



STOREY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Thursday, August 4, 2016 6:00 p.m.
Storey County Courthouse, District Courtroom
26 South "B" Street, Virginia City, Nevada

MEETING MINUTES

CHAIRMAN: Larry Prater

VICE-CHAIRMAN: Jim Hindle

COMMISSIONERS:

Virgil Bucchianeri, John Herrington, Pamela Smith, Ron Engelbrecht, Kris Thompson

-
1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 6:02 P.M.
 2. **Roll Call:** Jim Hindle, Virgil Bucchianeri, John Herrington, Pamela Smith, Kris Thompson, Ron Engelbrecht.
Absent: Larry Prater.
Also Present: Planning Director Austin Osborne, Planner Jason VanHavel, Deputy D.A. Keith Loomis, County Commissioner Jack McGuffey, and Contract Attorney Bob Morris.
 3. **Pledge of Allegiance:** The Chair led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.
 4. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Approval of Agenda for August 4, 2016.
Motion: Approve Agenda for August 4, 2016 **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Commissioner Smith, **Seconded by** Commissioner Thompson, **Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous vote (**summary:** Yes=6).
No public comment.
 5. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Approval of Minutes for May 19, 2016.
Motion: Approve Minutes for May 19, 2016 **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Commissioner Smith, **Seconded by** Commissioner Thompson, **Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous vote (**summary:** Yes=6).
 6. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Approval of Minutes for June 2, 2016.
Approval of June 2, 2016 minutes was continued to next planning commission meeting due to lack of quorum to approve. Three members were absent at the June 2, 2016 meeting and must abstain from vote.
 7. **Discussion/Possible Action:** 2016-013 Special Use Permit by Mickey Hazelwood of the Nature Conservancy. The applicant is requesting a special use permit to alter portions of the existing Truckee River channel and abutting floodplain environment to facilitate flood management, water quality improvement, biodiversity and habitat

enhancement, noxious weed eradication, and recreation opportunity. Location is 191 Wunotoo Rd, McCarran, Storey County, Nevada (APN: 004-091-72) 0 PLC#4: PTN NW4 S34 T20N R22E, McCarran, Storey County, Nevada (APN: 004-091-30).

Mickey Hazelwood, the Nature Conservancy: Explained that the purpose of the project is to lower the existing floodplain in order to reconnect it with the Truckee River which would improve water quality, enhance wildlife habitat and allow for recreational opportunities. The primary elements of the project include:

- Lowering the floodplain.
- Construction of point bars, rock groin migration barriers, and a grade control structure in and adjacent to the active channel.
- Lowering the elevation of an earthen berm structure.
- Sequestering spoils in an old gravel pit pond to create additional floodplain-elevation acreage.

This is the eighth project of this type that they have done.

Planner VanHavel: The first property is zoned heavy industrial and the second property is zoned natural resources, both requiring a special use permit for a project of this nature.

Commissioner Herrington: Asked what the budget is for this project.

Mickey Hazelwood, Applicant: It is about a three million dollar project.

Pete Viteritti, Lockwood Resident: Asked where the funding is coming from and is the project going to go all the way to the lake.

Mickey Hazelwood, Applicant: This project is entirely funded through the Bureau of Reclamation and will not be taken all the way to the lake.

Motion: In accordance with the recommendation by Staff, the Findings under Section 5.1 of the Staff Report and other Findings deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission, and in compliance with the conditions of approval in Section 6 of this report, I, Pamela Smith, hereby recommend conditional approval of Special Use Permit Application Number 2016-013 to amend portions of the Truckee River channel and abutting floodplain areas for the purpose stated forth in the SUP Application, located at 191 Wunotoo Rd, McCarran, Storey County, Nevada (APN: 004-091-72) & 0 PLC#4: PTN NW4 S34 T20N R22E, McCarran, Storey County, Nevada (APN: 004-091-30). **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Commissioner Smith, **Seconded by** Commissioner Thompson, **Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous vote (**summary:** Yes=6).

Planner VanHavel read the findings into the record.

5.1.1 SCC Sections 17.35.040(T) and 17.76.020(I) (Uses Subject to a Special Use Permit) require a special use permit for nature resource projects including river and waterway restoration, wetland creation, and recycling in the I-2 Heavy Industrial and NR Natural Resources Zones.

