

Monday, January 11, 2016

A special meeting of the Humboldt County Board of Commissioners was called to order on Monday, January 11, 2016, at 9:30 a.m. at the place of meeting at the Paradise Valley Community Hall, Paradise Valley, Nevada. Those present were Chairman Marlene Brissenden, Commissioners Mike Bell, Garley Amos, Jr., Jim French and Ron Cerri, Deputy District Attorney Gabrielle Carr, Administrator Dave Mendiola and Clerk of the Board Tami Rae Spero.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Chairman Brissenden asked for public comments. Gary Echevarria, present on behalf of the Paradise Valley New Building Fund, requested that Humboldt County grant an easement through the RV Park that the County owns; he noted that he had approached the Community Board who runs the Park and they were in favor of the request as was Jason Deputy, the Chief for the Paradise Valley Fire Department. Mr. Echevarria continued explaining the plan for the easement including the purpose and the location. Chairman Brissenden explained that as this item is not on the agenda so it could not be discussed but directed that the item be placed on the next County Commission Agenda. Mr. Echevarria asked for direction on what would be needed to present the request. Commissioner French suggested that Mr. Echevarria speak to the County Administrator. Chairman Brissenden asked for further public comments.

Tina Gast a home owner near the proposed site for the gymnasium appeared before the Commission and explained that she might not be able to stay for the entire meeting so she wanted to offer her comments; she continued to offer comments related to the effect of this proposal on the community including issues with Mr. Echevarria and other members of the new building group and actions and statements made by those individuals; Chairman Brissenden interrupted the public comment by Mrs. Gast and asked that any comments be directed to the Commission not audience members. Mrs. Gast continued referring to comments she has heard related to living in Winnemucca versus living in Paradise including being told that she is unable to serve on the Paradise Valley Community Board, the appearance that the Community Board is stacked with members who support the gym building, the division in the community caused by this building and the proposed type of building and location. Chairman Brissenden asked for further public comments.

Steve Lucas a resident of Paradise Valley appeared before the Commission and noted that he is the owner of the property that lies just east of the proposed site; he continued asking that the community come together to build a building that would not only have a basketball court but would have room to grow without the issues that are at hand; he commented on the effect of this proposal on the community and issues with the proposed location including the trees on his property which would result in a liability

01/11/2016

Page 1 of 11

for him if branches were to fall on the building site and cause damage or injuries, noise and debris that will effect property owners around the site and the lack of parking; he concluded by commenting on the benefits of attending school in the Paradise area.

No further public comment offered.

COMMISSION AND PUBLIC TO VISIT SITE WHERE THE RECREATION CENTER IS CURRENTLY PROPOSED TO BE BUILT: The Board of Commissioners, Administrator Mendiola and audience members visited the proposed site.

PUBLIC HEARING - To consider an appeal of a conditional use permit (CUP) (UN-15-08) approved by the Regional Planning Commission at their November 11, 2015 meeting to allow construction of a 70 foot x 125 foot steel building at 110 Bridge Street in Paradise Valley, NV for use as a gymnasium: Chairman Brissenden disclosed for the record that she and her husband had contributed to the New Building Fund but that she does not believe that this will prevent her from objectively and independently evaluating testimony and facts in the matter therefore she will be participating in the discussion and vote. Commissioner Cerri stated that he had also contributed but that would not effect his vote and that he has no financial benefit either way so he would also be participating in discussion and action on this matter. Chairman Brissenden stated that this hearing would be conducted as a Trial de Novo and explained what that would entail including that evidence would be considered related to two issues: does this application and the use of the gymnasium comply with the Master Plan and with the Humboldt County Zoning of M-3, who could present evidence, the type of evidence that would be considered, the manner in which comments/testimony could be offered and that this hearing would only be related to the appeal of the Conditional Use Permit at 110 Bridge Street. Deputy District Attorney Carr noted that all letters and correspondence that had been provided to the Regional Planning Commission at their November 12, 2016 meeting as well as the minutes, staff report and transcript from that meeting have also been provided to all members of this Board. Discussion occurred regarding the manner in which the hearing would be conducted.

