Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Meeting Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 16, 2009 in the Carson City Senior Citizens Center Tahoe Room, 911 Beverly Drive, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Donna Curtis

Vice Chairperson James Smolenski Commissioner Charles Adams Commissioner Lynette Conrad Commissioner Tom Keeton Commissioner Steve Lasco Commissioner Sean Lehmann Commissioner Pete Livermore

STAFF: Mitch Ames, Facility Operations Supervisor, Community Center

Scott Fahrenbruch, Parks and Recreation Director of Operations

Vern Krahn, Park Planner

Roger Moellendorf, Parks and Recreation Department Director

Lee Plemel, Planning Director Nick Providenti, Finance Director

Thoran Towler, Deputy District Attorney Jano Barnhurst, 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. These materials are on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and available for review during regular business hours.

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM (1-0024) - Chairperson Curtis called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Commissioners Conrad and Lasco arrived after roll call. Commissioners Walt and Westergard were absent. Chairperson Curtis advised that the meeting is being taped rather than shown live as it is being held in the Senior Center.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS (1-0046) - None.

- 1. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES (1-0049) Commissioner Lehmann moved to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2009 meeting as presented. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-2.
- **2. MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA** (1-0074) Chairperson Curtis advised that Item 3-B will be heard first followed by Item 3-A.
- 3. STAFF UPDATES DISCUSSION ONLY NO DELIBERATION
- **3-A.** MORGAN MILL ROAD RIVER ACCESS AREA PROJECT AND CARSON RIVER PARK PHASE 2 PROJECT (1-0210) Mr. Krahn gave a staff report and advised they are awaiting the letter of permission from the Corps of Engineers which was promised two weeks earlier and is affecting the project timeline. The project is a couple of weeks behind and he anticipated beginning construction in

Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Meeting Page 2

early August and completing it this year, but nothing can be done until permission is received from the Corps. They have been checking with the Corps on a weekly basis and will keep the PRC updated as it moves forward.

Mr. Krahn advised that planning and construction of Carson River Park Phase 2 is on hold as maintenance staffing levels are still down. Bringing a new facility on line doesn't make sense as the Department can barely take care of its current responsibilities. Planning will be done over the Winter with the hope of beginning construction next Spring or Summer. In response to a question, he replied that the delay will become an issue sooner rather than later. Question 1 (Q-1) will be presented to the Q-1 staff for their reaction. The project is being delayed, not terminated.

3-B. MEXICAN DITCH TRAIL BRIDGES PROJECT RIBBON CUTTING CEREMONY AND 5K RUN AND FAMILY FUN WALK SCHEDULED FOR SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 2009 (1-0082) - Mr. Krahn gave a staff report and said it was a great event. He narrated slides and advised that approximately 100 people attended. He acknowledged Fleet Feet Sports who helped organize the event. Anne MacQuarie and Cynthia Terchek received acknowledgment plaques for their assistance on the bridge. Members of the Open Space Advisory Committee unveiled a bronze plaque that was presented. Those donating time and effort include: Applied Engineering Consultants, American Society of Civil Engineers Capital Branch, Carson City's Quality of Life Initiative, Lumos and Associates, Muscle Powered Citizens for a Bikeable and Walkable Community, Nevada State Lands Conservation and Resource Protection Program and State Parks through the Recreational Trails Program. The project was built by Atlas Contractors Inc., and completed in February 2009. Walmart provided refreshments after the race. Winning time of the Fun Run was 18.26.

3-C. REDEDICATION OF TREADWAY PARK ON SATURDAY, JULY 4, 2009 (1-0274) - Mr. Fahrenbruch gave a staff report and advised that a working group was formed to discuss the rededication ceremony for the park. Representatives from the Carson City Historical Society, staff, Chairperson Curtis and Commissioner Livermore are planning the ceremony for July 4 from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. It will include a park sign dedication, an unveiling of a boulder with a plaque, barbecue, speakers, stage, picnic tables, and music. People will be dressed in period costumes and giving presentations. Fred and Maxine Nietz are helping organize the event. Special invitations will be sent to the PRC and other boards and committees. Chairperson Curtis advised that it's free of charge and the public is invited but there may be a small fee for food. Commissioner Livermore gave some historical information on Arnold Treadway and advised that a proclamation will be read by Mayor Crowell in recognition of Carson City's oldest park. A time capsule may be included with the plaque.

