

**STATE LAND USE PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

January 17, 2020

The Springs Preserve-Cienaga Room, 333 South Valley View Blvd., Las Vegas, NV 89107

**Members Present**

Lorinda Wichman, Nye County (Vice Chair)  
Delmo Andreozzi, Elko County  
James Barbee, Churchill County  
Bill Calderwood, White Pine County  
Jeanne Herman, Washoe County  
Lee Plemel, Carson City  
Kevin Phillips, Lincoln County  
Garth Price, Mineral County  
Sami Real, Clark County  
De Winsor, Esmeralda County

**Members Absent**

Jake Tibbitts, Eureka County (Chair)  
Nancy McDermid, Douglas County  
Don Alt, Lyon County  
Jim French, Humboldt County  
Art Clark, Lander County  
Roger Mancebo, Pershing County  
Kathy Canfield, Storey County  
Colby Prout, NACO

**Others Present**

Tori Sundheim, Office of Attorney General  
Charlie Donohue, Nevada Division of State Lands  
Ellery Stahler, Nevada Division of State Lands  
Scott Carey, Nevada Division of State Lands  
Curtis Moore, Elko County  
Lee Bonner, Nevada Department of Transportation  
Tom Erickson, Strategic Rail Finance  
Michael Sussman, Strategic Rail Finance  
Chaunsey Chau-Duong, Las Vegas Water District  
Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Clark County Commissioner  
Marci Henson, Clark County

**1) CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by **Lorinda Wichman** at 9:00 am and introductions were made by those present.

**2) PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Lee Bonner with the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) provided the Council with a brief overview of the update to the Nevada State Rail Plan. He requested to be placed on a future Council agenda to provide a formal presentation on the plan and discuss how local land use planning policy can support moving more goods by rail in Nevada.

Michael Sussman with Strategic Rail Finance discussed the importance of tying freight transportation to land use planning policy and how doing so could benefit Nevada like it has in other parts of the country. He stated

that the team is working on hosting 6 regional summits with the public to seek input on the Nevada State Rail Plan update in May.

### **3) REVIEW OF THE AGENDA**

**Kevin Phillips** made a motion to approve the agenda as submitted, the motion was seconded by **Garth Price**. The motion was approved.

### **4) APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Jeanne Herman** made a motion to approve the December 7, 2018 and September 27, 2019 meeting minutes as submitted, the motion was seconded by **Lee Plemel**. The motion was approved.

**Delmo Andreozzi, De Winsor, and Garth Price** abstained from voting on the December 7, 2018 and September 27, 2019 meeting minutes as they were not present at either meeting.

**Bill Calderwood** abstained from voting on the December 7, 2018 meeting minutes as he was not present at this meeting.

### **5) HOST PRESENTATION: SPRINGS PRESERVE**

Chaunsey Chau-Duong with the Las Vegas Water District provided the Council with a [PowerPoint presentation](#) that described the history of the Springs Preserve and highlighted programs offered throughout the year.

**Delmo Andreozzi** asked for a copy of Chaunsey's presentation to be emailed to the Council following the meeting.

Charlie Donohue with the Division of State Lands asked about the State Question 1 Bond Program and how much it cost to build the Springs Preserve. Chaunsey stated that the original construction was estimated at \$20 million and that roughly 1/3 of the facility was paid for using State Question 1 bond funds.

### **6) ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIRMAN FOR 2020**

**Lorinda Wichman** stated that she heard from **Jake Tibbitts** and that he was interested in serving another term as Chairman of the Council.

**Lorinda Wichman** made a motion to elect **Jake Tibbitts** as Chair for a 1-year term, the motion was seconded by **James Barbee**. The motion was approved.

**Kevin Phillips** made a motion to elect **Lorinda Wichman** as Vice Chairman for a 1-year term, the motion was seconded by **Jeanne Herman**. The motion was approved.

**Lorinda Wichman** abstained for voting on the motion to elect the Vice Chairman.

### **7) ELECTION OF FOUR MEMBERS TO SERVE ON THE SLUPAC EXECUTIVE COUNCIL**

Scott Carey with the Nevada Division of State Lands provided the Council with an overview of the purpose of the SLUPAC Executive Council and their duties. He stated that the terms of the existing four members of the SLUPAC Executive Council have all expired. He stated that the Council needs to appoint four new members to the SLUPAC Executive Council, and that state law requires that the SLUPAC Executive Council be geographically represented from around the State.

