

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting

Page 1

DRAFT

A regular meeting of the Carson City Board of Supervisors was scheduled for 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 3, 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
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

(8:30:31) – Mayor Bagwell called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. Ms. Warren called roll and noted the presence of a quorum. Ken Haskins, Pastor, First Christian Church, provided the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(8:34:40) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and called each member of the public who had signed in to speak.

(8:35:05) – Deni French introduced himself and noted his opposition to the location of the proposed slaughterhouse. He also thanked the Carson Water Subconservancy District and believed that they should not rely on grants, but that “our taxes should really provide them much more of their basic financial concerns and needs.” Mr. French recommended receiving federal funding for nuclear waste disposal in Nevada. He also believed that the Planning Commission erred in approving the slaughterhouse project.

(8:39:16) – Joan Buchanan introduced herself as a longtime resident of Carson City and stated her opposition to the proposed slaughterhouse which she believed was not appropriate for Carson City. She was concerned about water contamination and the limitless processing of game animals. Ms. Buchanan believed that the Planning Commission member who had visited the Wolfpack Meats facility had been there on a non-harvesting day, and she did not believe that the facility was near residences and downtown Reno.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting

Page 2

DRAFT

(8:42:38) – Glenn Conant, an Empire Ranch resident, also opposed the location of the proposed slaughterhouse. He read a prepared statement, and disagreed with the use of the “Mixed Use” zoning indicated in the Master Plan. He urged the Board to adhere to Guiding Principle No. 9, maintaining the quality and character of an established neighborhood.

(8:46:11) – Keriann Ortiz introduced herself as a 13-year-old president of her 4-H club. She spoke in support of the slaughterhouse as a convenient way of processing the animals she sells without having them travel to Reno. Miss Ortiz also believed that the Carson Valley Meats facility would benefit the youth that raise animals, and the local farmers and ranchers.

(8:47:20) – James Ortiz introduced himself as a 10-year-old farmer in strong support of the slaughterhouse. He shared his belt-buckle awards for raising the best looking duck and chickens. Mr. Ortiz noted that he was unable to sell his goats as it was “too tough to get on the list for processing.” He stated that he is currently unable to sell meat by the pound; therefore, he has to sell his goats at a lower price, the proceeds of which are deposited in his college fund.

(8:48:54) – Kadena Ortiz introduced herself as a Carson City Grange and 4-H leader who teaches youth how to grow their own food. She noted the learning experiences of children who participate in the programs and highlighted the Greenhouse Project at Carson High School, adding that roughly 300 students participated in the Future Farmers of America (FFA) program and 65 youth participating in her programs. Ms. Ortiz believed that purchasing from local farmers would bring down the cost of meat and believed that Carson Valley Meats was necessary for local farmers to farm and for her to teach the City’s youth.

(8:52:05) – Paula Peters introduced herself and noted that Eagle Valley Livestock sold their locally raised and slaughtered meat in the area. She also read into the record her written public comment, which is incorporated into the record, in opposition to the slaughterhouse.

(8:55:42) – Ana Winston introduced herself as an 18-year resident of Empire Ranch and spoke in opposition of the proposed slaughterhouse. She read a prepared statement in which she noted that she had spoken with Spanish-speaking residents of Villa Sierra Mobile Home Park and cited the demographics of the residents living in 42 owner-occupied homes housing 73 children, and added that most of the residents had signed a petition opposing the proposed slaughterhouse. She cited the odor, the noise of the stressed animals, the location on a floodplain that flows to the Carson River, and the decrease of their property values, adding that the residents “don’t have a voice.”

(8:58:55) – Mayor Bagwell stated for the record that Cheryl Roockwood would not testify; however, she had indicated her opposition to the proposed slaughterhouse.

(8:59:40) – Roger Rakow introduced himself as a Carson City resident since 1970. He also expressed concern regarding “the cosmetics of the town” and believed the Board members had their minds already made up. He also spoke about the underground water contamination during flooding and was concerned about the contaminants that could seep underground.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting

Page 3

DRAFT

(9:03:24) – Kendra Wilson introduced herself as a resident and business owner of Carson City and opposed the proposed slaughterhouse and believed that “public comment wasn’t really respected” or considered during the Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Wilson urged the Board to put the comments of the residents before the out of town ranchers, and to “show some pride in Carson City.”

(9:05:05) – Cheryl Roockwood explained that she wished to speak after all and referenced her written public comment, which is incorporated into the record. Ms. Roockwood opposed the project and recommended keeping the animals on the ranches.

(9:06:04) – Dr. Jennifer Verive introduced herself as an appellant who would speak during the time-specific agenda item. She expressed disappointment in Deputy District Attorney Todd Reese’s memorandum, incorporated into the record as late material, which indicated appellant Doreen Mack did not have standing to appeal the Planning Commission’s decision. Ms. Verive believed that as a community leader, Ms. Mack represented Carson City and wished that the Board would reconsider Mr. Reese’s opinion.

(9:07:57) – Mayor Bagwell entertained additional comments; however, none were forthcoming. She also thanked the members of the public for their respectfulness.

6. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JANUARY 6, 2022.

(9:08:08) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and entertained comments or corrections and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(9:08:16) – Supervisor Giomi moved to approve the minutes of the January 6, 2022 Board of Supervisors meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Supervisor Jones and carried 5-0-0.

CONSENT AGENDA

(9:08:38) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and entertained items to be pulled from the agenda. When none were forthcoming, she entertained a motion.

(9:08:52) – Supervisor Giomi moved to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of items 7.A, 8.A, 8.B, 9.A, 9.B, and 10.A (Resolution No. 2022-R-5) as published. Supervisor Schuette seconded the motion.

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

7. CITY MANAGER

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 4

DRAFT

7.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A CARSON CITY DESIGNEE(S) AGREEMENT OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS AND A CONFIDENTIALITY AND NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE OF NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF INDIGENT DEFENSE SERVICES (“DIDS”) AND ITS DESIGNATED CARSON CITY INDIGENT DEFENSE COORDINATORS, NANCY PAULSON AND STEPHANIE HICKS (“DESIGNEE(S)”), TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH DIDS REGULATIONS AND RELEVANT NEVADA LAW TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIAL CLIENT INFORMATION REGARDING INDIGENT DEFENDANT CASES.