4. NON-ACTION ITEMS - DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATION ONLY

4-A. <u>DISCUSSION ONLY</u> AND PRESENTATION REGARDING THE CARSON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE'S SIGN ORDINANCE AS IT RELATES TO OFF-PREMISES ADVERTISING (1-0399) - Chairperson Curtis advised that this item was a goal created at the strategic planning session on March 21. Commissioner Livermore commented that he was approached by a sign company vendor for a digital sign arrangement at the Community Center. Part of the sign would have included off premises advertising which nixed the deal. The sign ordinance in existence today doesn't exempt anyone and the deal died for lack of support.

Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Meeting Page 3

Mr. Plemel directed the PRC's attention to the Off-Premises Sign Regulations included in the agenda materials and incorporated into the record. He explained that the regulations regarding off premises signs define them as advertising commercial goods and services not related to the property and gave a brief history of the proliferation of billboards in Carson City. Marketing events for Carson City and civic events not taking place at the Community Center are different than a commercial message and are treated differently. Ordinances can be amended but there are location requirements around the City. Regarding the Community Center, it only applies to signs visible from the street and right of way. There are still opportunities to sell advertising space for events indoors and current code does not prohibit businesses that want to put things on inside walls. LED technology poses a new enforcement issue of the ability to change the copy and advertise different things. A property owner has to initiate an application to amend the code. There's no exemption of fees for City departments, but the Board of Supervisors (BOS) can initiate one without charge.

In response to a question about obtaining a variance, Mr. Plemel replied that it would be varying a lot of different aspects of the code regarding the location and distance from redevelopment and suggested exploring it further as an ordinance change. Commissioner Livermore cautioned that an issue is created when the City applies for a special exemption. The private sector takes exception to the City creating things for itself which then creates a wave of other applications that will be difficult to deny. He prefers to go slow and see what private industry brings. Mr. Plemel commented that the changing of copy on offpremises signs is currently prohibited. In response to a question, he replied that there are exemptions in the code for advertising civic events as they are not a commercial message but of a 'civic' nature. A sign doesn't have to be in any particular location to advertise civic events. Mr. Moellendorf commented that getting a private company willing to invest in a sign and sell advertising to the City in which it advertises events and receives a percentage of the advertising revenue would be good for the City. The City must be sure that it's done correctly to prevent a proliferation of signs. It may not be possible to have this type of sign unless the City can afford to fund it. Commissioner Lehmann commented that out of goodwill, a business could buy a sign, but not advertise and it wouldn't be an issue. Commissioner Livermore commented that the sign vendor suggested a reader board sign with the City's events and every fourth or fifth sign would be a business ad.

In response to a question, Mr. Ames replied that they have never been able to find someone willing to put just their logo on a sign. There was interest in advertising, and they looked for funding but encountered this same problem. One concept was to use it as a movie night screen as well as advertising but cost estimates came in at \$200,000. Breaking it down into eight investors with each getting an advertising share for five years would pay for a sign and its programming. The community would benefit by the events at the Community Center and the City could use it for public service announcements. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel replied that a company's logo on a sign would be considered off site advertising. Commissioner Lasco envisioned a sign, "Carson City brought to you by . . ." Mr. Plemel responded that that may be a possibility if it's the name of a building. He cautioned that a sign having numerous businesses may be considered off-premises advertising. In response to a question, Mr. Ames replied that the sign he envisioned would be able to turn and use the square footage in front. Commissioner Livermore opined that the City should be setting an example by upholding the rules instead of trying to circumvent them. He reiterated letting private business take its course regarding modifying the sign ordinance. Even if the ordinance was changed, the City doesn't have the funds to invest in this type of sign. Commissioner Lehmann suggested approaching the Fandango or Nugget to see if they would allow the City to advertise on their signs out of community goodwill. Mr. Moellendorf added that part of the agreement with Bodine's

Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Meeting Page 4

is they will advertise fairground events on their reader board sign but no other businesses have been approached. Chairperson Curtis reviewed the objectives discussed: seeing what the private sector does regarding new technology; approaching businesses with signs to see if they would advertise City events; and the Planning Department will check into legal issues. Commissioner Conrad agreed that it's a lot of money and would rather have the money go into an actual park than a sign. Commissioner Lehmann suggested somehow acknowledging the businesses who allow the City to advertise on their signs. Vice Chairperson Smolenski said he will talk to the Fandango. Chairperson Curtis asked for a report back in three months.

4-B <u>DISCUSSION ONLY</u> REGARDING THE STATUS OF QUALITY OF LIFE (QUESTION 18) RECREATION BONDS AND PROJECTS (1-0979) - Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the staff report which is incorporated into the record and advised that planning and development of the Indoor Recreation Center (IRC) is suspended until the economy improves so it can be funded through an additional bond. He said that \$6.3 million is set aside for the IRC and estimated that it will cost between \$10-\$12 million depending on alternatives included in the project. Bonding capacity has diminished due to falling sales tax revenues and is below \$2 million and it's also difficult to cover 100 percent of the IRC's operating costs. Exhibit A in the agenda packet shows the debt repayment schedule for the bonds: the 1998 bond for the aquatics facility and the 2005 IRC bond. From 2009-2018, the bonds average payments of \$645,615. In 2018-2019, the 1998 bond will be paid off but costs for financing the bonds will not be reduced as payments on the 2005 bond will be accelerated. In 2019-2020, the City will be paying a projected \$644,266 in bond payments.

Mr. Providenti explained that in 2005, the City tried to maximize the amount of money it could get by coordinating the types of bonds it had in order to borrow more money by doing this type of payment schedule. In response to a question, he replied that the payments can't be changed unless the bonds are refinanced. The bonds have a ten year call provision and can't be refinanced early. An advance refunding puts the money into an escrow account, but the principal and interest on the bonds have to be paid until 2015. Putting money in an escrow account earns less than one percent, yet the pay out is five percent. It can be put in escrow or used for other projects if it wasn't borrowed specifically for this project. Another option is buying back the bonds in secondary markets, which is expensive and not feasible. In response to a question, he replied that in two to three years, the City will be able to get more money, but it depends on the economy. The City can't afford to pay much of anything back based on sales tax numbers but in three or four years when the economy comes back, it can afford to pay more.

Mr. Moellendorf recommended sitting on the project for a year or two as the ability to bond additional funds may become more favorable if the economy turns around. There is \$6.3 million that can be used for other purposes but cautioned about dipping into that funding because it's uncertain how long it will take to replenish it. In response to a question, he replied that it's the ideal time to build and there's lots of competition, but financing isn't available to take advantage of that situation nor are there ongoing funds. To adequately fund the facility's operations, the plan and design would have to be drastically changed. Add alternatives have been built into the design but the stand alone portion won't work with a phasing aspect because of the facility's design which is due largely to the openness of the walking/running track above the gymnasium. The auxiliary gym is part of the openness of the design and not an option to explore at this time. It's more expensive to phase in those types of projects because of remobilization costs and costs of going out to bid. In response to a comment, he replied that the design of the facility is dictated by the central gym which has a given ceiling height for clearance. Around the gymnasium and just below

Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Meeting Page 5

ceiling height, is the second floor which includes the running track and fitness area. Volleyball and basketball need the given height of the gym. Hanging a suspended walking track after the shell is built would be very expensive. One of the reasons why it has evolved from a simple gym to an IRC is that they included a revenue generating potential, the largest of which is the fitness area. Without that portion completed, it would increase the cost of operations and subsidy to the building.