This item was tabled by the Council to be heard after item #10 on the agenda.

After reviewing the information presented by staff concerning the duties and powers of the SLUPAC Executive Council in item #10 **Lorinda Wichman** stated that she believes that the Council should delay action on making the appointments to the SLUPAC Executive Council till the next meeting. She stated that it would be good for the Council to receive additional information from staff on the legislative intent of the SLUPAC Executive Council and obtain additional information before making its appointments.

**James Barbee** made a motion to table the election of the four members to serve on the SLUPAC Executive Council until the next Council meeting, the motion was seconded by **Garth Price**. The motion was approved.

## **8) CLARK COUNTY LANDS BILL PRESENTATION**

Marci Henson with Clark County provided the Council with a [PowerPoint presentation](#) that described the proposed Southern Nevada Economic Development and Conservation Act and its status.

**Delmo Andreozzi** asked for a copy of Marci's presentation to be emailed to the Council following the meeting.

**Delmo Andreozzi** asked if there is a cost to the County associated with obtaining the additional public lands proposed in the lands bill. Marci Henson stated that the proposed legislation requires the jurisdiction requesting the land to pay for the realty transaction costs associated with acquiring the land from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

**Delmo Andreozzi** asked how much money was paid per acre for lands auctioned off as part of the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act. Marci Henson stated that the price for the lands sold is determined by an appraisal conducted by the BLM to determine fair market value. She further stated that recently lands sold by the BLM have been going for double the appraised value, or roughly about \$166,000 per acre.

**Delmo Andreozzi** stated that it's much different and difficult to determine highest and best use for BLM lands in rural areas of the state because the land values are so different compared Clark County. He further stated that the Elko County recently acquired 241 acres for a motorsports area and that it took the County 9 years to acquire this land from the BLM.

**Lorinda Wichman** stated that it can be difficult to work with the Federal Government and to determine the highest and best use for lands under their appraisal processes. Citing her experience involving obtaining BLM land for a historic cemetery in Nye County, she stated that it took nearly 2 years to change the land use designation of the cemetery from recreation and to get the BLM to back off from their original appraisal. She further stated that overall the process to acquire 12 acres for the historic cemetery cost the County about \$12,000.

**Jeanne Herman** stated that Congress is no longer interested in designating additional wilderness areas and asked how this would impact Clark County's lands bill. Marci Henson stated that within the House of Representatives, the County has been told that they would need to include more wilderness areas in the bill in order to get the bill passed out of the chamber. She further stated that within the Senate the majority party may not be as excited about additional wilderness areas and that the County will need to work with both chambers to get the bill approved.

Ellery Stahler with the Division of State Lands asked what the timeframe is to get the County's land bill approved. Marci Henson stated that the County desires to have the bill approved by the end of the year. Marci further stated that the County is exploring options with Nevada's delegation in Congress to pass the bill on its own or be combined with other military and county land bills.

Charlie Donohue with the Division of State Lands asked if the County's lands bill would allow the State to convert its Recreation and Public Purpose (R&PP) lands. Marci Henson stated that the proposed bill does allow for this.

Charlie Donohue asked if the State would regain ownership of the Mt Charleston fire station under the provisions of the proposed bill. Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Clark County Commissioner stated that the State would not regain ownership of the Mt. Charleston fire station.

Charlie Donohue asked about the proposed land exchange in Lee Canyon and how to get the Federal Government to agree on an equal value exchange. Marci Henson stated that the County did a lot of research on a [white paper by the University of Utah](#) about defining the public interest and equal value of Federal Lands. She further stated that the County wrote into its proposed bill why the proposed transfer is in the public interest (scientific, recreational, and aesthetic) and would be of equal value to other Federal lands for potential exchange.

Charlie Donohue asked if the public interest and equal value argument has ever been challenged or written into a Federal lands bill. Marci Henson stated there have been similar equal value and public interest arguments made in [Public Law 105-335](#), [Public Law 112-79](#), and the [Utah Test & Training Encroachment Prevention and Temporary Closure Act](#).

**Lorinda Wichman** asked that the University of Utah white paper and the other equal value and public interest laws that referenced in Marci Henson's presentation be emailed to the Council.

