

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, August 16, 2005 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Tom Keeton
Vice Chairperson Donna DePauw
Donna Curtis
John Felesina
Michael Hoffman
Pete Livermore
John McKenna
Tom Patton

STAFF: Linda Ritter, City Manager
Roger Moellendorf, Parks and Recreation Department Director
Vern Krahn, Park Planner
Barbara Singer, Recreation Superintendent
Lee Plemel, Principal Planner
Mike Suglia, Senior Deputy District Attorney
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and is available for review during regular business hours.

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM (1-0007) - Chairperson Keeton called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Commissioner Herst was absent. Commissioner Curtis arrived at 6:03 p.m.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS (1-0018) - None.

1. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - June 7, 2005 and July 19, 2005 (1-0021) - Commissioner Livermore moved to approve the minutes, with the change to the June 7th minutes as reported by the secretary. Commissioner Hoffman seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (1-0038) - Vice Chairperson DePauw requested to remove items 3-C, 3-D, and 3-E from the agenda. She discussed concerns with regard to reviewing the items without having received the survey results from the Hispanic community. She advised that since information for item 3-D was not made available until this meeting, the commissioners had insufficient time to review the materials prior to hearing Mr. Winston's presentation. Commissioner Livermore noted that the three items were for discussion and presentation only. In response to a question, Vice Chairperson DePauw reiterated concerns with regard to not having the survey responses from the Hispanic community. She expressed the understanding that the Hispanic survey was to be sent "at the same time as the other survey."

Mr. Moellendorf advised of a telephone conversation with Vice Chairperson DePauw earlier in the day. He advised that the surveys to which she referred were "exactly the same, except one is in Spanish and one is in English." He explained that the first survey was sent to the general population while the second was targeted toward the Hispanic community. The first survey, by its nature, is statistically valid. The second will not be, and its purpose is to "try to ascertain the feelings and ... the direction we need to go to serve

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 2

the Hispanic population.” Mr. Moellendorf advised that the Hispanic population has had the opportunity to provide input through various means during the master planning process. He noted focus groups, neighborhood meetings, and the general Citywide survey. He advised that Mr. Krahn had made several telephone calls, earlier in the day, to key members of the Hispanic community. The response was overwhelmingly positive with the indication that members of the Hispanic community “are absolutely delighted to be included in any form or manner” in providing input to the master plan process. Mr. Moellendorf advised there was no indication anyone felt City staff was being insensitive or treating members of the Hispanic community as second-class citizens. He suggested “quite the opposite is true;” that staff and the commission are “bending over backwards” to solicit the input and attempt to address the needs of the Hispanic community. He reiterated that the items were agendaized for presentation and discussion only; no action was to be taken.

In response to a question, Mr. Krahn advised that, at the time the Citywide general survey was mailed, no request was received from any Hispanic household to provide a survey in the Spanish language. He further advised that the survey results indicate 3% of the responding population is of Hispanic descent. He explained that the Hispanic survey has been “a work in progress;” that staff has been working with members of the Hispanic community to create the survey.

Mr. Moellendorf expressed the belief that staff had never communicated to the commission the Hispanic surveys would be sent at the same time as the Citywide general survey. He apologized for any misunderstanding, and advised this was never the intention. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the Hispanic survey had not yet been mailed. At a meeting with Mr. Winston earlier in the day, various methods to distribute the surveys were discussed. Mr. Moellendorf reiterated that the Citywide general survey was randomly mailed. The Hispanic survey will be targeted to individuals and will most likely require more personal contact for distribution. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf noted this as the difference between a statistically valid, random survey and one which targets a specific people group. He advised that the results of the Hispanic survey will be reviewed with the commission, with the intent of determining how they can be “folded ... into the general survey” to form the master plan.

In response to a question, Mr. Krahn reiterated that the Hispanic survey is a work in progress. He noted the commission’s clear indication to be involved in works in progress. The meeting and consultants’ schedules have been established to provide information to the commission and, in turn, for the commissioners to review the information and provide input to the consultants and staff. Mr. Krahn provided a brief overview of the master plan meeting schedule.

Commissioner McKenna expressed concern with regard to the discussion infringing on the requirements of the Open Meeting Law, and suggested moving on. In response to a question, Mr. Suglia advised there was no action to be taken under this item. He suggested, under the circumstances, that Chairperson Keeton decide whether or not to address the agenda items and proceed with the meeting. Chairperson Keeton decided to proceed and advised that requests to table individual agenda items would be addressed according to the sequence of the agenda.

At Mr. Moellendorf’s request, Chairperson Keeton modified the agenda to address item 3-E prior to item 3-C.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 3

3. AGENDA ITEMS:

3-A. ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE CONCEPTUAL PARKS AND LANDSCAPE GREENWAY PLAN(S) FOR THE RACE TRACK ROAD / SCHULZ RANCH SPECIAL PLANNING AREA (1-0286) - Mark Rotter, of Capital Engineering, introduced himself for the record and advised he was representing Reynen & Bardis and Barker Coleman Communities. He provided background information on this item, and introduced Susan Banovich, of Capital Engineering, and Sandra Wendel, the landscape architect. In response to a question, he oriented the commissioners to the project area. He narrated slides of the proposed development, and pointed out the linear parkway areas and the parkway areas which connect the north detention basin park, the central park, and the south detention basin park. He reviewed details of the linear parkway proceeding from the central park to the north detention basin park. Related landscape includes small areas of turf and will mainly accommodate buffering of the existing lots.