8. FINANCE

8.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE REPORT ON THE CONDITION OF EACH FUND IN THE TREASURY AND THE STATEMENTS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES THROUGH JANUARY 21, 2022, PER NRS 251.030 AND NRS 354.290.

8.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION TO REMOVE \$369,131.03 IN UNCOLLECTIBLE ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE FROM THE RECORDS OF THE AMBULANCE FUND.

9. PURCHASING AND CONTRACTS

9.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A PROPOSED INCREASE TO BADGER METER INC.’S (“BADGER”) PURCHASE ORDER FOR FISCAL YEAR (“FY”) 2022 (PO 2220153) FOR THE PURCHASE OF WATER METERS AND RELATED PARTS, FROM THE CURRENT AMOUNT OF \$35,784 TO A NEW TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$93,218 FOR FY 2022.

9.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CONTRACT NO. 21300239 WITH CAPITAL GLASS, INC. TO REPLACE TWO SKYLIGHTS AT THE CARSON CITY AQUATIC CENTER (“PROJECT”) FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$248,864, TO BE AWARDED WITHOUT COMPETITIVE BIDDING UNDER NRS 338.1385(7).

10. PUBLIC WORKS

10.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A PROPOSED RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY DESIGNATED AS CARSON CITY ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 002-752-05 AND ALSO KNOWN AS A PORTION OF RETAIL COURT, AS OFFERED FOR DEDICATION BY THE PARCEL MAP FOR GOLDEN GATE PETROLEUM OF NEVADA, LLC, RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CARSON CITY CLERK-RECORDER AS DOCUMENT NO. 505532, MAP NO. 2988 ON APRIL 23, 2020.

Resolution No. 2022-R-5 approved via the Consent Agenda.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, AND OTHER ITEMS

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

No items were pulled for discussion from the Consent Agenda.

12. DISTRICT ATTORNEY

12.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: (1) TO INTRODUCE, ON FIRST READING, A PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS OF THE CARSON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE; AND (2) TO CONSIDER A BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT CONCERNING THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE.

(9:09:30) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Carson City District Attorney Jason Woodbury gave background and presented the Staff Report and proposed Ordinance, incorporated into the record, and called the proposed Ordinance “the first substantive step in the code revision processes” with many to follow. Mr. Woodbury assured the Board that “there is no substantive policy change in any of the revisions” presented in this item. He explained that his office was making an effort to model the language and the style of the Carson City Municipal Code (CCMC) to that of the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS). Mr. Woodbury provided examples of the proposed changes and stressed the importance of cross referencing via hyperlinks. He also thanked Mr. Yu for his efforts and responded to clarifying questions. Mayor Bagwell credited the wisdom of the Board in 2019 for recommending the re-write as a strategic goal, to make it easier for Staff and members of the public, and thanked Mr. Woodbury and Mr. Yu for a great start.

(9:39:42) – Supervisor Jones moved to approve the business impact statement as presented, and to introduce, on first reading, Bill No. 104. Supervisor White seconded the motion.

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

12.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING: (A) EXECUTION OF "SUBDIVISION SETTLEMENT PARTICIPATION FORMS" AND RELEASES PURSUANT TO THE ONE NEVADA AGREEMENT ON ALLOCATION OF OPIOID RECOVERIES ("ONE NEVADA AGREEMENT") PREVIOUSLY AGREED UPON FOR PARTICIPATION IN SETTLEMENTS WITH (1) THE STATE OF NEVADA AND OPIOIDS DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting

Page 6

DRAFT

AMERISOURCEBERGEN DRUG CORPORATION, CARDINAL HEALTH AND MCKESSON AS LISTED IN EXHIBIT C TO THE ONE NEVADA AGREEMENT, AND (2) THE STATE OF NEVADA AND OPIOID MANUFACTURER DEFENDANT JANSSEN/JOHNSON & JOHNSON AS LISTED IN EXHIBIT C TO THE ONE NEVADA AGREEMENT; AND (B) EXECUTION OF AN "AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO ONE NEVADA AGREEMENT ON ALLOCATION OF OPIOID RECOVERIES" REGARDING A REDUCTION IN ATTORNEY'S FEES TO THE ONE NEVADA AGREEMENT FOR PURPOSES OF THESE TWO SETTLEMENTS ONLY.

(9:40:12) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Mr. Woodbury referenced the Staff Report and supporting documentation. He described the two opioid Settlement Agreements: the first, a "Distributor Settlement Agreement" with AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, Cardinal Health, Inc. and McKesson Corporation; the second, a "Settlement Participation Form" which would confirm Carson City's participation in the "Janssen Settlement Agreement" with Janssen. Mr. also Woodbury recommended approval of the agreements by the Board and responded to clarifying questions. Mayor Bagwell commented on the reduction of the contingency fee amount owed to the law firm of Eglet Adams, and entertained a motion.

(9:45:39) – Supervisor Giomi moved to approve Carson City's participation in the Distributor Settlement Agreement and the Janssen Settlement Agreement and authorize the Mayor to execute the documents necessary to memorialize that participation on behalf of Carson City. The motion was seconded by Supervisor Schuette.

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

13. FINANCE

13.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE CARSON CITY COST ALLOCATION PLAN FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2021.

(9:46:20) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Ms. Russell gave background and referenced the agenda materials. She also noted a bottom-line decrease due to an adjustment in the Clerk-Recorder's cost allocation. Supervisor White stated that he could not support this item where "709 pages of passing money around, back and forth between one another, to get this done." Ms. Russell clarified that some funds had specific uses and requirements to warrant the cost allocation. Mayor Bagwell noted that "the objective is to determine whether the General Fund is going to pay the administrative expenses for the Enterprise Funds." She explained that she understood Supervisor White's point; however, she was in favor of centralizing the duties and believed it was "cheaper." Supervisor Giomi believed it was a matter of fairness, citing the example of paying for the ambulance

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting

Page 7

DRAFT

fund if “you don’t use the ambulance, why would the General Fund...pay for dispatching.” Mayor Bagwell entertained a motion.

