



**CITY OF SPARKS, NV
COMMUNITY
SERVICES
DEPARTMENT**

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Marilie Smith, Administrative Secretary

Subject: Report of Sparks Planning Commission Action

Date: October 29, 2020

RE: **PCN18-0007** – Consideration of and possible action on a request to amend a tentative map (STM18-0004) to add 30 lots, increasing the number of lots from 459 to 489, by incorporating townhome units into the tentative map. The tentative map is for a site approximately 118.45 acres in size within the NUD (New Urban District – Stonebrook) zoning district generally located east of Pyramid Way and south of La Posada Drive, Sparks, Nevada.

Please see the attached excerpt from the October 15, 2020 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1 Thank you, Ian.

2 Next up is PCN18-0007, consideration of and
3 possible action on a request to amend a tentative map to
4 add 30 lots, increasing the number of lots from 459 to
5 489, by incorporating townhome units into the tentative
6 map. The tentative map is for a site approximately
7 118.45 acres in size within the New Urban District of
8 Stonebrook generally located east of Pyramid Way and
9 south of La Posada Drive in Sparks.

10 MS. REID: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair and
11 members of the Planning Commission. Sienna Reid with
12 Planning presenting this item tonight.

13 Let me go ahead and get my screen shared so you
14 can see the presentation.

15 All right. So just to confirm, the sound is
16 good and everyone can see the slide deck in front of
17 them?

18 Okay. So before you this evening is a request
19 to amend the tentative map for Phase 2 of the Stonebrook
20 planned development.

21 On this slide, you'll see the Stonebrook
22 Phase 2 project area is outlined in red. Phase 2 is
23 located at the southern terminus of Stonebrook Parkway.
24 And it's found in the southeast portion of the larger

1 Stonebrook planned development boundary. And on this
2 slide, you can see that larger Stonebrook boundary
3 outlined with the blue dashes. And then, for further
4 reference, Oppio Ranch Parkway is located along the
5 northern portion of the Phase 2 project site.

6 The original tentative map for Stonebrook
7 Phase 2 was approved in May of 2018, and it is still
8 active. The current planned development consists of 459
9 single-family lots on approximately 118.45 acres. Most
10 range in size from approximately 4,625 to 20,649 square
11 feet.

12 With that current tentative map, there are five
13 villages specified. And you can actually see those on
14 the back that's on this slide. Village E, which is
15 shown in green, includes 99 lots. 108 lots are shown in
16 Village F, which is the peachy-colored area. And a
17 total of 252 lots are found in Villages G1, 2 and 3.
18 And those areas are the pink, yellow and blue areas.
19 Plus, for the detention facility, which on this
20 particular slide is not colored. And then, also, south
21 of Stonebrook Parkway.

22 And as I mentioned, this map is still active.
23 And to date, we've had 141 lots within Phase 2 that are
24 being reviewed in two final maps.

1 The proposed amendment to the Stonebrook
2 Phase 2 tentative map before you tonight requests adding
3 30 lots that would increase the number from 459 to 489,
4 by incorporating townhome units into the tentative map.
5 The site size remains unchanged at a bit over size 118
6 acres. And as proposed, lots range in size from
7 approximately 4,174 to 21,777 square feet. And there's
8 an average lot size there of 6,500 square feet.

9 Across the project site, what we end up with is
10 a gross density of 4.2 dwelling units per acre.

11 In terms of the lot breakdown, there are three
12 primary Villages, E, F and G. And each of them have
13 been further divided into subvillages. Within
14 Village E, which you can see here on this slide in
15 purple, there are 105 lots. Village F, which is shown
16 in light green, has 109 lots. And then Village G, which
17 is actually a combination of the light orange and beige
18 colors, includes a total of 275 lots. Villages G2-A and
19 G2-B, which you can see in the light orange color at the
20 southwest portion of the project site, those are the
21 lots that are planned for townhome units.

22 In addition, there are also four lots where a
23 model home complex will be located that are also planned
24 for townhome units. And on this particular site, you

1 can see the location of that model home complex outlined
2 with some red dashes. And just to kind of point them
3 out, this model home complex is here, if you follow my
4 cursor.