Mr. Rotter advised that the tentative map proposes landscape and park areas to be maintained by a landscape maintenance district. The Nevada Revised Statutes were recently amended to provide for landscape maintenance districts. The City of Sparks and Clark County have experience with landscape maintenance districts, and the developers propose to work with City staff to draft an appropriate ordinance. Mr. Rotter explained that the entire project is comprised of 522 units in five neighborhoods, which he pointed out on a displayed parcel map. The five neighborhoods would pay for operation and maintenance of the park facilities into the future.

Mr. Rotter reviewed details of the north and south detention basin landscapes and the central park landscape. He advised that the linear park facilities comprise approximately 5.2 acres; the original special planning area ("SPA") document depicted approximately 2.5 acres. The north detention basin park is comprised of 1.5 acres, and was originally 1.1 acres. The south detention basin was 1.2 acres and is now 1.6 acres. The central park, originally proposed at 3.8 acres, remains the same. The overall park area represents 12.1 acres, increased from the original SPA document by 8.6 acres. Mr. Rotter compared the acreage proposed for the subject neighborhood park to other parks in Carson City, as depicted on a displayed topographic map. He reviewed a displayed document entitled "Carson City Neighborhood Parks: Sizes, Facilities, Approximate Number of Units Served, Related Ratios." The comparison included Mayor's Park, Sonoma Park, Empire Ranch Estates Park, Park Terrace Park, Sunland Vista Park, Sunset Park, Carriage Square Park, Monte Vista Park, Long Ranch Park, Silver Oak Park, the Northridge Development, and the Proposed Schulz Ranch Development. [Commissioner Curtis arrived at 6:03 p.m.] Mr. Rotter noted that Sonoma Park is comprised of 3.8 acres to provide an idea of the size of the proposed neighborhood park facility. He further noted that Carriage Square Park and the developed portion of Long Ranch park are also good comparisons as to size.

In response to a question, Ms. Wendel described the landscape interface proposed for the Clear Creek stream bank environment. She discussed the types of species proposed to be incorporated in the landscape plan. In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised that low flow channels will be included in the bottoms of the detention basins. Most minor events will flow through with very little ponding. A five-year event may result in up to 2-3' of depth. Mr. Rotter explained that the northern detention basin is designed to accommodate a 100-year event. He referred to a displayed photograph of Blackwells Pond Park, and pointed out the low flow areas in which willows and other vegetation have grown. He explained the method by which detention basins are designed to avoid always having the bottoms filled with water.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 4

In response to a question regarding the role of the Parks and Recreation Department in the landscape maintenance area, Mr. Rotter advised of having reviewed the pertinent City of Sparks ordinance. He explained the residents would be assessed a fee, and that the Parks Department would receive certain annual funding, specific to the subject site, to perform maintenance. An ordinance would be adopted and an agreement entered into relative to the costs and maintenance responsibilities.

Vice Chairperson DePauw referred to the commission's April 5th action to recommend to the Board of Supervisors a larger park. She discussed comparisons between the subject neighborhood park, Ronald D. Wilson Memorial Park, and Silver Oak Park. She provided background information on the acreage proposed for Silver Oak Park, and reviewed discussion which took place at the April 27th Planning Commission meeting. She discussed the Board of Supervisors' action, and reiterated the commission's recommendation for a larger park. She expressed approval for the two detention basin parks.

In response to a question, Mr. Rotter estimated that a couple years would be needed to accumulate sufficient funding to accomplish the landscape maintenance district. He anticipates the details would be addressed as part of the agreement process. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf agreed that details would be worked out in the agreement. Conceivably, until sufficient funds are available through the assessment, the developer would be responsible for maintenance of the park. In the past, developers have either contracted with a landscape maintenance company or with City forces. Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged that residential construction tax funds will be used to construct the park facilities.

In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised that detention facility slopes are generally kept to 3' - 4'. Commissioner Livermore referred to Mayor's Park, and discussed the function of a detention basin. He advised of living near Sonoma Park, and noted the lack of trails and pathways. He expressed appreciation for the park and recreation elements designed throughout the Schulz Ranch development. He advised there are never "masses of people" at Sonoma Park, and expressed the hope that the proposed park will generate more use. He noted that trails and pathways were "top issues" indicated by the survey responses, and suggested the proposed park will address those needs. Mr. Rotter acknowledged that school bus stops will be designated in the development. Commissioner Livermore noted that the proposed park facilities will benefit school-aged children in the area. He commended Mr. Rotter on the proposed plan.

