
Access Road

From Shaun Taylor <Shaun@nevadadirtworks.com>

Date Thu 5/8/2025 7:52 AM

To Loise Yates <loiseyates@outlook.com>; Nikolai Travis <ntravis@buildingbt.com>

Good morning Nikolai,

I came out and took a look at your property in regard to the feasibility of using an easement for adjacent access. A few things to consider prior to procuring design & engineering, permitting, roadway construction, and continued maintenance:

1. **Engineering:** the access road will first need to be engineered for soil retention, storm water/snow runoff drainage, and safety (guardrail or barriers). Engineering costs should be anticipated at 30-40% of overall project budget.
2. **Temporary Easement:** A 40' construction easement will be needed to construct the roadway, engineered wall system, drainage, and guardrail system. This easement would trend toward your property: A. because it is the downhill side requiring earthwork balance, and B. because there needs to be access in front of the retaining wall (or system) for construction. In my opinion, you might need a couple of feet beyond the 20' easement to the north side and nearly 20' (or potentially more) to the south for the structures, earthwork, and retaining system being installed. This is the reason you would need to have all trees on the north of your house removed.
3. **Land Clearing:** Approximately 52 trees & their root systems will need to be removed from your property prior to the start of construction along with 2 outbuildings, 12 boulders, and garden.
 1. 7 EA mature pine trees
 2. 5 EA deciduous trees
 3. 40 EA 20' hedge trees
4. **Flooding/Erosion Harm:** Because of tree and root removal erosion issues with the potential to cause harm will need to be addressed. Flooding will be an ongoing concern due to topography and larger amounts of precipitation in this area.
5. **Drainage System:** Non-permeable surface (asphalt) should be considered with a proper drainage system to prevent harm from run-off onto your property. Either a designed rip rap ditch or storm drain system will need to be designed and constructed to ensure flooding protection of your property. Drainage from behind the retention wall will also need to be considered to prevent harm/failure of the retaining system. Another consideration to run-off will be the proximity of the drainage system to existing infrastructure. Domestic wells and septic leach fields will have regulated set-backs that would pertain to this system as well as the roadway itself.
6. **Retention Wall and Guardrail System:** Because of the elevation change and proximity to the residence, an engineered retaining wall will need to be designed and constructed. This wall should be 5-6' tall and will need an engineered barrier system to prevent harm to your house/property due to the potential of an errant vehicle. A jersey barrier system would be most ideal for this location to further assist with snow removal and directing run-off as well as provide a visual barrier to the road from your property.
7. **Maintenance:** Private road owners will need to perform continued maintenance to keep up all engineered systems. Snow removal will need to be done in a way to ensure no runoff onto your property from this easement. Ditches and/or pipes will need to be cleaned and kept up on a regular basis.
8. **Privacy/Nuisance:** The design should consider room for a privacy fence. Because of the tight location of this easement, light and noise will be directed toward your living area and within 15' of your residence. Provisions for privacy fencing should be considered in the design and budget.

Because of the mature and established nature of this easement, along with the potential harm from flooding and proximity to the residence, the cost for this easement design and construction would be exorbitant when comparing it to other options that are available for these properties. If you would like us to proceed with a ROM for this work, please let me know. We will be happy to put something together.

Thank you,

Shaun Taylor - Manager
775-870-2815
PO Box 7724
Reno, NV 89510
NV Contractors License # 0086389
www.Nevadadirtworks.com






















RE: [External Email]Special Use Permit Question

From Zumstein, Matthew - FS, NV <matthew.zumstein@usda.gov>
Date Mon 4/7/2025 11:24 AM
To Loise Yates <loiseyates@outlook.com>; Bonesteel, Marnie - FS, NV <marnie.bonesteel@usda.gov>
Cc nikolai travis <nikolaigiantsfan@gmail.com>

We would entertain issuance of a Special Use Permit under the circumstances surrounding Rose Rock Lane. We would also entertain issuance of a FRTA easement to the County on Rose Rock Lane. This information has been shared with multiple residents of the area, as well as with Washoe County.