(9:52:10) – Supervisor Giomi moved to accept the final Cost Allocation Plan provided as late material, for the Fiscal Year ending on June 30, 2021, for use in preparing the Fiscal Year 2023 Carson City Budget. Supervisor Jones seconded the motion.

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

13.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ADOPT, ON SECOND READING, BILL NO. 101, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE BY CARSON CITY OF ITS "GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) WATER AND REFUNDING BONDS (ADDITIONALLY SECURED BY PLEDGED REVENUE), SERIES 2022A" IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$16,690,000.

(9:52:49) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and received confirmation from Ms. Russell that there had been no changes to the Bill since the first reading. She also entertained a motion as there were no Board questions.

(9:53:15) – Supervisor White moved to adopt, on second reading, Bill No. 101, Ordinance No. 2022-3. Supervisor Schuette seconded the motion.

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

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

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting

Page 8

DRAFT

(9:53:45) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and noted that the Emergency Ordinance would encompass the first and second reading of Bill 105. Sherman and Howard L.L.C. Bond Counsel Ryan Henry gave background and noted that the reason for the Emergency Ordinance, in accordance with the City’s charter, was because a version of this Ordinance had been introduced by unanimous vote on first reading at the Board’s January 20, 2022 meeting. However, there had been a non-substantive inconsistency between the agenda materials on first reading referencing “Wastewater Refunding Bonds” when the ordinance officially named the bonds as “Sewer Refunding Bonds.” Mayor Bagwell confirmed that this item was properly notice and noted that the City would save on interest rates. She also entertained a motion.

(9:56:32) – Supervisor Schuette moved to adopt Bill No. 105, Emergency Ordinance No. 2022-4. Supervisor White seconded the motion.

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

13.D FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ADOPT, ON SECOND READING, BILL NO. 103, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE BY CARSON CITY OF ITS "GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS (ADDITIONALLY SECURED BY PLEDGED REVENUE), SERIES 2022C" IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$8,100,000.

(9:57:00) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Ms. Russell confirmed that there were no changes to the Bill since the first reading. Mayor Bagwell entertained a motion.

(9:57:23) – Supervisor Giomi moved to adopt, on second reading, Bill No. 103, Ordinance No. 2022-5. Supervisor White seconded the motion.

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

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting

DRAFT

13.E FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING STAFF-RECOMMENDED ASSUMPTIONS TO BE USED IN PREPARATION OF THE CARSON CITY BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR ("FY") 2023 (JULY 1, 2022 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2023).

(9:57:57) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Ms. Russell reviewed the agenda materials, incorporated into the record, and noted that the projected General Fund Assessed Valuation would increase by six percent and predicted the property tax increase would be at 4.5 percent. She also responded to clarifying questions. The Board agreed to increase the Ending Fund Balance amount as well. Ms. Russell also discussed the budget timeline, noting that the Final Budget would be submitted to the Nevada Department of Taxation on June 1, 2022. Mayor Bagwell entertained questions/comments and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(10:19:00) – Supervisor Schuette moved to direct Staff to use \$3.57 as the property tax rate in preparing the FY 2023 Carson City Budget. Supervisor Giomi seconded the motion.

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

14. 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

(10:19:43) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item. Ms. Paulson announced that the Board retreat will take place on Friday, February 25, 2022, at 8:30 a.m. at the Adams Hub.

(10:20:18) – Mayor Bagwell reported on the Tahoe Transportation District (TDD) Board meeting, noting that the Board had expanded to 14 members, representing both California and Nevada. She believed that this was a pivotal time for TDD, and she was not certain what revenue option would come to fruition. She anticipated a “small request for funding” from each of the jurisdictions, adding that the impact of Lake Tahoe was important to Carson City. She also entertained input from the Board.

(10:22:53) – Supervisor Schuette noted that she had received input regarding the Highway 50 Corridor, and encouraged members of the public to complete the survey to provide their input. She also stated that she had been

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 10

DRAFT

contacted by a group of concerned citizens regarding information on how to encourage the City to incorporate green building designs in future projects. Supervisor Schuette called the City's disc golf course "a gem" and encouraged interested individuals to get involved in helping with fundraising and maintenance of recreational facilities. Supervisor White congratulated the disc golf enthusiasts for their tenacity and hard work to build the course. Mayor Bagwell praised the Carson City Parks Foundation for helping handle the tax implications of the disc golf course and looked forward to a tournament in the future.

CLOSED NON-MEETING TO CONFER WITH MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES AND COUNSEL

This item did not take place.

(10:30:16) – Mayor Bagwell reminded everyone that the Board would return at 5:00 p.m. for the time specific item 15.A and recessed the meeting.

(5:00:30) – Mayor Bagwell reconvened the meeting. A quorum was still present.

TIME SPECIFIC - 5:00 P.M.

15. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING

15.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THREE APPEALS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S DECISION TO APPROVE A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW FOR A SLAUGHTERHOUSE ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL INDUSTRIAL ("GI"), LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF HWY 50 E AND EAST OF DETROIT ROAD, PORTIONS OF APNS 008-371-38, 008-371-39 AND 008-371-10 (NOW COLLECTIVELY APN 008-371-54).