In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised of having discussed with Public Works Operations Manager Tom Hoffert the possibility of utilizing effluent water to irrigate the park facilities. There are a number of issues to be addressed, including spray versus drip irrigation. Mr. Rotter advised that the developers are hopeful to utilize effluent irrigation, and that these details will be addressed in the final design phase. In response to a further question, Mr. Rotter advised that both detention basins are proposed to be dog friendly. He advised that the homes will start in the high \$200s in response to a further question.

Vice Chairperson DePauw inquired as to the reason the central park was not comprised of closer to five acres as requested by the commission. She reiterated her review of discussion which took place at the April 27th Planning Commission meeting, and suggested that Mr. Rotter review a video tape recording of the meeting. She further suggested that the commission's recommendation had been ignored. Mr. Rotter advised that the designers had not ignored the commission's request. He reiterated that the overall acreage of the park facilities had been increased from 8.6 to 12.1, representing a nearly 40% increase. In the process of moving from a specific plan area to final design, conceptual landscape plans for the park facilities were drawn. As acreage for the other park facilities was increased and a determination was made that the conceptual plan allowed for constructing a neighborhood park with all the amenities indicated in the SPA document, leaving the central park facility at 3.8 acres was determined to be appropriate. Mr.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting
Page 5

Rotter advised that the subject proposal would stand, as presented. Vice Chairperson DePauw advised that the commission's recommendation was specific to the central park facility, and that the request was for acreage "closer to a five-acre park site." She discussed the lack of developable land in Carson City, and expressed concern that neighborhood park opportunities will continue to dwindle into the future. In response to a comment, Commissioner Livermore advised that the Board of Supervisors was aware of the commission's recommendation at the time the subject item was presented. Vice Chairperson DePauw expressed the opinion that the proposed plan was not "what [the commission] unanimously voted for."

In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised that the designers were able to accommodate a soccer field concept and many other facilities without increasing the acreage. He further advised that discussions indicated increasing the acreage could result in a regional facility rather than a neighborhood facility. In response to a further question, Mr. Rotter reiterated that the two detention basin facilities are proposed to be dog friendly and the centralized park is not. He suggested that the final decision with regard to allowing dogs in the central park should be left to Parks Department staff. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf noted there is presently no neighborhood in the area, nor has there been much public comment, from potential residents, regarding the size of the park or park amenities. Commissioner Livermore acknowledged the potential for a great deal of development "on the Douglas County side" and very little additional residential development "on the Carson City side." In response to a further question, Mr. Rotter advised there are approximately 80 one-acre lots around the perimeter of the subject development. He pointed out an area which has the potential for development of approximately 20 residential lots, and estimated the potential of 600 residential lots in the specific area.

Commissioner Felesina noted that 4.5 acres had been added to the overall park plan. He acknowledged having previously voted for a larger park but, considering the increased acreage and the proposed plan, he expressed doubt that he would have voted for a larger central park. In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised that the developers have proposed facilities which are well in excess of other park and recreation facilities in town, and have adequately addressed the neighborhood park issue. He reiterated that the proposal would stand, as presented. In response to a further question, he noted the 12.1 acres of park facilities for 522 residential units. He advised that the developers believe the park facilities are adequate. In response to a further question, he explained that the layouts and designs accommodate the linear and detention facilities as shown. "To go back at this point and start pulling out of those areas would be pretty tough."

Commissioner Livermore acknowledged the discussion which took place at the April 5th Parks and Recreation Commission meeting, and reviewed the commission's motion. He advised of having voted in favor of the motion because there was no specificity as to a five-acre park. He expressed the opinion that the proposed design provides adequate, overall park facilities. He expressed support for the conceptual plan, and reiterated that the developer had added 40% more park acreage. Chairperson Keeton expressed the opinion that the park and linear paths in the Long Ranch Development serve the area very, very well. He called for public comment; however, none was provided.

Commissioner Curtis inquired as to the point at which the park will be constructed. Mr. Rotter advised that the proposed tentative map indicates construction on the main park facilities will begin at the half-way point of the development. All linear park facilities will be constructed adjacent to development as it occurs. The detention basin facilities will be constructed "very early." Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged that the development agreement will be presented to the commission. In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised that if the Carson City Municipal Code is not amended to accommodate the proposed landscape maintenance district, the process will revert to the method by which park maintenance is presently done.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 6

Commissioner McKenna moved to recommend to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors approval of the conceptual parks and landscape greenway plans for the Race Track Road / Schulz Ranch special planning area. Commissioner Hoffman seconded the motion. At Commissioner McKenna's request, Mr. Moellendorf expressed the opinion that the proposed design is fine. Staff is very satisfied with design of the development as a whole, with the recreational amenities provided, including the detention basins, paths, and landscape areas, and the overall increase in park area to 12.1 acres. Mr. Moellendorf expressed the opinion that the park is very functional and will serve as "a real asset" to the development. He expressed full support for the design, as presented. Chairperson Keeton called for a vote on the pending motion; **motion carried 7-1.** Chairperson Keeton thanked Mr. Rotter and his associates for their presentation.

