

**BEATTY TOWN ADVISORY BOARD
P.O. BOX 837
BEATTY, NV 89003**

**Minutes
1/28/09**

**THE BEATTY TOWN ADVISORY BOARD MET IN REGULAR SESSION AT 6:30PM IN THE BEATTY COMMUNITY CENTER.
THE BEATTY TOWN ADVISORY BOARD HEREAFTER WILL BE REFERRED TO AS THE (BTAB)
THE BEATTY TOWN ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS HEREAFTER WILL BE REFERRED TO AS THEIR RESPECTIVE INITIALS.**

**MIKE LASORSA (ML)
BERT BERTRAM (BB) Absent
LARENE YOUNGHANS (LY)
TERESA SULLIVAN (TS)
JOE WHITE (JW)**

1 Pledge of Allegiance

2 Action - Approval of the Agenda for the Beatty Town Advisory Board's meeting of January 28, 2009

TS - Motioned to approve with the pulling of January 14, 2009 minutes and Action Item #5; seconded by LY 4-0

3 Action - Approval of Minutes of the Beatty Town Advisory Board's meeting(s) for December 18, 2008 & January 14, 2009

January 14, 2009 minutes were pulled.

TS - Motioned to approve the minutes from December 18, 2008; seconded by LY 4-0

4 GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Shirley Harlan wanted to respond to an article in the PVT regarding the BTAB meeting on January 14th and the discussion about building a new Ambulance Bay; suggested that the building be on the lot between the Library and the Lion's Club. On October 3, 1995 the County Commissioners deeded that property to the Library District; this has already been taken care of by the Commissioners. Shirley just wanted to bring it out so that there wouldn't be any question about it later on.

Jerry Hammes commented that he had attended a meeting today concerning 'open meetings' and he wanted to request that this Board institute a 5 minute time limit of public input for agenda items; just to keep things under control.

David Spicer wanted to comment as the President of the Steering Committee regarding Open Space. The Open Space Committee has met and have decided (voted) to abandon the idea of Open Space; would like to have this agenda item. They would like to be able to move the Open Space Committee up to the Master Plan Committee which is what the County wants to do. The Steering Committee had decided that was unnecessary because all the matters in the Open Space Program are able to be done under the Master Plan; they will present an idea of how that can happen. They would also like to advise the BTAB to advise the County that the Steering Committee no longer needs the services of Stantec as this is something we can do ourselves. They also have some costs coming on some maps, right-of-way's and items that would have been necessary for the Open Space but weren't delivered to us; price on that from a consulting group we are working with.

5 Action - Emergency Items

This item was pulled.

6 Action - Board Member's Comments

There were none.

7 Consent Agenda Items

a. Action - Discussion of any item from the Consent Agenda Items that needs review before a decision is made.

b. Approval of change orders submitted by LaHaye Electric in the amounts of \$1,000.00 & \$675.00

LaRene still wanted LaHaye to change the electrical 'J' boxes to read 'electrical' instead of 'water' and there are 4 of them that say 'water'; thinks they need to be changed before we pay the bill. Mike commented that this had been talked about and it was a misunderstanding; they tried to get the boxes in a timely manner and weren't able to so they picked up these. A few of us discussed this and thought if we went to Janda Ribbon and got a nice looking plate to put on top of this it would save us a lot of time; if they took the covers (like they had discussed) off & brought them to Pahrump you'd have 4 open boxes with electrical wires. Mike asked that the Board try to work with LaHaye as he'd done a pretty good job, was \$80,000.00 under bid and has done everything we've asked him to do; understands Renle's point. LaRene stated that she had personally bought metal strips from Janda Ribbon's that said 'fire hose' for my property and within a year you couldn't read it. She went on to state that she didn't know if they had changed their method of operation but also didn't think that it was up to us to take care and that it was up to the contractor. LaRene also thinks that this is a safety issue and that we are liable; open up that box that is mismarked.