## **9) AFFORDABLE HOUSING DISCUSSION**

Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Clark County Commissioner led the Council in a discussion on affordable housing and the County's ongoing efforts to address the issue. She stated that if the County doesn't do anything to address affordable housing, within 10 years the County will be short 59,000 homes that will be needed for veterans, seniors, and families that are living within the poverty level. She stated that the County Commission has chosen to set aside proceeds from the county marijuana licensing revenues to address this issue. She stated that using local funding is easier to use and more flexible at addressing the issue than Federal or State funding. Some of the initiatives that the county is using its funding towards include; paying for 6 months of rent for affordable housing leases, paying off liens on properties that are behind on county property taxes and transferring those properties for affordable housing development, and submitting a reservation request with the BLM for 40 properties within the County to build affordable housing. She stated that the BLM can only complete two affordable housing projects per year within the county which only equates to 300 units. To address this, the County is working with the BLM to acquire smaller 5-acre properties and is looking at constructing smaller pre-built "cube houses" that would be connected to utilities. She stated that within Clark County there are over 6,000 people who are homeless, the majority of whom are senior citizens. She further stated that the County is also working with partners to obtain donations to address the issue, to date over \$40 million has been raised towards to the initiative.

**Lorinda Wichman** asked if the County has any memorandums of understanding (MOU) or agreements with property owners and complexes where the County provides an affordable housing rent subsidy. Marilyn Kirkpatrick stated that the County meets regularly with the apartment association to discuss issues and concerns. She stated that the County does provide case management services to ensure rent is being paid and issues are being addressed at these complexes. She suggested that other local governments around the state use and leverage their own funding to provide an affordable housing rent subsidy because it comes with less restrictions. She stated that Clark County raised its sales tax rate 1/8<sup>th</sup> of a cent to support affordable housing which has raised \$54 million towards the initiative. She stated that combined with the marijuana licensing revenues the County will construct 1,200 units of affordable housing and provide additional transportation & preschool services to support the initiative.

**Lorinda Wichman** asked about the 1,200 sq. ft. minimum housing restriction and if the County is looking to construct tiny homes. Marilyn Kirkpatrick stated that the County has looked into tiny homes, but the concern is a lack of national standards and meeting public safety requirements. She stated that the county has looked to construct the pre-built "cube houses" and building larger boarding style housing.

**Lee Plemel** asked what the affordability rate is for service workers within the County. Marilyn Kirkpatrick stated that that affordability rate depends upon where they live within the County. She further stated that the County is attempting to look at the whole issue of affordability and all the costs associated with housing like childcare.

**Lee Plemel** asked if the County has a written policy on how the marijuana licensing revenues are used. Marilyn Kirkpatrick stated that the County Commission adopted a resolution of intent for this funding, established separate accounts to track the funding, and receives quarterly updates on how the funding is being spent.

Charlie Donohue with the Nevada Division of State Lands asked how the County prioritizes the individual with its funding. Marilyn Kirkpatrick stated that the priority for the County Commission is on families first, followed by disabled individuals.

Charlie Donohue asked about the abilities of a city to create land banks vs a county. Marilyn Kirkpatrick stated that the standard language of city charters throughout the state allow for greater flexibility to exercise their powers and authority than a county enabling statute.

**Lee Plemel** asked how the County can give preference to one group of people over another group. Marilyn Kirkpatrick stated by using local funding the County can establish its own rules and control how the funding is utilized.

## **10) REVIEW OF OPEN MEETING LAW AND REVIEW OF SLUPAC POWERS AND DUTIES**

Tori Sundheim with the Office of Attorney General provided the Council with a [PowerPoint Presentation](#) that included an overview of the Open Meeting Law and the powers and duties of the Council.

After reviewing NRS 321.740 (7) relating to establishing a quorum for the Council, Tori Sundheim asked the Council what they believe constitutes a quorum for the Council.

**Lee Plemel** stated that he believed that the intent of the statute was for the Council to establish a quorum under the same requirements as those referenced in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS).

**Delmo Andreozzi** stated that the way the statute for establishing a quorum is currently written adding the phrase “and” makes it very confusing.

Referencing NRS 321.740 (7) **Lorinda Wichman** stated that she believed a period is needed after the word “business” in order to avoid redundancy and make the statute clearer on what constitutes a quorum.