3-B. ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL OF A REQUEST FROM TIM MILLIGAN OF CAPITAL FORD TO USE FUJI PARK FOR A NEW CAR DISPLAY (1-1200) - Chairperson Keeton called for a representative from Capital Ford; however, none was present. Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the staff report and the pertinent agenda materials. At Chairperson Keeton's request, Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the optional recommendations included in the staff report for the benefit of the citizens present. He acknowledged that only the use of Fuji Park, and not the Fairgrounds, was being requested. In response to a question, he advised that the exhibit hall is used commercially by auctioneers. He was unaware of any commercial use of the park itself. In response to a further question, he advised that the vehicles would be parked on the grass. No vehicle sales are proposed; merely a showing. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf reiterated the concern that approving this item would establish a precedent for use of Fuji Park by commercial ventures.

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf was unaware as to other locations Mr. Milligan had considered. He advised that for-profit fees, according to the current rate schedule, would be charged for the use. He acknowledged that the current rate schedule may be revised by May 2006, and advised that no fees had yet been discussed. Commissioner Livermore advised that Fuji Park had been used for commercial ventures in the past. He noted that the special use permit process is not simple and that the Planning Commission establishes the permit criteria. He expressed the opinion there should be little concern over establishing a precedent. He advised that the "Run What 'Cha Brung" car show held in June had 360 cars parked in the parking lot. He commented that the concept is unique in that Mr. Milligan proposes to market the show to Costco members. He expressed confidence in the special use permit process to "control all the bad elements" of the proposal.

Commissioner Patton expressed understanding for staff's recommendations as outlined in the staff report. He inquired as to an alternative City-owned property at which such an event could be accommodated. He discussed certain for-profit operations supported in City facilities, such as the Farmer's Market, the X-Treme Sports event, and races. In light of staff's concerns over establishing precedent, he suggested developing guidelines to provide for the amount of this type of usage to be allowed, the appropriate fees, and a mechanism for reviewing such proposed uses altogether rather than on a first-come, first-served basis. Commissioner Livermore agreed with Commissioner Patton's comments. He commented that Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds have many different uses, and suggested that the car show take place at the Fairgrounds rather than the park.

In response to a question, Mr. Suglia advised that deciding to make the event a one-time occurrence would be outside the commission's purview. He reviewed the provisions of the City's special use permit for events at Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds. He explained that if the commission recommends approving the subject request, and the Planning Commission agrees, this commission could not then limit the number of

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 7

such events. In response to a question, Mr. Suglia clarified that limiting the requested use to one-time only “is a very fine line distinction” between recommending to not allow the use or allowing anyone to bring a similar car show. In response to a further question, he advised that, once the special use permit was granted, any event coordinator would be subject to the facility application requirements of the Parks and Recreation Department. Chairperson Keeton acknowledged the contributions of Mr. Campagni and the automobile industry to the City. Mr. Suglia acknowledged that special use permits can be rescinded, but advised it would be difficult to do so because of the “very fine line distinction” between the existing car shows and the proposed commercial car show. In response to a further question, he provided background information on the City’s existing special use permit. Commissioner Felesina noted that the subject request was specific to one certain date. Mr. Suglia referred again to the City’s special use permit, and advised that once a use is permitted, it is granted far into the future. In response to a comment, he advised that staff most likely has discretion with regard to competing uses on the same day. Chairperson Keeton called for public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. No motion was forthcoming.

Chairperson Keeton recessed the meeting at 7:05 p.m. and reconvened at 7:21 p.m. Although Vice Chairperson DePauw had left the meeting, a quorum was still present.

3-C. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING THE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSIONERS’ REVIEW COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS ON THE RESULTS OF THE PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS MASTER PLAN PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY (1-3175) -

Mr. Krahn reviewed the staff report. Commissioner Patton commended staff and the consultants on the survey, and advised of having extensively reviewed the survey responses. Mr. Krahn acknowledged that the survey responses are available to the public via the Envision Carson City website. He explained how to access it. Commissioner Patton reviewed highlights of the survey responses, with regard to the City’s appearance, the transportation system, the need for growth and vision management, and parks and recreation issues. He noted that the highest ranked priorities were indoor recreation facilities and trails and bike paths. He further noted the responses with regard to developing the Highway 50 East gateway.

Commissioner McKenna expressed the opinion that the survey is valid as to generalities: trails, arts, recreation opportunities. He expressed the opinion that the survey is not valid as to specific ideas or locations, and suggested “that’s where the art ... comes in.” Once discussion of specific projects or a specific master plan begins, then some of the comments can be used. Commissioner McKenna anticipates the community will become more involved once specific projects are discussed. He commended staff and the consultants on the survey, and advised that it provides “big picture” direction. He expressed the opinion that the general survey responses do not translate to “any specific.”

Commissioner Hoffman noted that culture was indicated as a priority, no one wants fees raised, a “50/50 split on neighborhood parks,” transportation, and growth. He further noted that biking and hiking were high priorities, and that the responses indicated the desire for “another Mills Park.” He expressed the opinion that a large park doesn’t have to be completely open to dogs.

Commissioner Felesina agreed with Commissioner Hoffman’s comments regarding dogs in parks, and agreed the City needs another regional park.

