

Tuesday, January 25, 2011

The annual retreat of the Humboldt County Board of Commissioners was called to order on Tuesday, January 25, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. at the East Hall of the Winnemucca Convention Center, Winnemucca, Nevada. Those present were Chairman Garley Amos Jr., Commissioners Mike Bell, Dan Cassinelli, Tom Fransway and Jim French, District Attorney Michael Macdonald, Administrator Bill Deist and Clerk of the Board Tami Rae Spero.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Chairman Amos asked for public comment. Phil Jacka asked the Board if they had filed a petition to reverse the stay of the conditional use permit associated with the Jungo Landfill. District Attorney Macdonald stated that while he appreciated the comment he would ask the Board to offer no response due to the pending litigation against the Commissioners and that Mr. Jacka could contact the District Attorney's Office for information if needed. Chairman Amos stated that the County Commission would take the advice of legal counsel and offer no comment.

COMMISSIONER'S RETREAT/PLANNING SESSION:

ADMINISTRATOR'S RETREAT MESSAGE: Administrator Deist offered the 2011 retreat message (see attached).

PLANNING MATTERS: Betty Lawrence, Senior Planning Technician for the Planning Department, appeared before the Board.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) APPROVAL PROCESS: Administrator Deist noted his understanding that some of the Commission feel that the final approval on conditional use permits should be at the County Commission level and not at the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) level; he noted that he had provided material for the Board's review (included were copies of Planning Staff Report Th-6-84, RPC minutes for March 8, 1984, Planning Staff Report TH-7-84, a portion of Ordinance 01-05-87a related to conditional use permits and Chapter 17.68 of County Code related to conditional use permits); that he believed the discussion at this time is related to the Jungo Landfill CUP issue and that he believes the process in place worked as the Commission served as the appeal body when the RPC granted the extension; he noted the importance of the appeal process as the only other alternative is a Petition for Judicial Review before the Court; he offered comment on how many appeals have occurred in his years with the County and the concern that the Commission will not be able pick and choose which CUPs to handle, that all will have to come to the Commission unless legal counsel can find a way around it. Based on a question from Commissioner Cassinelli regarding the Commissions' final approval District Attorney Macdonald reviewed what had occurred with the 1987 ordinance noting that the language of that ordinance in large part still exists in

01/25/2011

Page 1

County Code today as it related to CUPs. Commissioner Fransway commented on his belief that the process needs to change and that the CUP approvals need to come before the County Commission, that if that had occurred the County would not be in the situation it is in as there would have been more scrutiny. He continued citing 17.68.150 and the requirement that modification must be by a unanimous vote of the County Commission which he feels should be a majority vote and offered comment that this is what this body is elected to do. Chairman Amos offered his concurrence on the unanimous vote which is minority rule and that the Commission should look at that but as far as having everything come to the Commission he believes the Board still has the last say and the Board can still send those permits back to the Planning Commission to rework. Commissioner Cassinelli commented that the last say was too late for the Board that they need to become involved at the beginning. Commissioner French stated that the Commission should become more hands on with the CUP process noting issues with the CUP issued by the RPC for the landfill project; he noted that what is missed is the expertise of a Planning Director and offered comment on the need for the position including the Commission's need to obtain information at the front end of the CUP process rather than later, the need to revisit the master plan and the need to strengthen the community development ordinances and make changes relative to the economy and new industry such as geothermal and the need to be proactive about development and not reactive. Commissioner Bell concurred with the change to majority over unanimous vote but questioned a change to the CUP process; he suggested that maybe larger type businesses could come before the Commission noting that smaller businesses may not be able to afford going to Court if they wish to appeal a decision and asked about the ability to separate the types and the amount of oversight needed. Discussion continued about the ability to separate the applications, what types of businesses which need CUPs and the benefit of having a Planning Director. Audience member Phil Jacka offered comment on the CUP process, the need for a Planning Director, how these matters are handled in Pershing County and that the final decision should be before the County Commissioners as they are elected. District Attorney Macdonald commented on the issue of determining which permits would go before the RPC and which permits would go before the Commission noting that the Planning Department cannot act arbitrarily they must enforce code noting for example the code language related to home based businesses and M3 zoning; he discussed the delegation of duties and stated that he could put together an ordinance which covers this but there will need to be homework and it may take a bit of time. Commissioner Amos stated his agreement regarding delegation of authority and the need to be careful about micro managing. Mrs. Lawrence commented on ordinances from other counties, issues with notification and issues with determining gross income. Commissioner Fransway commented that the Planning Department needs to

