.com>  
**Subject:** RE: For the Board of Supervisors Agenda of May 5, 2022 - Subject: Item 14A

Hello Paula.

Thank you for reaching out with your concerns.  
Indeed there is room for discussion on this agenda item (or any other issue) slated for 5-5-2022. As you may have noticed the agenda item makes clear that the draft ordinance is not chiseled in stone. There is opportunity to modify the language. As such, if you have language you feel would make a better ordinance please forward that language as soon as possible.

Maurice White  
201 N. Carson St. Suite 2  
Carson City, Nv. 89701  
775-283-7934

---

**From:** Paula Peters <ppeterscpa@hotmail.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 11:47 AM

**To:** Lori Bagwell <LBagwell@carson.org>; Lisa Schuette <lschuette@carson.org>; Stan Jones <sjones@carson.org>; Maurice White <mwhite@carson.org>; Stacey Giomi <sgiommi@carson.org>; CCEO <CCEO@carson.org>; Public Comment <PublicComment@carson.org>

**Subject:** For the Board of Supervisors Agenda of May 5, 2022 - Subject: Item 14A

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

---

---

Subject: Item 14A – First Reading of proposed ordinance establishing various provisions governing administrative appeals related to land use and zoning

Dear Mayor Bagwell and Supervisors,

**I am writing to OPPOSE the draft ordinance establishing various provisions governing administrative appeal related to land use and zoning.**

District Attorney Jason Woodbury is proposing an ordinance to severely limit who is allowed to appeal a decision made by the Planning Commission. We elected him to serve US, and now he wants to restrict US from participating in the appeals process.

We all remember the slaughterhouse appeal. My take from that final Board of Supervisor's meeting was that many present agreed that the Planning Commission did not have all the information and tools to justify their approving the project.

Three of the five Board of Supervisors voted in favor of the appeal. They earned my respect by doing so, as many of the involved parties were upset that they did not support the Planning Commission's decision, regardless of whether it was a good decision. It was a bad decision on many counts but primarily that it concerned itself with zoning and failed to consider important aspects of our Master Plan. I left the meeting discouraged thinking that many people involved in our city government do not respect the reason that the appeals process exists.

Rather than making changes to ensure that the Planning Commission has all the information they need to make good decisions in the future, which would reduce the need to file appeals, Mr. Woodbury now wants to limit the appeals process. He proposes that the only individuals whose properties are directly affected by the proposed matter should have the right to appeal a decision.

What if I live on the north side of town but I am concerned about a hypothetical project on the south side of town. This project will dramatically increase traffic and the risk of traffic accidents. The Planning Commission approves the project without requiring a traffic study or feasibility study and is not requiring the developer to make any road improvement to accommodate the increase in traffic. All the Planning Commissioners can vote on this project regardless of where they live, but citizens who don't live on the south side of town will not

have access to the appeal process even though they may regularly drive within the vicinity of the project.

If the proposed ordinance will restrict citizens based on where they live, that reasoning should be applied to all the Carson City agencies and the Board of Supervisors. They would all be restricted from voting on issues that are not in their ward.

The proposed ordinance will also prevent group advocates from filing an appeal unless their personal property is affected. Many people in our community are busy raising families and working full time and they appreciate the fact that some community leaders will spend their time on issues and speak on their behalf.

I do not understand why our District Attorney wants to restrict our involvement in the appeals process. It is our community, and it is our right to be involved. Most local governments encourage their citizens to be involved. Please do not support this ordinance.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,  
Paula L. Peters  
Carson City Resident

**From:** [Juan Guzman](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [Lori Bagwell](#); [Stacey Giomi](#); [Stan Jones](#); [Lisa Schuette](#); [Maurice White](#)  
**Cc:** [Jill Larson](#); [Jennifer Budge](#); [Gregg Berggren](#); [Lyndsey Boyer](#); [Georgia Vasey](#); [Darren Schulz](#); [Chelsea Kincheloe](#); [Evelyn Grime](#); [Peter Doenges](#); [Donna Inversin](#); [Nathan Harrison](#); [dpetite1352@gmail.com](mailto:dpetite1352@gmail.com); [Neal Falk](#)  
**Subject:** Carson City Board of Supervisors Agenda Item no. 18B, requesting authorization for Staff to initiate due diligence for the acquisition of Apr. 007-091-28  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 4, 2022 2:59:10 PM

---

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

---

Mayor and Board;

Thanks for the opportunity to provide you with information advocating for the initiation of the due diligence process towards the acquisition of the 81 acres parcel owned by the Carson Masonic Lodge No1 near the entrance to Ash Canyon. Some of the property's unique attributes that favor City acquisition include, Ash Canyon Creek flows through the land, including a habitat diverse riparian zone with year round water in our high desert environment. Additional seeps and streams further enhance the Canyon banks and hillside areas habitat potential.

Open space funds by Ordinance may be used to protect scenic resources. The parcel is visible from many areas of Town and equally the site provides scenic views of the Eagle Valley.

The location and in close proximity to the edge of development enhance the site's capacity to offer recreation opportunities for our residents and visitors. This parcel comes with a really sweet single track trail developed on the Creek banks. This trail would become an official system trail and would continue to be maintained by Muscle Powered.

A section of the historic Ash Canyon Rd with a non defined width, runs through it.

Acquisition of the parcel is important to solidify access to the backcountry of the Lake Tahoe State Park, Hobart Reservoir, uphill Open Space Lands and our National Award Winner Trail, Ash to Kings , "7 miles of pure joy".

The 81 acres Property is adjacent to City owned lands containing very important infrastructure for our domestic water system. These lands are important to secure the safety of our water resources.

Buying this property is in keeping and favored by the City's Parks and Recreation relevant goals and adopted policy documents such as the Open Space Plan, The Unified Pathways Plan as updated by the Eagle Valley Trails Plan. Furthermore I would argue that the City's Land Use Element of the Master Plan policies to contain development primarily within the valley floor and to facilitate access to recreation of our public lands is also advanced by this potential purchase.

A final thought, what a fantastic proposition and opportunity for the City to pursue the acquisition of a property that has remained undeveloped under the ownership of the Masonic lodge for over 100 years and potentially to be preserved for the enjoyment of our Capital at the foothill of the majestic Sierra Nevada for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Juan F Guzman

775 690 7671

Muscle Powered and CVTA Board Member

Retired Open Space Administrator Carson City