**Sami Real** asked about the requirement in NRS for a County to have 2 or more nominations for its representative on the Council. Tori Sundheim stated that it would be good for a county to submit to the Governor more than one nomination for its representative on the Council. Charlie Donohue with the Nevada Division of State Lands stated that Governor Gibbons wanted to have more than one nomination to consider for appointment to the Council and for other State Boards and Commissions.

**Garth Price** asked what the process is when the Governor rejects a County’s nomination for its Council representative. Scott Carey with the Nevada Division of State Lands stated that the agency is working closely with the Governor’s Office to work through the backlog of Council appointments that are in process. He stated that there are currently 8 applications from Council members pending appointment from the Governor. He stated that the preference is that all appointments follow the process as outlined in NRS and that the agency and all counties work closely with the Governor’s Office.

Tori Sundheim clarified that the existing statute (NRS 321.740 (3) b does allow for a county’s nomination to the Council to become effective without the Governor’s appointment if after 30 days the Governor does not notify the county that they will not appoint the county’s nomination.

**Lorinda Wichman** stated that although the county’s nomination to the Council becomes effective without the Governor’s appointment after 30 days, the Governor under the statute has the opportunity to make the appointment or not.

**Lee Plemel** asked what would happen if the Council met after 30 days after a county submitted its nomination for its representative on the Council. Tori Sundheim stated that under the statute if the Governor does not act within the 30 days of receiving a county’s nomination, their nomination to the Council becomes effective. She

stated that if the Council meets within the 30 days of submitting its application, then the county's nomination does not become effective without the appointment of the Governor. Tori stated that it's important for the counties to submit a list of three persons and a preference of whom they nominate to the serve on the Council for the Governor to consider.

Tori Sunheim stated that NRS does not allow for a county to allow for alternate members to serve on the Council. She stated that whoever is the appointed representative for the County is the only one who can vote and participate in Council meetings. She further stated that counties are prohibited under the law to designate someone else to fill in for its representative when needed. Pursuant to NRS 241.025(1) an alternate member can vote only if the public body's legal authority allows it; the Council's statute NRS 321.740 does not authorize alternate members.

Tori Sunheim provided the Council with an overview of its powers and duties which include: advising and providing resources to the Administrator for the Division of State Lands and Counties on land use planning, providing statements of policies on Federal and State land acquisitions, and working cooperatively with the Nevada Attorney General's Office and the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) on RS 2477 roads.

Tori Sunheim stated that the Council through its SLUPAC Executive Council has the power under NRS 321.755 to resolve inconsistencies between the land use plans of local government entities. She provided the Council with an overview of the process and this council's role in resolving inconsistencies between local government entities land use plans. She also provided the Council with an overview of the process and the Council's role in planning for areas of critical environmental concerns in the State.

**Lorinda Wichman** recalled that since she has served on the Council that she has never seen the SLUPAC Executive Council exercise its authority in resolving land use inconsistencies between local governments. She asked if the SLUPAC Executive Council has ever exercised this authority before. Charlie Donohue with the Nevada Division of State Lands stated that he recalled that the SLUPAC Executive Council was set to engage with an issue involving the Moapa Dace several years ago but they did not meet and to the best of his knowledge has never been convened.

Scott Carey with the Nevada Division of State Lands stated that a hypothetical example of the SLUPAC Executive Council exercising its authority to resolve land use inconsistencies between local governments could be the Walmart and shopping center that was built in Douglas County on the border of Carson City. He stated that in this example Carson City could have found Douglas County's land use approval of the Walmart and shopping center inconsistent with its land use plan. He stated that Carson City could have requested that the SLUPAC Executive Council resolve this land use consistency. He further stated that it was staff's opinion that the statute provides the SLUPAC Executive Council with the authority to change a local government land use designation in order to resolve an inconsistency.

**Lorinda Wichman** asked for clarification if the SLUPAC Executive Council would have the authority to resolve a land use inconsistency between a local government and the Federal Government or if the statute only allows the SLUPAC Executive Council to resolve disputes between local governments. Scott Carey stated that the statute only applies to local government land use inconsistencies.

**Delmo Andreozzi** stated that he believes that land use decisions are made at the local government level and that it could be a slippery slope and become very political for the SLUPAC Executive Council to be involved with altering local government land use designations. He further stated that he is interested to see if this SLUPAC Executive Council has met before and if it has taken any previous actions.