5 So this next slide shows the preliminary
6 landscape plan for Stonebrook Phase 2 as proposed for
7 amendments. And it really gives you a better sense of
8 the overall subdivision design. So both Villages E and
9 F are designed to meet the single-family LDR residential
10 handbook standards. And, again, to orient, Village E is
11 located here on the eastern side of the site, and
12 Village F is located here on the northwest portion of
13 the site.

14 Villages G1-A and G1-B, those are each located
15 west of the drainage facility. Those are designed to
16 meet the patio home standards in the handbook. And I
17 just discussed Villages G2-A and G2-B are designed to
18 meet the townhome standards. And those are the
19 southwest portion of the project site.

20 One thing that you'll notice on this slide are
21 two thick black lines. Those are illustrating regional
22 trails within the project site. And the regional trail
23 that runs on the eastern side of the drainage facility,
24 it connects to Stonebrook Phase 1 to the north, and

1 that'll ultimately connect at the southeast corner of
2 the site to the existing regional trail system that's
3 located within Wingfield Springs.

4 At the northeast portion of the project site,
5 the regional trail proposed will actually see the
6 missing link connecting the existing regional trail
7 system in Cimarron to that trail, with just a small
8 portion running through Stonebrook Phase 2.

9 And also of note, a neighborhood park was
10 identified east of the drainage facility with the
11 original tentative map request. However, in January of
12 2019, City Council did approve a variety of amendments
13 to the Stonebrook handbook. And one of those amendments
14 provided for the consolidation of two 5-acre
15 neighborhood parks into one larger community park. That
16 community park is 20 acres in size, thereabouts, and
17 located just off of La Posada Drive within Stonebrook
18 Phase 3. So you'll see that coming forward with a
19 future tentative map.

20 But with that handbook amendment, a
21 neighborhood park is no longer shown east of the
22 drainage facility. So I definitely wanted to point that
23 out, because it does influence how the conditions have
24 been revised.

1 In conjunction with the request to amend the
2 Phase 2 tentative map, the applicant has also submitted
3 a request to deviate from the recreation area standards
4 for townhomes that are specified in the handbook. The
5 handbook does authorize the administrator to approve
6 deviations and waivers from a variety of handbook
7 standards.

8 The standards that are in place for the
9 townhome recreation areas require play areas that
10 include three features. Those could be tot lots, a half
11 court for basketball, fitness clusters, or large or
12 small group picnic areas. However, because the
13 applicant intends to develop an active adult community,
14 the deviation eliminates the more child-oriented play
15 area in favor of an active adult landscape common area
16 with features such as walking paths, benches, gathering
17 areas with trellis shading, active adult fitness
18 equipment and, potentially, a bocce ball court.

19 And so this deviation request, I did want to
20 point out, was approved by City staff on October 9th,
21 which was actually just Friday of last week.

22 So shifting gears here into the tentative map
23 findings that need to be considered this evening, for
24 the most part, the findings are listed in numerical

1 order. There are, however, limited instances where I've
2 taken them out of order in an attempt to group specific
3 topics together.

4 So, starting off here with Finding T1, which is
5 conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan, as
6 proposed, the amended tentative map increases the
7 allowed number of single-family lots by three. And
8 that, as we've discussed, is by incorporating townhomes
9 into the subdivision.

10 And ultimately incorporating those townhomes
11 into the subdivision advances Policy H1 and H2 by
12 providing a townhome housing product within the City of
13 Sparks housing market. And townhomes are commonly
14 classified as missing middle housing that offers home
15 ownership opportunities at lower price points when you
16 compare those to traditional single-family housing. So
17 diversity there in terms of product and price point.

18 Policy CC8 encourages neighborhood diversity
19 with varied lot sizes as well as a mix of architectural
20 styles, materials and colors. The proposed subdivision
21 does include lot size variation. And then homes buying
22 will need to comply with the architectural standards in
23 the handbook that are in place with standards that
24 address various building styles, color and materials.