spend more time in the field to see how the County is growing and to nip potential issues in the bud, that there needs to be better direction in the department, that the RPC needs professional guidance, that someone needs to make sure that community development occurs in a good manner, that the master plan needs to be revisited, that the ordinance needs to be changed to reflect the County Commission's authority over the CUPs and the vacancy of the Planning Director needs to be filled.

County Administrator's Summary:

- 1. Revise ordinance so Commission has final say on conditional use permits**
- 2. Revise unanimous language**
- 3. Look at community development ordinances and strengthen those & provide policy and procedures to the planning department as to what conditions elevate RPC decisions up to County Commission**

Discussion occurred regarding the issue of the Planning Director position.

ZONING IN UNDEVELOPED AREAS OF THE COUNTY: Copies of Chapter 17.42 of the Humboldt County Code related to MAR - Mining, Agriculture and Recreation District zoning and Chapter 17.44 of the Humboldt County Code related to M3 - Open Land Use District zoning were provided to the Board for review. Administrator Deist reviewed the issue for the Board noting most of the undeveloped land is public lands and that most of this land is presently zoned M3; he stated his belief that most of the issues which are concerning the Commission are related to the "checkerboard" lands. Administrator Deist discussed the M3 zoning and the MAR zoning and commented that past concern with a restriction dealt with a situation such as a rancher wanting to break out five acres for children or retirement which would not be allowed under the MAR zoning. Commissioner Cassinelli stated that this issue had been brought to his attention by other ranchers and the question is why the areas in the checkerboard lands way out in the county are being allowed to be broken down into forty acre parcels; he noted that he had thought action taken by the Commission previously would take care of the problem but it had not addressed the zoning and with the issue of breaking pieces out the ranchers may just have to deal with that as that is why these are ranches they want big spaces. Commissioner Fransway noted that the County is not in the business of doing estate planning and that a lot of the things that come before the Commission for decision are outside the checkerboard and while there is an issue with the checkerboard there is also an issue with lands not in the checkerboard. District Attorney Macdonald commented on some of the standard issues that come up when you are discussing developing in the rural parts of the county including the balance between property owners being able to do what they like with their own property but from the County's standpoint the ability to provide services and the burden that may cause. Commissioner French commented that under the CUP requirements within the M3 and MAR

zoning the 300 feet notification requirement is inadequate citing the limitation on notification regarding the Jungo project; he stated that the Commission needs to take a look at that. Commissioner Cassinelli discussed his concerns about the parcels being split down too small in the outlying areas. Commissioner Fransway noted that the requirements for large parcel maps are set forth by statute so it would be necessary to go to the Legislature to get any changes done. Mrs. Lawrence commented on how the issue has been dealt with in other counties.

County Administrator's Summary:

- 1. Look at re-zoning some or all of M3 to MAR to raise minimum lot size and look at this in relation to distance from population center.**

Discussion ensued regarding ability to provide emergency services and the problems with sales of land in the outlying areas to buyers who do not fully understand what they are purchasing. Commissioner French commented on the need to update the Master Plan.

POSSIBILITY OF HIRING A PLANNING DIRECTOR: Discussion occurred regarding the need for the position including what the duties of the position would be and what qualifications would be necessary.

County Administrator's Summary:

- 1. To pursue filling the position of planning director.**

FISCAL REVIEW AND BUDGET DIRECTION: Administrator Deist reviewed his memo for the Board related to budget issues for the County (see attached) and discussion occurred regarding the potential fiscal impact on the counties of the State's financial situation, room tax revenues, CTX revenues, the Nevada Energy lawsuit and the potential issues with it and the status of filling the comptroller position. The Board's response to the Administrator's questions as follows - Do you want taxes to remain at their current level? Yes; Do you want to allocate the tax dollars the same way as in the past? Yes; Do you want to retain the 60% ending fund balance goal? Yes if realistic; Do you want department requests to equal revenue projections? Yes; Do you have priorities you wish to fund or new programs you wish to include or existing programs you wish to discontinue? Filling the position of planning director.