Matthew D Zumstein
District Ranger
Forest Service
Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest, Carson Ranger District
p: 775-884-8100
c: 775-721-1259
f: 775-884-8199
matthew.zumstein@usda.gov
1536 S. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701
www.fs.usda.gov
  
Caring for the land and serving people

From: Loise Yates <loiseyates@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, April 4, 2025 10:41 AM
To: Zumstein, Matthew - FS, NV <matthew.zumstein@usda.gov>; Bonesteel, Marnie - FS, NV <marnie.bonesteel@usda.gov>
Cc: nikolai travis <nikolaigiantsfan@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: [External Email]Special Use Permit Question

Hello Mr. Zumstein,

Thank you for your response—that is what we thought. They stated that because, according to them, a special use permit is revokable without cause or reason that it is not a ‘legitimate’ solution to their access problem and shouldn’t be considered as a resolution.

Another concern that was presented is if filing for a special use permit is even worthwhile because of “other legal access” being present. They felt that, while the easements has never been developed in over 45 years due to practical use concerns because of topography and subsequent harm, it is still considered “other legal access” so a special use permit application would not be considered.

My understanding is that applications are evaluated based on their individual circumstances which is why “other legal access” is intentionally and understandably vague. Given the specific circumstances on Rose Rock Lane, in which unpermitted access has been established and used for about thirty years and no other developed access points are present, submitting an application is appropriate. Is my understanding correct?

I recognize that this question is much more complicated and has more nuance than I am aware of. If a phone call is needed, I would welcome that at a time of your convenience.

I cannot thank you enough for your patience, assistance and sharing of your expertise so we can be more educated on this.

Sincerely,

Loise Travis

15870 Caswell Lane

Reno, NV 89511

775.225.0091

loiseyates@outlook.com

RE: [External Email]Re: FRTA Easement

From Bonesteel, Marnie - FS, NV <marnie.bonesteel@usda.gov>
Date Mon 4/28/2025 2:15 PM
To Loise Yates <loiseyates@outlook.com>
Cc Zumstein, Matthew - FS, NV <matthew.zumstein@usda.gov>

Hi Loise,

There wouldn't be any concerns with who does the road maintenance so long as it meets standard maintenance practices and conditions of the authorization. For example, proper drainage to prevent affecting resources outside the road right of way.

A proposal for a FRTA easement is subject to cost recovery processing fees, incurred by the agency to review the application, environmental review, site visits, preparing documentation, decision and authorization preparation and issuance. FRTA easements require a plat map and legal description to be prepared by a licensed surveyor, as they are recorded instruments. A cost estimate would be provided upon acceptance of an application.

Reach out any time, glad to help.

Thank you, Marnie



Marnie Bonesteel
Lands Special Uses Program Manager
Forest Service
Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest

p: 775-352-1240

c: 775-221-9225

marnie.bonesteel@usda.gov

1200 Franklin Way

Sparks, NV 89431

www.fs.usda.gov



Caring for the land and serving people

From: Loise Yates <loiseyates@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 5:44 PM
To: Bonesteel, Marnie - FS, NV <marnie.bonesteel@usda.gov>
Cc: Zumstein, Matthew - FS, NV <matthew.zumstein@usda.gov>
Subject: Re: [External Email]Re: FRTA Easement

Hello Marnie,

Thank you so much for your email and your call. I found this very helpful! Another two questions if I may.

Is it also possible for the county to have the option for the road to be privately maintained, like the privately maintained public access county roads in this area?

What are the costs incurred to the county in the application process?

Thank you again for your time—we sincerely appreciate you.

Sincerely,

Loise Travis

15870 Caswell Lane

Reno, NV 89511

775.225.0091

loiseyates@outlook.com

Re: [External Email]Special Use Permit Question

From Loise Yates <loiseyates@outlook.com>

Date Tue 4/22/2025 4:21 PM

To Loise Yates <loiseyates@outlook.com>

From: Bonesteel, Marnie - FS, NV

Sent: Friday, April 11, 2025 12:47 PM

To: Loise Yates

Cc: Zumstein, Matthew - FS, NV; nikolai travis

Subject: RE: [External Email]Special Use Permit Question

Hi Loise,

In response to your questions below, a special use permit under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) is not automatically renewed upon expiration. The holder would apply for a new authorization 6 mo. prior to expiration. A new permit is discretionary and may be issued again if consistent with the applicable land management plan, the use and occupancy is the same type of use authorized, and the holder is in compliance with permit terms. These permits are for a 30-year term. This type of permit generally meets the majority of the access needs requested; when there are multiple residences needing access, a road users association is formed, and the permit is authorized to the user's association.

