

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, August 19, 2008 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Donna Curtis
Vice Chairperson Pete Livermore
Commissioner Charles Adams
Commissioner Tom Keeton
Commissioner John McKenna
Commissioner James Smolenski
Commissioner Todd Westergard

STAFF: Roger Moellendorf, Parks and Recreation Department Director
Scott Fahrenbruch, Parks and Recreation Director of Operations
Vern Krahn, Park Planner
Joel Benton, Senior Deputy District Attorney
Darlene Rubin, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the commission's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record, on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office. These materials are available for review during regular business hours.

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM (5:30:30) - Chair Curtis called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum was present. Commissioners Lasco and Shabi were absent.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS (5:31:24) - None

1. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - July 1, 2008 (5:31:28) - Motion to approve by Commissioner Livermore. Seconded by Commissioner Smolenski. The motion passed unanimously.

2. MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA (5:31:54) - None

3. STAFF UPDATES:

3-A. UPDATE ON RONALD D. WILSON MEMORIAL PARK (5:32:05) -Mr. Fahrenbruch reported that some warranty items (10 to 12 trees; panel of fabric shade structure) were being finished at present and there were some pending change orders. The irrigation system has presented a dilemma: the system was designed properly based upon the pressure at the time. However, Carson City Utilities has reported having had this problem with many areas around town where there is a loss of water pressure. The system has been revamped and a change order initiated to eliminate some sprinkler heads on each zone to increase volume and pressure. Mr. Fahrenbruch is looking to open the park at a grand opening ceremony scheduled for Friday, September 5, 2008, at 5:00 p.m. Invitations will go out for that shortly. The official

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 2

opening for the public will be on Saturday, September 6, 2008. They will be issuing press releases for the grand opening ceremony as well as for the public opening. Commissioner Livermore asked if the construction fence along the parkway would be removed. Mr. Fahrenbruch responded the fence would be left in place until the day of the ceremony. Mr. Livermore followed up by inquiring if the park project was on time and on budget, to which Mr. Fahrenbruch replied "yes." He said the Department of Public Works had done a great job keeping the contractor to the task; there were some things the contractor could have done better, but other things were out of Park and Recreation's control. He believes the completed project looks good. Chair Curtis remarked that there is a master plan and if funding was obtained at some point there may be other elements that could be put into the park, such as the labyrinth. Mr. Fahrenbruch said they would also be bringing more trees into the park.

3-B. UPDATE REGARDING THE CONDITION OF THE POND AT ROSS GOLD PARK

(5:37:08) - Mr. Fahrenbruch reported that there had been a letter to the editor of *The Nevada Appeal*, which he felt was justified because the condition of the pond most of the time was unsightly. The letter writer made a good point about the litter around the pond. However, the primary issue with the pond was its design; it was a stagnant pond--no ingress or egress of water--unlike the pond being designed for Fuji Park where there would be fresh water coming in from Clear Creek to replenish the pond and then exit back into Clear Creek. The pond at Ross Gold was refilled with potable water which has to be paid for. Another problem was the duck and goose waste that accumulates in the pond with no way of breaking down. Algae bloom was another problem due to the nitrates from fertilizer used in the park as well as the waste matter. The algae bloom was exacerbated because the pond was shallow--only three to six feet deep. The question was, how to bring fresh water into the pond to replace the stagnant water. The solution, which would appear in a later CIP Request, was a proposal to set up Ross Gold Pond like it was years ago, when water was pumped out of the pond to irrigate the park. Mr. Fahrenbruch anticipated that a pump station would be funded and installed to draw water out of the pond and then be replenished with potable water three or four times a week. Another plan of attack, he explained, was to work with the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) on feeding policies for waterfowl. Many citizens "show up with boxes of bread and bags of different food stuffs which is unhealthy for the ducks and geese and it attracts more of them into the park." In the short term, a policy has been implemented of daily walking the shore of the pond to clean up the litter. Although previously budget cuts and lack of manpower were responsible for some of their inability to clean up the area, the focus now is on the solution and it had also become a duty of the trash truck operators to patrol the pond daily.

The question of draining the pond was raised and discussion ensued, however, it was felt by the majority that a three-acre patch of earth, even if planted with shrubs and so forth, would not be as attractive or appealing to park users as the pond. Nevertheless, Mr. Fahrenbruch stated that if a design solution and the funding could not be found, that would need to be considered. Commissioner Livermore said he had a conversation with the City Manager, an engineering graduate from UNR, who informed that a similar problem had occurred at Manzanita Lake (at UNR). The engineering class there at the time took on the project and found a solution, and the City Manager offered to contact the appropriate person at UNR to see if they wanted to take on the Ross Gold Pond Project. Mr. Livermore stated the Ross Gold Park was a "William B. Anderson Award" recipient for its water feature when it first opened. It is the only park with a water feature, and although the ducks and geese present problems, they are nevertheless a great

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 3

enjoyment to the community. Perhaps NDOW could consider adding coin-operated feeders where the public could purchase the appropriate feed and also be a source of revenue. Mr. Livermore asked about partnering with the Utilities Company for a solution, which Mr. Fahrenbruch reported had been done previously when the Utilities purchased the sub-surface aerator pumps and paid for the power to run them.