5.1.2 The subject land is located in McCarran, Nevada, but is not located within the boundaries of the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center; therefore, the proposed use is not subject to the restrictions or entitlements of the Development Agreement between Storey County and the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center.

5.1.3 The conditions of SUP No. 2016-013 will not conflict with the purpose, intent, and other specific requirements of the I-2 Heavy Industrial Zone and the NR Natural Resources Zone, in which the project is located.

5.1.4 The Special Use Permit complies with all federal, state, and county regulations.

5.1.5 The Special Use Permit will not impose substantial adverse impacts or safety hazards on the adjacent properties or the surrounding area. The proposed project and the final product will not conflict with or adversely impact surrounding existing land uses, future land uses, or land use entitlements

5.1.6 The conditions of approval under SUP No. 2016-013 impose sufficient regulations on the proposed project to reasonably mitigate associated impacts on the surrounding environment and closest land uses.

5.1.7 The conditions under this The Special Use Permit do not conflict with the minimum requirements in SCC Chapter 17.12 General Provisions, Chapter 17.35 I-2 Heavy Industrial Zone, 17.76 NR Natural Resources Zone and Chapter 17.03.150 Special Use Permits, or any other federal, state, or county regulations, including public safety and health codes.

8. **Discussion/Possible Action:** 2016-018 Parcel Map by Laurie Weatherston of Weatherston Surveying. The applicant is requesting a parcel map merging and re-subdividing three parcels into two parcels located at 180 South O Street, 190

South O Street, and 200 South O Street in Virginia City, Storey County, Nevada (APNs 001-251-10, 001-251-11, 001-251-12).

Planner VanHavel: The location of these lots is on the west side of "O" Street and south of Washington Street. The three existing lots have two owners. Kerschner Living Trust currently owns two lots and Richard and Doreen Bacus own the other lot. Richard and Doreen have agreed to purchase half of lot 001-251-11 from the trust. The proposed parcel map will result in two 75' by 100' lots and are well within the zoning requirements for the R1 zone (single-family residential).

Commissioner Herrington: Asked if the shaded areas on the map represent pavement?

Planner VanHavel: He believes it does.

Commissioner Smith: Asked if the owners have made the sale?

Planner VanHavel: The agreement is contingent upon approval of the parcel map.

Motion: In accordance with the recommendation by Staff, the Findings under section 5.1 of the Staff Report, and in compliance with all Conditions of Approval, I, John Herrington, hereby recommend approval with conditions for the parcel map application number 2016-018 that merges three Virginia City lots into two lots located at 180 S O St, Virginia City, Storey County (APN: 001-251-10), 190 S O St, Virginia City, Storey County (APN: 001-251-11) and 200 S O St, Virginia City, Storey County (APN: 001-251-12). **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Commissioner Herrington, **Seconded by** Commissioner Thompson, **Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous vote (**summary:** Yes=6).

Planner VanHavel read the findings into the record.

5.1.1 The parcel map complies with NRS 278.475 through 278.477 relating to the change in location of boundary lines; and

5.1.2 The parcel map complies with all Federal, State, and County regulations pertaining to parcel maps and allowed land uses; and

5.1.3 The parcel map will not impose substantial adverse impacts or safety hazards on the abutting properties or the surrounding vicinity; and

5.1.4 The conditions of approval for the requested parcel map do not conflict with the minimum requirements in Storey County Code Chapters 17.16 R1 Residential Zone or any other Federal, State, or County regulations.

5.2 Motion for Denial

5.2.1 Substantial evidence shows that the parcel map conflicts with the purpose, intent, and other specific requirement of Storey County Code Chapter 17.16 R1 Residential Zone or any other Federal, State, or County regulations, including NRS 278.475 through 278.477; or

5.2.2 The Recommended Conditions of Approval for the parcel map do not adequately mitigate potential adverse impacts on surrounding uses or protect against potential safety hazards for surrounding uses.