To view the Board meeting in its entirety, please click on the following link:
https://carsoncity.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=1974

Or to watch this item only on YouTube, please click on the following link:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=62zmzbAQ70>

(5:00:33) – Mayor Bagwell introduced the item and read a statement into the record. She acknowledged that this item had generated "a good deal of controversy and publicity," which she believed was "a reflection of a passionate people," and called the difference of opinion "a true democracy." Mayor Bagwell also noted that whatever the outcome this evening, the decision made would be difficult because a group will not be satisfied with the results; however, she believed that she and the Board "are driven to do the right thing." She explained that the Board would act in a quasi-judicial capacity and would not make City policy as legislators and that the hearing would be administrative. She stated that the Board had received a lot of comments for and against the item, and assured everyone that they had read them all. Mayor Bagwell added that the hearing was not a popularity contest or a court of public opinion, and the outcome would not be based on which party had more vocal support. She outlined the hearing process which consisted of a brief introduction by Staff (as the Board

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 11

DRAFT

had seen the entire record). She highlighted the memorandum by Deputy District Attorney Todd Reese, noting that his job was to represent the Planning Commission, which he had done well: however, based on the ambiguity of the City's code on what a grieved party is, Mayor Bagwell had decided to allow Ms. Mack to present her appeal. She stated that after the presentation by Staff, each appellant would present their appeal as to why the Planning Commission's decision should be overturned by the Board, adding that the appellants would present based on the chronological order of when the appeals were filed, and recommended that they not repeat the other appellants' points. She directed each applicant to identify for the Board why they believed the Planning Commission erred (and not the fact that they are not in favor of the slaughterhouse). Mayor Bagwell stated that the Board would ask questions to the appellants after they completed presenting their appeals, followed by a response by the applicant, should they wish to do so; highlighting that their presentations were not in the form of public comment, as they would be directly impacted by the result of the appeals. She also noted that she planned to invite a representative of the Planning Commission to speak, followed by the Planning Commission Staff and Deputy District Attorney.

(5:10:10) – Planning Manager Heather Ferris presented the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, which included a timeline of previous actions, the project description, the outcome of the December 15, 2021 Planning Commission meeting, and the receipt of three appeals.

(5:15:05) – Appellant Doreen Mack read into the record her written appeal, dated December 20, 2021 and incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions. Supervisor Giomi inquired about the potential ground contamination given the enclosed and monitored facility which would be built on a slab. Ms. Mack explained that “none of us in this room know what this will do...we've never had a slaughterhouse before,” and cited the example of the V&T Railroad contamination, calling it a disaster. Supervisor Giomi noted that a lot of businesses had contaminants that were self-contained, adding that he did not find that argument compelling.

(5:20:45) – Supervisor White read into the record CCMC 18.02.060.C.4: *The letter shall provide the necessary facts or other information that support the appellant's contention that the staff or commission erred in its consideration or findings supporting its decision*, and noted that he was having trouble with “where you find an error” by the Planning Commission. Ms. Mack noted that many of the [December 15, 2021] meeting attendees were against the Special Use Permit (SUP), and a few were for it, adding that they had spoken or written to her about it. She also believed that the project would impact tourism in Carson City. She stated that “there's got to be a better way of doing this than just assuming it's good and hoping that it is, and dealing with the results afterwards.” She believed that the Planning Commission had not taken the public's comments into consideration.

(5:23:20) – Mayor Bagwell clarified that the role of the Planning Commission was “to implement the rules that are on the books.” She noted that the Commission had not erred in the issue of zoning, as a slaughterhouse was allowed in the General Industrial (GI) zone. Mayor Bagwell also explained that some of the 31 Conditions of Approval were based on public comment. Ms. Mack reiterated her concerns that the nearby residents either at the mobile home park or the custom homes in the area would be impacted by the slaughterhouse location.

(5:27:27) – Appellants Dr. Jennifer Verive and Robert Buttner presented their appeal via a PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Verive pointed out that the appeal would address the insufficient or incorrect data on which the Planning Commission had based its decision. She note that There is insufficient information in the application to make Finding Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7, adding that they had presented a lot of data to support their appeal.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 12

DRAFT

Dr. Verive and Mr. Buttner cited peaceful enjoyment, proximity to residences (especially the mobile home park), home prices, and the Quality of Life in Carson City as reasons to reverse the Planning Commission's decision. Dr. Verive believed that a feasibility study was not recommended by the applicant and that questions like water usage or accurate maps were not provided during the community meeting hosted by the applicants, calling it a public relations event. She believed that the "slaughterhouse stigma" perception was "very real." She also noted that the Planning Commission had made its decision based on the following incorrect/insufficient information:

- Wolfpack Meats was a much smaller operation than the proposed slaughterhouse.
- There are no homes near the Wolfpack Meats facility.
- "The outside corral does not require that they clean it."
- "The 1960s building is built of thick concrete walls, not SPF lumber."
- "Wolfpack Meats...is subject to a great deal of oversight by government agencies."

Therefore, Dr. Verive believed that Wolfpack Meats was not a fair comparison. She also believed that the wetlands information was omitted from the Staff Report and did not have approval from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, adding that that odor measurement devices were not considered either. Mr. Buttner explained that there were no studies that indicated nearby slaughterhouses increased urban home values. Dr. Verive believed that the Conditions of Approval were burdensome, and the corrective actions would come after complaints were received. She also believed that the water usage was underestimated by the applicants as noted in the PowerPoint presentation, and that odors, flies, sewer system needs, and insulation were not described in the application. Dr. Verive did not believe that the USDA carefully monitored oversight, and did not know how the special event notification process would work. She believed that the project would not provide community vitality and wished that the Planning Commission had used more objective data. Mayor Bagwell entertained Board questions.

(6:01:56) – Supervisor White clarified that he had watched the Planning Commission meeting video several times and noted that the special events information had been "explained thoroughly." Dr. Verive believed that since the events were not written down, they were open to interpretation.

