



GARDNERVILLE TOWN BOARD

1407 Highway 395 N.
Gardnerville, Nevada 89410
(p)775-782-7134 (f): 775-782-7135
www.gardnerville-nv.gov

Meeting Minutes

Ken Miller, Chairman
Linda Slater, Vice Chairman
Lloyd Higuera, Board Member
Mike Philips, Board Member
Mary Wenner, Board Member

Tuesday, April 2, 2013

4:30 p.m.

Gardnerville Town Hall

4:30 P.M.  Chairman Miller called the meeting to order and made the determination a quorum is present.

PRESENT:

Ken Miller, Chairman
Mike Philips
Lloyd Higuera
Mary Wenner

Tyler Altom, Town Counsel
Tom Dallaire, Town Manager
Paula Lochridge, Main Street Manager
Carol Louthan, Office Manager Sr.

ABSENT:

Linda Slater, Vice-Chairman

 The PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE was led by Lloyd Higuera

 **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF AGENDA, with public comment prior to Board action.**

The Gardnerville Town Board reserves the right to take items in a different order to accomplish business in the most efficient manner.

Motion Philips/Higuera to approve the agenda.

No public comment.

Upon call for the vote, motion carried with Board Member Slater absent.

 **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:
March 5, 2013 Regular Board meeting, with public comment prior to Board action.**

Motion Higuera/Wenner to approve the minutes of March 5, 2013.

No public comment.

Upon call for the vote, motion carried with Board Member Slater absent.

 **PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)**

This portion of the meeting is open to the public to speak on any topic not on the agenda and must be limited to 3 minutes. The Gardnerville Town Board is prohibited by law from taking immediate action on issues raised by the public that are not listed on the agenda.

Chairman Miller recognized the members of Boy Scout Troop 33 and would like each individual to stand up and introduce yourselves.

Mathew Kruse, Zachary Kruse, Tristan Futch, Nathan Caires, Colbey Tracy introduced themselves. They are working on their communications merit badge.

No further public comment.

 **CONSENT CALENDAR FOR POSSIBLE ACTION**

Items appearing on the Consent Calendar are items that may be adopted with one motion **after public comment**. Consent items may be pulled at the request of Town Board members wishing to have an item or items discussed further. When items are pulled for discussion, they will be automatically placed at the beginning of the Administrative Agenda.

1. **For Possible Action:** Correspondence
Read and noted
2. **For Possible Action:** Health and Sanitation & Public Works Departments Monthly Report of activities
Accepted
3. **For Possible Action:** Approve March 2013 claims
Approved
4. **For Possible Action:** Accept 2012 Year End Report
Accepted
5. **For Possible Action:** Recommend approval of a Douglas County Outdoor Festival Entertainment Event Application by Douglas County Senior Services for the 13th Annual Big Mama's Show & Shine, May 11, 2013 at Lampe Park.
Recommend approval
6. **For Possible Action:** Recommend approval of Douglas County Outdoor Festival Entertainment Event Application for the 103rd Annual Carson Valley Days Festival scheduled for June 5 through 10, 2013, sponsored by Carson Valley Active 20-30 Club #85.
Recommend approval

Motion Higuera/Wenner to approve the consent calendar.

No public comment.

Upon call for the vote, motion carried with Board Member Slater absent.

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

(Any agenda items pulled from the Consent Calendar will be heard at this point)

7.  **For Possible Action:** Discussion on a Town Street Closure Application for Trinity Lutheran Church to close Douglas Avenue from Mill to Cottonwood on May 4, 2013 and a request to waive street closure fee of \$100; with public comment prior to Board action.

Chairman Miller is affiliated with Trinity Lutheran Church. I will abstain from voting. If you have any questions about the event I will be glad to answer them.

Ms. Wenner asked if this was the first time they have done this.

Chairman Miller stated we did it last year and used the front lawn only. We did not close the street. We had about 20 cars on the front lawn.

Ms. Wenner asked if there are any town employees that will be working there.