Mr. Krahn commented that if the partnership between the City and BGC goes well, the City will have the option on the property and won't have to look for another site. The design will be completed so at the right time, the City can react quickly to put it out to bid. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf replied that they considered putting it out to bid to learn the cost of the facility but that creates ethical and legal issues. Contractors spend a lot of time and money preparing their bids which could create an issue forcing the City to pay the cost of preparing them. In response to another question, he replied that government bids require that everyone bid on the same thing. The City is dealing with taxpayers' funds and has to be as responsible as possible. He reiterated that the most responsible thing is to wait a year or two to see what the economy does and address the issue at that time. Six hundred thousand dollars is tied up in the design, planning and engineering of the facility and it isn't prudent to walk away from that investment but remain cautious in proceeding.

Chairperson Curtis expressed concern over the 2010 capital outlay tentative budget as she is trying to determine the partially funded unfinished projects. Mr. Providenti explained that the carry over of those amounts and the books won't close until August-September and the audited financial statements won't be received until November-December. In response to a question, he replied that money may have been budgeted because there was money available in 2009 but no new money is budgeted. Each department is assumed to spend all their money each year otherwise it's carried forward to the next year and there was probably nothing left for capital projects. In response to another question, he replied that the money is there but won't know until the end of the fiscal year then it will be carried over to 2010. In response to another question, he replied that he could generate a report showing how much has been spent and how much has been budgeted. Mr. Moellendorf commented that when the books are closed, unspent money is carried over in each project which is the infusion of Q-18 revenue. In response to a comment, Mr. Providenti replied that there apparently wasn't any money left over for 'undesignated projects' but that the 2010 numbers are budgeted. Commissioner Livermore commented that when a three percent sales tax increase is budgeted and an eight percent increase is realized, it is unanticipated revenue that rolls into other projects. Chairperson Curtis commented that there may be unanticipated expenditures and wages that get rolled over into 'undesignated projects'. Mr. Moellendorf explained that if all the money in Q-18 maintenance isn't spent, it can roll over into capital as well. For the last couple of years, undesignated carry overs have been moved into the IRC. In response to a comment, Mr. Moellendorf replied that not all of it has gone into the IRC, some has gone to trails and a dog park. Last year, the PRC recommended to the BOS that the budget be approved. Chairperson Curtis said it was because there were numbers in 'capital outlay', this year it's zero, and wants to know where left over money is going. Mr. Providenti advised that for 2010, based on projected sales tax revenues, there is no money for 'undesignated projects', and it's all accounted for in salaries, wages, services, supplies, BGC and the debt service; there is no new money. Chairperson Curtis wants the 'undesignated projects' line item to stay in as it's very important.

Chairperson Curtis brought up the subject of Internal Service Charges (ISC). She sees the PRC and Open Space Advisory Committee (OSAC) as guardians of Q-18 funds and it's very important to keep track of where the money goes. In reviewing OSAC's budget minutes, she noted that they wanted to be more

Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Meeting Page 6

proactive in bringing new budget initiatives to their attention early in the process. They asked to review the budget reports at each meeting which she would like to do as well. Mr. Moellendorf explained that budgets are estimates and if projections on sales tax revenues are conservative and higher than budgeted, there will be more money in these funds. In the last couple of years it was estimated that money would be left over which could be in 'undesignated funds'. Staff moved it into other projects such as the dog park, funding trails and the IRC. He reiterated that when it was moved into those areas, the PRC recommended to the BOS that the budget be approved. In response to a question, Mr. Providenti replied that there will probably be funds left over from fiscal year 2009 projects that haven't been spent which will be carried over and the PRC can decide whether to finish them or reallocate the money elsewhere. He added that he will know the numbers by November and augment the budget in December at which time the PRC can review them. Chairperson Curtis stated that the PRC will recommend what be done with it.