LY – Motioned to not approve these change orders until the electrical J boxes that are in the ground are changed to read electrical and that they are standard lids that every contractor has access to; seconded by TS

During further discussion Teresa wanted to comment that she did agree as we did contract with them for a job and its 4 lids (just replacing them). She went on to state that if we do it right now then its right, its right forever and those metal plates typically aren't intended for outdoor use and can get ripped off and say water again. Teresa thought that they needed to complete the job that they contracted to do. Brad Hunt commented that NDOT won't sign off on the permit unless they are legally approved lids on those that say electrical. Brad let Richard (LaHaye) know that the lids needed to be approved lids with the 'electrical' stamped on them.

ML – Called for the vote 4-0

c. Approval of Town Vouchers

ML – Motioned to approve the vouchers; seconded by LY 4-0

8 General Business

a. Update and status on BVFD new addition

ML – Gave the update to the questions that were asked as follows: the termination date being February 2010 if all stays the same and a rough list was made of everything needed (Fire Chief agrees) and now additional prices need to be gotten. Mike stated that as soon as he gets those he will bring it to the Fire Department as he needed to get some additional prices; this will be agendized at a future meeting to be discussed.

b. Action – Discussion and possible decision on sending a letter to NDOT concerning the clutter of objects within their right of way and all matters properly relating thereto

Mike read the letter written to NDOT addressing the clutter within the sidewalks and the signs that are still up advertising businesses that are no longer operating. Brad Hunt from NDOT made a comment regarding the letter and encouraged the Board to write one to remove the power poles out of the sidewalk; can force the utilities to move the poles to edge of right-of-way where they are supposed to be. As far as any signs on 374 they are all legal and there is nothing we can do about them; basically all signs in Town are legal except one (1) and it is in a position that NDOT can't do anything about it. There are a couple of signs that have been ignored but if the Town wants NDOT to take care of them Brad will; one is the Museum sign in front of the bank. Brad continued saying that NDOT's attitude was 'if we do anything, we do everything' and at that point there will be a lot of unhappy people in Town. Every canopy on 95 in front of the Sourdough and the Happy Burro will have to come down as NDOT has allowed them to trespass. If NDOT gets an official complaint from the Town they will come in and address all of that; Brad thought the letter should be amended to just address the stuff on the sidewalk (power poles). Brad talked to Steve (NDOT) and stated that his crew would do the cement work and put the sidewalks back together. Teresa wanted to know how far off the road would this put the power poles and Brad replied that it would be about 4 feet behind where the existing sidewalk is. LaRene asked Brad if he was suggesting we write the letter to NDOT but be specific about the power poles and only the power poles; Brad replied that this is what he would recommend. Brad continued stating that he had a thing about signs and this was something he had to address daily; does what he can about the biggest share but if they're legal there's nothing he (NDOT) can do about them. There was more discussion regarding the signs that are still up that are advertising businesses that are no longer in operation.

LY – Motioned to change the letter to Steve Baer (NDOT) to read that we want the power poles that are in the sidewalk moved back to the outer edge of the right-of-way and identify how many poles there are and where they are at; seconded by JW

During further discussion Richard Stephens stated that (since he brought it up originally) he didn't say anything about the power poles last time except maybe there were more poles than there needed to be; didn't know if telephone and electric needed to be separate. Richard continued with regards to the signs

and stated that he had driven around and didn't see that many signs that could go with exception to the 'Death Valley Information' one. He wondered if there might be any that could be combined on a single pole or something so there weren't quite so many (his thought). LaRene commented that we might want to re-think this motion and think about what signs could go together; she didn't look at it but did notice the telephone poles in the sidewalk. Teresa commented that maybe we could deal with it in two (2) separate ways; look at the power poles through NDOT and then maybe as a Town we can approach individuals with signs for updated them or removing them. LaRene asked Brad (Hunt) if regarding the 'Death Valley Visitor Center' they put it up or if they received permission from him to do it. Brad (from his seat) replied that he did and that he had forgotten about those and could pull them down as they are no longer open; was looking at the other signs not the NDOT ones put up.