With regard to a recreation facility, Commissioner Curtis noted that basketball and tennis courts seemed to be “on the bottom of the list.” She suggested the responses may not have been completely honest with regard to walking dogs in parks. She noted a “high rating for shade and rest areas,” and suggested considering this as well as culture. She expressed the opinion the “whole survey cries out for sidewalks.”

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 8

She discussed the responses regarding neighborhood parks, and suggested the importance of understanding the responses “by neighborhood or by area.” She noted the survey responses indicated satisfaction with regard to ADA accommodations. She commended staff and the consultants on the survey and analysis, and expressed the opinion it will be helpful.

Commissioner Livermore inquired as to how the written comments were reconciled from the process. He discussed the importance of communication and presentation to the public, of factual, easy-to-understand information. He noted that Carson City actually has the smallest percentage of growth throughout the region, but traffic volumes indicate otherwise. He expressed appreciation for the number of responses received from senior citizens, and discussed senior citizen participation in recreational activities at some of the facilities visited in Colorado.

Chairperson Keeton expressed appreciation for the number of survey responses received. He noted weaknesses inherent in surveys, but discussed the importance of giving careful consideration to the “broad ... and big patterns.” He further noted the indication that the community is pleased with the City’s parks. He suggested there was no “crying need” for basketball courts, but agreed an indoor recreation facility is needed. He expressed an interest in the low number of responses regarding the use of school grounds for recreation. He noted that the distance to neighborhood parks appeared not to be a factor for people. He expressed the opinion that people use neighborhood parks no matter how far they have to travel. He expressed appreciation for the interest in arts and culture. He noted there was no overwhelming response in favor of a leisure pool. He expressed appreciation for the survey, but suggested that many of the responses should be “taken with a grain of salt.”

In response to Commissioner Livermore’s question, Mr. Winston advised that most people who volunteer survey responses in the “Other” category usually “have something to get off their chest.” He advised that written comments are valuable in that themes are usually indicated. He expressed the opinion that the value of the survey indicates “where people are at, not what they’re directing you to do.” He noted that the survey was not a referendum. He advised that the survey question regarding the recreation center was very carefully worded. He discussed the neighborhood park question. He requested the commissioners to consider the survey as the parks, recreation, and trails master plan moves forward. Chairperson Keeton called for public comment; however, none was provided.

3-D. PRESENTATION ONLY REGARDING THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF THE PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN (2-0184) - Mr. Winston provided background information on this item, and discussed the purpose of a master plan to serve as a “broad policy direction document.” He noted that the commission’s purpose is not “about day-to-day decision making,” but establishing broad direction. He requested the commission to review the draft master plan with an eye toward broad policy direction. He narrated a Power Point presentation, which included demographic trends. Commissioner McKenna expressed disagreement with the demographic information presented, and advised that the School District is projecting significant declines in student populations this year. He expressed the opinion that growth will occur in the senior-aged population, and that facilities should be constructed for them now. Mr. Winston agreed, and continued reviewing information provided by the State Demographer’s Office. He discussed housing, economic development, and level of service. He discussed community park opportunities, and pointed out Centennial Park, properties on Lompa Lane and Little Lane, the undeveloped portions of the Edmonds Sports Complex, the WNCC campus, and the BLM parcel on both sides of Arrowhead Drive. Commissioner McKenna inquired as to the Koontz Lane water tank site,

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 9

and Mr. Winston explained access issues and the hillside as reasons for not considering the site. He clarified that the site would be “a great idea” as a natural park, and advised that the site was considered as an equestrian trail head and neighborhood park.

Mr. Winston reviewed sports complex opportunities as outlined in the draft plan. Commissioner Livermore commented that the Arrowhead property is an 80-acre site divided by a street. The Edmonds Sports Complex is comprised of 110 acres and less than half is currently developed. He suggested that the Edmonds Sports Complex has the most potential.

Mr. Winston discussed the need for indoor recreation facilities, specifically in light of the programming associated with the Community Center gymnasium and the Aquatic Facility. He advised of the need for at least two basketball courts to meet current needs; and additional parking, a larger women’s locker room, outside lap and fun pool for the Aquatic Facility. He expressed the opinion that the popularity of recreation centers is growing around the country. He advised of strong support in the survey responses for a teen center, and suggested that recreation centers can serve as teen centers. He noted that the draw is the “drop-in capability.” He advised that the list of locations for recreation center opportunities is the same as for a community park. He suggested continued consideration of recreation center sites, amenities, costs, and proceeding to design only if sufficient funding is available. He further suggested that the location should be central with broad community coverage. He expressed the opinion that once one recreation center is built, the community will want a second center. He recommended considering BLM and the Edmonds Sports Complex sites, formalizing the relationship with the School District for ongoing shared use of facilities, and tying the Community Center and the Aquatic Facility together with such things as paint, sidewalks, and traffic circulation.

With regard to performing arts and culture, Mr. Winston discussed the need for a backstage to the Community Center Theater, including a load-in / load-out room, a place for building sets, etc. He suggested that such amenities would increase theater operation efficiency by approximately 50%. He reviewed possible design details.