County Administrator's Summary:

- 1. Same process as in the past only change addition of the planning director and whatever comes from the State.**

2011 LEGISLATIVE SESSION/PROTOCOL/COMMISSION PROCESS: Administrator Deist reviewed issues with the upcoming Legislative session noting what had been said during the Governor's State of the State address and information provided by Assemblyman Goicoechea when he addressed the Commission;

he noted the importance of communication between the Commissioners and with staff. Commissioner French commented on the need for a united front, the need to put in face time before the Legislature and the need to be proactive. Commissioner Cassinelli agreed noting that the consensus of the Board needs to be presented to the Legislature but he also noted the need to be careful with costs. Commissioner Bell stated his agreement noting the importance of communication, the need to be in contact with the Administrator and the need to be aware of the Open Meeting Law when the Commissioners discuss issues. Discussion occurred regarding the need to be involved in the process and the need to communicate. District Attorney Macdonald noted that the District Attorneys' Association is reviewing Bill Draft Requests and he will assist the Commission in any way he can.

County Administrator's Summary:

1. **United front**
2. **Open communication**
3. **Utilize staff to get message/communication out**

Commissioner French discussed the need for increased travel this year and the importance of being involved. Commissioner Fransway discussed a meeting with Speaker Ocegüera.

ROAD MATTERS/REVIEW/DISCUSSION/PROPOSALS: Provided to the Board for review was a memo from Road Superintendent Ben Garrett regarding road issues (see attached), a copy of the planned five year equipment replacement plan for the Road Department, a copy of the pavement preservation cost estimates and 5 year Plan for County roads and the gravel road plan for 2011 - 2015 for County roads. Superintendent Garrett appeared before the Board. Superintendent Garrett discussed the issues with numerous right-of-ways having been dedicated to the County but not accepted into the maintained system including that when the right-of-ways are accepted the roads meet County standards but by the time the occupancy levels reach the required 60% the roads no longer meet standards and the developers are long gone leaving it to the residents to meet those requirements. Discussion ensued regarding possible solutions included in the memo as the Board agreed that there is an issue.

Superintendent Garrett offered an update on the Ruby Pipeline impact including that initially the project had intended to drill for wells for the project and then turn them over to the Road Department for use but the project did not drill for those wells so there are no opportunities for the department to obtain those wells, that there is still one on Bottle Creek Road but there is minimal potential for a Road Department benefit with what is left. Commissioner Amos noted discussion which had occurred at the Humboldt River Basin Water Authority meeting relative to this issue. Superintendent Garrett continued discussing Precision

Pipeline's and El Paso's commitment to leave the roads in as good or better condition than before the project, the number of roads impacted in the County and the requirements of the County's street cut/encroachment permits, that so far the commitment has been followed through on. Discussion occurred regarding what work the County has done on the roads impacted as opposed to the companies, about the bad conditions on Leonard Creek Road, whether the County will continue dust abatement on the roads that were treated for this project but have not been treated by the County in the past and the time frame for the pipeline project.

Superintendent Garrett discussed the status of the County-City equipment sharing and detailed what had occurred since 2008 and the benefits of the program including cost savings; he noted he will continue to look for sharing capabilities with other governmental entities. Administrator Deist noted the benefits of the cooperation between the entities. Chairman Amos concurred with the Administrator's comments. Commissioner Fransway offered comment on the sharing of RTC funds with the City.

Commissioner French commented on the Road Department making road base material available for the shooting range in the past and the desire of the shooting range committee to maintain that relationship.

Superintendent Garrett discussed the issues with pavement on the roads in the County and the importance of preventative maintenance on those roads to extend the life of the roads without costly reconstruction. Discussion occurred regarding the roads involved, the costs associated with cape seals, chip seals, overlays and crack fills and the time frame for the project. Administrator Deist commented on the benefit of the preventative maintenance. Discussion occurred regarding the benefits of combined bids with the City of Winnemucca and the possibility of working with the State too.