9. **Discussion /Possible Action (Master Plan Amendments):** Discussion and possible action on the adoption of comprehensive text amendments to the existing Storey County Master Plan, including the following elements: land use; population; housing; economic development; transportation; public services and facilities; water and natural resources; cultural and historical resources; and other provisions thereof, and the adoption of comprehensive map amendments to the existing Storey County Master Plan area and land use designation maps. Public participation is encouraged. Copies of the master plan draft may be obtained from the Planning Department website at <http://www.storeycounty.org/521/Updates>, at 775.847.1144, or from planning@storeycounty.org.

Planning Director Osborne: Explained that this is the last day of a seven year process. Public workshops have been held in our communities starting in 2008 to get input on how we want our county to grow. It has been a team effort putting this master plan together, and I think it rivals some of the larger jurisdictions in the area. I am very proud of this document. Planning Director Osborne read comments from Chairman Prater into the record due to his inability to attend the meeting because of travel out of the country.

Austin and others,

I'm sorry I've been busy getting ready to leave and haven't had the time to put together a note. Please tell everyone that I sincerely appreciate everyone's efforts in putting this together. It is a document that we can all be proud of.

Larry Prater, Chairman

Dr. Fred Steinmann, UNR: Introduced himself as a research professor with the University Center for Economic Development at the College of Business at the University of Nevada, Reno. He also serves at the secretary of the Nevada Chapter of the American Planning Association. He was contacted in June 2016 by the planning department to review the 2016 draft of the Storey County Master Plan. He congratulated the planning staff, Storey County, the planning commission the board of county commissioners and the public who participated in the seven year process. Dr. Steinmann stated “Most of my comments were primarily editorial in nature (delete a comma here, add a comma there). The two most substantial suggestions that I had was to change the word redevelopment to revitalization in the land use chapter and the economic development chapter; the other change was the removal of the phrase “new urbanism” and replace with neo traditional design. I found that this written in a way that anyone can read it and easily understand it. I find that the policy recommendations are really based upon strong community input. It was a pleasure to review this master plan.”

Commissioner Herrington: Asked if Dr. Steinman teaches at UNR?

Dr. Fred Steinmann, UNR: Yes. Strategic Managing and Policy, as well as Changing Environments. I have also taught Urban Landscape Analysis, Introduction to American Public Policy and Environmental Policy.

Commissioner Smith: Thanked Dr. Steinmann for his work on editing the master plan.

Larry Huddleson, Lockwood Resident: Said that he thought he heard Dr. Steinmann say that this document also has to have human protection?

Dr. Fred Steinmann, UNR: Answered that the master plan process is designed with the overall goal of protecting human health and safety.

Planning Director Osborne: Thanked Mr. Steinmann for his all the work he did on editing the master plan.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: Asked if Mr. Osborne would like to highlight some corrections that need to be made to the master plan.

Planning Director Osborne: Explained that the maps that are in the draft are still in rough draft form. In chapter 4, Public Lands, the highlighted yellow sections are gone. In Chapter 3 the acronyms and abbreviations will be removed based on the suggestion of Dr. Steinmann. Lastly, the resolution that will come with the adoption of this master plan will be embedded at the end of chapter one. Page 69 of the Land Use chapter 3 there is an “s” missing from the word master plan.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: For my clarification, the things you are changing are really not consequential to meaning and impact, correct?

Planning Director Osborne: Correct.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: And if approved, I take it from counsel anything that’s a correction of spelling or grammar is allowed to be changed after we approve, if we do indeed approve.

Keith Loomis, Deputy District Attorney: I would incorporate the comments made by Austin that we are going to make the changes as recommended.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: Are we ready to proceed with public comments?

Planning Director Osborne: Yes. We have a representative from the school district present. I don’t know if this would be considered a public comment or an agency comment.

Keith Loomis, Deputy District Attorney: I would refer to it as public comment.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: Unless there are any other comments or questions from the commission, we will open it up to the floor.

Public Comment:

Greg "Bum" Hess, Storey County School District: The school district is adamantly against large scale residential development in the Lockwood area and how it would impact the schools. They are in favor of the master plan as it was written for the Lockwood area in February and March.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: You support the master plan as being proposed by staff?

Bum Hess, Storey County School District: As proposed by staff, yes.