Mr. Dallaire answered no. They will need detour signs. We redid the policy for the street closure a couple months ago. This is the first time we have had an application since. We have generally waived fees for those types of organizations. There is also a \$300 security deposit. That would be waived as well. They will probably use some of our barricades. They will need arrow signs pointing in each direction showing there is a detour.

Mr. Miller informed the committee at Trinity they can get any signage they need from Ahern Rental. They are aware of that.

Motion Philips/Higuera to approve the application including waiving the fees.

Ms. Lochridge has some A-frame signs from Main Street they are welcome to use.

No further public comment.

Motion carried with Board Member Miller abstaining and Board Member Slater absent.

8.  **Not for Possible Action:** Discussion on the Main Street Program Manager's Monthly Report of activities for March 2013.

Ms. Lochridge reported at the monthly morning coffee meeting this morning we had 20 people this morning. I love the partnerships that form out of these meetings. Craig Witt with Full Circle Compost has been working with Pacific Gas to grow tomato plants. Another attendee was Larry Rice with Doug's Barbecue who is working with Pacific Gas to have barbecued sandwiches available a couple of times a week. So now Craig wants to work with Larry on growing special tomatoes and creating a special BLT sandwich. They have a partnership starting there. A couple of the businesses that are not within the district that want to participate in the wine walks were able to forge some partnerships with the businesses that were at the meeting. That will work and help them cut costs. It was great to see. Also we talked about the July 4th event Main Street is working with the Town on. They had several representatives from Made in Nevada who would love to be there for this event. If you haven't joined us for this meeting, stop in if you can. Our Thirsty Third Thursday wine walks start in May. We held a special training event at the Historian and had about 30 or 40 people show up. It was a great way for us to work with them and tell them how they can benefit from participating in the wine walks, and also to learn the proper presentation. We also informed them the Douglas County Sheriff's office has partnered with the Partnership of Community Resources to hold a free server training seminar. It talks about the legalities of serving wine. The volunteer recognition gala is coming up this Thursday.

Ms. Wenner asked if anything has been cemented for the 4th of July.

Ms. Lochridge will be finalizing the last few details tomorrow at the promotions committee meeting and then will send everything out.

a.  **Not for Possible Action: 5 year Update of Main Street's accomplishments, presentation by Dorette Caldana**

Dorette Caldana explained the volunteer program provides a service to both the Town of Gardnerville and also to Douglas County. We have not provided an overview in the five years that we have been in existence. Dorette went over the Main Street Program (their goals and accomplishments, funding sources, marketing analysis, business inventory tracker) in a Power Point presentation.

Basic goals: revitalization, development and preservation.

Developing a program to provide training for businesses and business recruitment

Committee goals:

Design goals: visually attractive, pedestrian friendly.

Accomplishments: Flower program, kiosk at Eddy Street, Heritage Park Gardens, benches, donation of food from Heritage Park Gardens to food bank.

Economic Restructuring goals: 5 percent vacancy rate, clustering businesses, business recruitment, retention, expansion and training.

Accomplishments: Revolving loan fund,

Organization goals: Action plan matches with what is going on in the county and town; physically stable, independent, increase knowledge base, training within the community.

Accomplishments: Over 100 volunteers with over 4,650 hours of service for a value of almost \$100,000, morning coffee meetings, membership revision, fundraising to make Main Street more self-sufficient, alcohol policy, business friendly, coop advertising and working on 501c3 for Heritage Park Garden to make it independent.

Promotion goals: Promote the downtown

Accomplishments: Fans on Facebook and Twitter, Thirsty Third Thursday, Shopping Bazaar and Cash Mob.

9.  **For Possible Action: Discussion on Proclamation 2013P-01 recognizing April 26, 2013 as Arbor Day; with public comment prior to Board action.**

Mr. Dallaire advised Arbor Day is coming up. We are looking at the island on Toler and Harvest or Heritage Park Gardens and something with the high school. If there are any other ideas we would appreciate them. It is part of the requirements for the Tree City USA award.

Motion Higuera/Wenner to approve Proclamation 2013P-01 recognizing April 26, 2013 as Arbor Day.

No public comment.

Upon call for the vote, motion carried with Board Member Slater absent.