If there was a scenario where National Forest was conveyed out of federal ownership there are a few potential options that may occur. The land is transferred subject to valid existing rights and the permit holder negotiates with the new landowner new terms and conditions. Transfer occurs as is, permit terms are honored until the permit expires, and the use and occupancy would end. Lastly, the FLPMA permit could be converted to an FLPMA easement upon transfer, 30-year term with check in at end of 30-year term and possible reissue.

A National Forest Road and Trail Act Easement (FRTA) are easements authorized to road managing agencies, such as a county. The county would apply for a FRTA easement utilizing and SF-299 standard form (attached) and submit to our office for processing. Essentially, jurisdiction is transferred to the County for the road, and they operate and maintain for residential purposes. You are welcome to share my contact information, and we can discuss this option with the County.

Thank you, Marnie



Marnie Bonesteel
Lands Special Uses Program Manager

Forest Service
Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest

p: 775-352-1240

c: 775-221-9225

marnie.bonesteel@usda.gov

1200 Franklin Way

Sparks, NV 89431

www.fs.usda.gov



Caring for the land and serving people

Oakley, Katherine

From: Lyn Hamilton <keithlynham@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 1:50 PM
To: Oakley, Katherine
Subject: 15870 Caswell Lane Easement Abandonment

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear Kat Oakley,
Please acknowledge receipt of this email to: keithlynham@gmail.com
Thank you.

March 4, 2025

Keith Hamilton
15924 Caswell Lane
Reno, NV 89511
keithlynham@gmail.com

Washoe County Commissioners
c/o katoakley@washoecounty.gov

Dear Washoe County Commissioners,

As one of the oldest property owners on Caswell Lane (42 years) I support the abandonment of the small tract easement on the property owned by Nickolai and Loise Travis at 15870 Caswell Lane and NOT allowing the proposed access road by the Young's to be constructed through the Travis property for the following reasons:

The construction of a road on the Travis property would significantly impact the owners, their peace, space to raise their children and would be ten (10) feet from their home.

The Young's have objected to the Travis's abandonment of the archaic small tract act easement surrounding the Travis's property in hopes they can use the easement to access Caswell Lane as access to their property. The Young's address is 6020 Rose Rock Lane and has been since they purchased their property. The Young's neighbor's address is 6000 Rose Rock Lane. The Young's and their neighbors has used Rose Rock Lane for twenty eight (28) years which confirms that they already have established access to their property.

Caswell Lane was established as a private road forty five (45) years ago and is illustrated and recorded by numerous maps noted as **private** including the Washoe County Recorder's Office.

The cost to build the proposed road within the Travis property does not justify the potential litigation against it and waste of time to pursue it.

The eleven landowners on Caswell Lane have paid for their land and homes, and paid for the construction, paving, and maintenance of Caswell Lane without contribution from the State or County. Caswell Lane is not and never has been a public road.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.
Keith Hamilton

Edward L. Devenyns
Mineral Land Consultant
15900 Caswell Lane
Reno, Nevada 89511
eldevenyns@gmail.com

Via email

February 28, 2025

Washoe County Commissioners
c/o koakley@washoecounty.gov

Dear Commissioners:

I have lived at 15900 Caswell Lane, Reno, NV 89511 for 40 years. I am in support of the easement abandonment (EA) applied for by Nikolai and Loise Travis who recently purchased their home at 15870 Caswell Lane. I understand that Barrett and Katherine Young object to the EA in hopes that they may use it as access to Caswell Lane instead of the use of Rose Rock Lane that they have been and are currently using as access to their property.

I object to the use of the easement as access to Caswell Land for the following reasons which are separated by Rose Rock Lane and Caswell Lane.

Rose Rock Lane (RRL)

- 1) The Youngs purchased their property knowing and using RRL as access.
- 2) RRL has been in existence and used for 30 years and it provides access to other properties as well.
- 3) There has been a Road Maintenance Agreement in place since 1993 and is recorded in the Washoe County Official Records. The parties simply failed to obtain a special use permit from the USFS for use of the road which borders and traverses USFS land.
- 4) The Travis's would sustain a significant decrease in property value if the subject easement was approved for public access; the existing landscaping would be destroyed; peaceful enjoyment of their property would not exist, the easement would be within 20 feet of their home; there would be no place for snow removal without blowing it on either adjoining property; the exiting slope would require significant development to create a road.
- 5) The USFS acknowledges the existence of RRL as evidenced by a USFS 2011 survey which shows the road as well as personal discussions with personnel. The USFS has provided documentation of two options to the Youngs and Washoe County: special use permit (SUP SF-299) information as well as potential RRL public road information (FRTA). They are willing to process either application according to federal regulations 36 CFR 251.54: a special use permit application to the private users (Youngs +) or an application by Washoe County to make RRL