**Lee Plemel** asked what it would take for the SLUPAC Executive Council to resolve a local government land use inconsistency. Tori Sunheim stated that the statute outlines that one or more local governments would submit a request to the SLUPAC Executive Council to resolve the land use inconsistency.

**Lorinda Wichman** stated that she believes that the intent of the statute is not for the SLUPAC Executive Council to impose its will but to act as a mediator and offer its assistance to local governments in resolving the land use inconsistencies.

Scott Carey stated that he believes that the statute was adopted prior to the enactment of regional planning laws around the State and the ability for local governments to resolve land use issues through regional planning. He stated that given the statute's age, he believed that the Legislature's intent with creating the SLUPAC Executive Council's powers was a way for local governments to resolve land use disputes.

**Sami Real** asked if the Council itself is to act as a mediator in land use planning issues rather than providing statewide guidance and bringing forth land use planning issues. Tori Sundheim stated that the Council has the duty and authority to do both. She stated that the Council is tasked with bringing forward information regarding land use issues and to provide insight on Federal and State land issues and acquisitions.

Tori Sundheim clarified that the SLUPAC Executive Council only can resolve land use inconsistencies between local governments and not between local governments and Federal agencies. She stated that the SLUPAC Executive Council has the authority to resolve land use inconsistencies between cities, counties, general improvement districts, and other political subdivisions of the State that are adjacent or overlapping to each other. She provided a hypothetical example that the SLUPAC Executive Council could not resolve a land use inconsistency between the City of Las Vegas and the City of Reno.

**Lorinda Wichman** asked about the state law that requires private property rights for public right of way access and if the SLUPAC Executive Council would have the authority to resolve any disputes between a private property owner and a local government. Tori Sundheim stated that she believed that the SLUPAC Executive Council would not have the authority to resolve this type of dispute and that its powers are limited to what is included in the statute.

Tori Sundheim stated that another duty of the Council outlined in NRS 321.770 is the ability to review and assist the Governor in land use planning for areas of critical environmental concern (ACEC) on State lands. She stated that the statute outlines a process for the Council to review and provide a recommendation to the Governor on establishing a State ACEC if brought forward or requested by a local government. She clarified that a State ACEC is different than a Federal ACEC designation, and that the Council does not have the authority to create a Federal ACEC. Charlie Donohue stated that he can think of two instances where an ACEC could be designated on State lands: one for the desert pupfish in the Railroad Valley and another for steamboat buckwheat in Washoe County near the Steamboat geothermal plant.

**Delmo Andreozzi** stated that this presentation has been a lot to review and that Council should take a look at its powers and duties again at a future meeting. **Lorinda Wichman** agreed with this and suggested that the Council's powers and duties be discussed again at its next meeting.

Charlie Donohue stated that staff will put this item on the next agenda. He further stated that staff will also conduct additional research and provide the Council with additional background on the legislative intent of the SLUPAC Executive Council's authority to resolve local government land use inconsistencies.

## **11) RECOMENDATION TO REPEAL OR REVISE SLUPAC BYLAWS AND DIRECTION ON POTENTIAL SLUPAC LEGISLATIVE CHANGES**

Scott Carey with the Nevada Division of State Lands provided the Council with a brief overview of its bylaws which were last updated in 2014. He stated that many of the Council's bylaws refer to statute and that there are sections of the bylaws which are not allowed under NRS such as designating alternate members. He stated that staff is recommending that the Council repeal these bylaws to avoid potential conflicts and allow staff to come back with a new set of bylaws. Charlie Donohue with the Nevada Division of State Lands added that staff could also come back to the Council with suggestions for legislative changes to its statute.

**Lorinda Wichman** asked if there are specific legislative changes to the Council's statute that staff believes it should pursue. Charlie Donohue stated that one specific legislative change would be to revise the Council's statute to allow for alternate members to serve on the Council.

Scott Carey stated that another conflict with the bylaws that was not provided with the Council's statute was the ability of the Council to elect a Vice Chairman. He stated that section 1.4 of the bylaws state that the Council shall elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman, however the Council's statute only specifically allows for the election of a Chairman. Tori Sundheim with the Office of Attorney General stated that the Council's bylaws are not effective if they conflict with NRS. She recommended that that Council revise its bylaws, so they are compliant with the Council's statute and does not conflict with NRS.