10.  **For Possible Action:** Discussion on Boundary Line Adjustment between The Ranch at Gardnerville and Town of Gardnerville between APN's 1320-32-614-001 and 1320-33-210-063, with public comment prior to Board action.
- a. **For Possible Action:** Discussion on Boundary Line Adjustment (quitclaim deed) for the removal of open space (the "adjusted" area) from the Town's parcel, with public comment prior to Board action.
 - b. **For Possible Action:** Discussion on potential new slope easements and public utility easements along the adjusted boundary to relocate those along the existing lines being adjusted, with public comment prior to Board action.

Mr. Dallaire prepared a brief report. It was under the planned development provisions. There is an issue with the trail. Dirk is here from the county. I did a detail on the slope easement. We approved the development in 2004 with a perimeter easement. This is a much better solution for everyone.

Mr. Rob Anderson representing the Ranch at Gardnerville, put up an illustration of the boundary line adjustment. This issue was identified as part of the amended PD. We have obtained approval for the rough grading on Phase 2. We anticipate submitting the improvement plans for Phase 2A and B for final review and a permit application. Recently I was made aware of an issue. The concern is what happens if the grant application for the trail is not approved. Who is responsible for the trail? The trail is the multimodal trail that was essentially a proposal submitted by Douglas County last April or May as part of a grant application with NDOT from the existing terminus of the town's trail north to Jake's Wetlands. In April 2012 the Ranch submitted a letter in support of the application indicating they would advance their dedication of the necessary right-of-way and open space area north of Zerolene Road, the value of which could be used as a match for that grant. In addition the Ranch at Gardnerville committed to make a deposit of \$50,000 in 2013 and another \$50,000 deposit in 2014 to be used as matching money for the grant. That grant application received favorable consideration. It was ranked #2 by the state but ultimately that grant process stopped. Just recently we have been made aware that there is an opportunity to resubmit the application under a slightly reconfigured program. Our client is willing and able to support the application. We are hopeful it will be successful. The amended conditions of approval when the amended map was done in November 2012, condition #8 required the applicant to dedicate a 25 foot wide right-of-way to accommodate the Martin Slough multimodal trail project and also pay the \$100,000 offer of dedication. In my estimation that is the sum total of the Ranch at Gardnerville's obligation. There is a question as to what happens in the event the grant is not successful. My hope is that won't happen. (Mr. Anderson passed out some background material and went over the history of the project.).

Mr. Dirk Goering, Douglas County Planning, believed Mr. Anderson and the Planning Department have a difference of opinion on who is responsible for the construction of the trail. We are having meetings about who is responsible for the trail. If you have improvements associated with a map, the applicant is required to construct or secure for those improvements prior to submitting a final map. Staff is concerned with the boundary line adjustment. It is taking a portion of open space associated with Phase 2 and we will lose the ability to require the improvements with the final map. By doing the boundary line adjustment that particular area is no longer part of the final map. We would lose the ability to require that improvement. We think it might be appropriate to continue the item until we can figure out who is required to build the trail. In the staff report submitted to the Board of Commissioners it addressed the applicant is required to construct the trail. Sooner or later we will get to the bottom of that.

Mr. Philips thought it appeared the battle is not with the town but with the county.

Mr. Goering explained by doing the boundary line adjustment it will take the portion of open space that will house the trail out of the final map process. The improvement process for this particular area is being circumvented. We understand why the town wants to do the boundary line adjustment. It makes sense. However, we would request a letter of commitment from the client saying they understand they are required to construct that trail for this particular area even after the Town of Gardnerville takes ownership of it.

Chairman Miller asked about the county signing off on the map, even though the town signs off on it for the boundary line adjustment. Even if we pass this tonight the county could still delay it by not signing off on the map.

Mr. Goering told Mr. Dallaire the county doesn't want to go against what the town wants. We respect your opinion. We are asking for a little more time so we can get to the bottom of it. We don't want to deny the boundary line adjustment the town is recommending approval of. The requirement is linked to the final map. Due to the boundary line adjustment it is taking that open space away from the final map. It would be associated with the final map you are asking the applicant to make improvements on.