a public road. Either option, upon approval, provides legal access via RRL for the Youngs and other uses as they have been using for 30 years without the absurd disturbance of an easement through a landscaped yard that only leads to a private road which will not be expanded for additional users. In order for the approval process to proceed, the Youngs simply need to comply with the regulations of the USFS which include applying for the SUP and forming a road maintenance association if the previous one is not sufficient. If Washoe County prefers to make RRL a public road it may submit an application for processing as well under FRTA, Forest Road and Trail Act Easement.

Caswell Lane (CL)

- A) The subject easement ends on CL which is a private road since its inception in 1977. The residents are adamant that CL is private and will remain that way.
- B) There are numerous documents and maps of record in Washoe County which describe CL as a private road. This fact alone addresses/refutes NRS 405.191.3 that states a road is public unless noted as private in recorded maps and documents. The following recorded maps note CL as private: Map 666 9/13/78; Map 566; Map 1031; Map 5381; Odyssey Map 01/20/12
- C) In order to purchase my property in 1985 I was required to obtain a mortgage through a private company instead of FHA since Caswell Lane was private without a Road Maintenance Agreement.
- D) A Road Maintenance Agreement dated 1987 was entered into between the residents and recorded in the Official Records of Washoe County. Since then the residents alone have continued, at their effort and expense, to maintain and improve the road including installation and regular sealing of pavement, acquisition and use of snow removal equipment, cleaning and improving ditches and drainages etc.
- E) After NDOT widened Mt Rose Highway from 2 to 4 lanes and revised the drainage system which flooded then non-paved CL, it created a 3' ditch which was repaired by the costs and effort of the residents. Washoe County and NDOT were contacted and refused to assist since it was a private road.
- F) CL is shown as a private road on google maps and NDOT maps, it is not shown as public on any county map; see attached maps and legend.
- G) There is a sign and the entrance of CL stating it is Private.
- H) As previously mentioned, the residents of CL have enjoyed the peace and tranquility of private CL, paid for it by effort and expense and are not willing to change the status of it; they are willing to expand the effort and expense to retain their rights and the status as a private road.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 775.846.2828 or eldevenyms@gmail.com.

Sincerely


Edward L. Devenyms

Encl: Four Maps and Legend

Paragraph F; Page 2: CL is shown as a private road on google maps and NDOT maps, it is not shown as public on any county map; see attached maps and legend.

MAPS LEGEND

First: google showing street view of Mt Rose and public blue line, note it does not go south on Caswell.

Second, google maps shows aerial view not street view of private roads including Caswell.

Third, google aerial views of public roads shown in blue; does not include Caswell or Montreaux.

Fourth, NDOT, maps view does not show Caswell or Montreaux as public road.

Oakley, Katherine

From: Lyn Hamilton <keithlynham@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 2:53 PM
To: Oakley, Katherine
Subject: Fwd: 15870 Caswell Lane Easement Abandonment

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Hi Kat, I am sure I sent this to you but it is not showing up in my sent file.
Apologies if I have sent it twice. Thank you. Lyn Hamilton

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lyn Hamilton <keithlynham@gmail.com>
Subject: 15870 Caswell Lane Easement Abandonment
Date: March 4, 2025 at 1:50:10 PM PST
To: Katherine Oakley <koakley@washoecounty.gov>

Dear Kat,
Please acknowledge receipt of this email to keithlynham@gmail.com.
Thank you.

March 4, 2025

Lyn Hamilton
15924 Caswell Lane
Reno, NV. 89511
keithlynham@gmail.com

Washoe County Commissioners
c/o katoakley@washoecounty.gov

Washoe County Commissioners,

I strongly oppose to the use of the easement access to Caswell Lane from Rose Rock Lane. I am in 100% favor of a complete dismissal of said easement.

I have lived at 19524 Caswell Lane, Reno, NV 89511 since May, 1983. My husband Keith and I built our home on Caswell and have lived here 42 years. Caswell Lane at that time was a dirt road. Caswell Lane is a private road and any and all upkeep of Caswell lane including paving, snow removal, maintenance, resurfacing, and repairing has been the sole responsibility of the people living on Caswell Lane. The county has not once done any road work on Caswell Lane.