Superintendent Garrett discussed the gravel road maintenance plans for 2011 through 2015 including the roads included, improvement to drainage, dust control program, repair of cattle guards, repair of bridges and the ongoing maintenance for the roads.

Discussion occurred regarding issues with the dust palliatives used on Hershell Road. Audience member Phil Jacka commented on the need to use dust control that is environmentally friendly and discussion regarding the issue occurred.

Superintendent Garrett updated the Board on the status of the RS2477 roadways in the County. Commissioner Fransway commented on the need to prioritize this process due to issues at the federal level and if necessary the Commission could intervene with the BLM to request that the process be expedited.

Superintendent Garrett updated the Board on bridge maintenance in the County including Eden Valley Bridge and bridges in the McDermitt area that need minor repairs.

(The Commission took a lunch recess from 11:51 a.m. to 12:36 p.m.)

Superintendent Garrett continued presenting on behalf of the Road Department discussing sign maintenance including issues with the County's signs not meeting new standards set for by the Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices and the plan to replace all nonconforming signs over a period of five years as the expense to replace all signs immediately would be cost prohibitive.

Superintendent Garrett reviewed equipment issues including the need to replace motor graders and options for that process, the need to replace some semi-tractors and belly dumps, the need to replace two snow plows/sanders, the need to purchase additional rollers, the need to replace water tankers and an equipment transport trailer and need to look at an emergency generator for the shop. Discussion occurred regarding the request.

County Administrator's Summary:

1. Revisit the standards for bringing roads into the County Maintained System at a Commission meeting - when & how.

NEGOTIATION PROCESS OVERVIEW: Administrator Deist reviewed for the Board how negotiations have been handled in the past including the make up of the negotiation team for the County; he noted that Gene Bell, who has served as the negotiator in the past, is no longer working in Nevada and that here are two bill draft requests which have been introduced in the Legislature which could change the process currently used. Administrator Deist stated that he had spoke to Gene Bell and that he would be available on a call basis for assistance at an hourly rate. Commissioner Fransway suggested that the Commission wait and see if Mr. Bell's assistance would be needed. Administrator Deist noted that both the County employees and the County law enforcement contracts are due for negotiations this year. Commissioner French disclosed for the record that his wife is currently an employee of the Humboldt County Assessor's Office but is planning on leaving that position in 2011. Commissioner French discussed his observations related to the County/employee relationship and issues that have hampered that relationship and resulted in a lack of trust; he noted issues with Mr. Bell during the negotiation process that he felt were counterproductive. Commissioner French continued discussing salary compensation for the employees, the need for the County to improve in the recognizing the employees for the services they provide and issues that arose in the last negotiation that damaged the perception the employees had of the County. Commissioner Bell commented on the prior negotiation and what was done noting that it appeared that the agreement was not seen as equitable by the employees. Commissioner Fransway suggested that the county look at a program to initiate more personal contact with the employees. Discussion occurred regarding events and programs which had been used in the past. Commissioner Cassinelli agreed that the County and the Commission need to get more

in tune with the employees and offered comment on the prior years negotiations; he stated that the Chairman or Vice-Chairman should be present at the negotiations but suggested that Mr. Bell's services be retained for back up. Chairman Amos commented on sitting in on the prior negotiations in his capacity as Vice-Chairman and his issues with Mr. Bell's actions; he suggested that the County could retain his services but that he not be involved in negotiations just if arbitration is required. Administrator Deist commented on the prior negotiations and issues with both sides; he noted that he has handled negotiations in his past as Administrator for other governmental entities. Discussion occurred regarding using the Administrator as the negotiator with the Chairman or Vice-Chairman being present, the need to use another employee such as the Administrative Assistant in the Administrator's Office for assistance in taking notes and such during the negotiations, whether to retain Mr. Bell's services on a month by month contract for assistance when necessary for negotiations or other employee/employer issues and what the length of that contract would be if it is done.