Gary Echevarria, President of the non-profit corporation, Paradise Valley New Building Fund and Rolfe Schwartz, secretary and Richard Gavica treasurer appeared before the Commission. Mr. Echevarria offered opening comments stating that the building is permitted under the current zoning, conforms with the Master Plan, that they would like to exercise their rights as property owners as they like this spot for the proposed building due to its closeness to both the school and the community hall and that they will adhere to any building codes and requirements by the City and Health Departments.

Chairman Brissenden asked for public comments. Therese A. Ure of Schroeder Law Offices,

01/11/2016

Page 2 of 11

appeared before the Commission supporting appellant, Steve Lucas; she stated that appellant Lucas and the other appellants are requesting this Commission to disapprove and withdraw the current CUP permit at this time; she noted the appellants' understanding of the time frame for decision set by Humboldt County Code and notified the Board of appellants' request for notification per Code of the decision in this matter; she continued noting comments submitted by her office on January 8th which supplemented the appellants' statements and requested that the Board take notice of said comments and that they be made part of the appeal packet. Ms. Ure stated that Mr. Lucas does not oppose the building of a recreational facility in Paradise Valley but in fact supports it if done correctly and in a manner to allow for maximum benefit to the community and to allow for future growth; she continued offering comments on the planned use for the facility as opposed to the use identified within the CUP, issues that may arise if the building is dedicated to the County and the County assumes liability for the facility, the requirements related to CUPs per County Code and what must be found for issuance of the CUP, an alternative site that is available, issues with the CUP as issued including parking availability, emergency services access, zoning issues, lighting requirements and how they may create a nuisance, emergency exit problems, fire protection issues, the liability to the County if they were to take over the facility and the need to control the uses to which the building is put, issues with the old trees including liability and damage to, the disturbance of surrounding properties as to their way of life and the potential of creation of a nuisance, the lack of sufficient water availability, the operating/maintenance costs and lack of a plan for those costs and lack of taxing authority to generate funds to cover the costs unless a General Improvement District is formed, that another location for a facility is available and while it also has issues they can be more easily mitigated. Ms. Ure concluded by noting that there are other more feasible options available for this facility in this community. Chairman Brissenden asked for further public comment.

Mike Gast appeared before the Commission discussing his concerns about the proposed facility including the requirement in the CUP that the facility not interfere with the peace of the community, that given the proposed size of the building it will be the highest building in the community and will be able to be seen as people come into the community, that the proposed lighting will illuminate neighboring properties and create a disturbance and his opinion is that this is not the proper location for a community building.

Camma Marvel commented on the need for growth in the Paradise community and the attempt by some residents to keep things as they are forever which is not the reality; she continued commenting on the trees previously discussed noting that they have been a hazard all along; she spoke in support of letting the process begin.

01/11/2016

Page 3 of 11

Tony Lesperance offered comment on the division in the community and offered caution to the Commission on rushing in with any type of judgment at this time further suggesting that it might be prudent to stand back and select several people in the valley from both sides to sit down and try and resolve the issue as any decision made today would be the wrong one, no matter which way it goes.

Tina Gast appeared before the Commission noting that she had submitted an appeal letter and confirming that the Commission had received said letter; she reiterated her concerns as to the adverse effect of the facility location on adjacent property owners including the parking and lighting issues and voiced concern about the effect the facility will have on property values on adjacent property owners.

Tom Cassinelli addressed the Board and clarified that people are not opposed to the building but to the location of the building; he noted the other possible location for the building and that contributions to the building fund were made for a community hall similar to Orovada's facility as opposed to a gym; he stated his concerns that the location identified would not allow for a community hall. Chairman Brissenden asked for further public comment. None offered.