Mr. Winston advised that equity is the main issue associated with neighborhood parks. He clarified that equity is not the same as equality, and advised there is no way to make every neighborhood equal with regard to recreation facilities. “There just isn’t the land to do the same thing in every neighborhood.” He advised that the consultants are working with staff to develop a strategy, and discussed various approaches to providing recreation facilities. In response to a comment, Mr. Krahn discussed the status of Sierra Pacific Power Company’s Electric Master Plan. Mr. Winston pointed out park and school facilities on a displayed map, and noted the areas which are lacking. He advised this is the equity question: to create some kind of recreation opportunity particularly as the freeway bypass is completed and potentially cuts off some of the neighborhoods. He noted that the survey responses emphasize a desire for natural parks.

Mr. Winston discussed the economic development potential of recreation, actual costs associated with constructing neighborhood parks as compared to the amount of residential construction tax generated, and subsidization of services. He reiterated the request for the commissioners to provide input regarding broad policy direction. In response to a question, he offered to provide copies of the PowerPoint presentation to the commissioners. Commissioner Hoffman agreed with Mr. Winston’s comments regarding actual costs to construct neighborhood parks. He suggested agendaizing this for discussion at a future meeting.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 10

3-E. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING THE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSIONERS' REVIEW COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS ON THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF THE UNIFIED TRAILS MASTER PLAN (1-1635) - Mr. Krahn reviewed the staff report. Mr. Winston provided background information on this item and reviewed the master plan meeting schedule. He assured the commissioners that the process "will take its own time," and advised that the schedule would be adjusted, as necessary, in order that the commissioners "feel comfortable." He expressed an interest in the commissioners' input as to the draft trails master plan. He acknowledged that the map is fairly complicated, and emphasized it is not the plan which would serve as a trail guide for the general public. He explained that the map is a working, internal document to help guide the Parks and Recreation Department, the Planning and Community Development Department, and the Public Works Department as to the appropriate location for trails, types of trails, trail connectivity, trail standards, etc. The trails guide will be much simpler. Mr. Winston requested input of the commissioners.

Commissioner McKenna referred to the comments and input provided at the August 2nd meeting, and commented that the draft plan represents a fairly comprehensive start and "only a start." Commissioner Hoffman expressed an interest in actually addressing the bypass, particularly the southern leg, and to indicate a multi-use trail. He acknowledged an agreement with NDOT regarding not demanding the multi-use trail. He acknowledged that the multi-use trail should also be included in the policy statement.

Commissioner Patton expressed agreement with Commissioner Hoffman, and suggested that a multi-use path along the freeway corridor would be the backbone of a continuous trail system. He referred to the recent freeway tour, and advised of having requested NDOT Project Manager Jim Gallegos to provide information regarding the status of extending pedestrian and bicycle access across the Lompa property. He noted that one of the objectives of the trails master plan is connectivity. Mr. Krahn advised that the City has been working with NDOT on phase 2B to ensure that design of the freeway and the bridge structures will not preclude installation of a bike path at a later time. He offered to request Project Manager Jim Gallegos to provide a presentation to the commission. In response to a question, he reviewed the route of phases 2A and 2B. Commissioner Patton expressed an interest in phase 2A, from Highway 50 East to Fifth Street and from Fifth Street to Fairview. He expressed the understanding that the Lompa property is from Highway 50 East to Fifth Street. He expressed the further understanding that a utility easement will exist along the freeway corridor, but that it doesn't include any pedestrian or bicycle use. He noted that the City's multi-use trail ends at Highway 50 East and a bicyclist or pedestrian would have to go to Edmonds Drive or Saliman Road to "get around this portion." He requested information regarding whether there is any possibility for change. He advised of having inquired of NDOT Chief Deputy Attorney General Joe Ward with regard to the situation, but is still awaiting a response. He reiterated the inquiry as to any possibility that phase 2A could include a multi-use trail. Mr. Krahn reiterated that he would request Mr. Gallegos to provide a presentation.

Mr. Krahn acknowledged that the multi-use path associated with the north leg of the freeway bypass is on the south and west sides of the freeway. Commissioner Livermore suggested considering a loop to connect the east side of the valley. He recalled discussions that the maintenance roads on the Lompa property would be accessible to bicyclists, and suggested having "solid conversations" with NDOT representatives about multi-uses for maintenance roads. He discussed increased bicycle usage throughout the community, and suggested the community is considering other means of transportation. He expressed an interest in researching available funding for bicycle paths, and discussed the importance of making every effort to acquire roadway widths.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 11

Commissioner Curtis inquired as to the type of plan Carson City will have. She referred to the Eagle Valley Trails Plan wherein trails are described. Mr. Winston advised that the final plan will look like the Eagle Valley Trails Plan; "it'll be a written document." In response to a comment, Mr. Krahn explained the intent of staff and the consultant to begin "a give and take process" with the commissioners. He reiterated that the commission has been very clear with regard to the desire to participate in development processes. He provided background information on the work done thus far to obtain input from the community, and advised that "now it's [the commission's] turn." He emphasized that the draft plan is "by no means a finished document."