The idea to build a road through the backyard of Nickolai and Loise Travis just does not make any sense whatsoever in more ways than one. To name a few, the expense of building a road and the potential lawsuits from multiple land owners would be huge, extensive engineering would need to be done, road would need to be wide enough for emergency vehicles, the serenity and safeness of Caswell Lane would be compromised.

We have a son, daughter-in-law, and three beautiful grandchildren under the age of four. Being able to let them play and be safe where we live is a blessing and is what we love about living here. To bring much unnecessary and unwanted and unwarranted traffic would not be beneficial for anyone.

Regards,
Lyn Hamilton

Nancy G. Devenyns
15900 Caswell Lane
Reno, NV 89511
devenyns@gmail.com

Via email

March 3, 2025

Washoe County Commissioners
c/o koakley@washoecounty.gov

Dear Commissioners,

I am a neighbor of Loise and Nikolai Travis, residing at 15900 Caswell Lane since 1985. It has been brought to my attention that they have applied for a release of a "Small Tracts" easement on their property. I'd like to go on record as being in FULL favor of a complete dismissal of said easement, on all sides of their property.

In particular, it makes no sense to propose a public road/driveway on the north side of their property to access homes located behind them on Rose Rock Lane. These homes have been accessed via Rose Rock Lane for the past 30+ years and have a recorded road maintenance agreement that goes with the properties. The homes have been bought and sold over the years with that existing road as their access. If the parties living on Rose Rock need to improve their existing easement/road, there is no reason to think that the Forest Service won't be a willing partner through a special use permit if they simply apply and complete the paperwork.

In contrast, there is nothing to gain by building a new road through the Travis' existing landscaped property. The topography and landscaping would require tremendous work and expense, not only for the installation of the road but also the maintenance. Summer months would require dust mitigation (unless paved), and during the winter months snow removal would be a huge problem as there is nowhere to put the snow. Caswell Lane does NOT get plowed by the county, and in fact NDOT leaves a huge snow/ice berm at the intersection of Caswell and Mt. Rose highway blocking our road during every storm. I believe that the parties who are protesting the abandonment of the easement have been misinformed. Kristyn Young, residing at 6020 Rose Rock Lane, submitted a letter to Kat Oakley on August 30th, 2024 opposing the abandonment of the easement stating **"Our motivation in pursuing Caswell Lane is due to the fact the current access roads (Thompson & Rose Rock Ln) are unmaintained roads by the County and have become inaccessible multiple times for the last three winters during big storms. We get massive snow drifts that are 4' thick and make all access impossible until heavy equipment(a massive D10 Front End loaders) came to dig us out and remove the snow."** Caswell Lane gets the same amount of snow as Rose Rock Lane receives, Caswell Lane is NOT plowed or maintained by the County, and there are numerous times that the road has been completely blocked by drifts and become impassable. What has been gained by the Youngs accessing Caswell Lane instead of Thompson Lane?

That said, Caswell Lane is a private road, and the residents intend to keep it that way. We purchased our property in 1985, and there are numerous recorded documents (Plat 666 etc.), showing Caswell as private. The property owners have a recorded road maintenance agreement (shows Caswell as private),

and have collectively maintained the road for 40+ years at our expense. We purchased our homes recognizing the many benefits of living here; peace and quiet, no traffic and the opportunity for our kids and grandchildren to safely ride bikes, walk the dog, hop on a sled as long as we control the cost and condition of our road. I am very strongly opposed to declaring Caswell a public road, and I'm willing to engage in whatever action might be necessary to preserve it as a private road.

Sincerely,

Nancy Devenyns

Oakley, Katherine

From: Al K <ak755@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 7:06 PM
To: Oakley, Katherine
Subject: Caswell Lane

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Good evening,

I hope you are doing well.

We are expressing sentiments that Caswell Lane is private, and therefore, no roads should be allowed to be built to access it.

We request that the easement should be fully abandoned because it's a private street, and we don't want an increase in traffic, noise and we like living on a quiet, tranquil private street.

We are also concerned about where the snow would be removed too in the event that someone tried to use the road easement and that is why we, the neighbors on Caswell Lane, are also in agreement for a full abandonment.

We will appreciate your help and support in protecting our quiet neighborhood and the protect the serenity of this community.