Chairman Brissenden asked the appellants for any evidence to support the arguments or opinions presented that the CUP is not consistent with the Master Plan or fails to comply with the zoning requirements. Ms. Ure appeared before the Commission and addressed the zoning requirements noting that the zoning for this building is M-3 as contained in HCC 17.44 and in said chapter recreational facilities are not listed but they are also not specifically prohibited; she continued noting that the current CUP is void of information related to safety issues such as parking and ingress & egress of emergency vehicles and so the CUP as applied for in the application itself is deficient; she further noted that HCC 17.68.080 sets forth what the Planning Commission shall make findings including the size and shape, which, in this case, keeps shifting and that adequate parking spaces are available and that also keeps changing so until more information is submitted and until a survey of the plan is provided what evidence is there to show that there are adequate parking spaces. Ms. Ure provided a copy of a Facebook© page to the Commission that referred to the proposed building as a community center as opposed to a gym and noted that the application for the CUP identified the facility as being for recreation; she noted that requirements for a community center are more stringent and commented on requirements for additional approvals if the lot size is under 2.5 acres. Ms. Ure suggested that no evidence is necessary at this time as the application itself is deficient and insufficient and noted the information provided from multiple sources as well as the ability of the Commission to take this matter under review. Commissioner French asked Ms. Ure if her comments submitted previously included all of the information she provided today. Ms. Ure indicated that she had included additional comments today but that she could provide those in

01/11/2016

Page 4 of 11

writing if the Commission wished. Commissioner French asked that she do so. Commissioner Bell asked Ms. Ure to elaborate as to how the parking spaces are a nuisance. Ms. Ure responded discussing the location of the spaces, the language of the Nevada Revised Statutes related to nuisances and the effect they would have on Mr. Lucas as the property owner next to those spaces; she noted that if and when the property is dedicated to the County, if the County would be willing sign a hold harmless agreement with Mr. Lucas as to the trees that would be acceptable. Commissioner Bell asked why those trees were not currently a nuisance and noted the responsibility of a property owner to maintain their trees; he again asked about the potential nuisance and suggested that assumptions are being made. Ms. Ure noted that part of the issue is that they do not know where the parking spaces will be located as the application is deficient as to that point; she agreed that she was assuming that the parking would be on the east side of the lot which means the trees would overhang it. Commissioner Bell questioned why that would be the applicant's nuisance and not the owner of the property that has the trees. Ms. Ure agreed that it would be a nuisance against Mr. Lucas but indicated that it is occurring because of the change in what is located on the abutting lot and would interfere with his enjoyment of his property as he will have added maintenance and added liability. Ms. Ure asked when the additional comments are required. Commissioner French asked that it be provided as soon as possible perhaps by next Monday. Deputy Carr commented on the ability to provide additional information and the time frame for decision; she noted her issue with any new information being provided after this meeting. Commissioner Bell commented on the proposed building being referred to today as both a gym and a community center and asked for clarification on that. Ms. Ure explained that the CUP application before the Commission today indicates a recreational facility only however during the fund raising it had been identified as both and today at the site the applicant had indicated that a kitchen would be included. Commissioner Bell asked if the inclusion of a kitchen would change the designation. Ms. Ure indicated that it would have different code regulations and noted that in the future, if the County takes over the facility, they would have to control who can use the facility and for what it can be used. Commissioner Bell noted that would be another assumption as he did not believe the County would have an obligation to take over the building from a 501C3. Ms. Ure concurred. Commissioner French stated his concern that there may be additional plans for the building down the road and it brings into question whether all of the conditions in the CUP being discussed have been adhered to given the size of the property and the ability of ingress/egress and the parking issues though he noted that the CUP does address limiting the scope of permission of how to use the property based on gymnasium only. Deputy Carr commented that if the matter came back to the Planning Department to amend or change the uses it would need to go before the Planning Commission again. Deputy Carr stated that there