ML – Called for the Vote 4-0

c. Action – Discussion and possible decision on placement of park benches and trash receptacles

Mike stated that Bert had some thinking on this and with him not here to express them he asked for comments from the audience. Ann Marchand commented that she knew that whenever this project first started that Mike Lasorsa had talked about Tehachapi and how wonderful the street lights looked; most of them have a park bench & trash receptacle next to them. Ann continued, saying that she did go down and look at them and that this would make the downtown area look finished; put together it will bring out the light poles a little more. Mike commented that we have two (2) benches out in front of the main office and he would like to keep one (1) there and one (1) in front; all the County buildings have park benches. Mike continued stating that we had 8 of them and that would leave 6 to put throughout Town; the benches will need to be fixed (bolted) in concrete. Mike stated that it might be easier to table this until our next meeting and have the people who have a suggestion for the park benches maybe send that information to the Town Office; gather together for our next meeting. The consensus is that the people would like to see them somewhere along the Downtown area and not sure of what was supposed to go in the Town Square; also suggested if put by a business that the business take care of emptying the trash. Teresa asked if we could have a rough map put together that designates where all of those (lights) are in relationship to the businesses and streets; have it up on the ELMO on a screen that night. LaRene commented that it was her understanding that when the lights went up it was already discussed with NDOT where the benches were going to go as this is what Brad had told her; they were already tentatively approved by NDOT. LaRene wanted to know if we changed the location of the lights if we needed to get another approval from NDOT to put them in. Janet replied to this comment saying that the park benches and trash receptacles were included in our occupancy permit for the street lights and there are already locations that were chosen for their placement. LaRene asked why we didn't have it if it had already been approved and Janet replied that the occupancy permit gave a map of the lights but also included the 7 park benches and 7 trash receptacles. Janet continued saying that of the 17 locations (street lights) the occupancy permit allows us to place them (benches/trash receptacles) in any of those locations. There was more discussion and clarification of the occupancy permit with regards to the placement of benches and trash receptacles. Joannie Jarvis stated to 'correct her if she's wrong' but it was her understanding that they were purchased out of the downtown beautification grant; Janet replied that yes they were. Joannie continued saying that in her mind all of those benches should go downtown to beautify the downtown area. Joannie is all for doing what we need to in order to make this a nicer building but in her mind she thought if it was bought out of the downtown beautification grant then all the benches and all the receptacles should go downtown. Mike asked what the pleasure of the Board was and LaRene replied that she thought we needed some kind of plan to decide where to put 8 benches. Teresa commented that if we have a map at the next meeting and put it up we can point out where people want them placed; she needs a visual to see it all as talking about it doesn't really help. There was more discussion regarding the placement of the items along with tabling this item so that a map can be put up for the community to look at with a final decision being made for this placement.

LY – Requested this be tabled until the next meeting; seconded by JW 4-0

d. Action – Discussion and possible decision on setting procedures for submitting BVFD vouchers

Teresa commented that we needed to set a procedure for submitting 'vouchers' and that it wasn't appropriate to set one for procedure for one and another procedure for another; she didn't see this on the first agenda or would have asked for it to be changed. Teresa would like to hear from Jim (Benshoof) but thought we needed 'a' procedure for everyone. Jim Benshoof (BVFD Fire Chief) commented that this was discussed and as an entity of the BTAB the Fire Department thought it would be wise to make a report each meeting and make it perfectly clear what their business operations were. They want to be as transparent as they possibly can and they have discussed some different procedures; would like to report on what they have decided. First of all each receipt from each purchase will have Mr. Benshoof's initials or signature on them then once a voucher is prepared it will be brought to the FD membership for review and approval; this will be signed of by Jim Benshoof and the President James Revert and be submitted to the BTAB for their review. LaRene asked about the FD having a regular meeting and Jim replied that they have them twice a month and could be easily done that way. LaRene asked if the date of the meeting