1 Looking at Policy C4, sidewalks are proposed on
2 both sides of the street per the handbook and in
3 compliance with this policy. And City services to the
4 site can be provided at acceptable service levels. And
5 that is something that was previously also evaluated
6 with the handbook, the original handbook approval and
7 then the initial tentative map approval for Phase 2.

8 Here on this side, Findings T2 and T7 each
9 relate to streets. For conformance with the City's
10 street master plan, project access is provided from
11 Stonebrook Parkway, Oppio Ranch Parkway, and then, also,
12 Fen Way. This is consistent with the handbook approval
13 and the initial tentative map.

14 Finding T7 focuses on impact to public streets.
15 With this particular application, we received an updated
16 trip generation letter that estimates 489 single-family
17 dwelling units will generate 4,478 average daily trips,
18 with 466 p.m. peak-hour trips. These residential units
19 were considered at the time of the initial handbook
20 approval. And the Stonebrook planned development was
21 designed to accommodate just shy of 2,000 total family
22 dwelling units, generating almost 16,000 average daily
23 trips.

24 And so, ultimately, adequate capacity exists to

1 accommodate the addition of 30 lots to the Phase 2
2 tentative map, because the overall number of
3 single-family units in the Stonebrook handbook remains
4 capped. And there are the single-family lots remaining
5 approved for them. So staff is not concerned that we
6 don't have adequate capacity in the roadway network.

7 It is worth noting that both RTC and NDOT
8 provided comments on the amendment request. RTC did not
9 identify any concerns. NDOT did, however, express
10 concern that the 2017 traffic study that was provided
11 with the original tentative map didn't address
12 increments at the intersection of Oppio Ranch and
13 Pyramid Way. And here it's important to note that those
14 improvements were considered at the time of handbook
15 approval, and those improvements continue to move
16 forward consistent with those improvements that were
17 identified.

18 Moving on here with this slide to Finding T3,
19 agencies that regulate environmental impact did not
20 choose to provide comment on this request. However, the
21 developer does need to meet both county and state
22 requirements.

23 Finding T4 focuses on the availability of water
24 to serve the site. Here the domestic water requirements

1 is estimated a little over 130 acre-feet per year. And
2 municipal water service will be provided by TMWA.

3 Finding T5 takes a look at the availability of
4 utilities to serve the site, including sewer and storm
5 drain capacity. Here the applicant is required to
6 provide evidence that there is adequate sewer capacity
7 to serve the project prior to the recordation of the
8 final map. And the City has accounted for the sewer
9 capacity in the studies conducted at the handbook
10 approval stage and in the original tentative map. The
11 stormwater and drainage plan for the development also
12 must be approved prior to the recordation of any final
13 map.

14 Finding T6 takes a look at availability of
15 schools, police, transportation, and parks.

16 For schools, we did get an updated comment
17 letter from the Washoe County School District. And with
18 the additional 30 residential units, that will
19 ultimately add 104 new students to Bohach Elementary, 48
20 to Shaw Middle School, and 44 to Spanish Springs High
21 School.

22 What was noted is that Bohach and Sky Ranch are
23 projected to remain under capacity for at least five
24 years. And while current enrollment at Spanish Springs

1 High School is over capacity, enrollment relief at
2 Spanish Springs High is anticipated with the opening of
3 the new Hug High School in fall of 2022.

4 For police, the Sparks Police Department will
5 provide services to the site. They didn't provide any
6 concerns with the planned proposal. And as previously
7 discussed, the roadway network for Stonebrook was
8 designed to accommodate a total of over 1,900
9 single-family lots. And that maximum number of
10 single-family lots has not yet been achieved.

11 For parks, as discussed earlier, this amended
12 tentative map provides in the handbook a 20-acre
13 community park study located within Phase 3 of
14 Stonebrook.

15 Moving on here to Finding T8, which addresses
16 flood plain, slopes and soil, the lots proposed with the
17 amended tentative map, those don't fall within the
18 100-year floodplain. And the site is predominantly
19 flat. We don't have any type of development standards
20 where they're triggering sites that contain significant
21 slopes and any other types of approval. And then we
22 have final geotechnical reports that are required out
23 the time of the final map.