01/11/2016

Page 5 of 11

was some additional information that she believes will be relevant to the Commission's determination today including that the Planning Commission had concerns about the parking and setback requirements and ensuring that they complied with various codes and so there was supposed to be an updated map or a different configuration of the building provided to ensure this was accomplished; she asked Betty Lawrence of the Planning Department if that had been received yet. Mrs. Lawrence indicated that it had not. Mr. Echevarria stated that they had not presented it to the Building Department yet but that they have a proposed drawing. Deputy Carr respectfully recommended that because the Commission is making a brand new determination on this matter, that the document be turned into them to assist in that determination. Ms. Ure, for the record, objected to the entry of this additional map as it was not submitted prior to this hearing and not made available to everyone, to have a fair hearing and be addressed in the hearing. Commissioner Bell asked Deputy Carr to address said objection. Deputy Carr responded to the objection and explained why it is acceptable to consider this information as this was a condition placed on the applicant by the RPC and it is necessary to be make a determination. Commissioner French asked about the prior discussion related to the appellant not being able to provide additional information after today's hearing. Deputy Carr noted that this evidence had been specifically requested of the applicant at a prior hearing. Commissioner French asked Mr. Echevarria how long he had this information prior to today's meeting. Mr. Echevarria indicated that they had not been aware of any issues with the parking until late last week and agreed that there are some things that they have not done but that is because they do not have their land issue resolved and they are working on a limited budget so they are addressing items as they can; he stated that he had the plan if they would like to see it. Commissioner Bell agreed that it was relevant but he asked the Building Director if it could be approved today. Building Director Bobby Thomas appeared before the Commission and stated that what they are being presented has not been reviewed for any compliance other than several visits by individuals asking what would be the minimum requirements and so could be subject to change during the review and that until he gets a complete package he cannot give any determination whatsoever. Deputy Carr agreed that usually the various departments review for compliance with code and requirements and that will be done in this case but the Commission could potentially consider the recommendations from staff and the input from the various individuals as one of the conditions of this permit is that it comply with all applicable laws and codes so if he submits to staff who submit their recommendations to the Commission based on their analysis as to whether it complies with the applicable codes and regulations the Commission could proceed. Discussion occurred between the Commission and Deputy Carr about the need for the compliance with all applicable state, local and federal laws in order for the project to move forward and

01/11/2016

Page 6 of 11

the Commission's ability to approve based on compliance occurring. Director Thomas explained what would occur once the plans are presented and how deficiencies can be addressed. Commissioner French and Bell agreed that a decision can be made today on the appeal based on the evidence submitted today.

Deputy Carr explained the three options available to the Commission for today per the Code. Commissioner French asked if the issue could be referred back to the Regional Planning Commission for further deliberation and to consider the additional evidence presented today. Deputy Carr stated that the law does not contemplate that action. Commissioner French observed that there are compelling arguments on both sides of this issue and that with the references in the staff report related to maintaining the peace and welfare and the references today to the nuisance statutes, it truly depends on who you are and where you reside based on the comments as to that issue have been received today and through comments he had heard prior to this meeting; he stated that with the evidence presented today he does not believe that he is in a position to make a decision today as he would like have time to review all of the facts before making any decision.

Commissioner Cerri noted the difficulty of making this decision for a valley which can't come together and agreed that this building is being planned for the kids but stated that he also believed the building would turn into a community hall and as there would be different codes and building requirement for a community hall, it would seem that those are being circumvented; he stated his concern with that occurring as if the community comes to the County to take the building over, would the County be able to and, if it can't, is the community prepared to pay for and take care of the facility forever. Commissioner Cerri stated that if it does not meet parking and fire requirements, he does not believe this Commission should take it over and burden the rest of the taxpayers with the liability; he referred to Mr. Lesperance's suggestion of a getting a group to try and bring the community together and wondered if that would help but, he observed head shaking in the audience which seemed to indicate that was not a good idea. Commissioner Bell observed that it appeared that either location resulted in a community split. Mr. Echevarria explained that when this matter went before the RPC letters were submitted from people in support of and opposed to and he reviewed the signatures and counted them and there were 74 signatures in support and 44 against and anyone who was not specific was included with the against; he continued stating that the building will only be used as a gym, that there is no other use and he apologized for it not being correct on the Facebook© page; he noted that the research had shown that they could not afford a community center so that is why the gym plan went forward and that the kitchen was included for the purpose of the concession stand. Discussion occurred regarding the letters that were sent out by the PTO to determine support and that they were not included in today's packet. Commissioner Amos suggested

01/11/2016

Page 7 of 11

that the Commission needed to either approve the action taken by the Regional Planning Commission or not approve it. Commissioner Bell stated that he was okay with some additional time to review the information provided.