Mr. Moellendorf reminded the PRC that they are an advisory board that makes recommendations to the BOS who makes the final decisions. He stated that everyone wants to start the budget process earlier but a lot of information comes from the State which usually isn't received until later in the year. Money may not be available for augmentations this year. Chairperson Curtis reiterated that she wants the budget brought back when the zeroes are filled in. Mr. Providenti offered to get up-to-date figures anytime they want them. Commissioner Livermore advised that the source of that money since Q-18 was passed is the \$120,000 for the BGC. They were entitled to it since the bond passed because they didn't have a clubhouse. That money always rolled over into 'unanticipated projects'. Mr. Moellendorf advised that if the money hasn't been used for maintenance items, it has rolled over into 'capital projects'. In response to a question, Mr. Providenti replied that the \$6.3 million is secure unless it's allocated to another project. The debt service on the bond is about \$270,000 a year until 2020 when it will be \$644,000. Mr. Moellendorf advised that he had a copy of the current Q-18 fiscal year budget, in which most of the categories haven't had a lot of money spent so the numbers will show what may be carried over. Mr. Providenti instructed comparing the year-to-date actual to the budgeted figure and the difference will be carried forward. Mr. Moellendorf reported there was about \$6.3 million in the IRC; Centennial fields \$103,567; Beautification \$29,000; Community Center improvements -\$1,000; and will include it as a regular agenda FYI. Commissioner Livermore stated that Q-18 is a single source fund that ISC is coming out of and is diminishing the monies for ongoing and unfunded projects. Q-18 was a funding source for new parks and 20 percent was for operations of those parks - not staff's salaries - which is an issue to defend when the budget goes to the BOS.

4-C. <u>DISCUSSION ONLY</u> REGARDING A PROPOSAL REQUESTED BY AND SUBMITTED TO THE CARSON CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT FROM THE CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT TO PROVIDE TURF MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS TO SPECIFIC SCHOOL PROPERTIES (2-0144) - Mr. Fahrenbruch reported that the Carson City School District (CCSD) and Parks and Recreation staff met to discuss possible shared use and the current joint use agreement. They discussed expanding the idea and whether there is manpower and resources to share as Parks has a lot more grounds maintenance to offer than CCSD. They have three to four people maintaining all school grounds and building maintenance. He toured sites with Operations Manager Mark Korinek who advised that the CCSD wants to save money and free up staff for other things. Parks doesn't have a lot of manpower and resources to take care of what it has now so the idea is to develop a plan that benefits the taxpayer and the Parks system. One criteria is maintaining the large open turf areas. Parks did not want to maintain irrigation systems because many are antiquated requiring a lot of maintenance. He directed the PRC's attention to his proposal included in the agenda materials and

Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Meeting Page 7

incorporated into the record. He said that additional services would require additional costs. An immediate need is purchasing a large mower and the first annual \$15,000 payment would go towards that unit. The CCSD won't be paying the full price of the mower as in calculating the amount of maintenance, Parks will be working at their sites two to three days each week and their employees and equipment will be working in the Parks system the other two to three days which is a substantial savings for the CCSD. They will be able to do the same work they have been contracting out but also have the manpower and resources to work in the Parks system.

Mr. Fahrenbruch advised that the Carson City Youth Sports Association (YSA) also uses these turf areas for their practices which can be improved and brought up to the level they enjoy with the Parks system. There have been a lot of improvements to the turf in the open areas which will assure the YSA that the sites will receive the same level of maintenance as the parks and sports fields. There is an increased service level to the sports fields and a decrease in the passive areas. Mr. Towler is drafting an agreement and resolution which should go to the BOS for approval on July 2. The first year's proposed payment is \$78,429. The agreement also provides for cost adjustments due to price fluctuations and termination of the agreement with 30 days written notice. It also adjusts the 17.59 acres to approximately 18 acres and rounds the total up to \$78,500. CCSD is excited about the proposal. In response to a question, he replied that the high school has its own grounds crew and has been using contractors for the last few years. Grounds maintenance has been done in house which they want to continue. They've had contracts for all the turf areas Parks is proposing for the last few years. In response to a question, Mr. Towler replied that liability provisions are included in the agreement along with standard dual indemnity clauses and the tort cap provided to all Nevada entities. Commissioner Livermore expressed the belief that there may be other opportunities for further consolidation or services and this is a great opportunity for the community to be served at a much better level and cost. Mr. Fahrenbruch agreed that it will be lower costs for the taxpayers which will be offset by resources and monies provided by the CCSD. Chairperson Curtis expressed disappointment in not having the agreement to review. Mr. Moellendorf added that this could be the beginning of future collaborations between the City and the CCSD.