Mr. Fahrenbruch reported that last week Parks Department staff rounded up all of the domestic ducks and geese--65 ducks and 15 geese were adopted out. It is important to manage the waterfowl at the pond because that has an impact on the water quality. They also set off explosive devices in the fall to "haze" the Canada Geese and Mallard Ducks.

3-C. UPDATE REGARDING THE CARSON CITY FAIRGROUNDS PROJECT (5:46:47) -

Mr. Krahn reported that progress was being made. The last structure to be installed is the announcer's booth which is now under construction. Based on the reports from the weekly construction meeting with Public Works, completion is scheduled for the second week of September. It is hoped that the contractor will hold to that schedule, although some deadlines have been missed in the past. There has been a lot of public interest in the project; one of the more interesting phone calls came from Sandra Wallen of 4-H who was curious if staff would be willing to put on a tour for the 4-H folks. That was done last Tuesday, August 12, 2008. There were approximately 20-25 people walking around the site and briefed on the details of each building as well as the amenities being provided for the different user groups. The tour lasted about one and one-half hours and generated a lot of excitement. Mr. Krahn offered to give the Parks and Recreation Commission a private tour at the next commission meeting. He asked for a show of interest, and it was decided that the best time would be between 5:30 and 6:30. Mr. Krahn would confirm the time with everyone, as well as the Recording Secretary, and confirm the availability of the Exhibit Hall for the meeting.

Commissioner Livermore remarked that the progress being made on the park was not sufficient as far as he was concerned. He felt it was a debacle that should not have occurred, taking close to two years. When the commission approved the design, it was believed that the park would be open at the end of March 2008. The contractor was allowed to work four days a week with four people on a 180-day contract. Commissioner Livermore did not feel the project would be finished before the year's end, unless some major changes took place, and asked about the status of the contractor's extension contract that was terminated on July 31, 2008. Mr. Krahn responded that the Public Works staff was taking that issue very seriously; the contractor was contractually obligated to be finished by the end of July. There are some liquidated damages issues that Public Works will be looking at and there will be some tough negotiations after the project is completed. Commissioner Livermore said he would be attending a meeting at City Hall this Friday regarding the status of the Fairgrounds, and added that he would request the Board of Supervisors take to action to determine what went wrong with the project.

3-D. Mr. Moellendorf provided members of the commission a copy of an e-mail from Assessor David Dawley regarding the success achieved this year in the Summer Kamp Program. There were 300-plus kids and many favorable comments have been received from parents. It proved to be one of the best camps in several years. Mr. Moellendorf said the staff worked extremely hard putting the camp on this year

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 4

and commends and congratulates them all. The camp staff is made up primarily of seasonal part time employees. Megan Soracco, presently on family medical leave, was in charge of that program. She trained Scott Chapman, one of her right-hand aides, who is a part time employee who took over the camp this year and ran it on his own, under the guidance of Joel Dunn. At the next meeting Mr. Moellendorf hopes to have copies of the survey results and more comments about the camp.

4. NON-ACTION ITEMS:

4-A. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING A PROJECT UPDATE ON THE INDOOR RECREATION CENTER LOCATED AT THE BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS OF WESTERN NEVADA PROPERTY ON NORTHRIDGE DRIVE (5:55:24) - Roger Moellendorf reported they had been working with Brent Tippets, from Valentine/Crane, who has developed a schematic on a special design for the recreation center as part of the joint effort with The Boys and Girls Club. Mr. Tippets presented those plans here several months ago. The plans at that time indicated a co-joined building--a building with a common wall between The Boys and Girls Club and the City's portion of the Indoor Recreation Center. Unfortunately although they tried every means possible to get around it, the International Building Code (IBC) would not allow two separate entities to have a co-joined building. The only way out would be to have one ownership of the facility, but neither party (the City nor The Boys and Girls Club) was willing to give up their interest. As a result, they need to go back to the drawing board and design two new separate facilities--the City designing only its half. That necessitates that the City amend the current contract with Valentine/Crane, because it will cause an extension of the deadline, and an additional cost of about \$92,000 to redesign the site, the grading plan, utilities, schematic layout, and design of the facility, and the floorplan.