(6:04:27) – Supervisor Giomi inquired about the water usage and Community Development Director Hope Sullivan referenced Condition of Approval No. 22 which specifically addressed water use, stating: *The water use will be analyzed by Carson City staff for the first three years of operation, at annual intervals. If the water use exceeds the water use estimated by the applicant, the applicant will be required to correct connection fees and pursue any other approvals that may be necessary as they relate to water usage.* Development Engineer Stephen Pottéy explained that Staff had addressed the potential water demands which had been submitted by members of the public, and noted that "even if this facility would operate at the higher range of those estimates, the City could still supply that water demand." He also explained to Supervisor Schuette that the analysis was below the Growth Management trigger; however, should the usage trigger a higher demand, other reviews such as growth management would be required. Supervisor Jones was informed by Mr. Pottéy that the water meter would be used to measure the daily and hourly water readings. Supervisor Giomi believed that the applicant could exceed the 15,000 gallon daily water usage and Mr. Pottéy explained that the City had the capacity to manage the water usage, adding that they had reviewed the estimates provided by the applicant and Dr. Verive to reach their conclusion. Ms. Sullivan clarified that should the water usage exceed the Growth Management threshold the applicant must adjust the usage or "make mechanical changes" for its usage to remain under the daily 15,000 water usage.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 13

DRAFT

(6:12:20) – Mayor Bagwell received confirmation from Dr. Verive that a feasibility study was not required. She stated that the applicant had met the code requirement and that the Planning Commission treated all businesses the same; “that’s what the code is all about...I’m trying to understand how you want to hold the applicant or the Planning Commission to extra data that is not required. I’m not saying it’s not a good idea for data, but it isn’t required.” Dr. Verive called the process subjective and noted that a Special Use Permit needs to be treated “specially.” She also noted that the Major Project Review would have been a good place to suggest a feasibility study and believed that the filtering system for the blood and other material going through the sewer system should have been included. Mr. Buttner did not believe that the 150-gallon water use covered the cleaning of the indoor holding facility which had been added later. Mayor Bagwell clarified that as long as the water use estimate do not exceed 15,000 gallons per day, the applicant would still remain within the requirements of the code. She also explained that the City had all the safeguards in place to deal with the water issues, and did not want to “apply something different to this business.” Supervisor Giomi clarified that applicant could not discharge anything in the sewer that the City’s ordinances wouldn’t allow, adding that all the details are not described in the application because they are in the City’s code for any business to comply with. He believed that it would be difficult for the general public to realize the amount of work involved to get an application to this point. Dr. Verive noted that a different location would avoid the issue of flies and odors in the neighborhood. She believed that they would be harmed because a business would be allowed to exist.

(6:28:28) – Kathleen Franco Simmons introduced herself and read into the record her appeal, which is incorporated into the record, that she had filed on behalf of her parents, George and Diane Howard, and included exhibits in the form of letters from her siblings. In her appeal, Ms. Simmons noted that Finding Numbers 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 were not met. She also responded to clarifying questions by the Board. Supervisor White inquired about the term “open space corridor” mentioned by Ms. Simmons who stated that it was a term she used to access the Carson River. Mr. Pottéy informed Supervisor White that the floodplain issues were addressed in Condition of Approval No. 12 and clarified for Supervisor Schuette that by moving the corral indoors, the floodplain ordinance would apply to the entire structure. Ms. Sullivan explained that this had been a concern of the Planning Commission as well in the September meeting to the point where they were considering denying the SUP; however, the applicant had offered to house the animals indoors which had alleviated their concerns.

(6:58:03) – Mayor Bagwell thanked all the appellants for their politeness and recessed the meeting.

(7:05:36) – Mayor Bagwell reconvened the meeting. A quorum was still present. She also referenced the previously-described process and invited the applicant to present.

(7:05:57) – Manhard Consulting Planning Manager Chris Baker introduced himself and applicant Mike Holcomb, Carson Valley Meats Operations Manager. Mr. Baker referenced presentation materials and noted that he would answer specific question; however, he would refer to the slides if needed. He stated that the applicant had provided all necessary data required by CCMC which had been reviewed, validated, and approved by Staff and the Planning Commission. Mr. Baker noted that two major arguments were brought forward during the appeal process: a slaughterhouse should not be in Carson City, and not at this location. He believed that a slaughterhouse was allowed, through conditional use, in Carson City in the GI zoning of “an established industrial area.” Mr. Baker read CCMC 18.04.150 into the record:

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 14

DRAFT

The GI District is established to preserve an industrial district for uses engaged in [the basic processing and manufacturing of materials or products predominantly from extracted or raw materials, or a use engaged in storage of or manufacturing processes using flammable or explosive materials, or] storage or manufacturing processes that potentially involve hazardous or commonly recognized offensive conditions. [Specific uses set forth in this section are prohibited in the Limited Industrial and Air Industrial Park districts unless specifically identified as a use in those sections.]

Mr. Baker believed this was “absolutely” the right location, adding that recently the City had required disclosure statements regarding living in an area adjacent to a GI zone, and showed several industrial businesses in that zone. He also highlighted the added Conditions of Approval for the December 15, 2021 meeting resulting from public comments received during the September 29, 2021 meeting. He considered dust, odor, holding animals outdoors for 24 hours as valid concerns and highlighted the solutions provided by the applicant such as having an enclosed corral, a landscape buffer, the annual SUP review, the wetlands delineation, and odor and noise control.

(7:18:40) – Mr. Baker commended the Planning Commission for their due diligence, including visits to Wolfpack Meats and for adding conditions to mitigate certain impacts. He read into the record quotes from the Planning Commission members and urged the Board to uphold the Planning Commission’s decision and to deny the appeal.

(7:23:40) – Supervisor Schuette inquired about the need for additional water due to the indoor corral and Mr. Baker clarified that the water usage was based on the original plan with the outdoor corral and with data from Wolfpack Meats for 150 gallons of water per animal with one harvesting day. He believed that even with 250 gallons of water per animal, they would not exceed the 15,000 gallon threshold set by the Growth Management Commission. Mr. Baker noted that the applicant would clean up after the animals “in real time,” especially when the water usage was averaged.