Mr. Higuera asked if the county had a written commitment from the developer would they then sign off on it.

Mr. Goering would be fine with it then. You would have something in writing from the owner saying we are committed to constructing this trail. We recognize there is a grant in process. The next date for the grant approval is December. We don't want to hold up the applicant from moving forward with different phases. That's why we came up with the solution for the map of writing a letter saying they are committed to the improvement. The other option is to issue a site improvement permit and secure funds for it. Then they would have to have funds of 150 percent of the cost.

Ms. Wenner felt it might be better business sense to get something in writing instead of going by word value.

Mr. Goering thought it appropriate to get something in writing to make sure we have the construction of the trail.

Mr. Altom reviewed the main issue is the county believes the applicant should be constructing that portion of the trail and the applicant does not think they should.

Mr. Goering agreed that is the main issue.

Mr. Altom asked if they go forward today what is the county's concern.

Mr. Goering believed before you sign off on the final map we want to say you have to meet specifically condition 8. We interpret 8 a little differently. That's why we believe the applicant is required to construct the trail. If the boundary line adjustment is approved we're taking this away from the final map process and we don't have the ability to require any improvements.

Mr. Altom asked since the county respects the town board and usually goes with their recommendation, since technically by statute we are an adjunct to the county and the county has to make the final approval, that's the concern is that since you follow the board's recommendations you would feel somehow obligated.

Mr. Goering agreed. The county respects the opinion of the town board and they are asking for a little more time to iron out all the details and make sure we all understand what is at stake.

Ms. Wenner asked how much longer they are talking about.

Mr. Goering believed next month you could hear it. We will be meeting in two weeks. If there still is a difference of opinion we would send it back to the Board of Commissioners to see how they interpret that condition. We don't want to lose the improvement for a master plan trail that is going through the property.

Mr. Altom made a suggestion of continuing the item.

Mr. Anderson explained our client is fully committed to do what they said they would do in the April 2012 letter. That commitment is bound up in the conditions of approval of the modified planned development. To the extent that Douglas County is looking for a letter that says our client commits to construct the multimodal trail if the grant is not approved, whether it be for the portion of the boundary line adjustment or all of it, the answer is unequivocally no. I think I have authority from our client to say that is not forthcoming. They will offer a dedication so there is a right-of-way from Zerolene Road to connect into the other areas Douglas County controls. That is in writing already. I believe Mr. Goering is incorrect about Douglas County losing the ability to require this improvement if it is dedicated and a boundary line adjustment recorded. The meeting is two weeks away. Is there any urgency to wait? Yes. We have a builder who has actually sold 30 houses. There is actually some momentum going in a project that was dead. To the extent this becomes a requirement of a private entity in my estimation it is no longer eligible for federal grant money. I believe that is another justification to allow the process to go forward. If after ten years of trying they don't get a grant then looks like in 2023 we'll be about in phase 3.

You could ask again.

Mr. Goering would want to talk to the district attorney before he made a statement like that. I'm afraid you lose a stronger argument once the property is not a part of the map. I can check with the DA. If Rob's comments on the boundary line adjustment are correct, it makes the town's decision that much more important. Then the county won't have the ability to stop it.

Mr. Altom hasn't reviewed Douglas County Code on planned developments recently, so I couldn't directly answer your question.

Mr. Cavillia is here on behalf of the Ranch at Gardnerville. First the language of the conditions is explicit. It incorporates the letter of April 12th. The county has the right to apply that condition at any time during this project. If their reading of that condition is as Mr. Goering just said it was, that we have to pay for the entire improvement of the trail then he can apply that condition any time, whether we own the property or you own the property. The condition of approval as approved by the county in November of last year specifically says per the letter of April 12 to dedicate the right-of-way and pay \$100,000. They have the opportunity throughout the phasing of the project to apply the conditions.

Chairman Miller called for public comment.

Robin Futch summarized what she believed to be the issue. What I am understanding is the Town of Gardnerville wants to move a boundary. Once they move the boundary then there is a little piece of land that then becomes a part of the Ranch. The county is concerned about that piece of land, the trail going through, and who's basically responsible for that once Gardnerville is out of the picture. Am I right there?