**James Barbee** asked if the Council needs to change its bylaws so that the sections that conflict with its statute are removed. He added that he would not like to see the bylaws removed in their entirety.

**James Barbee** made a motion to remove section 1.3 Designation of Alternatives and amend section 2.4 Quorum and Vote Required by removing the requirement for nine voting members to be present as outlined on page 23 of the meeting packet. The motion was seconded by **Garth Price**.

**Sami Real** asked if **James Barbee** would amend his motion to include removing section 1.5 Executive Council Membership from the bylaws. She stated that this section is not necessary within the bylaws because the membership of the SLUPAC Executive Council is outlined within NRS 321.755. **James Barbee** stated that he would accept this amendment to his motion.

**James Barbee** made a motion to revise the Council's bylaws by removing section 1.3, section 1.5, and revising section 2.4 as outlined in the meeting packet. The motion was seconded by **Garth Price**.

**Delmo Andreozzi** stated that he supports the motion and the proposed changes to the bylaws. He stated that it can be difficult for members of Council to attend the meetings. He stated that he thinks that it would be of value for Elko County to be able send an alternate member to attend the meetings and provide information but not participate in discussions or vote.

Charlie Donohue stated that **Jake Tibbitts** and staff are of the opinion that the Council will need a bill draft request next legislative session to clean up the statute which would allow the Council to be more engaged and action oriented on land use planning issues around the State.

The motion to revise the Council's bylaws was approved.

**Lorinda Wichman** stated that Council needs to take another look at making further changes to its bylaws at a future meeting. She also stated that the Council should also review a possible bill draft request and discuss changes to the Council's statute. Scott Carey stated that staff can look at additional changes that may be needed to the Council's statute and bring forth concepts and specific language for the Council's consideration at its next meeting.

**James Barbee** asked if the bylaws could be revised to allow for the Council to weigh in and engage with local governments on Federal land issues as outlined in NRS 321.735(1). Tori Sundheim stated that the Council can weigh in an engage on these issues but only to the degree that the Council is allowed to do so under the statute. She further stated that the emphasis of the statute itself seems to be focused on the Council dealing with local, inter-local, and regional land use planning issues.

**Sami Real** asked if there is anything in the statute that prevents the Council from reviewing or providing input on a Federal land issue in support of a local government. Tori Sundheim stated that bylaws cannot give the Council more authority than what is established in its statutes.

Scott Carey stated that staff will conduct research on the legislative intent of the Council and the powers of the SLUPAC Executive Council and will the place an item on the next agenda for the Council to review and discuss potential legislative changes.

## **12) COUNTY PLANNING UPDATES**

**Delmo Andreozzi**, Elko County:

**Nevada Division of State Lands**  
State Land Use Planning Agency  
901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5003  
Carson City, NV 89701

Telephone: (775) 684-2723  
[www.lands.nv.gov/land-use-planning](http://www.lands.nv.gov/land-use-planning)



Delmo stated that that he appreciates the opportunity to serve on the Council and values the collaboration with the other counties. He stated that after 20 years the County has come to resolution on the South Canyon road dispute with the US Forest Service. He stated that the County has accepted an easement for the road from the US Forest Service which will ensure future public access and maintenance for the County.

Curtis Moore with Elko County stated that the County is working on an update to its codes which were originally created in the 1970's. He stated that the County is following and supporting recent Federal actions within the county for targeted grazing permits. He stated that the County has completed an economic assessment with the University of Nevada as part of the Nevada Economic Assessment Project. He also stated that the County met with Sean Gephart with the Nevada Department of Agriculture concerning noxious weed controls and possible amendments to the County's code.

**De Winsor**, Esmeralda County:

De stated that the County is in the process of reevaluating its land use plan because two mines are in the process of development. He stated that the new mines are creating a need for areas for new housing within the County.

**James Barbee**, Churchill County:

James stated that the County has been involved with the NAS Fallon lands withdrawal proposal and that the County is working on its draft of a future lands bill. He stated that the County is completing preliminary engineering for expansion of water and wastewater facilities to facilitate workforce housing. He stated that the County has purchased 30 acres to support this effort and that the county is working with a land trust to develop additional workforce housing on other county owned lands. He also stated that the County is in the process of updating its master plan and land use section which should be completed in the next couple of months.