4-D. DISCUSSION ONLY AND REPORT FROM CHAIRPERSON CURTIS REGARDING INFORMATION ON THE PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES (2-0473) - Chairperson Curtis advised that the number of implementation measures is 60 which makes it easy to split between teams. The first team will address items 1-20, the second 21-40, and the third 41-60. She suggested meeting at the Parks' conference room so staff would be available to answer questions. In response to a question, Mr. Towler replied that anytime there is a committee or subcommittee that's going to advise, it has to be treated as an open meeting and be posted three working days before the meeting. Mr. Moellendorf advised that excerpts from the Master Plan have been assembled and read Section 1.4, Policies and Implementation Strategies, into the record. He said a challenge for the PRC is reviewing the implementation strategies and determining if they are policy or operational. An example of a decision making matrix was provided to help decide whether they're relevant, completed or urgent. Mr. Krahn reviewed and explained the Status Matrix and suggested prioritizing 'in progress' strategies in another matrix. Chairperson Curtis reminded the PRC that it's up to each group to arrange their meetings. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf replied that the meetings have to be in a place that is noticed and disclosed. Mr. Towler added that they can be anywhere as long as the public can attend. Chairperson Curtis commented on the need for recording equipment. In response to a question, Mr. Krahn replied that he would create a matrix template for each team's set of implementation strategies. Mr. Moellendorf added that an idea may surface which wasn't considered when the Master Plan was adopted and asked the PRC

Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Meeting Page 8

to let staff know when they plan to meet in order to provide the required notice. Mr. Krahn will get the matrixes to the team members with the corresponding strategies next week.

5. ACTION ITEMS

5-A. ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF A DRAFT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF WESTERN NEVADA AND THE CITY OF CARSON CITY REGARDING AN OPTION TO CONSTRUCT A RECREATIONAL FACILITY ON PROPERTY OWNED BY THE BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB AT 1870 RUSSELL WAY FOR A PERIOD OF TEN YEARS (1-2028) - Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the staff report which is incorporated into the record and introduced Ryan Russell, President of the Boys and Girls Club of Western Nevada, (BGC) and Hal Hansen, Executive Director. He advised that work on the IRC has been suspended but the BGC needs to continue construction of their clubhouse. The parking lot in front of the BGC is a joint use parking lot with the IRC and the parking spaces are part of the IRC's count to provide adequate parking. Peak use hours of the IRC will be at different times than the BGC. The City has entered into a draft agreement with the BGC to retain an option for the property. He read several points of the agreement into the record which are included in the agenda materials. In response to a series of questions, he replied that \$375,000 would be paid to the BGC upon approval of the agreement by the BOS. If the City was ready to build, it wouldn't be necessary to enter into the option agreement because it's unknown how long this will last. If the City doesn't exercise its option within ten years, it could lose the \$375,000; or the BGC can terminate the option by refunding the \$375,000 any time prior to the City giving notice of starting the project.

Mr. Russell explained that the City is buying the right to build on BGC property and if that right is exercised, they are giving the City the property it sits on as long as it's used as a recreational facility. In response to a question, he replied that the \$375,000 becomes part of the purchase price for the property. In response to another question, he replied that when the City and BGC initially entered into this agreement, the City would build a recreation center in exchange for joint use of the property. Part of the obligation in exchange for BGC deeding the property were site improvements. When the economy began to decline, Parks considered kicking some of the \$484,000 in site improvements back to the BGC. The option of phasing in the project was discussed but the City had already designed it and would incur substantial costs. Subsequent meetings resulted in the idea of an option agreement. In exchange for \$375,000, the BGC would give the City the option to build. The money is being used to finish most of the site improvements and \$375,000 was determined as a fair amount to secure the option. The BGC can't do anything with the property until the option is terminated or exercised. In response to another question, he replied that construction has started and they are scheduled to have a certificate of occupancy on August 24. Contractors know the City has entered into a tentative agreement with staff recommendations for approval and are operating on that basis.