could be put on it that it was approved and wanted to know if everybody voted on it. Jim replied that the membership would vote on the approval of that. LaRene asked if that would be a problem getting the bills paid because it would be too long or did they have a meeting every month. Jim explained that they have 2 meetings every month and thought that the logistics of it would be fine; try it out and see how it works. LaRene commented that she agreed with Teresa and thought we should make everybody that is coming to us follow the same procedure. She went on to say that she thought it was a great procedure with Jim Benshoof signing off on it, take it to their meeting, they vote on it, approve it, send it back to us with the date its approved and then we sign off on it. Teresa commented that, that was procedural for the FD and that our requirement would be the 2 signatures on the voucher plus the date it was approved by the FD. Mike asked if this procedure was acceptable from the Board and Teresa replied that she thought it was they way we requested it from all the other agencies. She also thought that instead of making it a procedure for just 1 entity it should be a procedure for all entities. Mike wanted to know what we would do to implement that and Teresa replied that she would ask for an item for the next meeting to encompass all entities that come to us (under us/who we provide the money for) to follow the same procedure. Teresa continued saying that it's been in the past that we've always required 2 signatures from the other organizations and just thinks we need it in writing; a policy or a procedure we expect. Mike asked if Teresa wanted to put that in the form of a motion and Teresa replied that she didn't think it was a motion but was asking for an agenda item for the next meeting as she didn't want to act on this. Suzy McCoy (Beatty Museum) commented that her Board passed (15 years ago) what bills would go in front of Nye County and what bills (normal/ordinary) to be paid promptly. She continued saying that a system like that could cause their electricity not to be paid timely and Nye County doesn't pay the penalties; they have 2 Board signatures that go on their vouchers but it's not approved by the members whether they can pay the electric bill or the propane bill. Suzy wanted to know how something like the Board is asking to do would affect the Museum. Teresa replied that she thought that was a really good point and maybe standard operating costs...we're not really asking that through the FD; identify what all those are or however it needed to be worded. Suzy asked if they just purchased something extra and wanted to bring it in as a voucher...Teresa replied that, that was her thinking. LaRene stated that we needed to agendize this because this agenda item only deals with FD; need to agendize the whole thing if we're going to change it. Debbie Baker (Chamber of Commerce) stated that they fall into the same voucher situation that the Museum does and this Board allowed the Chamber to submit vouchers for operating expenses that didn't have to go through our membership so late fees weren't incurred that the County doesn't pay; just for consideration for next agenda item. Richard Stephens stated that he thought Teresa had tried to make a point a while ago; what the FD does is their internal procedure and what you want is 2 signatures and a date. This doesn't mean that everybody needs to go before their membership as that is their internal affair (how it is handled); what you need are the signatures and a date. Janet asked for clarification with regards to these procedures being put into affect and until they are was the Board requesting that every single voucher (utilities) on behalf of every entity have 2 signatures; not driving around looking for 2 FD members to sign an electric bill. Janet explained that the utility bills only needed one BTAB signature to be submitted for payment. Teresa replied that she thought these were important things and we just need to decide what we want to do; all those things need to come up and if that's normal operating practices then for me that's okay (utility bills). Teresa went on to state that to her knowledge there was nothing in writing for any of these entities; to know what is expected of them. Janet stated that there was and Teresa was on the Board when those procedures were approved as well as when the procedures (at the same time) for submitting an agenda request. Teresa replied that, that was asking for 2 signatures from all entities to approve vouchers, correct? Janet replied no; if we look back that was only the Chamber and Museum. Teresa stated that she remembered specifically saying, 'does that mean all entities'. Janet stated that it was very difficult to defend Teresa's statement when the Town Office has handled the FD vouchers in a way since 1999. When the reason for the submittal of vouchers came up was because the Chamber had a problem getting their bills to use in a timely fashion. The Chairman of the BTAB at that time requested that these procedures be brought up and that they are stamped & dated as to the day that the bills are brought to the Town Office; the FD was never mentioned at that time. Janet just wanted clarification that if it was going to be across the board that's fine and when the FD utility bills come in she will give them to Mike to bring to the FD... LaRene interjected at this point and asked Janet to wait a minute as the Board had not said what the rules would be. LaRene went on to say that they were going to discuss it and come up with what will be done. Teresa commented that if part of what we were doing works then let's continue to do it and she didn't want to turn anything upside down. Mike replied that, that was what we were doing; we were changing everything. He continued stating that we were changing everything and he wasn't really sure why as it was going to present problems; you heard somebody from the Chamber and the Museum. Teresa stated that all she was asking for were 2 signatures on the vouchers so she knows it has gone through the process; if that excludes normal operating procedures that's fine (all she's asking for). Mike stated that we would get together, either agendize this and try to work this out; agendize this for next meeting. Joe (White) commented that we needed to work this out between now and the next meeting; get our facts and procedures together. We can present this again as we are hashing this out way to long and right now we have no guidelines to go by. The BTAB members were in agreement with Joe's comment. Teresa continued saying that if Janet could get us some