24 In regards to outside agency responses per

1 Finding T9 here, only the school district, RTC and NDOT
2 provided comments, and I already went over those
3 comments.

4 And then Finding 10 asks you to look at the
5 availability of fire protection services. Here the site
6 is located outside the four-minute travel time standard
7 for the Sparks Fire Department. The City does, however,
8 have an agreement with the Truckee Meadows Fire
9 Protection District for automatic aid to serve the area.

10 And, in addition, as it relates to fire
11 service, I did want to point out that Condition 20 has
12 been modified. Only one temporary turnaround is needed
13 at the western terminus of Stonebrook Parkway with this
14 amended request. And, in addition, there's flexibility
15 that's been built in to Condition 20 that allows for
16 either a temporary turnaround or another alternative
17 method.

18 Finding T11 looks to other instances that staff
19 has identified in our analysis of the proposal. Here
20 we've identified landscaping area maintenance,
21 architecture for the residents and fencing and regional
22 trails.

23 Condition 12 addresses landscaping, requiring
24 that common areas be maintained by a landscape

1 maintenance association.

2 And, I think, I mentioned the architectural
3 standards outlined in the handbook. Those are in place.
4 And those will be reviewed as model house plans come
5 forward prior to each final map.

6 And then, in terms of fencing, Condition 19 not
7 only requires fencing plans at the time of final map,
8 but also specifies how trap fencing for the model homes
9 complex must be addressed. That trap fencing, which is
10 temporary in nature, it needs to accommodate emergency
11 access, minimize intrusion of the posts into concrete,
12 and then also be removed prior to the sale of model
13 homes.

14 Conditions 14 and 15 both address options for
15 construction of planned regional trails, either by
16 payment of the regional trail impact fee or with
17 construction by the developer through an impact fee
18 credit agreement. And with the first option, which is
19 payment of the impact fee, final plans for construction
20 of the regional trails are required.

21 And then, finally, Finding T12 requires the
22 public be notified of this item. And here the posting
23 of the agenda for this meeting, as well as the City
24 Council meeting, serves to provide that, that public

1 noticing. And the Planning Commission agenda was posted
2 on October 7.

3 And so, to conclude here, staff is recommending
4 the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of
5 approval to City Council.

6 And I am happy to answer any questions that you
7 may have on this amended tentative map.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Sienna.

9 Do any of the Commissioners have questions for
10 staff?

11 Commissioner Carey.

12 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Madam Chair, I just wanted
13 to follow up on kind what if Commissioner Pritsos was
14 talking about the other day concerning density. Looking
15 through the staff report, it looks like, roughly,
16 Stonebrook has gone through about two-thirds of the
17 maximum number of units that have been approved, whether
18 they've been tentative maps or final maps. By my count,
19 there's like something like 574 units left to be built.

20 I was just kind of curious. Is there enough
21 land within, remaining within Stonebrook to build out
22 those remaining units that are allowed?

23 MS. REID: It is my understanding that there
24 is. In working through the analysis for this particular

1 request, Phase 1 is almost to what was initially
2 approved through the tentative maps. But, you know, it
3 actually changed a few lots. And we don't have any
4 information otherwise that there wouldn't be enough land
5 area to accommodate the units that were identified, or
6 are identified in the handbook.

7 COMMISSIONER CAREY: I guess, as a follow-up,
8 and I don't know if something like this exists or not,
9 but is there a projection of how close the Stonebrook
10 development will come out in reaching those 1,848 units
11 that have been approved and where it would be at upon
12 build-out in terms of density?

13 MS. REID: I'd have to actually go back and do
14 a little bit more research. I don't have those numbers
15 off the top of my head.

16 You know, as I noted, there was, you know, just
17 very, very slight differences in Phase 1. So there
18 might be, you know a slight bit under what, you know,
19 the absolute maximum allowed in Stonebrook. And, you
20 know, I'm certainly happy to get back to you at a later
21 time with those exact numbers.

22 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Okay. That's fair enough.
23 Thank you, Madam Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

1 Any other questions?

2 Sienna, I had just one question, just for just
3 clarification. On the townhomes, did you say that they
4 were mainly going to be for senior living, or?