Chairperson Curtis read Commissioner Westergard's e-mail into the record, "the proposed agreement is not in the best interests of Carson City. As I understand it, we are now going to give \$375,000 to the BGC. They previously were going to give it to the City and now if the City doesn't exercise its option to build on the land within ten years, we neither get the land or the money back. This is bad policy and contrary to the fiduciary responsibility the City has to its taxpayers." She said that Ex Officio Commissioner Walt called to advise that she also was opposed because, "if we don't build we don't get the \$375,000 back." Mr. Russell responded that the agreement was never to give the property to Carson City as there is no

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Meeting

Page 9

incentive. At the time they were going to give the property, the City was going to build a gym and do all the site improvements. Chairperson Curtis stated that the City wasn't going to do all the site improvements but would build the parking area and the BGC would build the fields. Mr. Moellendorf added that part of the site improvements included the athletic fields and tennis courts which the BGC were going to build with a redevelopment grant. The City was doing the site improvements surrounding the BGC except for the tennis courts and athletic fields but including the front parking lot. Mr. Russell apologized that the word 'all' was confusing and stated that the City was going to do site improvements to benefit the club but the BGC was never going to give. Aside from the City's site improvements, the BGC would have joint use. There is consideration to the BGC for deeding the property to the City and consideration to the City in reserving the option on the property.

Mr. Moellendorf commented that if the City was building today, it would be building the parking lot at an estimated cost of \$484,000 but is instead getting it for \$375,000. The parking lot and part of the building were part of the site improvements. In response to a comment, Commissioner Livermore replied that the City will have joint use of their parking lot which exceeds their joint use of the City's parking lot. To put it in perspective, \$375,000 is \$37,500 a year or about \$3,000 a month in which the City gets joint use of their clubhouse and outdoor facilities. He added that once the complex is completed, there may be further deeding of the property to the City. Mr. Moellendorf added that it would probably cost about \$375,000 for the City to build the athletic fields. In response to a question, he replied that when the clubhouse is not being used by the BGC, the City could use it for some of its programs through Parks and Recreation and off hours from the BGC. Outdoor facilities would also be available for the City's youth sports teams. Mr. Hansen commented that the fields would be available, but tennis courts would have to be discussed as the main support system is expensive and kept locked down. Commissioner Lehmann opined that there should be minimum use which needs to be clearly defined if the City is going to pay \$400,000 up front. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf replied that the joint use agreement would be taken to the BOS when the project is ready to commence which may be two to ten years. There's no reason to enter into a joint use agreement if the City doesn't have facilities for them to use as well. In response to another question, he replied that the City would be responsible for maintaining the parking lot when it takes ownership and the \$120,000 would be a point of negotiation. Mr. Hansen also responded that if the City had a recreation center somewhere else, it would have to pay for maintaining the parking lot. Chairperson Curtis replied that it would be paid for out of Q-18 funds. Mr. Moellendorf responded that it may not come from O-18, but from the general fund. In response to a comment, Commissioner Livermore replied that the BGC would have the option to purchase services from the City out of the \$120,000 but could have someone else maintain it. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf reiterated that the joint use agreement provides for the City and BGC to have joint use of each other's facilities. In response to a question, Mr. Russell replied that the agreement states that the City will enjoy joint use of the BGC's facilities during the ten year option period. Once the IRC is constructed, the BGC will enjoy joint use of that facility and the City's joint use of the BGC will continue. Mr. Moellendorf reiterated that between now and the next ten years, when the City is ready to begin the project, the joint use agreement will be taken to the BOS because right now there are no facilities for them to jointly use. Vice Chairperson Smolenski confirmed that the option agreement will be superseded by the joint use agreement at that time. Mr. Moellendorf stated that the City needs their parking lot when it's ready to build and their ballfields when they're not using them. The City will get some use of the tennis courts and they're giving up an option on their property. At \$37,500 a year, the City can't build or buy those types of facilities. In response to a question, Mr. Russell directed the PRC's attention to the last sentence in paragraph 1 of the Option Agreement and recited it into

Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Meeting Page 10

the record. The paragraph also discusses the City developing a recreation center on parcel B. In response to a comment, he replied the BGC is a non-profit organization trying to provide services to youth.