County Administrator's Summary:

- 1. County Administrator will lead negotiations with Chairman/Vice-Chairman observing**
- 2. To retain Gene Bell's services for advice**

ATTRITION POLICY REVIEW AND POSSIBLE REVISION: Administrator Deist reviewed the reason for the original adoption of the attrition policy, the effect of the policy on the number of employees in 2011 compared to 2001 and what has occurred with waivers over the last few years; he noted that what needs to be looked at is whether the Commission wants to continue with the attrition policy and if the Board does how do they want to handle it and if they don't what is the process. Commissioner Cassinelli suggested that it is time to do away with the policy as waivers are not being denied but that the County needs to hold the line on the number of employees. Commissioner Fransway confirmed that the attrition policy covers only those employees currently budgeted for not the addition of new positions. Administrator Deist concurred and noted that the purpose behind implementing the policy was to reduce the number of employees Humboldt County had and that has been very successful and resulted in a cost savings. Commissioner Cassinelli noted the issues that had resulted in some departments such as Building and Grounds with the custodial position due to the Commission enforcing the policy. Commissioner French questioned if departments could come up with a list of core employees who would be exempted from the attrition policy. Administrator Deist suggested that at this point "core" would be everyone they have in the office. Commissioner Bell offered comment that he would be ok with doing away with the waiver requirement as long as the number of employees is held at its current level and any new position must be brought before the Commission. Commissioner Cassinelli noted that the requirement to request the waiver did bring the heads of offices in

before the Commission for discussion. Commissioner Bell reiterated his position that new positions have to be requested but if the position is budgeted for fill it. Sheriff Kilgore addressed the Board regarding the attrition policy noting that the policy definitely served its purpose and that budgeted positions could be discussed during the budget process and suggested that if the Commission wants to hear from the department heads maybe they could request that each one come before the Commission once a quarter to update the Board on what is occurring in their respective offices. Discussion occurred regarding the Commissioners rotating and attending the Management Team meetings and inviting the department heads to address the County Commission with office updates.

County Administrator's Summary:

1. Remove attrition policy
2. Attempt to hold the number of employees at current level
3. Policy to invite department heads to address the County Commission

RECAP OF THE DAY'S ACTIVITIES: Administrator Deist reviewed the items identified in the summaries for the day.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Chairman Amos asked for public comments. None were offered.

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Amos adjourned the meeting at 1:55 p.m.

ATTESTED: _____

[Signature]

Clerk

APPROVED: _____

[Signature]

2/2/11

Chairman

RETREAT MESSAGE
2011

As I look back at the past 10 years of retreats much has changed. Commissioner Cassinelli is the only member of the current Commission who has participated in all 10 retreats. Over those 10 years a great deal has been accomplished and the direction given by the Commission has been beneficial.

The purpose of today's meeting is to get away from the more formal setting of the Court House and to give you the opportunity to discuss among yourselves the issues you have identified. No decisions will be made today; instead you will be giving direction. I will attempt to capture that direction after each topic and will discuss it with you to insure I have heard what you said. At your next regular meeting we will bring it to you for adoption. I will then take this direction to the Management Team and share it with them for the coming year.

Each year I have taken a moment to say thank you for setting this day aside and this year is no different. Thank you. We have a busy day ahead and I hope it will be productive.

Each year we take a few minutes to look at some overall issues that may impact us in the coming year. The first is the economy. Depending on what you read or who you talk to the economy is improving or at least not declining on the federal level. We are all aware of what is happening in the State of Nevada. We are not out of the hole and won't be for some time. In Humboldt County we have been somewhat isolated from some of the downturn, primarily due to the mining economy. We have also enjoyed a boost due to the Ruby Pipeline project. However this is a temporary boost and will end in the near future. The expansion at Hycroft is a big positive on our horizon. This will generate jobs, potential increased CTX and net proceeds. In addition it is possible that Newmont will move forward with the Sand Man project in the next year. If the price of gold continues at the level we have seen in the last year, mining will continue to help. However there are issues related to this industry not only on the federal level, but also on the State level. Changes either in mining law or regulations as well as additional tax burden could adversely impact the

industry or in turn their influence on our economy. We have not seen the drastic downturn that other counties have, yet and I hope we don't. There is no guarantee.

There are three issues which we will be discussing today which have the potential to impact us in the coming year. Those are the 2011 session of the legislature which begins February 7, 2011, the budget process, and negotiations with both associations. In addition the NV Power issue related to coal at Valmy is still out there and we are all aware of the legal issues the County is facing. Any or all of these may impact us in the next year.