information that tells us how everything's handled right now and then we'll have some good information to work from at the next meeting.

This item will be re-agendized for the next meeting.

LaRene wanted clarification that the agenda item would read, 'Action - discussion and possible decision on setting procedures for submitting vouchers' period; Joe replied yes. Mike commented that there would be ramifications as we just found out. Teresa stated that it was nothing we couldn't work around.

e. Action - Discussion and possible decision to rescind previous motion to approve the purchase of a doublewide for perspective Doctor in the not to exceed amount of \$170,000.00

Teresa stated that she had asked Janet to look into the issue, then proceeded to ask Janet if this is what they wanted; for it to be on the agenda and an actual motion. This was confirmed by Janet as what needed to be done per Judy in Purchasing.

ML - Motioned to rescind this motion; seconded by JW 4-0

f. Action - Discussion and possible decision to purchase for the Beatty Museum one Clover All-In-One Observation System in a not to exceed amount of \$1,700.00 to be funded out of the Tourism & Promotion account - BMHS

LY - Motioned to approve; seconded by JW 4-0

Suzy McCoy was here to speak on this item if need be; thanked the BTAB.

Debbie Baker wanted to go back to public comment as she missed it before.

ML - Re-opened Public Comment:

Debbie Baker (Chamber of Commerce) stated that it had come to her attention that the billboard as you are leaving Rhyolite (outside the Rhyolite road) was thought to be the Chamber's, it's BGID's, it's the BTAB's; BTAB owns it and it is deteriorating. Teresa replied that Bert has brought that to our attention and that we were in the process of taking care of that. Joe replied that it was being looked at. Janet commented since it was brought up that we'd like to read the minutes from the BGID meeting on March of 2000; the minutes from the BTAB meetings where it was discussed was basically Larry Gray talking and the Town paying for half of it. Janet continued saying that we don't know who owns it as the minutes do not reflect ownership, they don't reflect how much was paid, and they don't reflect anything. So it was Janet's suggestion to Bert that when this item does come up on the agenda that we do set the parameters of who is actually responsible for this sign; don't believe that there is a problem ever to have it repaired or replaced with the funds coming out of Tourism. It is a matter that should be settled as to who is actually responsible for this sign and didn't know how much luck we'd have with BGID minutes from way back when. No one is saying that no one is taking responsibility for the sign of course, except for the Chamber, but Janet thinks it needed to be defined as to who was a part of it, what was paid into it and what can be done for it in the future. Mike wanted to agendize this for our next meeting and if Mary (Revert) could find out what she could we would be able to put this together and see who owns this sign. LaRene asked Brad (Hunt) if he could find out who the permit was issued to; Brad replied that it was issued to the Town he thought. Janet stated that the minutes reflect that no permit was needed; but had difficulty believing that because we are a Town entity that no permit was needed as it took 1 & 1/2 (one & a half) years with NDOT for an occupancy permit.

9 Adjournment

JW - Motioned to adjourn at 7:26 pm; seconded by TS 4-0