On the positive side, not all the work put into this design initially is for naught. It is estimated that approximately 23 percent of the design work already completed in the phases can be reused for the new design concept. The design elements include the lighting, the traffic impact study, topographic map, water and sanitary sewer analysis. Mr. Moellendorf plans to bring the amended contract to the Board of Supervisors for approval on Thursday, August 21, 2008. Mr. Krahn noted there were challenges with the project; the small building site, the orientation, and the parking lot. Despite those challenges, he believed the finished design would be much improved over the original plan. He also hoped the Board of Supervisors would allow the project to move forward with the contract amendment. Mr. Moellendorf felt perhaps there would be some additional flexibility and creativity the architect may be able to employ since he does not have to be joined to an existing building. There were some orientation challenges in connection with the water feature location/splash pad--it cannot be located on the east or north side of the facility because of the cool temperatures. He feels, too, the finished product would be better with the redesign. Unfortunately some time has been lost and additional money would be expended. Chair Curtis asked about the possibility of using different building materials since now it does not have to match exactly with The Boys and Girls Club, and if that made the building less expensive were there other things that could be added to it? Mr. Krahn responded that it would be a great opportunity to look at the project anew. It was hoped that there would be a benefit to be received from the building materials since the structures would not be co-joined. The building would have its own architectural style which could lend itself to another type of product, different concrete, panel systems, and so on. He hoped to stay with about a 34,000 square

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 5

foot building. With different orientations and rearrangements of the spaces within the building, some of the concerns expressed by others could be addressed. Mr. Moellendorf noted that while the new design did not have to mirror the architecture or style of The Boys and Girls Club, it should look complementary and have a semblance of continuity.

Commissioner Smolenski asked if this problem could have been avoided--architects should be aware of building codes. Mr. Moellendorf responded that early on in the initial discussion with The Boys and Girls Club, they talked of having the buildings joined together because it would efficiently make use of each other's facilities, such as the restrooms. But it was known there would be challenges with a co-joined building. Many options were considered in order to satisfy the IBC, from having a condominium type of set up, which they discovered was not allowed by NRS, and it came down to the only option being to have just one owner, which was ultimately not an option. That was the information given to the architect--"design one building and we'll make it work." "As we went down that path, we met dead ends." Commissioner Livermore added that the City was working off The Boys and Girls Club's special use permit and the building permit. Their existing plan included the gymnasium, "all we were going to do was build the gym with some additional features." When it was time to modify the special use permit, it was discovered that with two owners, they would run into the IBC issue. The Boys and Girls Club had an approved set of plans including the gym and there were no notations as to having a single owner only. Mr. Krahn remarked that because there was a tight budget, the fact that The Boys and Girls Club had prepared a structural pad for the gym would be a tremendous savings to the City to be able to use that. Also utilities were already on-site, another potential cost saving to the City by joining the buildings.

Commissioner Westergard opined that with this break in the original plan to join the buildings, and the necessity of redoing plans and so forth, perhaps now would be the time to look at the location for the new Indoor Recreation Center. He was not convinced that was the best place for a community center, although it was the best place for The Boys and Girls Club gym. That location is 1.3 miles from the Mills Park Community Center, and it seemed that in constructing a gym to be used by the whole community they should consider a location that would best serve that population. Cost of transportation should also be considered, he believed. Chair Curtis suggested that Mr. Westergard talk with staff to determine what they had looked at previously and what was available. After that, if he felt other locations might be preferable, she said the matter could be put on the agenda. Mr. Moellendorf said they had seen at least 15-19 sites, some were public properties, some private, even school sites. While he did not think it was the "perfect" site, it was somewhat centrally located and met most criteria. The City, he believed, probably needs more than one community center and may at some point in the future have another one or two. Mr. Moellendorf said that nevertheless he would be happy to meet with Mr. Westergard and go over other possibilities; in fact "if the commission as a whole would like to readdress the location issue we could bring it back to the table." Mr. McKenna asked to clarify why this was being taken to the Board of Supervisors if there had not been a vote on it? Mr. Livermore informed that it was being taken for a contract amendment, which means to him that there had been no change, the deal was going forward if the supervisors want it, "We're out of the loop completely and I'd like to stay out of the loop completely. We could discuss this. We could have a lot of fun with it. It's not the deal we heard, it's the deal that the supervisors want or don't want. It's out of this commission's bailiwick and I'm ready to move onto the next item."

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 6

Commissioner Adams felt the same as Mr. Westergard; he came into this at midpoint but had attended some of the workshops. Some of the things he saw had happened are being “voided now” with the new redesign because Public Works, the Building Department, and so on are involved, and there is more feedback from City staff to make sure the redesign is going to work for everybody. He believed they should continue on so the community can use it. Commissioner Keeton reminded that he had opposed this site since the start and would continue to dislike it, but if they can get it finished for \$92,000 they should go ahead, because “we wasted several million dollars waiting this long...” Commissioner Adams noted the supervisors had not yet voted on it, and this commission could ask Mr. Moellendorf to withdraw that item. Discussion ensued about the ability to do that...”no formal action can be taken at this meeting, etc.,” and what constituted a “formal action.” Chair Curtis said the commission had “the opportunity at any time to make a change, we have a Board of Supervisor member here, and if we all felt very strongly...Commissioner Livermore could help us.”