I thought it would be good to review the direction you gave last year prior to starting into the discussion before you today. That direction was:

- Development of a Large Parcel Ordinance. That ordinance was developed by the RPC and presented to you for adoption last fall.
- Budget/Fiscal issues: The budget was developed with out an increase in taxes; there were no new programs and in fact the Management Team brought forward requests at all most the same level as the prior year; you wanted to tighten up the attrition policy, but not to change it (I would suggest that this was not accomplished and we will discuss it further later in the meeting); we were able to add revenue to our General Fund reserves and we will discuss this under the budget, however at budget time we still had a gap between revenue and expenditures; we followed the same process for the budget and were able to get it completed in one day; we did not discuss the reinstatement of a group such as the cost reduction task force; and we did meet the 60% ending fund balance goal (actual at 6-30-10 was 77%).
- Road Issue: We continued with an emphasis on pavement management; we continued to look at what would be required as development occurred including the need for drainage; we were able to do several tests with products other than mag to see the effect on dust control as well as overall road impact; compaction of gravel roads continued as a priority and we continued to include pull behind rollers in the budget; we also continued to share equipment with other agencies when practical.
- PILT: We continued to place the majority of the money received in the Road Department and we continued to follow the direction of having the money before we used it.

042

We will be placing memos related to each issue in the area of the issue instead of including them in this message. Today I am looking for direction from you that I can share with the Management Team as we begin the new year. I hope this will be a beneficial day for you and if it is it will beneficial for the organization.

UNOFFICIAL

MEMORANDUM

TO: County Commissioners

FROM: County Administrator

DATE: January 20, 2011

SUBJECT: Fiscal Review and Budget Direction

On Monday night the Governor will deliver his State of the State address. This may very well impact much of the discussion we have the next day on this subject. If indeed the plan is to push services down to our level we must begin now to plan for the delivery of those services as well as the funding of those services. I would hope that we can find a way to address this with out adding additional employees or creating new units for delivery. We need to look at contracting for the service either with the State (Community Health Nurse Model) or another service provider already in the community.

As we look toward the development of the 2011-2012 budget there are a few things I would offer. First I believe that much like last year we will not have a good feel for the revenue picture at the time we develop the tentative budget. With the legislature in session the projections made by taxation will be on time, but like last year will not be ones we want to rely on and in fact may change dramatically prior to the adoption of the final budget. One known factor is that the Management Team has bought into the present budget process and it has worked. This may be the year that we are required to file an amended budget as we may not have a good feel even at final budget time as to what may be expected or required of Humboldt County.

As we begin the budget process we look to you for direction and ask the same questions even though we think we know the answers we want to be sure. Those questions are:

1. Do you want taxes to remain at their current level?

044

2. Do you want to allocate the tax dollars the same way as in the past?
3. Do you want to retain the 60% ending fund balance goal?
4. Do you want Department Requests to equal revenue projections?
5. Do you have priorities you wish to fund or new programs you wish to include or existing programs you wish to discontinue?

You received the audit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010 in December. In the Management Discussion and analysis the financial highlights were discussed including the fact that we had achieved the 60% goal once again. This is something we have done each year since you adopted it in 2002. While this is something we can be very proud of will it become a target? It was also noted that our revenue in the General Fund exceeded our expenses. Once again much of this had to do with the net proceeds and the prepayment. If the legislature does not address this and allows the program to revert to the old method of payment we will not receive payment in this calendar year as they have already been paid.

Through the first six months our CTX is up over last year but not to the level it was in 08-09. In the General fund our revenues are very close to where they were this time last year and our expenses are slightly higher. We will be watching this closely and discussing spending patterns with the departments. One encouraging note is that revenue at the Winnemucca Events Complex is up by approximately \$90,000 over what it was this time last year while expenditures are only up slightly over this time last year. I believe the revenue increase is directly linked to room tax.

Unless directed otherwise we plan on following the same process as we have for the last several years. That process is for the departments to develop their requests and submit them. They will then be put together to form the budget which I will review and then meet with them for discussion. Once that has occurred I will provide you and the departments my recommendations as to what should and what should not be included in the tentative budget. This process has worked well for the last several years and made the process more efficient and less time consuming.