Audience member Lewis Trout, a member of the Regional Planning Commission, asked if the code specifically prohibited remanding the matter back to the RPC. Deputy Carr replied that the authority is not given and her recommendation would be that, as the ordinance specifies that the Commission reverse, approve or amend and modify the conditions, that is what their authority is and that she would be uncomfortable going outside of that if it is not specifically identified in the ordinance, however, this ordinance and chapter do require revision and that may be something to consider for the future. The following motion was made by Commissioner French and passed unanimously:

To continue this matter until the next County Commission meeting to allow for the opportunity for review of the documents and information provided.

DISCUSSION OF AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CREATION OF A GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT, SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS INVOLVING PARADISE VALLEY, OR OTHER OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO MAINTAIN GYMNASIUM, IF APPROVED, AND STEPS NECESSARY TO COMPLY WITH NRS CHAPTER 318 INCLUDING VOTING REQUIREMENTS AND TIMING OF VOTING PROCESS:

Commissioner Bell asked if this matter is premature and should be tabled. Commissioner French commented on the need to receive input on the matter from the people in this community. Commissioner Cerri commented on how the facilities are handled in the Orovada and McDermitt communities and suggested that Paradise Valley needs to figure out how they want to handle this matter. Mr. Echevarria noted that the New Building Fund has nothing to do with bringing this matter up and that in the past an attempt to create a GID was voted down by the community so that is one of the reasons the smaller lot was chosen so they could pay for everything; he did state that he is not opposed to a GID. Commissioner Cerri commented on what it takes to maintain a facility for the community and stated that there needs to be a long term plan for the maintenance of the building. Discussion occurred regarding the issue. Administrator Mendiola commented that, from the County perspective, these types of buildings are often turned over to the County and that he would be very uncomfortable accepting any building without having a funding source in place; he noted issues that are occurring with the McDermitt building and that the costs to repair that have to be absorbed by the whole county as there was no funding source in place. An audience member commented on the same type of issues with the IOOF Hall that is being used as a community hall currently and the importance of doing this building right to protect the community. Commissioner Cerri suggested that if the community

wants a community hall that they create an assessment district first, then build a building. An audience member commented on the need for the community to work together. Lewis Trout commented that the RPC had not offered any comments about the creation of a district, that he as an individual had offered the suggestion during public comment in a Commission meeting following a conversation with Commissioner Cerri. Discussion occurred regarding the manner in which a GID could be created, election or commission action, the time frame for that creation, the need to have community support, the need to create a revenue stream, what funding is being used currently, the length of time it would take to build a community center, the difference between a community hall/center and a gym and the benefits to the community of both facilities. Tom Cassinelli stated his opposition to building a gymnasium that would remain a gymnasium, he stated that he would support a structure that will accommodate growing into a community center. Discussion occurred regarding the cost of running the facility in Orovada, the ability of the County to assist in the process of creating a GID or assessment district, the ability of the County to assist in funding the building and the need of the community to meet without the Commission to discuss the matter. Commissioner French asked that the processes and options for creating a GID be placed on a Commission agenda within a couple of meetings. Comments were made from the audience regarding the need for a GID if the County is going to be responsible for the meeting, the ability to combine the other districts within Paradise into one district, the need for the community to meet and discuss this matter outside the presence of the County Commission, that the community may not approve a GID in a vote, that the Commission directing the creation with an appeal process would be the way to go, the creation of the GID occurring separate from this proposal as there is currently a community building but there is no gym for the school, the need to use restraint to avoid further division within the community, the need to give the community time to see if they can decide how to proceed, the need to determine what the cost would be and what the difference would be between special assessment district and a GID. After discussion the following motion was made by Commissioner French and passed unanimously:

To place this item on the Tuesday, February 16th Commission agenda to deliberate on whether we will vote on a resolution for forming a GID in Paradise Valley or a special assessment depending on the nuances of which one would work best for the valley and at the same time have some information from our county administrator on what the rate would be per 100 for a GID.