Commissioner Curtis referred to the scope of work and noted there was supposed to be an economic analysis. In response to a question, Mr. Krahn explained the process by which Mr. Winston would prepare a draft document for review by this commission and the Planning Commission prior to the September 20th joint meeting. He pointed out that no action would be agendized for this item at the September 20th joint meeting. He advised that no move toward formal adoption of any plan was scheduled before mid-November. In response to an earlier comment, Mr. Winston advised that property owner feasibility is a city staff responsibility in the scope of work. Open Space Manager Juan Guzman and other City staff have spent time considering the maps and alignments in order to reconcile them with property ownership. In some cases, alignments have been adjusted; in other cases, a note has been added that the map does not imply right-of-way has been acquired; and in many cases, redundancy has been built into the plan. Commissioner Curtis expressed concern over implementation. Mr. Winston explained that the draft plan is "a skeleton." The goals, objectives, and policies will continue to be fine-tuned. He discussed the importance of "getting agreement on these real, essential pieces" rather than spending a great deal of time writing reports and finding there has been misdirection. He advised that, from here on, detail will continue to be added but hopefully will not change direction unless the commission feels otherwise. In response to the question regarding implementation, Mr. Winston advised of a coordination meeting with the pedestrian plan consultants which took place approximately two weeks ago. The agreement reached was that the trails plan will be a composite; all trails will be on the unified trails plan. A subset of the trails plan will become part of the pedestrian and CAMPO alternative transportation plan. Mr. Winston advised that the reason for the subset is that some trails qualify for different funding sources. He further advised that opportunities for various funding sources will be included in information as the plan is nearing finalization. In addition, some general "order-of-magnitude" numbers will be provided. Mr. Winston requested input from the commissioners and the public regarding priorities. In response to a question, he advised that the priorities may not be established for the September 20th joint meeting. He expressed the hope that a fairly complete document will be ready in October for final editing and proofing.

Commissioner Livermore suggested that Mr. Winston meet with Chamber of Commerce representatives. He discussed various requirements which could be associated with business development, including access if located within a certain distance of a bike path, bicycle parking, etc. He noted the importance of Chamber of Commerce "buy-in" during the process of developing the plan. Mr. Krahn advised that he has accompanied Principal Planner Lee Plemel as he has visited with Chamber of Commerce representatives regarding the master plan. Mr. Winston summarized Commissioner Livermore's comments, as follows: "Business support for bike-friendly policies."

Commissioner Felesina noted the importance of keeping in mind that the V&T Railway is anticipated to be completed within four years. He discussed the importance of including a trail along the route of the railway. Mr. Krahn advised of having met with Ken Dorr, the V&T Railway project engineer, who has met with the Carson River and Open Space Advisory Committees. An additional meeting took place last week, which included Mr. Dorr, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Krahn, Planning Commissioner Mark Kimbrough, and some

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting
Page 12

members of the Carson River Advisory Committee to consider alternative routes. Mr. Krahn discussed issues of safety and alignments, and advised that trails are being considered both above the railway alignment and on the south side of the River. He expressed the opinion that the railway and the recreational opportunities can co-exist. He will participate, during the week of August 22nd, in plotting proposed trail routes to be presented to Mr. Dorr for review and consideration.

Commissioner Curtis requested staff and the consultant to consider multi-uses everywhere the word “bike” appeared in the goals and objectives. She read Goal #4 into the record, and requested that the words “fitness-minded” be removed. She requested specific descriptions for trail head amenities, and to include a trail footprint wherever possible. In terms of economic benefit, she suggested development of cost / benefit examples, and providing the information to the Convention and Visitors Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce as a basis for requesting their financial support. She further suggested including trail etiquette in the policies, and installing benches along the routes of urban trails.

Chairperson Keeton noted the emphasis on trails indicated by the survey responses. He suggested that the current problem with trails is no indication of priority. He commented that the public opinion survey is very valuable, but noted the importance of deciding the “grey issues.” He expressed support for multiple use facilities, but suggested motorized and non-motorized uses may not always mix. He discussed the importance of being clear with regard to “bike” designations as the word doesn’t always refer to bicycles. Mr. Winston discussed his experience with establishing project priorities, and suggested that the most effective approach is to annually establish priorities based on pressures, areas of use, problems, etc. He noted that the unified trails plan is a policy document, and advised that the most helpful input to staff and the consultants would be the “big picture highest priority.”

Mr. Winston advised that the multiple use issue is “tough,” and he requested directional input from the commission. He referred to the public comment received at the August 2nd commission meeting, and requested input with regard to trail types. He noted that the public comment received at the August 2nd meeting was different than that which had been previously provided. He advised that if sharing facilities “isn’t going to work out in real terms, ... real life, ... real circumstances, this plan will be out of date pretty quickly” and will need to be amended. He reiterated this would be a good time to provide input.