Commissioner Keeton said he was on the commission when the discussion on the ice skating rink in Mills Park began, “everyone was excited and it got pared down and changed and a decision was made to go ahead with it because of some of the same issues, and I think it was a mistake.” He said he was glad to “see it was getting used now and some groups were benefitting from it, but it is certainly not what the community envisioned.” He added that just because an investment had been made was not a reason to absolutely go forward if other factors had changed in the meantime. Commissioner Livermore recalled that in 1995 when Question 18 was put together, a gym was one of the major items on the ballot that people voted for. Over the past ten years discussions were held about the definition or vision for a gym or recreation center and, he believed, despite the challenges, this “was the best opportunity we have.” One of the board members at the time, he said, wanted us not to invest in buying land, instead we should get land given to us free. And that was what was happening here with The Boys and Girls Club location. We are being given the land for the value of their use of the gym next to it. This community has been waiting for years for an indoor recreation center, “and we are at a place where we can finally provide that.” To do otherwise, to start over again the process would take much too long. The projected date for completion of the Indoor Recreation Center is slated for June 2010; Commissioner Livermore felt the community has waited too long already.

Commissioner Livermore concluded that we have a good relationship with a user that can share the operational costs with us, the location is in a neighborhood of young families and others, and he could not see a better, more centralized location. The sites where the land was free could not be considered for a number of reasons; other sites might be available from BLM. However there were hard costs that came with them that made those choices untenable.

Chair Curtis asked Roger Moellendorf if he was going to bring the Joint Use Agreement to the next meeting. She also asked to look at the estimate for the cost of the building and the funds available. Mr. Krahn was uncertain whether estimates would be available by the September meeting, with the design revisions needed now, but possibly by the October meeting.

Commissioner Keeton wanted to be clear that because of the problems with the co-joined wall, he hoped someone had determined what the distance should be from the new center to The Boys and Girls Club. Mr.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 7

Krahn said he would be certain to get it right this time.

Commissioner Livermore noted that meeting only once a month in December, June, July and August severely limited the Commission's ability to review projects in a timely manner. Perhaps there was a need to call special meetings. There was no discussion.

5. ACTION ITEMS:

5-A. ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FISCAL YEAR 2008 / 2009 PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT BUDGET (6:21:34) - Mr. Moellendorf provided background on how the capital projects were formulated. Basically, "it's part of a carry-over from the previous year's budget. There is no special revenue funding mechanism to develop our capital project outside of the savings we create through the City. Like last year, it appears this will be another tight fiscal year." It is unknown how much money will be available, however, it is rumored it may be close to \$2 million; that would be twice as much as last year. Much of that money is based upon the budget reductions that his department and all the departments in the City made through the course of the year to come up with an ending fund balance. Nevertheless, the capital improvement budget will be tight. Mr. Moellendorf believed they have come up with an aggressive CIP Request to the Parks and Recreation Commission that will bring it to the Internal Finance Budget Committee as well. Eventually it will reach the Board of Supervisors. There are no illusions that all of the items will be funded. The total request is more than \$3.5 million, however, that was a statement in the short term of how they saw their needs.

Mr. Moellendorf described, as stated on Exhibit A, a list of all the capital improvement projects being brought forward. They were divided into two broad categories: Minor Capital Improvement Fund Project, and Major Capital Improvement Fund Project. The "Minors" are projects less than \$15,000, and the "Majors" are \$15,000 and over. They are segmented and segregated into Parks and Recreation. The emphasis this year was the same as in the last two years: the funding will probably go first toward what are typically ongoing maintenance items. Exhibit A, "Parks Equipment Replacement and Repair" was an ongoing request every year, to repair and replace equipment that is used in the daily operations in the Parks Division, such as mowers, playground equipment, and so forth. A similar request is made every year in Buildings for the replacement of parts in buildings and equipment. There is an ongoing Maintenance request yearly in the replacement of roofs in City-owned facilities. Funding those items first does not leave much money for anything extra. When that left over amount was divided among all the departments in all the divisions in the City, it means very little for any one place. Staff will make individual presentations and they have been asked to rank those items. Mr. Moellendorf invited the Commission to make their own ranking, if desired, and he will take that to the Internal Finance Budget Committee as well.

Chair Curtis asked about the rankings of items. She wanted to be able to distinguish between the more urgent and less urgent items. Mr. Moellendorf stated the "A" items were very important, dire needs. He suggested that if the Chair wanted to rank then it be done by the segments and not as compared to each other. Commissioner Livermore suggested that there was money for some of the items listed--such as the theater. The theater has had money held somewhere for at least five years; why not complete that with the

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 8

existing money? Mr. Moellendorf said that would be explained by Mitch Ames when he discussed the theater improvements. Mr. Moellendorf also stated that the parking lot was very important for this facility. Surveys show that to be the number one complaint, however, no one was advocating spending \$1.2 million on this project, instead simply bringing it up again to show there is a need there. He believed they had “a more common sense approach” to solving the parking situation.