Larry Huddleson, Lockwood Resident: I don't see how anybody can put a development out by Peri Ranch Road without water being available. Something as simple as a fire truck filling up will give us water like this (showed plastic bag full of brown water).

Commissioner Smith: How long does that last when it happens (brown water)?

Larry Huddleson, Lockwood Resident: It is supposed to be a blue system which is supposed to affect all of the houses but it doesn't. I had the water tested. The results show that the manganese is 40 and a half times higher than the safe limit and the iron is six and half times higher than the safe limit. Please notice on page 2 of this report that it states it does not meet drinking water standards. This is something as simple as a fire truck filling up. The Canyon GID is not capable of supporting development.

Commissioner Herrington: Is that a result of the sediments getting stirred up on the bottom of the tank?

Larry Huddleson, Lockwood Resident: The latest excuse is that the sediments are in the pipes. The EPA has been out to test the wells and they are clean. So it is in the delivery system itself. To avoid this happening to our water, fire trucks could fill up with the hydrants on Peri Ranch Road which are not connected to our system, but the state was told that the road cannot handle the weight of a fully loaded truck. The GID is unable to support any more load on their system.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: Asked Mr. Huddleson if he is in favor of the master plan as proposed, or if he is against it, would he like to see amendments?

Larry Huddleson, Lockwood Resident: Stated the he would choose option A because the term residential is not there, but he is against light industrial zoning for Peri Ranch Road.

Commissioner Thompson: Asked Greg "Bum" Hess if the school district would feel different if a developer was required to contribute to the upgrade of the school as part of approval of his plan.

Bum Hess, Storey County School District: I'm just the messenger, but that may be a possibility. There is limited space at the school.

Commissioner Smith: There is literally no room for that school to grow.

Bum Hess, Storey County School District: Right now they are opposed to development because they don't have the room or the money.

Larry Huddleson, Lockwood Resident: The school had this water (brown water) for almost 2 weeks because they could not flush it.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: Asked Mr. Osborne for clarification on master plan proposal (Option A) for Lockwood.

Planning Director Osborne: What we have in front of us is the one that written in February, Option A.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: So Option A is essentially is the master plan as it was developed originally several months ago and that is the one that staff is recommending?

Planning Director Osborne: That is correct.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: We've had a comment in favor of Option A, is there anyone who would like to comment or question option A?

Rose Austin, Lockwood Resident: “I, like most of us here, support Option A”. She asked everyone who supported Option A to rise.

Keith Loomis, Deputy District Attorney: The majority of the people present, which appears to be approximately 50 people support Option A.

Terry Croxton, Lockwood Resident: Asked why the Lockwood community was not included in the development of the master plan.

Planning Director Osborne: The Lockwood community has been involved in numerous public workshops since the very beginning of this master plan process. Mr. Osborne described meetings that had occurred in Lockwood.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: It is my understanding that since 2010 there have been six workshops in Lockwood.

Planning Director Osborne: That is likely correct. Workshops were held at both the senior center and the Rainbow Bend Clubhouse.

Dante Perano, Peri Ranch Property Owner: This property is located in a very strategic location, between the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Park and Reno/Sparks. It is projected there is going to be thousands of new employees at the industrial park. We have to look into the future and ask where these people are going to live. Remember, the Peri’s didn’t want River Bend going in. If we work together I think we can develop a project that is good for everybody. As far as the water is concerned, we don’t have any control over the water. The GID is responsible for monitoring the quality of your water. I don’t think the topic has come up enough about where all these new employees are going to live. We haven’t even proposed anything yet. We’re asking you to keep an open mind.

Tom Minkler, LLC: Asked how people would get to these proposed houses, Peri Ranch Road or Mustang Ranch Rd. The LCC has a one lane road and will not support additional traffic.

Planning Director Osborne: The master plan is only a general discussion. There are at least 500 pages in the master plan and a tremendous amount of effort from staff and the community went into every single word. There is plenty of opportunity in the future for someone to go through the public process to come up with a development plan – it’s not a closed door.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: The master plan addresses much of what Tom Minkler was commenting on. It highlights historically how those have been mitigated and how going forward we need to keep traffic off Peri Ranch Road and in front of the school and not put undue burden on the Lockwood interchange.