Commissioner Livermore expressed concern with regard to restricting certain areas from motorized vehicles. Mr. Winston explained that some areas predominantly used in certain ways have been designated, but “by and large, ... this is a shared-trail community.” He pointed out that motorized vehicle access is not allowed everywhere. One of the concerns was that a number of the motorized trails were dead ends, and consideration was subsequently given to making loops. He noted that this will, in turn, encroach upon “somebody else’s solitude” however. He advised that the plan will be a work in progress even after the report is printed. Chairperson Keeton expressed appreciation for the consideration given to having “trails that go somewhere.” He expressed a preference for at least a ring concept to begin with. Mr. Winston discussed the benefits of a spokes-of-the-wheel design. He suggested this as a general priority to obtain a basic system, and that the other pieces will be built in “as time and interest permits.”

Commissioner McKenna suggested that discussion of this item should have centered around a general overview of things in the master plan which bothered the commissioners. He noted that the discussion had shifted from the master plan to specific details, including trail etiquette. He expressed the opinion that the master plan should indicate the desire for trails, that they should be all over town and multi-use. Whether

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 13

or not multi-use works is a subject for discussion “months from now.” Construction standards will also be a topic for community input later on; “it’s not a master plan discussion.” Commissioner McKenna expressed an interest in hearing from the citizens present. Chairperson Keeton called for public comment.

(1-2844) Bryan Doyal, of the Pine Nut Mountains Trails Association, advised of having reviewed the map at the August 2nd meeting. He expressed the belief that the unified trails plan will be used to work with the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, and advised that “all their roads are shown as non-motorized.” He requested that cross-hatching or areas of use be designated on the map. He discussed various details of the map. Mr. Winston advised that USFS representatives have indicated they are unable to change their trail designations. He invited Mr. Doyal to meet with the consultants and USFS representatives to discuss “what’s feasible and realistic even though they may not be able to implement it for a number of years.” Mr. Doyal advised that the USFS and the BLM have requested input of the users. He expressed concern that the map presently indicates OHV use is not desired in most areas.

(1-2923) Sue Newberry, President of Muscle Powered, advised of having researched comprehensive plans. She indicated that a great deal of public input provided by Muscle Powered members was not reflected in the goals and objectives of the draft plan. She referred to a recently submitted letter and withdrew the reference to non-motorized devices. She expressed concern there will be a “confusing mass of plans ... if we don’t think now about how we might be a little bit more comprehensive in our approach.” She advised that the Federal Department of Transportation has indicated there is no reason to not combine the trails, bicycle, and pedestrian plans into one plan. She suggested that it will be difficult for developers to review three different plans and then design a site plan which will serve everyone well. She expressed the opinion that objective #11 is another example of “how confusing this is going to get.” She advised that if the trails plan is not incorporated into CAMPO, it will not qualify for federal transportation project funding. Criteria includes that a trail serves two points, goes from A to B, and meets national standards. She read objective #11 into the record, and stated, “this is a trails plan.” She advised that multi-use trails, by definition, are off-street. She requested the commission to meet with federal transportation representatives to discuss the bicycle plan. She noted that automobile transportation systems are not separated based on use. She advised that Muscle Powered is interested in a “system” to ride bicycles for transportation or recreation. She reiterated that developing a comprehensive, understandable system will be difficult if the approach continues to be toward three separate plans. She requested that, once the plans are brought together, consideration be given to providing feedback to interested parties and organization representatives who have provided input. She suggested developing a matrix of public input received to date. She discussed the importance, to tourists and the local community, of naming trails. She discussed the importance of looking down the road and the big picture, and advised that “the really big picture is the master plan and regional transportation plan.” She suggested aiming at a plan which will accommodate cutting and pasting key implementation strategies into both the master plan and the regional transportation plan. She further suggested a “stand-alone document that will be more about standards and guidelines” needed in the future. She advised of having provided written recommendations to Mr. Winston.

Chairperson Keeton called for additional public comment; however, none was provided. Mr. Winston expressed appreciation for Ms. Newberry’s comments. He explained the intent of the policies to include on-street bike lanes or trails in road construction projects if so indicated on the plan. He acknowledged a need to re-work the language. He advised that the CAMPO plan will be incorporated into the unified trails plan.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 14

4. NON-ACTION ITEMS:

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM STAFF (2-0899) - Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the "FYI" items included in the agenda materials. He reported that the new lights at Governor's Field will be tested this week, that the National Softball Association is again awarding Carson City the Outstanding Park Award for the Centennial Sports Complex, and that residential construction tax applications will be presented at the September 6th meeting.

STATUS REPORTS, COMMENTS, AND CONCERNS FROM COMMISSIONERS (2-0963) - In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the Governor's Field parking lot schedule will be considered at a meeting on September 22nd. Commissioner Livermore anticipated that the Eagle Creek Detention Basin park will be presented at one of the commission's September meetings. He provided a status report on the project.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS (2-0857) - Commissioner Curtis suggested limiting future agendas to items pertinent to the master plan and the recreation center as much as possible. She requested to agendize discussion of the Foundation for the Betterment of Parks and Recreation annual awards.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM STAFF (2-0985) - Previously covered.

5. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (2-0989) - Commissioner Livermore moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m. The motion was seconded and carried 7-0.

The Minutes of the August 16, 2005 meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission are so approved this 4th day of October, 2005.

THOMAS N. KEETON, Chair