

**SEWAGE, WASTEWATER, AND SANITATION (SWS)
HEARING ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

Members

Kenneth Lund, Chair
Matthew Buehler
John Adams
Chad Carnes, P.E.
Robert Sweeney, REHS
Matt Smith
Julianne Zotter, P.E.

Thursday, April 02, 2026

5:30 p.m.

**Washoe County Administration Complex,
Building B
Health District South Conference Room**

**1001 East Ninth Street
Reno, NV**

5:30 p.m.

1. *Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

The following members and staff were present:

Members present: Kenneth Lund- Chair
John Adams
Julianne Zotter, P.E.
Robert Sweeney
Chad Carnes, P.E.

Staff present: David Kelly
Latricia Lord
DDA Herbert Kaplan

Members absent: Matthew Buehler
Matt Smith

2. *Pledge of Allegiance

Those present pledged allegiance to the flag.

3. *Public Comment

As no public comment was presented, the public comment period was closed.

4. Approval of Agenda – April 2, 2026

Mr. Lund moved to approve the agenda of the April 2, 2026, Sewage, Wastewater, and Sanitation (SWS) Board regular meeting. Second by Mr. Adams. Motion approved unanimously.

5. Approval of Draft Minutes – March 5, 2026

Mr. Carnes moved to approve the minutes of March 5, 2026, Sewage, Wastewater, and Sanitation Board regular meeting. Second by Mr. Adams. Motion approved unanimously.

6. Public Hearing – H26-0002VARI Variance Application

Mr. Lund opened the public hearing for H26-0002VARI. Ms. Zotter indicated that as her company had participated in the design of the variance request, she would be abstaining.

Ms. Lord presented the staff report for NNPH.

Mr. Carnes asked if Health would want to inspect the concrete and pipe. Ms. Lord responded that inspection of the concrete would be expected and was part of the staff recommended conditions. Mr. Carnes said he felt that Health should also inspect the pipe before the pour.

Mr. Adams asked about a hydrostatic test on the pipe. Some jurisdictions require it. He felt that it could be of value.

Mr. Sweeney asked if the piping was being placed in a traffic area and if that was why concrete was being placed. The answer was yes and it was partly why the concrete was so thick. He also noted that the pipe had a curvature in it and if the intent was to pour concrete around the bend. He indicated that he felt sleeving was a better and more standard method of protection and also that it might be less expensive. Mr. Adams asked the diameter of the pipe in question and 4” was the response.

Sagen Johnson, design engineer, clarified for the Board that the old building was going to be completely demolished and a new one put in its place. He said concrete was due to traffic. He had not considered the additional sleeving suggested by Mr. Sweeney but would be fine if it was a condition. Mr. Carnes stated that Washoe County standard was concrete. He acknowledged that cracking could occur but did not think it was a huge risk. Adding an additional sleeve would reduce the amount of concrete around it. He didn't have an objection to an additional sleeve but didn't think it was necessary. There was some discussion of cost between concrete and sleeving. Mr. Sweeney clarified that he felt that sleeving was an alternative option to the concrete, not as an additional condition. Ms. Greenwell (owner) asked if the variance could be approved with the option to move forward with whichever was cheapest.

Mr. Lund asked for clarification on how a motion could be modified. Ms. Lord stated that the Board could modify the motion as they saw fit.

Some discussion ensued regarding how large the sleeve would need to be, the general consensus was 8”. Mr. Sweeney clarified that he did not feel that sleeving was even necessary with the material being used, however, he still felt it was an alternative to be considered if mitigation was required.

Mr. Lund asked the Board to articulate conditions. Mr. Carnes indicated that he didn't feel that the sleeving would actually end up being cost effective and so he didn't feel it was a good condition. Mr. Greenwell indicated he was fine with the cost of the concrete, regardless of cost. Mr. Lund asked about the life of concrete. Mr. Sagen indicated that 20 years was where he was comfortable stating. Ms. Lord stated that variance requirement was at least 10 years. Mr. Carnes indicated concrete in this area lasts a long time. Mr. Greenwell agreed, stating that underground it could last up to 100 years, which Mr. Adams also agreed with. Mr. Adams requested that hydrostatic testing be a condition. Mr. Sweeney reiterated that he did not feel that any mitigation was necessary based on the pipe material. The Board discussed the conditions requested and possible motions. Mr. Carnes said that the conditions should be staff conditions plus hydrostatic testing, and visual inspection by NNPH staff of the pipe prior to the concrete placement as well as the concrete upon completion.

Motion

Mr. Lund moved to present to the District Board of Health a recommendation for approval of Variance Case Number H26-0002VARI (Greenwell & Becker) to allow the installation of a building sewer line within the 50' setback to a private well on parcel 038-132-12, 2425 Warrior Lane, Reno, NV, so long as the entire building sewer line is encased in 6" of concrete on all sides, as proposed, including all staff recommended conditions and the following additional conditions:

1. The building sewer line shall be hydrostatically tested once installed with test results provided to NNPH staff as requested.
2. Prior to the concrete encasement, the building sewer line shall be made available for NNPH staff to inspect with respect to the welded joints.

Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Public hearing was closed.

9. *Public Comment

As there were no public comment requests, the public comment period was closed.

10. Adjournment –

At 5:59 p.m., Mr. Lund adjourned the meeting.