Mitch Ames, Facility Manager, Carson City Community Center, reported that when they looked at the rankings they looked at the facility as a whole, not just the theater. The largest complaint from all users is parking. That parking area serves more than just the Community Center Building. There is the Aquatic Facility, Community Park, and so on. The number shown was the original design number going back quite a few years with inflation. One should take a look at that number and consider the possibility of entertaining a cooperative parking agreement with the facility across the road. The last time such an agreement was considered, all the facility owner asked for was sealing the parking lot once a year and doing snow removal. Mr. Ames felt that a cooperative agreement with a nearby facility was the best strategy for the parking needs. Mr. Moellendorf said parking was included because it was recognized as a problem. He was not going to bring a \$1.2 million project to the board. Mr. Livermore interjected that there was not much chance with a project that size. What was needed was to find another way to pay for this. Mr. Ames said the intent with this CIP request was to give a “snapshot of our needs,” as seen at this time. Commissioner Livermore was adamant that the likelihood of getting the necessary funding was slim and that there had to be another way of doing it. Mr. Ames said there was another option that needed to be explored and he was actively working with Public Works on that, i.e., the shared parking lot.

Mr. Ames reported that the cost to finish the theater was \$726,757. That figure included the orchestra pit, the gallery, and so on, all components from the study undertaken in 2000 when Question 18 was passed. Inflation from 2000 to 2008-2009 “eats up original budget figures.” Commissioner Livermore questioned the money that was still available--“Question 18 money, construction tax money, was sitting there.” Mr. Ames said there was about \$54,000 for the seats remaining from those dollars; there was also fixture money from CIP (a separate project from this but which was included). Chair Curtis asked about the sound system, which Mr. Ames reported was not included because that was a “replacement years down the road, after the present work would be completed.” The sound system was “end of life” and not included. Mr. Livermore next asked about the orchestra pit--only used “A dozen times a year.” Mr. Ames responded that the pit was not simply a “flat cover.” It was a multipurpose pit cover that can be flat, up at the level it is now, and it could be “staircased-down” for choirs and so forth. More discussion took place regarding the money remaining in the seating funding account, which Mr. Ames stated was \$53,994.

Furthermore, Mr. Ames stated, there was a contingency of the existing project of about \$40,000 and one issue that was waiting to be resolved, whether it was material or a design issue was unclear, however it had been noticed under warranty and the architect was looking at it. Mr. Moellendorf noted that the discussion underway could be confusing. To clarify he stated that Mr. Ames was in the process of completing a project (the dimmer project); money had been carried over several years to do that. He felt that could be some of the money Mr. Livermore was thinking of in addition to the seating, but they were two separate projects.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 9

Regarding the improvements to the theater, Mr. Ames continued, while they could be done individually it would not make sense; they might find themselves in a position once the new seats were installed, to make acoustic ceiling or lighting improvements and then have to cover the seats. Mr. Livermore asked why the money that was lost for the seats could not simply be restored. Mr. Ames said it could but that was not enough to complete the entire project.

More discussion ensued about rankings. Briefly, Mr. Ames said the bleachers were a smaller cost but a greater number of people used the gymnasium. There was not adequate seating. Next, the architectural engineering and design of the ADA restroom; at present there was no ADA restroom which put the City in violation. As to the scoreboard replacement, that was a “massive economic engine.” Mr. Livermore felt finding sponsors was the answer (as was done at Governors Field). Next was the parking, which was the biggest complaint and greatest need, and finally, the theater.

Chair Curtis asked about a playground on the westside. Mr. Ames responded that the architectural engineering for the ADA restroom design included an adaptive playground. There were a number of programs currently operating but there were other children who needed a safe place to play and that enhanced the P&R’s Child Enrichment Program; he envisioned something similar to Centennial. The goal, he said, was to look “long term and inclusive.” Further, if the cooperative parking arrangement could be worked out, they would like to see the playground next to the Tahoe Room, which among other benefits was close to the Child Enrichment Programs.

Commissioner McKenna stated he had no problem with the plan except for the Riverview Park exercise course, for which he could see no components remaining, thus the question, why bother putting it back in because it would only be destroyed? He did not want to put any more money in Riverview Park until it could be safe. He next asked about the community center reader board--which could not be funded by off-site advertising sales as it was against City code. Why not change the code? Lengthy discussion ensued: it had been attempted before however they really did not want that kind of advertising (beer, etc), and if they made a change for Parks and Recreation then others would want it done. An individual from California in the sign business had offered to build an electronic reader board in exchange for the advertising fees, but it had to be declined because of the ordinance. Chair Curtis asked if Parks and Recreation could use the sign at Bodine’s in conjunction with the fairgrounds. Mr. Moellendorf said “yes,” and if they wanted to advertise Pepsi or whatever, they could do on-site advertising for the casino as well as advertise Parks and Recreation events at the fairgrounds because they partnered with us in the building of the facility.

Commissioner Westergard returned to the Ross Gold Park-water feature issue. It seemed futile to him to insist on a water feature which would always have inherent problems. Mr. Moellendorf opined that when the pond was developed the piping system was adequate, which it no longer is. Now there are “dirty water heads, valves, better filtration systems, etc.” He believed technology had advanced to the point where improvements could be made to get the pond operating properly. If the pond were simply eliminated, there would be an unsightly sinkhole in its place that would require capital expenditure to correct. The discussion had merit because perhaps it should be determined at some point if the pond were an asset to the park and to that part of town if the filtering system was improved, or if it was more of a liability should

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 10

it be removed completely. Chair Curtis felt that since the engineers believed they could remedy the problem, it should be tried because many people do use and enjoy that park.