Chairman Miller clarified it is still in the town of Gardnerville, even though the town does not own that property. They are providing a 25 foot easement for the purpose of a trail through that area.

Ms. Futch asked if they are saying they will pay \$100,000 toward the project. That ties into the grant. I'm not sure if I'm getting how that is tied into the grant.

Mr. Dallaire explained what happened with the grant. We will be doing a pre-app now and then we will get an invitation to apply for a new submittal. The Ranch participated in it. They were on the hook in phase 1 to build \$150,000 worth of maintenance access road. They matched and partnered with the county at \$100,000. We went with a large match on a \$700,000 project. That is basically what the trail itself would cost. It is constructing the path from Gilman ponds clear up to Jake's Wetlands minus the section of the CVI. We didn't have the right-of-way or access through the upper portions from Zerolene north so that is what they have dedicated or are going to dedicate in phase 2 all of the right-of-way and wetlands for that trail. We don't have the ability to have them build the trail. There are other funding options.

Ms. Futch wondered if there was kind of a trust issue. You're not really sure if they're going to be committed to that.

Mr. Dallaire shared the grant wasn't actually funded from NDOT. We don't know how many years that will go on. But we will apply and keep trying. There are other funding options the town has.

Ms. Futch asked if they were asking for something in writing showing they are committed if the grant is never awarded.

Ms. Wenner asked if they could get something in writing.

Mr. Higuera thought it was an overreach to think the Ranch at Gardnerville is going to spend \$750,000 to a million dollars to build a trail. It will have to be a grant situation.

No further public comment.

Mr. Higuera believed they have made a good faith effort by giving the right-of-way and contributing \$100,000 to the project. It will be up to the town to work from our direction to get grants and the county to work from their direction. To hold this over the head of the Ranch and not approve this doesn't sit well with me.

Mr. Philips didn't believe that even the county is going to make the Ranch at Gardnerville come back and pay to put the trail in. The Ranch would not agree to that.

Chairman Miller thought Rob made a very good point. If they commit to build a trail, why would we get a grant approved.

Ms. Wenner asked if we get the grant they still would give the \$100,000.

Mr. Anderson advised his client is fully committed to that.

Mr. Philips didn't think if the Board approves this it we are slapping the county in the face. I hope they don't take it that way if we should approve this. I like the fact we've worked hard over the years to be able to work with the county and for them to listen to us. But I hope the county doesn't look at it as a slap if we pass this.

Mr. Dallaire asked if the grant is never approved, then it will be a long time before we actually get the trail. We had the road in phase 1. They were going to build the trail that went all the way up to the edge of the Seeman Ranch. That was an SIP. They spent a lot of time and prepared improvement plans and that went forward. That has gone away. I didn't realize that application had expired. If we go forward and apply for the grant and the grant is never funded then we won't ever get a trail unless we pay for it.

Mr. Goering's understanding was it was originally a part of the 2004 planned development. The condition that you see on the 2012 letter is the same wording from before. We didn't change it or alter it. Staff is here to listen to your comments and pass it on to staff in the county and the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Anderson pointed out in 2007 we had an approved set of plans. The economy changed. A lot has changed. I believe the two towns and the county are better off as a result of the current proposal. Now you will have the land area for the full distance. In 2008, 9 and 10 early part of 11, there was no dedication of that north piece. Even if the county was successful in getting the grant you couldn't have gotten across this piece of property north of Zerolene Road. The commitment that has occurred as a result of the amended map is that dedication is made in the Phase 2 final map, plus you get \$100,000. I think you're way ahead because you now have the potential of getting all the way. Even if you are unsuccessful in getting the grant you have \$100,000 I feel she would commit to you that irrespective of the grant she would still pay the \$100,000 and make the dedication. That's her commitment. That's the developer's commitment. Overall you're better.