Mr. Moellendorf advised that if the PRC decides to not recommend this item to the BOS, he will disclose that information to them. In response to a question, Mr. Russell replied that for three months a year, the BGC uses its facility Monday through Friday from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. For the rest of the year, it's used Monday through Friday from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. It's not used weekends, evenings or during school hours which are the periods that will be available to the City. Mr. Moellendorf advised that the MOU has already been approved by the BOS for joint use of the facilities. He reiterated that the details of the joint use agreement have not yet been taken to the BOS because the City doesn't have a facility for the BGC to jointly use. In response to a question, he replied that the map in the exhibit to the agreement is still the plan they are moving forward with. In response to another question, he replied that the decision has to be made within the ten year option period. In response to a question, Mr. Russell replied that until the option agreement terminates, the City will enjoy joint use of the BGC's facilities. Commissioner Livermore complimented the PRC for their diligence in trying to protect the City's assets and well being. It benefits the community in a lot of different ways and is an opportunity to serve the community in a larger focus. The BGC is an asset to this community and this is a small amount of money to ensure its long term operation. Mr. Russell stated that the entire BGC Board consists of volunteers that have raised money to build the club to where it is. The BGC is trying to serve the youth of this community in joint use with the City because combined they can serve more youth of Carson City. They provide better lives for the youth who grow up to be better adults and Carson City continues to grow and thrive. Commissioner Lehmann responded that the PRC is also comprised of volunteers and wants to see Carson City be a better community which is under equipped for kids' activities. The BGC is a good thing. Commissioner Adams commented that this is a good partnership with the BGC which needs to be kept going and he gives it his full support. Vice Chairperson Smolenski moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of a draft agreement between the Boys and Girls Club of Western Nevada and the City of Carson City regarding an option to construct a recreational facility on property owned by the Boys and Girls Club at 1870 Russell Way for a period of ten years. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Chairperson Curtis commented that she would like to take to the BOS a smaller version of the joint use agreement that addresses the other issues. No one knows what will happen in ten years but \$37,500 a year sounds like a good deal. Commissioner Lehmann commented that if the City doesn't build and loses the \$375,000, the only thing it's getting is joint use and there's a chance it could be built elsewhere. For \$375,000, it's buying ten years of joint use which needs to be very well defined. Mr. Moellendorf replied that the City is not just buying joint use, but also the option for the property. Commissioner Lehmann responded that the option is vague because when and how it's built is on the shelf. The City is buying joint use but it also has an agreement to not use the property for anything other than the purposes the BGC has designated for it. Mr. Moellendorf reiterated that the BGC is giving up the right to develop, sell or do something else with the property. Motion carried 5-2-1 with Commissioners Keeton and Lehmann **opposing.** Commissioner Conrad left the meeting before the vote but left a note that she was in favor of the motion. Mr. Moellendorf thanked the PRC for taking their fiduciary responsibility seriously.

6. MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION: (2-0781) Commissioner Lasco apologized for being late as he went to the Sierra Room. Commissioner Livermore recognized Ronni Hannaman for the Sports Programming article in the newspaper which boosted the image of recreation and what the Department does. He acknowledged Joel Dunn for his efforts in bringing tournaments to Carson City and stated that it's not a cost but a direct benefit. He asked staff to draft a letter

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Meeting Page 11

to Ronni thanking her for her wonderful coverage. In response to a question, Commissioner Livermore replied that requests have been made regarding the joint meeting with the BOS.

- **6-A. REPORT FROM SCHOOL BOARD LIAISON** (2-0830) None.
- 7. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS** (2-0832) None.
- **8. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT** (2-0835) Vice Chairperson Smolenski moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:37 p.m. Commissioner Lasco seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission meeting are so approved this 1st day of September, 2009.

DONNA J. CURTIS, Chair