Commissioner Livermore made a motion that the Ross Gold Park irrigation pump system be moved to the number one priority of the Parks and Recreation major project list. More discussion ensued wherein Chair Curtis wanted to approve with any other exceptions or changes. Ms. Curtis commented on the bleachers, stating that in a Sonoma County program individuals made contributions in exchange for having their name on a bleacher seat and the bleachers were paid for accordingly. Perhaps something similar could be launched here and pay for all or a portion of the expense. She also asked if Ross Gold were moved to the top would that affect what would happen in the next segment?

Commissioner McKenna wanted to send the item forward with no ranking and see what happened. Commissioner Smolenski agreed with Mr. McKenna, felt this was basically a “wish list” and depending upon the amount of funding available that would be the time to prioritize. Meanwhile, just send it forward and see what happened. Commissioner Livermore withdrew his motion. Mr. Moellendorf wanted to be clear that he was not going to ask the Internal Finance Committee for \$1.2 million for a parking lot on the side of the building. He would be addressing that we have a “parking concern.” Mr. Westergard felt it was important to let them know just what was needed.

Commissioner Smolenski moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors the proposed fiscal year 2008-2009 Parks and Recreation Department’s Capital Improvement Project Budget. Motion seconded by Commissioner Westergard. Before the vote, more discussion whether it would be more appropriate to go directly before the Internal Finance Committee. Attorney Joel Benton said it could be sent to either one. Mr. Livermore stated that his struggle with the Internal Finance Committee was that the Board never got to see them; when it comes out of Internal Finance it was already decided and done. He said he had challenged that previously in order to re-prioritize but City staff goes along with Internal Finance so there was no chance to change it. Chair Curtis wanted to send it directly to the Board of Supervisors so they could see the list. Mr. Livermore informed that previously there was a joint meeting between this board and the Board of Supervisors to discuss the Parks and Recreation needs and budget. The Board’s job was to be budget overseer, the advocates were the Parks and Recreation people, they were the consumers of the community represented here. There was no longer that opportunity. Internal Finance Committee now did that. Mr. Westergard agreed with Attorney Benton, there was nothing that precluded the Commission from making a recommendation. **The vote was taken, motion carried unanimously.**

5-B. ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FINDINGS OF A BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE PROPOSED BOB BOLDRICK THEATER FEES. Mr. Moellendorf read a portion of the staff report. He stated no one was present at the hearing, no one commented at the meeting, however, there was a letter submitted by a nonprofit user. Mr. Moellendorf requested the Parks and Recreation Commission to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to accept the findings of the Business Impact Statement. He realized that whenever fees were set it did create some type of impact on those businesses, however without comment from any of those business it was unknown to what degree or how severe the impact might be. The packet included Exhibit A, the notice of public hearing, Exhibit B was the Business Impact Statement, noting the eleven

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 11

businesses to whom the notice was sent. Exhibit C was a Petition Objecting to the Adoption of the Rule, and Exhibit D was an example of the letter that was sent to Ms. Ronni Hannaman, the Executive Director of the Carson City Chamber of Commerce.

Chair Curtis commented that in looking at the communication received, and at his statements in the Impact Statement, in the future the responses could be a “little more vigorous,” in the sense that the writer’s concern was over “inflation” and “declining attendance.” If the attendance goes down they can no longer afford to produce events. Maybe there could be more discussion or comments about what could be done to help them; maybe they could help each other, something they could do on their end to reduce costs. Perhaps the purpose of the Business Impact Statement would be to try to reduce the impact rather than stating there was going to be one. Mr. Moellendorf said he may have confused the issue by having that letter inserted in the staff report, in that the letter was from a nonprofit, not a business.

There was some discussion about the purpose of the Business Impact Statement and to what degree we were impacting the business, and was it to the degree of being completely detrimental or was it a minor impact. With no response coming from the businesses we did not know. Mr. Benton commented that the purpose of the Business Impact Statement is to allow businesses to say “this is how we will be impacted by any increase in your fee,” and the findings are then used when setting the fee. Mr. Moellendorf stated they had not done business impact statements previously because fees were not set through ordinance, but through resolution. Mr. Benton said that in essence they were setting a fee by ordinance; setting the actual dollar amount to staff, but the fee itself is created by an ordinance. Essentially they had delegated the actual setting of the dollar amount of the fee to staff, but the ordinance itself creates the authority for staff to set that fee. **Commissioner Westergard motioned to the Board of Supervisors the finding of a Business Impact Statement Public Hearing regarding the proposed Bob Boldrick Theater fees. Seconded by Commissioner Smolenski. The motion carried unanimously.**

Commissioner Livermore commented regarding the fees that Mitch Ames had presented and how they were applied. The policy he deals with was the recovery of ongoing costs. There were three different percentiles of recovery: at Fuji Park, 25 percent of direct cost were collected. At the swimming pool, 50 percent of direct costs were collected. For the theater, 100 percent recovery, with a 25 percent discount for nonprofits. He found that inequitable; people who use the theater were “paying through the nose.” The new Arts and Culture Commission will undoubtedly have that issue as one of its challenges.