(7:26:14) – Supervisor Jones was informed that there would be a limit of three special event days, with no more than 120 animals per event. Mr. Holcomb clarified that each event may take up to three harvest days, adding that on a non-event day there would be a limit of 60 animals per day, per week. He also explained to Mayor Bagwell that game animals would be excluded from USDA jurisdiction as they would be previously harvested by hunters but butchered on site; therefore, they would be housed in a separate area and processed after all USDA animals were cleared from the area. At Mayor Bagwell’s request, Mr. Holcomb reviewed the denaturing process which he noted was a soap and food coloring-based product sprayed in the barrels that rendered meat inedible. He also stated that Denature was not hazardous and the Fire Department would not need to be notified, adding that the only other products housed in the facility would be the cleaning supplies such as soaps. Mayor Bagwell inquired about the noise issues highlighted in public comments. Mr. Holcomb explained that the animals would be dropped off within 24 hours of harvesting and the doors of the indoor facility would be closed prior to unloading into its own pen and would be watered until harvest time. He also clarified that the animals would moo or squeal only when handled improperly; however, USDA’s humane handling personnel would be watching the process and could shut the facility down, adding that he has an impeccable record with the USDA and the University [of Nevada, Reno], calling the facility “a phenomenal addition to this community.” Mr. Holcomb noted that they could not start the harvesting process without the presence of the USDA inspector, adding that on processing days, they would be under USDA oversight; however, an inspector may not be present.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 15

DRAFT

(7:38:31) – Supervisor White was informed that the game animals brought into the facility would have had their hides already removed. He also received confirmation from Mr. Holcomb that the facility would be sanitized when switching from game animals to USDA animals and vice versa. Mayor Bagwell entertained additional questions and when none were forthcoming, she invites Staff and Planning Commission representatives to present.

(7:40:01) – Ms. Sullivan addressed the soil contamination concerns, noting that converting to an indoor corral would mitigate that issue. She also highlighted the additional Condition of Approvals No. 30 which specified that *no odors related to the processing of animals could be realized at the property line*, and No. 31 which specified that *noise levels could not exceed 80 decibels*. Ms. Sullivan reminded the Board that they, along with the Planning Commission, had discussed the use of the Nasal Ranger device to address the odors emanating from Tahoe Western Asphalt, which she believed had not been a good experience, adding that the Planning Commission’s Conditions of Approval were based on performance standards. She also clarified that the Commission had not relied on the applicant for any of their decisions and had added Condition No. 29, the wetlands delineation condition based on public input, and stated that the Commission always considered property values in their decisions. Ms. Sullivan noted that Conditions No. 20 and No. 22 addressed the water and wastewater concerns, while Condition No. 26 clarified the event questions brought forward in public comment. She addressed additional comments such as the facility “would not make mead readily available,” noting that the Commission had not relied on that item and clarified that the Planning Commission would revoke an SUP, reminding everyone of the condition to have annual reviews of the SUP. She called the Planning Commission’s hearings on the item “very cordial,” adding that enforcement was “already in the Code.” Ms. Sullivan explained that the Commission had voted to approve the project based on the findings of fact, had found it consistent with the Master Plan, and thought that it would not overburden public facilities.

(7:45:42) – Mr. Reese explained that his role in this meeting was to advocate for the Planning Commission, while Mr. Yu was the Board Counsel. He addressed several public comments which noted that the decisions were made prior to the first and second Planning Commission meetings, the public comments were ignored, or statements were prepared prior to the meetings taking place. Mr. Reese assured the Board that those statements were “simply false,” adding that the Planning Commission had initially been skeptical of the project as they had been concerned about its impact on the Carson River and the noise and odor a livestock pen might generate. However, based upon the additional Conditions of Approval and the concessions made by the applicant, they had approved the project. Mr. Reese also noted that while the Commission was encouraged by national and international interest in Carson City, based on the public comments received from different states and countries, they encouraged the Board to pay attention to the local concerns. He clarified that his memorandum on [Ms. Mack’s] standing was based on his role as an advocate; however, he stated that according to the law, “this is the Board’s determination.” He cited CCMC 18.02.060 (Appeals) and explained that because new material is not allowed, the Standard of Review would not be a de novo review which would require a new decision by the Board. He stated that the review was “to see if the Planning Commission acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner or whether substantial evidence supports the Planning Commission’s decision” and read into the record CCMC 18.02.080 (Special Use Permit) subsection 5 (Findings). Mr. Reese read the following findings into the record and explained how the Planning Commission had mitigated the concerns and had added Conditions of Approval, subject to enforcement “like any other project” such as revoking business licenses or SUPs.

1. Will be consistent with the objectives of the Master Plan elements;

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 16

DRAFT

2. Will not be detrimental to the use, peaceful enjoyment, economic value, or development of surrounding properties or the general neighborhood; and is compatible with and preserves the character and integrity of adjacent development and neighborhoods or includes improvements or modifications either on-site or within the public right-of-way to mitigate development related to adverse impacts such as noise, vibrations, fumes, odors, dust, glare or physical activity;
3. Will have little or no detrimental effect on vehicular or pedestrian traffic;
4. Will not overburden existing public services and facilities, including schools, police and fire protection, water, sanitary sewer, public roads, storm drainage and other public improvements;
5. Meets the definition and specific standards set forth elsewhere in this Title for such particular use and meets the purpose statement of that district;
6. Will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, convenience and welfare; and
7. Will not result in material damage or prejudice to other property in the vicinity, as a result of proposed mitigation measures.
8. The applicant for a Special Use Permit shall have the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence to provide facts supporting the proposed Special Use Permit. For purposes of legal clarity, this shall include the burden of going forward with the evidence and the burden of persuasion on all questions of fact which are to be determined by the Commission and the Board. Additionally, the applicant shall provide adequate information in the application and on the site plan to substantiate the findings required in this Section.

(7:59:01) – Supervisor White inquired about the sewer lift station and Mr. Reese read Condition No. 25 into the record: *The sewer lift station downstream of the project is at capacity with entitled projects. The project must enter into a development agreement with the City to pay its pro-rata share based on the peak flow to be contributed, with an available flow of 320 gallons per minute and a total project cost of \$1,000,000.* Mr. Pottéy explained that the condition would not have a positive or negative effect on the mobile home park as the issues were “on the private side” of the property.