5 MS. REID: What the applicant has identified is
6 that they will be targeted towards an active adult
7 community. So, you know, we haven't necessarily heard
8 that they will be targeted for seniors, but certainly
9 that is, you know, a population that could be considered
10 an active adult. With the deviation request that was
11 submitted, really the goal in terms of providing, you
12 know, a different type of recreation facility was to
13 kind of move away from that child-oriented play facility
14 just to have amenities that are a little bit more
15 desirable for an adult population.

16 CHAIRMAN READ: Certainly. Thank you.

17 Any other questions?

18 Ian.

19 MR. CRITTENDEN: I just wanted to just tag on a
20 little bit to what Sienna had said to Commissioner
21 Carey's question. We have, in the handbook they have
22 broken down the number of units per village or
23 development as they go through this, the Stonebrook
24 development. And none of those developments at this

1 point are over capacity. None of them have asked for
2 more units than are permitted in their or have been
3 allotted to their individual village, with the one
4 exception being the multi-family project over on the
5 west side of Stonebrook, out by Pyramid Highway. If you
6 may remember that, that project, they did a tentative
7 map at a little bit lower density, because they knew
8 that they were going to share that density under the
9 same ownership with another site. And that's actually
10 gone through the process and both been approved. The
11 tentative map's been approved there, and the
12 administrative review for the multi-family's been
13 approved. And the Planning Commission saw the
14 elevations for those units.

15 And so, throughout the development, we know
16 that we have not in any way consistently exceeded the
17 number of units allotted to each village. So we know
18 that if they continue to develop as they have been, they
19 will be within their allotted units. In fact, they may
20 be asking to transfer them to additional villages at the
21 end, because they potentially could have some additional
22 units.

23 We know that density is important. But the way
24 that the handbooks were written at the time, they really

1 allowed for a little bit lower density potentially in
2 their villages and asked for a little bit more to make
3 sure they could make all of their pieces. Just to kind
4 of give you a little more background information of
5 where that's at.

6 CHAIRMAN READ: Does that help, Commissioner
7 Carey?

8 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
9 Yes, it does.

10 And thanks for that, that information, Ian. I
11 get what you're saying about that they're not over their
12 maximum. It just kind of appears to me that they're,
13 you know, to date with all these tentative maps that
14 we've reviewed as a Commission in Stonebrook, it appears
15 that they're under. And there's quite a few units
16 remaining.

17 I was just kind of curious, in your opinion and
18 kind of what you're seeing with processing the final
19 maps and building permits and with your team, I was just
20 kind of curious what your feeling is on this.

21 We're going to end up, once we get through
22 Phase 3 of Stonebrook, if there's going to be a ton of
23 units left over, we're going to have a really low
24 density than what's called out in the Comprehensive Plan

1 and in the handbook.

2 MR. CRITTENDEN: Sure. The general
3 developments, as we go through and update the IFSA,
4 which goes and looks at specifically not just what's in
5 title, but what the projects that are building out, all
6 throughout the North Valleys, we have consistently had
7 slightly lower densities. There's no reason we would
8 expect that to change drastically in this case.

9 However, as we have become more and more aware
10 of how important that density is, although we are
11 accounting for all of that through IFSA, we're
12 accounting for whatever they come in at, we encourage
13 those builders to come in closer and closer to those,
14 those design development thresholds.

15 However, as I was saying, that the handbooks
16 don't typically set lower ends. Even though the Comp
17 Plan does push in that direction, the handbooks don't
18 require minimum densities typically. And so, you know,
19 we are working with them to try to do what we can to get
20 the densities as high as we reasonably can throughout
21 those developments.

22 MS. REID: And, Commissioner Carey, I'm happy
23 to get you some more detailed numbers. But as it
24 relates to this particular request, I will point out

1 that the tentative map densities for Villages E, F and G
2 are substantially in alignment with the Comprehensive
3 Plan density ranges.

4 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you for that. Thank
5 you, Sienna. Thank you, Ian.