5-C (5:17:10) ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PROPOSED FEES FOR THE BOB BOLDRICK THEATER. Mr. Moellendorf recalled that the fees were brought before the Board on March 4, 2008, for discussion only, because it was still a work in progress and he wanted a sense that they were moving in the right direction. Since that time he had met with some music groups and with the Carson City Arts and Cultural Coalition and went over the fees with them. Now that the Business Impact Statement had been done he wanted to bring forward the fees. Mr. Moellendorf agreed there was some discrepancy in the resolution. The resolution stated “recover a minimum of 25 percent for park usage.” He felt it would be wise to look at that portion of it again to see if we needed to make that more consistent with our other fees

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 12

Mr. Moellendorf went over the fees developed in compliance with the Resolution 2007-R-28, which were set to recover a minimum of 100 percent of the direct costs. "The main tenants fees were (1) the fees were calculated on an hourly basis and the minimum hours booked per day would be four hours; (2) a performance fee would be assessed for all performances; (3) a dark day fee would be assessed for days encumbered by the renter which did not have either rehearsals or performances." As mentioned earlier, the fee schedule "also includes a 25 percent discount for nonprofit resident users. All renters receiving a nonprofit resident discount would be required to include the Bob Boldrick Theater logo on all event advertising and promotional materials, and a technical support fee schedule would be provided which allowed for fees which would cover a wide range of technical assistance requests from the renter."

Mr. Ames gave a PowerPoint presentation, providing definitions of some things which had not been given earlier. Performance was defined as an "advertised program of up to four hours or a change of audience. The performance begins at the advertised time or when the auditorium doors open to the public, whichever occurs first. Charges for technical labor would be calculated per technician and require a minimum of eight hours per day. The reason being that when someone is called in at the request of the user group, that individual's day is being taken--they cannot work elsewhere in a technical capacity. Specialized equipment--fog machine, bubble machine, etc., would continue to be billed on a daily basis. That was the highest fee paid--75 percent above direct cost. Parks and Recreation do not retain that money; it goes back to the City who initially put that money out to purchase the equipment. Also there was always a requirement for two technicians: a technical supervisor and a house manager. The performance fee nonresident profit, it is the highest fee, which includes consumables--toilet paper, cleaning supplies, staffing, and so on.

Commissioner Livermore interjected that he knew of nothing in the ordinance that allowed for nonresident nonprofit. There should only be three fees: nonprofits, residents, and nonresidents. Mr. Ames said it was a "nonresident profit." Asked why the separation between the two, Mr. Ames explained the 25 percent additional for the nonresident.

Mr. Ames went on to explain the theater seating count: 790 was the current maximum. The base hourly cost per seat sold was 22 cents. At one-third of the house (263) sold, the base cost was 65 cents. If for a performance, twelve-hour total booking, four operators provided by Parks and Recreation at 12 hours each, at 790, the cost per seat would be \$5.46; and at 263, the cost per seat would be \$16.40. To offset those costs, a group could get its attendance numbers up, reduce costs by not having technical staff and instead use volunteers (which Mr. Ames would train). Further, the total number of rehearsal hours could be reduced. Thus it is within the control of the group to [stay within] the minimum of four hours. It did depend upon the group and what show was being produced. Mr. Ames said they considered a plan whereby Parks and Recreation could share in the costs and in the revenue of the productions, however, it was not well received.

Chair Curtis asked if Mr. Ames knew what kind of revenue had been gained from this on an annual basis. He responded it was somewhat difficult to say, however, it was possibly around \$10,000 to \$15,000.

Commissioner Livermore remarked that the when the proposal came out, "there were some emails from

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 13

Stephanie Aragotti, at WNC, who said her fees were almost doubled. She said that to put on a production here would cost her between \$9,000 and \$11,000 which might put her out of business. She was looking to move some productions held here previously to Winnamucca Hall (WNC) and also going to Fallon. Commissioner McKenna asked if we were required by ordinance to do this, or was it for different reasons. Mr. Moellendorf stated that Resolution 2007-R-28 provided that we recover 100 percent of direct costs. The City, not Parks and Recreation, were the ones forcing the people out of the theater. He stated further that Parks and Recreation really did not recover 100 percent because they gave a 25 percent discount to nonprofit residents which represented approximately 80 percent of the renters.

Mr. McKenna said the Commission's charge from the Board of Supervisors was to pass fees that recovered 100 percent of direct costs. Undoubtedly those were the minimum fees that could be charged, they could not be lowered, so what was the purpose of discussing them? Mr. Ames said the original resolution to the Board gave guidelines, percentages of cost recovery, and the idea was that as long as the guidelines were adhered to they would not have to revisit the fees again. The reason they were bringing the fees back to the Commission was because they have changed radically to be in compliance with the resolution. He said further the fees had been compared to others such as Brewery Arts Center, the theater in Fallon and so on, and "our fees were less."