Motion Higuera/Wenner to approve the boundary line adjustment between the Ranch at Gardnerville and the Town of Gardnerville APN's 1320-32-614-001 and 1320-33-210-063 and authorize the chairman to sign the boundary line adjustment map;

also A, Motion to approve the .39 acre reduction in open space from the Town parcel and authorize the chairman to sign the quitclaim deed;

and also B, Motion to approve the adjusted slope and public utility easements that will accompany the boundary line as indicated on the boundary line adjustment map and authorize the chairman to sign the slope and public utility easement documents.

Mr. Dallaire clarified instead of the .39 acres it should be .34 acres.

Amended motion Higuera/Wenner to change the .39 acres to .34 acres.

Mr. Dallaire explained that was the additional 10 feet we got back because Rob allowed the change from 15 to 25 feet on that section between Zerolene and our old piece. That increased by 10 feet along the whole strip with the new map that he is showing to comply with the criteria from the county.

Motion carried with Board Member Slater absent.

11.  **For Possible Action:** Discussion to award, deny or re-bid, the Chichester Microsurfacing project (project number 2012-03). The project consists of noticing adjacent residents and providing materials and labor to microsurface portions of Gilman Avenue, Chichester Drive, Marion Russell Dr, Lampe Road, and Harvest Avenue. Together with Additive Alternate "A" consisting of North Hampton Circle, Wilson Circle, and Easton Way. Awarding the project will include authorizing the town manager to sign the

contract and authorize the billings in addition to 10% over the total contract amount, and to cover any change orders during construction; with public comment prior to Board action.

Mr. Dallaire reported we received four bids. My original thought was to award this in its entirety. Going through the next budget and the errors or discrepancies that happened between the information we received from the county and the state I think we should award the first portion or the core project. The award amount would be \$123,003.50. That would just include the Chichester area. We would push forward the funds into next year so we can use it for Hellwinkel. I only have \$23,000 in the budget this year for Hellwinkel. There are other items we can discuss and cut. But \$23,000 to start working in the trench is not going to be enough from our side of the contribution to take care of the construction. I don't have an exact quantity but I know it will be roughly \$600,000. We have \$307,000 coming from Q1 and the town needs to come up with about \$300,000 as well in order for that to match. It doesn't meet the criteria we originally agreed upon. It will have to go back to Q1 for approval. I can't do that until I get the construction plans. I am supposed to be meeting Denny in the middle of this month. He will be coming next month to do a presentation for the Board on that project.

Mr. Philips asked what company you are looking at to award the bid.

Mr. Dallaire answered VSS. I was going to award it on the overall but I don't have a good feeling about where the budget is. I would just award the core and let the remainder roll over to next year to use in the construction of the ranch.

Mr. Altom advised NRS 338.1385 you are required to accept the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. Given Tom's recommendation to just go with the core without alternate A, if you agree with what Tom recommends and the Board deems that VSS International is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder then you are basically obliged by the statute to go ahead with that.

No public comment.

Motion Philips/Higuera to award Project #2012-03 the Chichester Microsurfacing project in the amount of \$123,003.50 to VSS International and to exclude Alternate A and authorize the Town Manager to sign the contract with the addition of the 10 percent. Motion carried with Board Member Slater absent.

12.  **For Possible Action: Discussion to approve, approve with conditions or deny the strategic plan update for the Town of Gardnerville, with public comment prior to Board action.**

Mr. Dallaire sent the vision information after the workshop to Steve. I have not received it back. Our highlighted areas are what we changed from the original strategic plan. These are the modifications that were recommended. I scaled the text down a little. If that is all good we will make it official. I will try and get Steve's vision from him to combine the Board's visions.

Mr. Higuera thought the workshop was helpful.

Chairman Miller would have liked to have had the public more involved.

Mr. Dallaire is still working on a project list. I did budget for the zoning. After the vision plan it would be a good opportunity to look at the plan and entwine that with the valley vision. Candace seems to think with the master plan update they will create a new one. At that time it would be a great opportunity to have input on zoning changes. We can talk about that and have an item brought back. April 8 – 10 is the valley vision. I want to get the strategic plan on the internet without the highlighted areas once it is formally adopted.

Chairman Miller would not want to approve this without the vision.

Mr. Higuera asked if they couldn't approve it without the vision. They can bring the vision back.