(8:00:39) – Planning Commission member and former chair Chuck Borders explained that the Commission is required to follow the process which includes input in the form of public comment. Mr. Borders believed that the public at times does not realize that the Commission will only listen to the comments and not engage in a debate. He also explained that the process had become better after each meeting. He reiterated the previous discussion regarding the use of water under the daily 15,000 gallon threshold, noting that 105,000 gallons per week did not seem unreasonable for this project, reminding everyone that the Board had approved the use of over one million gallons of water per month by a carwash. Mr. Borders also spoke about the annual review of the SUP to ensure the water usage was below the Growth Management threshold. He believed that “the Commission made the right choice,” even though they were hesitant in the beginning, prior to adding the new Conditions of Approval. As outgoing chair of the Commission, he requested that the Board “give us confidence that we would

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 17

DRAFT

do the right thing.” Mr. Borders also corrected Ms. Verive’s statement that a Texas A&M student had testified. He stated that she was a Texas Tech student, which had “a world renown meat judging team.” Discussion ensued regarding the findings and Mayor Bagwell was informed that Commission in general could have the confidence to meet the findings or provide Conditions of Approval. Mr. Borders explained that when Douglas County Commission members had provided comment during the December hearing, they had cited that it had been turned down for different reasons. He also believed that the project would benefit the community and in return, “the community would learn to tolerate it.”

(8:10:20) – Mayor Bagwell ensured members of the public that “we do listen. I’m really tired of people telling me I don’t. I read every word. There are binders of data...and we were handed another couple of hundred pages yesterday...we are not bound to necessarily agree with you.” She highlighted the fact that she had received comments in favor of and against the project and noted that she would make her judgment based on the record. She disagreed with previous public comments that believed Board members had come to the meeting with predetermined decisions, adding that they did not know how the other would vote. Mayor Bagwell clarified that the Board’s job this evening was to determine whether the Planning Commission had erred or not and thanked everyone for being kind and respectful. She also entertained final questions prior to discussion; however, none were forthcoming.

(8:14:06) – Mayor Bagwell entertained Board discussion. Supervisor Jones thanked the Planning Commission for their service. He noted that the quality of life had not been discussed, and read an excerpt from the Supreme Court decision regarding the Douglas County decision. He believed that a slaughterhouse would affect all of Carson City and believed that public opinion deserved to be listened to and stated that he would vote for the appeal.

(8:17:33) – Supervisor Giomi also thanked everyone for being respectful; however, he did not find the “mass emails” helpful. He highlighted the thousands of emails received from countries such as South Africa, Germany, and states such as Texas and Florida which had caused him to possibly miss legitimate comments from local citizens. Supervisor Giomi noted his struggle to see how the project would bring down the community; however, he cited the example of Tahoe Western Asphalt and the length of time it had taken for the Board to rectify that situation. He explained how he was struggling with Findings No. 2 and 7 and believed the Board had done a disservice to the Planning Commission by not specifying when deeper studies were needed. Supervisor Giomi clarified that he did not know how he would vote on the item; however, he felt that “we as a City, and the Planning Commission in particular, erred in finding a couple of things.” He believed that the Board should have known more to make a decision and for that reason “I can’t find the same facts, and I believe the Planning Commission had erred in finding them on 2 and 7; therefore, I would vote to overturn the Planning Commission’s decision.”

(8:23:05) – Supervisor Schuette called the process “incredibly difficult” and stated that she had learned a lot about harvesting, noting that she was grateful to hear that humane processes had been put in place. She stated that the GI zoning was still near a neighborhood area. She addressed the community’s concern about the location and the impact it was making. She thanked Staff and the Planning Commission; however, she referenced Finding No. 2 and believed that the City could not guarantee that the Conditions of Approval will be met, and the mitigations will work, resulting in a frustrated community. Supervisor Schuette believed that even though the project was away from the FEMA floodplain, she could not guarantee that with live animals Finding No. 6 would be met.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 18

DRAFT

She explained that although she supported the farm-to-table concept, she could not vote for the project and would support the appeal.

(8:29:20) – Supervisor White called the process to allow three-minute public comment unfriendly, because it would not allow the public to deliver a fully-constructed thought in that timeframe. He referenced Mr. Reese’s memorandum that stated much of the guidance to the Board was either vague, ambiguous, or absent. Supervisor White recommended that appellants work with Staff to better the process. He also noted that the Planning Commission did not err as they followed the same procedures “as is their customary course of action.” He did not believe that the public was ignored as he had attended the September hearing and had watched the December hearing three times and had noticed that Staff had spent over 40 minutes deliberating and crafting language to address the concerns of the public, highlighting several sections of the appeal that had addressed the Conditions of Approval. Supervisor White did not believe that the Planning Commission had abused its authority of discretion and provided the example of a sausage factory on Sage Street that did “what part of this plant is planning to do” and was in close proximity to two mobile home parks. He also gave the example of Butler Meats that operated its facility on Highway 50 East, 450 feet from the same mobile home park, and gave other examples as well and reiterated his point of view that the Planning Commission had not erred.

(8:37:50) – Mayor Bagwell believed that the Planning Commission had not erred, nor they had abused their discretion, as they had reviewed all the documents submitted by the public and had weighed them to conclude that “the preponderance of the evidence was not in the favor of the appellant.” She believed that both Staff and the applicant had followed the rules and she did not understand how the applicant could be held accountable for additional studies [that were not required]. She also addressed Supervisor Schuette’s concern about the wetlands, noting that “if it’s a problem, they don’t get to build.” Mayor Bagwell noted that should all conditions have requirements to be perfect, hospitals and schools could not be built, adding that a slaughterhouse can only be built in a GI zone and believed there was nothing objectionable about the project. She explained that the job at hand tonight was whether the Planning Commission had erred and not whether to approve a slaughterhouse.