DISCUSSION OF ABILITY OR AUTHORITY OF COUNTY TO ACCEPT DEDICATION OF REAL PROPERTY AND STEPS RELATED TO THE PROCESS OF DEDICATION, CREATION

01/11/2016

Page 9 of 11

OF A PROCESS TO ACCEPT DEDICATIONS OF REAL PROPERTY, RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COUNTY IN ACCEPTING DEDICATED PROPERTY AND POSSIBLE ACCEPTANCE OF DEDICATION OF REAL PROPERTY REGARDING PARADISE VALLEY PROPERTY LOCATED AT 110 BRIDGE STREET:

Administrator Mendiola suggested that this item might be more appropriate to be discussed as part of the retreat as he wants to prepare some suggested criteria based on prior acceptances the County has done including not only buildings but roads and such; he noted that some dedications such as with roads have specific criteria already identified the need to be included. Chairman Brissenden directed the Administrator to place this item on the retreat agenda. Commissioner French suggested that a formal policy needs to be developed and adopted so all requests are treated the same. Commissioner French also suggested that representatives from Paradise that are interested in the formation of a GID also attend the meeting.

CONSIDERATION OF AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF FINAL DRAFT COMMENTS LETTER PREPARED BY THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMMENTING ON THE PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION ("NOTICE OF PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL; SAGEBRUSH FOCAL AREAS; IDAHO, MONTANA, NEVADA, OREGON, UTAH AND WYOMING AND NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT") BY THE BLM POSTED ON SEPTEMBER 24, 2015. THIS NOTICE TEMPORARILY SEGREGATES THE WITHDRAWAL LANDS FOR UP TO TWO YEARS WHILE THE APPLICATION IS PROCESSED. COMMENTS ARE DUE BY JANUARY 14, 2016:

Commissioner French requested that a couple of other items be added to the letter related to the travel management for keeping roads open and the need for the EIS to fully comply with the County Master Plan; he indicated that he would be willing to add a paragraph to the letter to address these issues. Commissioner French explained the purpose of the letter to the audience. Commissioner Cerri inquired if compliance with the State Plan could also be included. Commissioner French indicated that he could add language related to that too. After discussion the following motion was made by Commissioner Bell and passed unanimously:

To approve the letter drafted by Commissioner French with the inclusion of the modifications indicated related to travel management plan, compliance with the master plan and with the state plan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Chairman Brissenden asked for public comments. Lewis Trout appeared before the Commission and commented on the importance of providing to the citizens of Paradise Valley of the estimated cost to establish a GID; he suggested that information be provided to the citizens prior to

01/11/2016

Page 10 of 11

any meeting and further suggested that a County Commissioner moderate the meeting.

Ron Schrempp commented on the availability of property he owns for the building of a community hall, the contract he has signed with community members for that use and that use only, with the stipulation that the water tower remain.

Gary Echevarria questioned if the property is for a community hall why the special use permit applied for by Mr. Lucas on behalf of Mr. Schrempp indicates a gymnasium/sports center. Mr. Lucas stated that it would become a community hall. Mr. Schrempp stated it is for whatever the community needs, as long as it is for the community he is okay with it.

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Brissenden adjourned the meeting at 12:41 p.m.

ATTESTED: [Signature]
Clerk

APPROVED: [Signature]
Chairman

(Minutes approved by the Commission and signed by the Chairman on 10-17-16)

024

Notice of Public Meeting
 HUMBOLDT COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING
Monday, January 11, 2016
 9:30 a.m.

******NEW MEETING LOCATION******

**Paradise Valley Community Hall
 50 South Main Street, Paradise Valley, NV 89426**

All times on this agenda are approximate.