This is your opportunity to provide me direction and through me to the Management Team that direction for the coming year related to budget.

To: Humboldt County Commissioners
From: Ben Garrett, Road Superintendent
Date: January 25, 2011
Subject: Road Issues for the Retreat

- 1) Acceptance into the Road Maintenance Infrastructure:
 - a. Issues: Numerous Right-of-Ways have been dedicated to Humboldt County, but not accepted into the Maintained System. Under our current structure developers are required to bring the dedicated Right-of-Ways up to County Road Standards as a condition for approval from the Planning Department. Several years may pass before the road meets the occupancy standards for acceptance in the Maintained System. Roads have deteriorated with time and require reconstruction prior to acceptance into the Maintained System.
 - b. Road Scenario Examples:
 - i. Sand Creek Circle: road brought up to standards in 2009, but is unoccupied at this time.
 - ii. Bird, Teal and Pelican: the road was accepted into the Maintained Road System in April of 2008 when the road was constructed to current road standards. The work has not been completed.
 - iii. Supreme Court: the road is constructed to standards, but does not meet occupancy requirements or connect to a maintained County, City or State roadway. Improvements were not required from the nearest maintained road to the proposed roadway.
 - iv. Cowboy and Brayton: The residences of both roadways have inquired about acceptance into the Maintained System. Both roadways met Standards at the time of the parcel splits, but have deteriorated over time and require reconstruction. All other conditions for occupancy and connectivity are met.
 - c. Solutions:
 - i. Accept all roads upon completion of the conditions set for the parcel split with a requirement of improvement to the nearest connecting maintained roadway.
 - ii. Require developer to maintain roadway until occupancy standards are met and roadway is accepted in the Maintained System.
 - iii. Require a bond from the developer to cover the cost of reconstruction at the time all existing requirements for acceptance in the Maintained System are met.
 - iv. Leave requirements for acceptance at current standards.

2) Ruby Pipeline Impact Update:

- a. Potential Water Sources: Initially several water sources were identified as a potential benefit to the operation of the Road Department upon completion of the pipeline. The proposed wells did not materialize over the course of construction. A potential for one water source on Bottle Creek Road still exists.
- b. Impacted Roadways: Precision Pipeline and El Paso Pipeline have committed to leave our infrastructure in "Leave the roads in as good or better condition than when the project began". 19 of our roads will be impacted to some degree. To this point in the project the contractor has followed through on the pledge to repair damage to the infrastructure. Our Street Cut and Encroachment Permits require the contractor to repair any damage to the Right-of-Way due to project impact.
- c. Mitigation Solutions:
 - i. Pavement repair
 - ii. Drainage structure repair
 - iii. Road Realignment.
 - iv. Grading and new gravel on gravel roadways

3) County-City Equipment sharing: In 2008 Humboldt County and the City of Winnemucca began sharing equipment and manpower to mutually benefit both entities. Both entities own specialized equipment unique specific aspects of road maintenance ie: Motor Graders, Street Sweepers, Pipe Cleaning Trucks, Crack Seal Machine and Transport Vehicles. With the limited use of this equipment by each entity, ownership or rental (when possible) of this equipment can be expensive.

- a. Purchase of a Compaction Roller in saved both entities money on the purchase or the rental. The roller is used about 50 hours by each entity annually. The cost was \$ 11,300 each. The rental cost for each entity, if available would exceed \$3000 annually.
- b. In 2008-2009 the County borrowed more equipment from the City than it loaned. Mainly through the use of the City's Crack Seal Machine. The imbalance leaned toward the \$6,400.
- c. In 2009-2010 the County lent more equipment to the City than it borrowed. The imbalance was \$4,800.
- d. In 2010-2011 the ledger has the County on positive side for \$2,200, but crack seal season will shift the imbalance.
- e. Over the course of several years I would anticipate a fairly even exchange of equipment and manpower with a positive benefit to the community.
- f. We have shared equipment with the City and NDOT. We are currently working with BLM, Lander and Pershing Counties on potential opportunities for savings.