(8:43:01) – Supervisor Jones moved to uphold the appeal. Supervisor Schuette seconded the motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (3-2-0)
MOVER:	Supervisor Jones
SECONDER:	Supervisor Schuette
AYES:	Supervisors Giomi, Jones, and Schuette
NAYS:	Supervisor White and Mayor Bagwell
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

16. PUBLIC COMMENT

(8:44:27) – Mayor Bagwell entertained final public comments.

(8:44:40) – Charlie Abowd introduced himself as a former co-owner of Adele’s Restaurant and wondered about having public comment after the vote. Mayor Bagwell clarified that public comment had been agendized in the

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 19

DRAFT

morning as well. Mr. Abowd reaffirmed his family's commitment to Carson City and expressed disappointment in seeing it divided and antagonistic towards the Board this evening. He noted that he had done business with Mr. Holcomb for 15 years, calling him "a first-class operator."

(8:47:29) – Peter Bader introduced himself and noted that the proposed site of the project was on the lowest part of the property, which caused him concern and believed the Planning Commission had erred. Mr. Bader wished to have a guarantee that his property values would not go down. Mayor Bagwell cited the example of a similar operation near her home, adding that the property values in her neighborhood had increased.

(8:50:00) – Charles Mann introduced himself as the agricultural mechanics teacher at Carson High School and an FFA advisor. He expressed sadness about the vote as he believed the project would have brought many educational opportunities to the students. Mr. Mann believed that processing facility was the currently used term for a slaughterhouse, which had not been used "for a long time." He sided with the decision of the Planning Commission and was certain many of the food issues faced with the closure of Highway 80 due to weather could have been alleviated by having a local facility. He was certain that his family could have benefited from having the processing plant in Carson City. Mr. Mann was also disappointed that he had to provide public comment after the vote.

(8:54:22) – Kelsey Penrose introduced herself and noted that she was neither for nor against the project. However, she believed that the community was disconnected from the agricultural and livestock procedures. She referenced Carson City's roots in agriculture and encouraged the community and Board members to reach out to local ranchers. Ms. Penrose explained that farms and animals did not smell, adding that the odors were from bacterial processes which formed after a certain time had passed. She cited the Carson City Fair at Fuji park, noting that the animals there were penned for about four days; however, there was no odor. She based the public's concern on the lack of familiarity with the processes.

(8:57:32) – Todd Brown agreed with Ms. Penrose and stated that most of the green space discussed by the appellants would not exist without family farms. He believed that they would eventually be sold for development. Mr. Brown explained that currently there were four meat processors nationwide that controlled 80 percent of the market and pricing. He also believed that small family businesses would grow tourism.

(9:00:34) – John Uhart introduced himself as a third generation Carson City resident, a 42-year commercial real estate broker, and a small rancher. Mr. Uhart expressed disappointment in this evening's vote as he had spent time on the project as the broker; however, he noted his appreciation for the work done by the Planning Commission and Staff. He believed the property was zoned properly and called it "a good location." He believed that the FAA participants were in need of a processing plant as Wolfpack Meats was "a year out."

(9:03:40) – Fritz Richards thanked the Board for their deliberation and the Planning Commission for "an awesome job." He addressed the Supervisors who voted for the appeal and noted that they had missed "an invaluable teaching moment." Mr. Richards called processing meat "a reality" and believed that our world "is governed by emotion." He believed that the Planning Commission had followed the rule of law; however, the Supervisors had chosen to overlook that, basing their decisions on emotion, and had missed an opportunity. He also noted that the current demand could not be met even with four meat processing plants.

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

DRAFT

(4:07:15) – Karl Baker introduced himself as a small rancher and expressed disappointment that “emotion got to you guys.” He noted that Staff, Engineering, and the Planning Commission had “signed off” on the project and he disagreed with the Board’s vote. Mr. Baker thanked Mayor Bagwell and Supervisor White for their votes and believed that the project fit the zoning.

(4:09:35) – Louis Test noted that he and his wife had been long-time 4-H leaders. He praised the 4-H program for teaching responsibility and highlighted the lack of processing plants after shows. Mr. Test explained that during events, the livestock stays near homes for four days, and gave the example of sheep being used for fire protection. He cited the example of local ranchers sending their sheep to California for processing. He believed that the project was in the right zoning area with appropriate Conditions of Approval for appropriate compliance. Mr. Test explained that one of the Board members should request a reconsideration of the item and hoped that his public comment would be entered into the record.

(9:14:01) – Mr. French believed that Finding No. 2 was the most critical one and was concerned that some of the issues were murky. He recommended getting together and finding the applicant a better location. He believed that the opposing parties were very sincere in their concerns.

(9:17:19) – Pete Sinnott introduced himself as a Carson City resident since 1955. He explained that he had attended every hearing on the item, including the ones in Douglas County. Mr. Sinnott thanked the Board for their time and objected to the fact that many people could not testify until after the vote, as they agreed with the Planning Commission decision. He cited the example of the local hospital and noted that expensive homes were being sold around it. Mr. Sinnott clarified that Carson Valley Meats planned to repair the sewage issues of the mobile home park and bring it up to standard. He also called the public comment period essential.

(9:20:00) – Paula Peters thanked the supervisors who voted for the appeal, noting that “they recognized that the slaughterhouse would not comply with the Master Plan.” She believed that the Nevada Supreme Court had the same concerns. She acknowledged the needs of the farmers and ranchers; however, she called Carson City an urban community with many new developments.

(9:20:59) – Mayor Bagwell expressed her appreciation to everyone for being courteous and thanked the Board members for “painstakingly watching and reading everything” adding “we don’t always come to the same resolution.” She also noted that she had been approached by an equal number of supporters and opponents of the slaughterhouse.

17. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO ADJOURN

(9:22:39) – Mayor Bagwell adjourned the meeting at 9:22 p.m.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Meeting
Page 21

DRAFT

The Minutes of the February 3, 2022 Carson City Board of Supervisors meeting are so approved on this 3rd day of March, 2022.

LORI BAGWELL, Mayor

ATTEST:

AUBREY ROWLATT, Clerk – Recorder

Attachments: written public comments