Consideration of items may require more or less time than is scheduled. Items on the agenda may be taken out of order; the public body may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; and the public body may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

Public comment is designated for discussion only. The public has the opportunity to address the Commission on any matter not appearing on the agenda; however, no action may be taken on a Matter raised until the matter itself has been specifically included on the agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Additionally, public comment may be heard on any item listed on the Agenda. Persons are invited to submit comments in writing and/or attend and make comments on any agenda item at the Commission meeting. All public comment may be limited to three (3) minutes per person, at the discretion of the Commission.

Agenda – Monday, January 11, 2016

1. A. 9:30 a.m. Call to Order
 B. Pledge of Allegiance
 932 C. Public Comments: General public comment is designated for discussion only. The public has the opportunity to address the Commission on any matter not appearing on this agenda; however, no action may be taken on a matter raised until the matter itself has been specifically included on the agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.
- 946 D. Commission and public to visit site where the recreation center is currently proposed to be built.
- 1015 2. Public Hearing to consider an appeal of a conditional use permit (UH-15-08) approved by the Regional Planning Commission at their November 11, 2015 meeting to allow construction of a 70 foot x 125 foot steel building at 110 Bridge Street in Paradise Valley, NV for use as a gymnasium – Discussion and for Possible Action
- 34
1144 3. Discussion of and possible action regarding creation of a General Improvement District, special assessments involving Paradise Valley, or other options available to maintain gymnasium, if approved, and steps necessary to comply with NRS Chapter 318 including voting requirements and timing of voting process.
- 26
1236 4. Discussion of ability or authority of County to accept dedication of real property and steps related to the process of dedication, creation of a process to accept dedications of real property, responsibilities of the County in accepting dedicated property, and possible acceptance of dedication of real property regarding Paradise Valley property located at 110 Bridge Street.
- 30
1256 5. Consideration of and possible approval of final draft comments letter prepared by the County Administrator for the purpose of commenting on the proposed withdrawal application (“Notice of Proposed Withdrawal; Sagebrush Focal Areas; Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming and Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement”) by the BLM posted on September 24, 2015. This notice temporarily segregates the withdrawal lands for up to two years while the application is processed. Comments are due by January 14, 2016 – Discussion and for Possible Action


1257 6. Public Comments: General public comment is designated for discussion only. The public has the opportunity to address the Commission on any matter not appearing on this agenda; however, no action may be taken on a matter raised until the matter itself has been specifically included on the agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

7. Adjournment (For Possible Action)

NOTICE: The County Commission may close the meeting to receive information from legal counsel pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 241.015

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

PLACES POSTED: Humboldt Co. Courthouse, 50 W. 5th St.: Rooms 201, 205, & 207 at _____ A.M. By: _____
Humboldt County Library: 85 E. 5th St. at _____ A.M. By: _____
County Annex: 4th & Bridge St. at _____ A.M. By: _____
Winnemucca City Hall: 4th & Melarkey St. at _____ A.M. By: _____
Humboldt County Website: www.hcnv.us at _____ A.M. By: _____
State of Nevada Website: www.notice.nv.gov at _____ A.M. By: _____
Paradise Valley Community Hall, 50 South Main St, Paradise Valley, NV 89426 at _____ A.M./P.M.
By: _____

MEETING DATE: January 11, 2016 POSTED BY: 
DATE POSTED: January 6, 2015 before 9:00 A.M. Karen Bannister, Administrative Specialist

NOTE FOR SUPPORTING MATERIAL: A copy of the supporting material for the meeting may be obtained at Commissioner meeting/agendas on the Humboldt County website: www.hcnv.us or by contacting Dave Mendiola, County Administrator, at 50 W. Fifth Street, Winnemucca, Nevada 89445, (775) 623-6300

NOTICE TO PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES - Reasonable efforts will be made to assist and accommodate physically disabled persons desiring to attend the meeting. Please call the Humboldt County Administrator's Office at 623-6300 in advance so that arrangements may be conveniently made.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY NOTICE - Humboldt County is an Equal Opportunity Employer and will not discriminate against employees or applicants for employment or services in an unlawful manner.