Merilee Miller, Lockwood Resident: Stated how long it takes to get on the interchange.

Frank Lepori, Peri Ranch Property Owner: With regards to traffic on Peri Ranch Road, I believe it is a private road. He explained that they don’t have a plan. But they want the opportunity to come to the community with a plan. I think mixed-used would be good for the area.

Steven Smiley, Lockwood Resident: Opposes residential development in the Peri Ranch area and the traffic problems it would bring.

Michael Wilson, Lockwood Resident: It is quality of life that we are talking about here. He stated his opposition to development of any kind in Lockwood. The housing need due to the industrial park is not the Lockwood residents concern. Lockwood is a small tightknit community.

Andrew Poh, Lockwood Resident: Moved to Lockwood because it was a small community and doesn’t want that to change. He is worried about increased traffic on Peri Ranch Road.

Kim Marvin, Lockwood Resident: Explained that he works with Operation Lifesaver (program dedicated to ending collisions, fatalities and injuries at highway-rail grade crossings and on railroad rights of way) and that the railroad has concerns about a new community out there because of the threat of terrorism using trains.

Larry Austin, Lockwood Resident: Expressed his concerns about Option B because he feels it takes away all control from the community.

Planning Director Osborne: Option A allows light industrial east of Rainbow Bend. If residential was proposed there, a master plan amendment would be required and the public would be involved in that process. It would be up to this commission to decide whether or not the proposed master plan amendment was in conflict with the existing master plan. If it was decided that it did not conflict it could be considered for amendment and then there would opportunity for a zone change. This would all be a public process.

Commissioner Thompson: Staff recommendation is Option A?

Planning Director Osborne: Yes.

Pete Tuhus, Lockwood Resident: Served on the planning commission in 1994. Supports Option A, because even though residential development can still be proposed, it has to go through a higher standard. Is this correct?

Planning Director Osborne: Clarified that Option A designates the area east of Rainbow Bend as light industrial. Any type of residential development would have to go through a master plan amendment.

Dante Perano, Peri Ranch Property Owner: One of the things that hasn't been clarified is that once you have an established zone, if you go in to readjust that zone after a general plan is adopted, you have to wait at least one year before you can do such adjustments. We never came here to take anything away from the community. We want to add to the community. And I believe there is a real need for affordable residential near the industrial park. Painted Rock has a lot of hurdles that this property in Lockwood does not have.

Larry Austin, Lockwood Resident: Will the Lockwood community have the opportunity to see the developer's plans or will they just put in whatever they want? He reiterated he supports Option A.

Michael Wilson, Lockwood Resident: The staff recommends Option A. That's what we are all here for. We want Option A.

Frannie Lepori: I am the past president of the Truckee Meadows Boys and Girls Club. We serve over 10,000 children. My children are third generation residents. Residential development would bring money into your community.

Edna Cudworth, LCC Resident: Why can't we see the developer's plan?

Commissioner Thompson: Economic development in Storey County is not dependent on housing development in Lockwood. There is housing opportunity in Reno, Sparks and Fernley and Silver Springs after USA Parkway is finished. There is no urgency to have housing in Lockwood.

Commissioner Engelbrecht: All I hear are problems and not solutions. I would like to move forward with Option A.

Commissioner Smith: The master plan is dependent on what the communities want. I believe that Option A is the best. I appreciate all of you that came up here tonight. We are here for you – we work for you.

Commissioner Herrington: Thanked everyone for attending. It's important to hear both sides of the issues. He supports the master plan as it is.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: Asked Mr. Osborne if there were other comments he wanted to read into the record.

Planning Director Osborne: Interim Superintendent Todd Hess of the Storey County School District supports Option A. Option A also appears to be supported by Storey County School District Superintendent Dr. Rob Slaby. The school board of trustees wants to see the plans and have a discussion with an applicant for residential development, but the board feels that a move on that type of plan is premature right now. For now the school board, superintendent, and interim superintendent are in favor of Option A.