No public comment.

Motion Wenner/Higuera to approve the strategic plan update for the Town of Gardnerville waiting on the vision to update later. Motion carried with Board Member Slater absent.

13.  **For Possible Action: Discussion on the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Tentative Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), with public comment prior to Board action.**

Mr. Dallaire has revised the plan because of the estimates on funding. Our tax rate based on the negotiations with the county, fire district, towns and Indian Hills set the tax rate at 0.6677 which is down from .6699. But at that rate we never did get any numbers from the state. The finance department gave me a number last month. When I got the state numbers their projection was 962,000. We lost about \$50,000. Basically we are \$20,000 less next year than where we are this year. That is not good. We will see what happens with Eagle Gas. We modified the 2013 budget to these particular projects: ADA upgrades, Hellwinkel channel and Kingslane match. On Friday I got the signed agreement for Kingslane. We will be moving forward on that. We got the notice to proceed on Friday. Road maintenance still has \$50,000 for crack sealing. Patch repair will continue with the large crack replacements. Storm drain maintenance is being done under a contract with Summit Plumbing to clean out the storm drain on Industrial Way, video and inventory. We want to continue that and do little sections so we have an inventory of the storm drains. That contract was about \$9,000. Raley's and Toler sidewalk is \$35,000. That will get the trail portion done but not the shop improvements. If we have funds we can identify after we figure out what is going on with the Hellwinkel project we can do that. There is a permit issued ready and waiting to be picked up at the county. There is \$40,000 for the Hellwinkel shop. Debt service is down to \$118,000. That is the lighting phase 2 bonds. We have two more years on that. Small equipment replacement we put \$2,500 for now. City of Reno is going to be selling their crack seal machine. We have \$45,000 in our 613 fund that we can use for capital purchases. I will probably be coming to you when I find out more information to see if we can go after that unit and find someone to buy our unit.

No public comment.

Motion Higuera/Wenner to approve the tentative five-year capital improvement plan for fiscal year 2013-2018 as presented. Motion carried with Board Member Slater absent.

14.  **For Possible Action: Public hearing to adopt the Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-2014, with public comment prior to Board action.**

a. **For Possible Action: Discussion on Town Board compensation with public comment prior to Board action.**

Mr. Dallaire explained we have budgeted \$13,770 per fund right now.

No public comment.

Motion Higuera/Philips to increase the board compensation to members at \$500 a month and the chair at \$550. Motion carried with Board Member Slater absent.

Mr. Dallaire will increase the board comp for each account for the final budget.

Mr. Dallaire went over the tentative budget.

Mr. Dallaire reviewed the maintenance supervisor position. The job description has one item that says they can assist staff but it is mainly supervision. If that is what the Board wants we will go forward with that. It would be of benefit to me, but as far as staff goes, a maintenance tech would be of more benefit.

Ms. Wenner asked which would you feel more comfortable with.

Mr. Dallaire felt a maintenance tech to help staff would be more beneficial. I think the Board would be able to see the results a little better. I talked with Minden and I understand they may be selecting a 2% merit increase this year for their staff. They did 4% this year and we did 2%. Final budget is due next month. We can bring an item for the maintenance supervisor versus maintenance tech next month. A maintenance supervisor is included in the tentative budget. All of this makes cuts out of the project budget. We don't have a lot of room in services and supplies. That is pretty tight. The big ticket items are salaries and benefits and adding another employee costs quite a bit.

Chairman Miller believed there are two ways to look at this. If we have a supervisor it will take a load off you. But if we get a supervisor there might be more tension between the employees without the help. So it really doesn't take the load off you; it puts the load back on you.

Mr. Dallaire thought that is where the frustration is right now. We talked about redoing the fees on the dumpsters. I will need to write letters and visit some of the businesses. We could wait until next year and see how this year progresses. We are still down on customer pickups. We have a side load trash vehicle budgeted. We have two more years on the Main Street Lighting bond payment. We have budgeted a \$64,000 distribution to Main Street Gardnerville.

Motion Miller/Higuera to approve the tentative budget as presented with the exception of the town board compensation as we discussed earlier and also with the exception of having a tech 2 rather than a supervisor in that position.