6 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

7 Any other questions for staff?

8 Is the applicant rep on the call?

9 MS. MARTINEZ: They are. I will allow them to
10 speak right now.

11 MS. STACIE HUGGINS: Hi. This is Stacie. Can
12 you guys hear me?

13 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

14 MS. STACIE HUGGINS: Okay. I just wanted to
15 make sure. Stacie Huggins with Wood Rodgers
16 representing the applicant.

17 I just want to say Sienna did a great job
18 summarizing the project. I don't have anything to add.
19 We have read the conditions and agree with them as
20 proposed.

21 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

22 Do any of the Commissioners have questions for
23 the applicant?

24 Okay. Any further discussion? I'll entertain

1 a motion.

2 Commissioner Pritsos.

3 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
4 I just wanted to say I really appreciated that
5 discussion that Commissioner Carey had with both Sienna
6 and Ian. I thought that was very informative.

7 I share some of Commissioner Carey's concerns
8 about the densities. A lot of these tentative maps seem
9 to be a little under density. But I really do
10 appreciate this, this request to move towards some more
11 townhouses. I think, that is a good way to kind of add
12 diversity to the housing market and, also, to help with
13 that density problem.

14 And so I just wanted to say I will be
15 supporting this request.

16 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner
17 Pritsos.

18 Any further discussion? Any questions?
19 Motion?

20 Don't all speak up at once.

21 Commissioner Petersen.

22 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: I'll take a stab at the
23 motion. I move to forward a recommendation of approval
24 to the City Council to amend the Stonebrook Phase 2

1 tentative map adopting Findings T1 through T12 and the
2 facts supporting these findings as set forth in the
3 staff's report, and subject to Conditions of Approval 1
4 through 21.

5 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

6 We have a motion. Second?

7 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. We have a motion by
9 Commissioner Petersen and a second by Commissioner
10 Pritsos. Any further discussion before we vote?

11 Commissioner Carey.

12 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
13 Just a couple comments, for the record, before we vote.

14 Yeah, I overall, I remain concerned about
15 density within Stonebrook and some of the other planned
16 developments we have in the north part of the city. And
17 how will, you know those, those densities and the number
18 of units coming below what's called out in the handbook,
19 and how that's going to impact Impact Fee Service
20 Area 1.

21 You know, although I think that there's room,
22 particularly within Village E and Village C, within this
23 tentative map, revised tentative map request, I think,
24 there's room for more, more density in those villages.

1 But, I think, I think this is going to help increase the
2 densities in this area and get if closer to what's
3 envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan and, you know,
4 within the handbook.

5 I concur with staff's recommendation and agree
6 that the proposed change is consistent with what's
7 called out. I think, Sienna did a good job explaining
8 that.

9 I'll just note. I heard a presentation today
10 at the State economic forum from EDAWN. And they were
11 talking about the need within the region to help
12 increase density in the area and develop additional
13 units and smaller lots and townhomes and multi-family
14 development. I think, that's something that we should
15 keep in mind as a Commission as we move forward with our
16 Comprehensive Plan update and looking at future
17 tentative maps in order to kind of make sure that we're
18 getting to those higher densities that are envisioned in
19 the Comprehensive Plan and these handbooks, and create
20 smaller lots and different housing, housing choices.

21 So I will be supporting the motion. But I just
22 wanted to get, those comments out there. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner Carey.

24 Any further discussion?

1 Okay. We'll go ahead and do a roll call vote.
2 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Read?
3 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.
4 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Pritsos?
5 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.
6 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Blaco is absent.
7 Commissioner Carey?
8 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.
9 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Petersen?
10 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.
11 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Rawson?
12 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.
13 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes.
14 Let's move on to item 8, which is selection of
15 a Commissioner to serve on the Truckee Meadows Regional
16 Planning Commission to fill the remainder of a term
17 vacated by Commissioner VanderWell effective immediately
18 and ending on June 30, 2021 from the following pooling
19 of applicants. In alphabetical order, Scott Carey,
20 Frank Petersen, Evan Pritsos, and Mike Rawson.
21 Any discussion?
22 Commissioner Pritsos.
23 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: I would like to, if I
24 can, make a motion to appoint Commissioner Carey to