Aliudeen Khan Abraham
15835 Caswell Lane
Reno NV
7252220944

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Oakley, Katherine

From: Alana Wild <wildlemonstwo@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 4:58 PM
To: Oakley, Katherine
Subject: Full abandonment of easment at APN 049-080-19, 15870 Caswell Lane, Reno, NV 89511
Attachments: 15925 Caswell.jpg; 15925 Caswell 3.jpg; 15925 Caswell 2.jpg

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Ms. Oakley,

My husband and I own and reside at 15925 Caswell Lane, Reno, NV 89511 and purchased the home in March of 2019. During escrow, including title search, etc. we were informed that Caswell Lane was a private road (not maintained by the County), and the maintenance, upkeep and snow removal were at the expense and management of all owners of property on Caswell Lane. For the last 6 years we have contributed to the cost to have the street resurfaced, weeds removed from the culverts, dug out culverts for water drainage and removed snow. Each owner of Caswell also contributed to these maintenance efforts.

The homes on Caswell lane are at 5800 feet in elevation and we receive a significant amount of snow in relation to the valley floor. In the winter of 2023, there were days that we could not get out of our driveway, let alone the street, due to feet of snow. Since Caswell is private, the owners have invested a significant amount of money to ensure we have the appropriate snow removal equipment to clear the road.

Mr. and Mrs. Travis, who own 15870 Caswell Lane, informed us of their request for a full abandonment of their northern easement and the objection of their neighbor at 6020 Rose Rock Lane, the Young's, stating "our motivation in pursuing access to Caswell is due to the fact the current access roads (Thompson & Rose Rock Ln) are unmaintained roads by the county and have become inaccessible multiple times for the last 3 winters during big storms." Access to Caswell Lane will not change their circumstances, since they will still have to provide the means to clear the driveway and road to get to Mount Rose Highway, without piling the snow from their potential driveway onto the other parcels that flank the easement in question, nor onto Caswell either.

If the full abandonment for the Travis's property is not granted, it will negatively impact the residents of Caswell Lane by:

- Increased traffic and potential for pets and children to be in harm's way
- Increase vehicle noise, which deters from the peaceful environment
- Decrease in property values, especially for the Travis's property, which are at risk of having a driveway built 12' from their house
- Increase in snow piled on Caswell, which in turn increases the chance for flooding for the residents at the southern end of the street.

These houses were built in the 1980's, and there has never been a need for the residents on Rose Rock Lane to look to utilizing the easement for access to their homes, and there is not a need now. The most direct route to Mt. Rose Highway is through the Forest Service parcels to the north of the Young's property. There is a process in place for the Young's to pursue this by submitting an application to the Forest Service.

We are in support of full abandonment of the northern easement at APN 049-080-19, 15870 Caswell Lane.

Thank you,
Alana and Corey Wild

Attached 3 photos

Jim & Wendy Long
15905 Caswell Lane
Reno, NV 89511
WendyL3481@sbcglobal.net

March 2, 2025

Washoe County Commissioners
c/o katoakley@washoecounty.gov

Dear Commissioners:

I have lived at 15905 Caswell Lane, Reno, NV 89511 since 1978. My husband built our house and we moved in on December 28, 1978. We purchased the property from Robert & Julie Kutnock. My husband also built the home at 15925 Caswell Lane. When we purchased the land from Mr. & Mrs. Kutnock we were told the road was private and each property owner would be responsible for road maintenance. The Road Maintenance Agreement, dated 1987, is recorded in the Washoe County Official Records.

My husband spent many hours walking behind a snow blower clearing Caswell Lane. As more homes were built and occupied, other homeowners also helped with the snow clearance. Not once, has Washoe County made any effort to maintain or clear Caswell Lane. Caswell property owners have maintained the road, graded the road and eventually paved the road all at their own expense. Not once has any maintenance been provided by Washoe County.

Claiming Caswell Lane is a public road is not substantiated by any documentation. Allowing others to claim they should be able to access Caswell Lane, just because they don't want to clear their own road is not acceptable. Mr. & Mrs. Young were aware of the access to their property when they purchased the home. Caswell Lane is a private road and should remain private in order to maintain the peaceful and safe environment where we reside.

I can be reached at 775 722-2149 or WendyL3481@sbcglobal.net, if you need to contact me.

Sincerely,

Wendy C. Long