**Garth Price**, Mineral County:

Garth stated that the County is also following the NAS Fallon lands withdrawal proposal.

**Bill Calderwood**, White Pine County:

Bill stated that the County is moving forward with its mapping for RS 2477 roads, he added that the County is using a similar mapping process used by other counties in Nevada. He stated that the County is using its new GIS mapping data to update and improve its 9-1-1 communications system and for other uses within the county. He stated that the County is working on a proposal to hire its own Natural Resources Director. He also stated that the County Commission has signed an agreement to expand its industrial park by 120 acres, which will include a new rail spur.

**Sami Real**, Clark County:

Sami stated that the County continues to work on its lands bill and efforts to address housing affordability. She stated that the County is working on a full update to the County's comprehensive master plan and zoning ordinance. She stated that the County has hired a consultant to assist with the updating the comprehensive master plan and zoning ordinance. She stated that the goal of the update is to better align zoning designations and master plan land uses.

**Kevin Phillips**, Lincoln County:

Kevin stated that there was no update for the County.

**Lorinda Wichman**, Nye County:

Lorinda stated that the County is working on an update to its master plan and adding a new groundwater management plan component of its master plan. She also stated that the County is following the NAS Fallon

lands withdrawal proposal and is seeking minor concessions from the Navy to recognize the cumulative impacts of the proposal to the County.

**Jeanne Herman**, Washoe County:

Jeanne stated that the update to the County's regional plan has been completed. She stated that the County is also working on a public lands bill and expressed concerns about the potential impact to recreation, mining and ranching within the County. She also stated that the State Engineer has recently issued a moratorium on new well drilling within Cold Springs and that the County continues to have flooding in Swan Lake.

**Lee Plemel**, Carson City:

Lee stated that Carson City was directed by the Board of Supervisors to rewrite its zoning code over the next two years. Lee stated that the staff will be updating its zoning code without the help of consultants and will be relying on other zoning code updates from around the State. Lee also stated that Carson City has adopted a diesel fuel tax which will be in place for two years and the going to an election.

### **13) FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Scott Carey with the Nevada Division of State Lands stated that the staff had received a request from Lee Bonner with NDOT to provide a formal presentation at the next meeting about the State Rail Plan, another request from Sean Gephart with the Nevada Department of Agriculture to provide a presentation on noxious weeds, and the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources would like to provide a presentation on Governor Sisolak's Climate Change Executive Order and greenhouse gas emissions report.

Scott stated that other future agenda items requested by the Council at this meeting include: a review of the Council's powers and duties, the Council's bylaws, potential SLUPAC legislative changes, and the election of SLUPAC Executive Council members.

### **14) SCHEDULING OF FUTURE SLUPAC MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS**

Scott Carey with the Nevada Division of State Lands provided an overview of the previous Council meeting locations from the past six years. He stated that staff was looking for direction from the Council on a setting a meeting date and location for its next meeting.

**Jeanne Herman** suggested that if the Council is going to have another special meeting for RS 2477 roads, that Carson City would be a good location to have this type of meeting.

**Lorinda Wichman** suggested that Friday April 3, 2020 would be a good date for the Council to hold its next meeting. Scott Carey stated that it has been awhile since the Council met in Storey County and considering all the development within the County it would be a good location to hold a meeting.

**James Barbee** made a motion to hold the next Council meeting on April 3, 2020 in Storey County, the motion was seconded by **Garth Price**. The motion was approved.

### **15) PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

### **16) ADJOURN**

**Garth Price** made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by **Sami Real** and approved by the Council. The meeting was adjourned at 1:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Carey  
/s/

**Nevada Division of State Lands**  
State Land Use Planning Agency  
901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5003  
Carson City, NV 89701

Telephone: (775) 684-2723  
[www.lands.nv.gov/land-use-planning](http://www.lands.nv.gov/land-use-planning)

Meeting Recorder

Please note that minutes should be considered draft minutes pending their approval at a future meeting of the State Land Use Planning Advisory Council. Corrections and changes could be made before approval.

The meeting was digitally recorded. Anyone wishing to receive or review the recording may call (775) 684-2723. The recording will be retained for three years.