No public present

Upon call for the vote, motion carried with Board Member Slater absent.

15.  **Not For Possible Action: Discussion on the Town Attorney's Monthly Report of activities for March 2013.**

Mr. Altom's participation was mainly limited to items related to the agenda.

16.  **Not For Possible Action: Discussion on the Town Manager/Engineer's Monthly Report of activities for March 2013.**

Chairman Miller asked about Eagle Gas. It's a possibility that somebody else may buy it. My input is, in the event someone buys it, I would like to pursue putting a gateway sign on the property.

Mr. Dallaire talked with Steve Sorenson from Smith's who has been looking to buy the hotel next to Jack in the Box and put a gas station on it. That has not been a viable option. They want to compete with Wal Mart and this is how they will do it by having someplace locally next to their store that can use their Rewards card. When you shop at Smith's you get rewards and you can go to their gas station and you can get up to \$1.00 a gallon off on gas. Steve has contacted the bank about it. The bank would have to pay the taxes. Smith's has cleaned up gas stations in the past. They are looking for a six bay gas station accessible from the highway. It would be a kiosk style and no convenience store. Steve mentioned usually on stations like that it is not the tanks that are leaking it's the lines. So that's where the issue really lies. He will try to come in next week. I also got calls from Hamdogs wanting to reapply for some improvements. I will meet with them next week. New Beginnings plan review, would a couple of board members like to come and look at the landscape plans to see if you are okay with it?

Chairman Miller can come in.

Mr. Dallaire met with Daniel Gourlay, who will be doing an Eagle Scout project at the barns. He will be planting a couple of trees and cleaning up the area from the fence to the barn, trimming the willows and raking out the hay in the barn. I am trying to get a tour of GES together. David Ogles will be doing an Eagle Scout project putting doggie pot stations down Toler: one at Stodick Park where it goes into the right-of-way, one at Harvest, one at Lampe on the Harvest side and another at GES.

There could be some open meeting law changes coming forward in the legislature.

Mr. Altom saw a public records request. I haven't heard about any open meeting law changes. One of the changes to the public records request was going to take away the high fees for the extraordinary use of personnel in responding to public records requests. Right now they have a provision to prevent people from doing nuisance public records requests. If you are using extraordinary use of personnel to respond to this then you can start charging a much higher fee. Right now it is only the actual cost. If it's an extensive request or all the time you can start charging the lowest hourly rate of the person responding.

Mr. Dallaire went to a FEMA workshop. Had a meeting with the county manager, Town of Minden, Town of Genoa and the contractor for the Valley Vision. After the meeting we met with the county manager about the cost allocation. We have an agreement with the county from '97. It rolls over for five year increments. It's not like Minden's where it expired. The County has one with us and one with Genoa. There is a process we have to go through to get rid of that agreement. Also we have to identify with a memo of understanding or agreement that these are the services the county provides for this fee. I don't have a problem with the H & S side paying things, but I have a problem with the admin side. I went to a cost benefit analysis class from FEMA. It will be useful when we work on

the channel and all the flooding improvements. My review is coming due. I was hoping to have a list of projects that we completed. You have the list of accomplishments that you were given in the past. We created a format for the manager review so you can go through and just mark it.

Chairman Miller worked with Paul last year on redoing the way the manager was evaluated. Each member of the board now has input on the review. Then they were compiled here into one review. That is what was presented to the Board.

Mr. Dallaire can email the form to everyone. It will be tabulated after everyone turns in their evaluations. The final will be printed in next month's board packet. We can push it off another month if we need to. Nevada League of Cities offers a scholarship for schools. We got five applications. We can only submit three. Two members would need to come in and go over them. We can select those and then give them to Linda to look over and make sure she is okay with the selection. (Mary and Ken volunteered to come in and review them.) We are going to meet with Nevada Division of Forestry on the Cottonwood Slough cleanup.

Motion Higuera/Wenner to adjourn the meeting at 8:17 p.m. Motion carried with Board Member Slater absent.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken Miller
Chairman

Tom Dallaire
Town Manager