Mr. Livermore complimented Mr. Ames for doing an outstanding job in trying to make a revenue center of the theater. Unfortunately, the revenue did not go back to the theater but to the general fund then he has to compete for it later on with all the other departments. They had looked into putting a \$1 surcharge on every ticket sold, but that met with resistance from the theater groups. Mr. Ames allowed the groups to run their own concessions as a means for them to gain income. Most theaters would not do that. Mr. Westergard also said he appreciated all the work Mr. Ames had put into the theater; he had tried to "make sure that people paid for what they were using, and make it equitable." Mr. Ames said he had a great staff that worked well together, "from custodians to Preston Dunn, technical director, to Carol Peterson, house manager."

Dave Morgan commented there was a "disconnect" between what Mitch Ames was trying to do and what the Commission was trying to do. The "higher end" productions put out a quality product that brought people from as far as Sacramento. Due to the costs for orchestras, copyrights, royalties and performance fees, and so on, they were already "right up against it." Those groups really needed a "cheap place to put it on or they are upside down." Perhaps, he suggested, "a specialty case negotiation". He added, there were economic benefits to the City from these productions the same way there had been from tournament softball and soccer. "If there was some overall economic benefit to having an incredibly high quality production that cannot be found in Reno, and is offered infrequently in Sacramento, if that is a part of what we want to do, and part of the general welfare of our city...there might be some way to get up on these negotiations."

Chair Curtis expressed understanding of that position, however, she felt staff had gone "overboard" trying to get people here and get their feelings, and as far as she could tell they could live with what was being done. During the year ahead perhaps there would be some fallout with fewer people wanting to use the theater; it remained to be seen. **Commissioner Keeton moved to recommend to the Board of**

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 14

Supervisors approval of proposed fees for the Bob Boldrick Theater. Commissioner Smolenski seconded the motion. The vote was taken; the motion passed unanimously.

5-D. DISCUSSION WITH POSSIBLE ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FINDINGS OF A BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE PROPOSED CARSON CITY FAIRGROUND FEES. (7:45:57) There was no discussion and Chair Curtis reported that no one had come forward at the public hearing to protest. **Commissioner McKenna moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors the findings of a Business Impact Statement public hearing regarding the proposed Carson City Fairground fees. Seconded by Commissioner Smolenski. The vote was taken and the motion unanimously.**

5-E. ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS A PROCEDURE FOR THE HOSTING AND CONDUCTING OF PUBLIC HEARINGS. Chair Curtis noted that the reason this was before the Commission was because she and Commissioner Livermore had been concerned that when the Business Impact Statement public hearing occurred, there was an ordinance that the Commission was to be involved with the fees and that if there were to be public hearings there should be some definite role for the Parks and Recreation Commission. She added that Mr. Moellendorf had done a good job of outlining how those roles might work; they had a meeting to go over the process and all were in agreement there was a role for the Parks and Recreation Commission. If people were concerned and felt there would be an impact, whether as a business or private individual, they should feel there was an opportunity to express that concern. She commented further that in the April-May Staff Report, when the staff completed a business impact statement and conducted a public hearing, if required, in that notice could they announce the date when the Parks and Recreation would hold that hearing? That way, she said, if they could not attend the hearing they might be able to attend the commission meeting. Mr. Moellendorf agreed they could add a statement that the fees would also be publicly discussed at the Parks and Recreation meeting date. **A motion was made by Commissioner McKenna to recommend to the Board of Supervisors a procedure for the hosting and conducting of public hearings. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Keaton. The vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.(7:50:11)**

6. MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION (7:50:11). Chair Curtis announced she had received the Open Space Advisory Committee's agenda for the previous night. They spoke about an agreement with WNC for trails linked in the Ash Canyon area. Also for trail design for the Moffett Open Space Property. Since the Parks and Recreation Commission was also involved in trails it should be known there was action to have a methodology for the development of an "Open Space Economic Study" for Carson City. Further, there was a status report on Wildlife Habitat Improvement Project for Kings Canyon. Another item of particular interest to Chair Curtis was the status report regarding the Carson City Lands Bill. She requested that item be placed on the Parks and Recreation agenda. Mr. Moellendorf said that would be done. Finally, she noted a discussion had taken place regarding the off-road vehicle articles in the newspaper. Mr. Moellendorf reported that had been generated by a member of the Open Space Advisory Committee. An article had appeared regarding the use and misuse of OHV vehicles in the state and the movement to try to radically control those type of vehicles and the member simply wanted to have that article presented in the agenda.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Meeting

Page 15

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS Chair Curtis asked to have an update on Question 1. There was a chart about their Open Space Property. Check the status particularly on any projects affecting Parks and Recreation. Also, to include a cost and funding update on the recreation center in October.

8. (7:53:33) ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT. Commissioner Keaton moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Smolenski and carried unanimously. Meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

The Minutes of the August 19, 2008 Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission meeting are so approved this 2nd of September, 2008.

DONNA J. CURTIS, Chair