The following correspondence was read into the record:

On Aug 2, 2016, at 6:55 PM, Casey Conley <4conleys@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

PLEASE READ INTO THE MINUTES

Commissioners,

My name is Casey Conley and my family has resided in Lockwood (Rainbow Bend) for 21 years. We moved out here because it was small and it was an Association with little room for growth. There will be nothing but a downside for us if you allow apartments to be built out here. I know there are at least three of you on the planning commission that live in the Highlands and remember Corda Vista. The Commissioners fought and won against a developer because you didn't want it. Well, we don't want this. This is the Corda Vista of Lockwood, so please fight for us like you fought for the highlands and do not rezone for residential. It is not in the best interest of your constituents in this part of the county.

Thank You,
Casey Conley

From: Faith Tyler [<mailto:faithstclair420@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 12:08 PM
To: Austin Osborne
Subject: Master Plan options for Lockwood OPTION A

As a resident of Lockwood I am in favor of OPTION A for the Master Plan. No residential development in the River District.

I request that my vote be counted and read at tonight's Planning Commission Meeting.

Thank you, Faith StClair
401 Canyon Way #47
Lockwood, NV 89434-9616
775-342-2930

08/04/16 Correspondence

Please read into record per request.

Correspondence for 08/04/16 planning commission meeting regarding adoption of the Storey County Master Plan amendment

At or about 4:00 p.m. Thursday, August 04, 2016, Kurt Matthies of 320 Avenue De La Blue De Clair called Planning Director Austin Osborne at 775.847.1144 (Planning Department). Kurt asked Austin to read in the record Kurt's opinion regarding the master plan as it pertains to Lockwood, Nevada. He stated, "I am opposed to multi-family apartment complexes and similar uses, zoning, and master plan allowances for Lockwood. I am okay with light residential uses, such as single-family dwellings. The developer of the land also needs to update the water, sewer, and other public services in the area to support new uses developed by him/her. The cost of all such improvements should be by the developer and not the taxpayers."

Austin Osborne
Statement for Kurt Matties,
Resident of 320 Avenue De La Blue De Clair

Planning Director Osborne: Acknowledged planning staff Jason VanHavel and Lyndi Renaud for all of their efforts during the master plan process. Also Special Legal Counsel Bob Morris, Deputy District Attorney Keith Loomis, the Board of County Commissioners, present and past members of the planning commission, County Manager Pat Whitten, District Attorney Ann Langer, Assessor Jana Seddon, Recorder Jen Chapman, Clerk-Treasurer Vanessa Stevens, Public Works Director Mike Nevin, Fire Department Chief Gary Hames, Comptroller Hugh Gallagher, Community Development Director Dean Haymore, Virginia City Tourism Commission, Storey County School Board of Trustees, Comstock Historic District Commission, Storey County School District, local/neighborhood organizations, Bureau of Land Management, Nevada Division of State Lands, NV Energy Economic Development Division, and the University of Nevada, Reno, College of Business Center for Economic Development.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: Thanked the all the county's communities for their input and involvement in the master plan workshops over the last several years.

Planning Director Osborne: Read Resolution 2016-444:

A Resolution adopting the 2016 Storey County Master Plan

Whereas, Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), sections 278.150 to 278.220, and Storey County Code, 17.03.210, provides the procedure for the adoption and amendment of the Master Plan by Planning Commissions and the Boards of County Commissioners; and

Whereas, the Storey County Planning Commission (Commission) has conducted numerous hearings throughout Storey County to obtain public input for comprehensive amendments to the text and maps of the existing Storey County Master Plan over a number of years; and

Whereas, notice of a meeting to be held on the August 4, 2016 by the Commission to consider the adoption of comprehensive changes to the Master Plan and Maps was duly published in the Comstock Chronicle on the 22nd day of July, 2016, and an agenda identifying as a topic of discussion the adoption of the comprehensive amendments to the Master Plan and maps was duly posted on or before July 26, 2016, and published as required by the law; and

Whereas, the attached Master Plan contains eleven chapters including Chapter 1 Introduction and Framework; Chapter 2 Themes and Principles; Chapter 3 Land Use; Chapter 4 Public Lands; Chapter 5 Population; Chapter 6 Housing; Chapter 7 Economic Development; Chapter 8 Transportation; Chapter 9 Public Services and Facilities; Chapter 10 Water and Natural Resources; Chapter 11 Cultural and Historic Resources; Bibliography; Appendices; and Land Use Maps.

Now Therefore, the Storey County Planning Commission hereby resolves to amend the Master Plan by adopting the attached 2016 amendment of the Storey County Master Plan, with accompanying charts, drawings, diagrams, maps, reports, and other descriptive materials covering the following subject matters or portions thereof as are appropriate to Storey County: Introduction and Framework; Themes and Principles; Land Use; Housing; Population; Transportation, Water and Natural Resources, Economic Development; Public Services and Facilities, Public Lands, Cultural and Historic Resources; along with supporting References, Maps, Appendixes A through J, Bibliography, and Ten Land Use Maps, as the Storey County Master Plan.

The Storey County Master Plan is adopted to conserve and promote the public health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of Storey County.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: Recessed at 8:12 and reconvened at 8:17.

Planning Director Osborne: In the last "therefore" paragraph of the resolution, Appendixes E through P should read A through J.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: Clarified they are adopting a resolution that includes Option A for Lockwood Area Plans.

Planning Director Osborne: If you refer to the online document there is an Option A available. The document we have on record in my hand also is the Option A.

Deputy DA Keith Loomis: Asked for clarification on Option A and Option B as posted on the Storey County website.

Planning Director Osborne: On the website you have all of the chapters. In addition to Chapter 3 there is an addition

subset: Chapter 3 Option A and Chapter 3 Option B for the Lockwood Area.

Deputy DA Keith Loomis: I would recommend that the board make a motion to approve the resolution with Option A for the Lockwood Area as the master plan for Storey County along with the corrections in the resolution.

Commissioner Smith: Worried if they say Option A for Lockwood it is confusing since Option is A as it is written.

Planning Director Osborne: If you reference Option A it makes it very clear.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: From council's recommendation we would take the resolution and make a motion to adopt the resolution stipulating that it is the incorporation of Option A in both chapter 3 and in the section of maps.

Planning Director Osborne: That motion will include the corrections mentioned earlier.

Motion: Adopt the master plan per the resolution incorporating Option A into Chapter 3 and into the maps section and will include the corrections as being proposed. **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Commissioner Bucchianeri, **Seconded by** Commissioner Smith, **Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous vote (**summary:** Yes=6).

Vice-Chairman Hindle: Recessed at 8:25; reconvened at 8:29.

10. Discussion/Possible Action: Determination of next planning commission meeting.

Motion: Next planning commission meeting to be held on Thursday September 1, 2016 at the Storey County Courthouse, District Courtroom, Virginia City, NV at 6:00 p.m., **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Commissioner Smith, **Seconded by** Commissioner Thompson, **Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous vote (**summary:** Yes=6).

11. Discussion/Possible Action: Approval of claims - None

12. Correspondence (No Action) - None

13. Public Comment (No Action) - None

14. Staff (No Action):

Planning Director Osborne: Flood planning for Mark Twain is moving forward. We are working with Lyon County and the Carson Water Subconservancy District to do regional flood planning for that area. The USGS (United States Geological Survey) gave a presentation to the board of commissioners on the water problems facing the Highlands and Mark Twain. They believe there may not be a connection between the problem in Mark Twain and the development in neighboring Lyon County. Preliminary studies show 160 foot drop in wells up in the Highlands. Following the master plan adoption, we are going to be working on the sign ordinance, design standards, a tattoo ordinance, and a utilities corridor ordinance,

Planner VanHavel: I've reached out to the 1 acre association and encouraged them to put the USGS presentation on their agenda. I asked them to reach out to the 10 acre association as well.

15. Board Comments (No Action) -

Commissioner Herrington: Reiterated that the planning commission has been in all communities throughout the master plan process.

Vice-Chairman Hindle: Thanked the planning staff for all of their hard work on the master plan. He also mentioned that the housing moratorium expires at the end of August. Thanked Commissioner Ron Englebrecht for his service to the county. This is his last meeting - he's moving to the Midwest.

Planning Director Osborne: Thanked Commissioner Englebrecht, who is announcing his retirement from the planning

commission and who is moving from the area, for not only serving on the planning commission but his dedication to the Mark Twain community and its community center.

16. Adjournment (No Action) - The meeting was adjourned at 8:41 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

By Lyndi Renaud