

**CARSON CITY CULTURAL COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2008**  
**Page 1**

The meeting of the Carson City Cultural Commission was held on October 21, 2008, 5:30 p.m., at the Community Center-Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Peter Barton  
Vice Chairperson Karen Abowd  
Commissioner Linda Deacy  
Commissioner Stephen Lincoln  
Commissioner Pete Livermore  
Commissioner Jennifer Russell  
Commissioner Jeffery Scott

**STAFF:** Joe McCarthy, Director of the Office of Business Development  
Joel Benton, 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.

- A. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Peter Barton called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.
- B. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM: (1-015)** Roll was called. A quorum was present.
- C. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENIZED ITEMS: (1-027)** None.
- D. DISCLOSURES: (1-029)** None.
- E. MODIFICATION TO THE AGENDA: (1-032)** None
- F. PUBLIC HEARING MATTERS: (1-035)**

**F-1 Presentation by the Brewery Arts Center on its conceptual master plan and request for the endorsement of the plan by the commission.** John Procaccini, on behalf of the Brewery Arts Center (BAC), and the concept developer, distributed a brochure entitled "*Our Vision. Your Benefit. The Future of the Brewery Arts Center.*" He described the concept for the center as having been in existence for a very long time—the concept of closing the street (Minnesota) and joining the two properties together—they were now looking at today's needs compared to what they were then. It was evident, he said, that outdoor use space was very important to the city. There was nothing in Carson City in the medium-size range, and there was nothing that resembled an art park; a place where people who were enthusiasts of visual or performing arts could congregate. Joining the two properties together required abandoning the

**CARSON CITY CULTURAL COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2008**  
**Page 2**

(Minnesota) street and the presentations previously presented had been aimed at acquiring endorsements for that action. Mr. Procaccini's goal here was to obtain the Commission's endorsement for the project as conceptualized. He added that he was not looking for anything beyond that because it was incumbent upon the BAC to include the Arts and Cultural Coalition in any needs assessments and anything that made that space useable by arts enthusiasts and arts organizations and also by the community, so they felt they had "bought into this." He reiterated his desire to leave this meeting with the Commission's endorsement for the concept and the street abandonment.

Mr. Procaccini reported that Joan Wright, Jed Block and John Copoulos had spearheaded a team to put all the research materials together. Traffic studies had been done, as well as some assessments, and polling of neighbors, and they had talked to the school department as they could possibly be affected by changing traffic patterns. They had also spoken with the Parks Department and involved them with the design. In doing those things they found that while at first they were concerned about transportation having some valid points as to why it should not be done, after some studies they came back and endorsed the concept. They said there was not a negative impact on the traffic. Only one space was lost in the redesign of the parking plan, but more on-street parking had been created on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. The end result was a much improved piece of property that accommodated the City on many other levels.

Thus far he had received endorsements from the Parks and Recreation Department and the Regional Transportation Commission, both motions were made by supervisors. He was encouraged by that, he said, because once they got through Planning and then to the Board of Supervisors, they had two supervisors who had endorsed the project. The next step was that the street would not be closed until BAC was financially and, from an engineering standpoint, capable of doing such an endeavor. However, they could not go to funding sources until the street was abandoned and they had control of it. When that time came, they would do a needs assessment and would design according to what those needs were determined to be. Although he believed the conceptualized design was beautiful, it probably would not look like the final design. He said they were hesitant to put the design out to the public for fear of raising questions for which they were unprepared at this point. The next step would be to get Planning and Board of Supervisors approval and thereafter they would start the needs assessment, perhaps via town hall meetings at the BAC or models. For the latter, he said he would turn to Joe McCarthy and others at Redevelopment because they had previously accomplished "one of the finest needs assessments" he had ever seen for the Downtown assessment. That process, he added, went exceptionally well and the response was that two town hall meetings were to packed houses.

The hope was to raise money—he did not know what the project cost would be at this point—and believed it would cost about \$3 million or \$4 million. Construction could be done in phases. Engineering had to be done regardless of whether the finished product was a 30x40 stage or a 20x60 stage. State Historic Preservation (SHPO) had a project on which BAC had a grant application for restoring the corner of the BAC building to its original brick state. Over the years it had been painted and re-pointed among other things, but it was not in its original condition, and SHPO's mission was to restore and to fund restoration and preservation. In applying for that grant, should they succeed, by the time it came through (about 16

**CARSON CITY CULTURAL COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2008**  
**Page 3**

months from present), it could well be the kick-off event to casting this vision as a real future, as they would have taken that corner building and restored it to its original state. Any brick they decided to use for continuity to tie the two properties together would mimic that look. They had some events in motion, they had received great support for the concept, and it was important they remained active in other things the City was doing. For example, he believed the library was very important and it should have space for performing and visual arts, and he wanted to make sure that whatever they did they “filled the gaps.” BAC was at a critical point in its development. He asked for questions from the Commission.

Chair Peter Barton congratulated Mr. Procaccini on reaching this point in his mission. He asked, if the project were able to be funded as a single project, what would be a realistic time frame. Mr. Procaccini believed it could be opened in the summer of 2012. Although, he added, that if it were funded and engineered it was probably a 16 to 18 month build-out, so it could be as short as that. However, based on what they were attempting to do, it was about three to 4 years out.

Chair Barton noted that one of the Commission’s early tasks was to develop work plans and strategic planning, so it was important to get an idea of where that project would be going.

Commissioner Livermore said he was the supervisor at the Parks Commission who had made the motion and one of things he had suggested to John Copoulos and Joan Wright at that time was to “hold firm” to commit at least 1 percent of their project budget to cultural arts. He hoped the Commission would endorse that as a policy that all developments of any size (\$1 million and above, perhaps) would make that 1 percent contribution to the arts. Mr. Procaccini asked for clarification. Mr. Livermore said it could be a statue or something that could be identified as a contribution to the arts. Mr. Procaccini agreed.

Commissioner Karen Abowd said one of the things she would like to see would be a “community arts garden.” She explained that part of what they did was to promote/jury a contest for people to express art on the exterior of the buildings. That would be a beginning that could perhaps become a successive event planning type scenario with something like that incorporated into it.

Mr. Procaccini noted there were so many different needs in the project on many levels, for instance, mitigating sound issues. It was possible that an art piece or garden could actually serve two purposes, so as the project developed they needed someone to help them understand how that could be accomplished.

Commissioner Lincoln asked if there were any thoughts on the corner property (the small house). Mr. Procaccini said that prior to his arrival at the BAC he knew attempts had been made to acquire that property and there were some very logical reasons for doing so. There was a time when Joe McCarthy was involved that it was leased out as artists’ accommodations. Mr. McCarthy then recalled that they had leased it for two years to the boys that did the wood carving at the south end of town who lived there. It was artists’ housing at the time, however, not enough money could be raised in the overall project to secure that piece of property because they were also going after Father Jerry’s rectory. They did not get either property. Mr. Procaccini said they had looked at it again when it came up for sale a couple of years ago and at that time

**CARSON CITY CULTURAL COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2008**  
**Page 4**

the BAC board decided the price per square foot could be “wrapped” into the build-out of closing the street for far less—it was about \$350.00 a square foot—and for that same price per square foot they felt they could get a lot of work done. Mr. Lincoln asked what they would do with that property if they had it. Mr. Procaccini said they needed some visual arts space, there was not enough, and some of the quaint homes would lend themselves to tapestry, sculpture, or other quaint displays, so it could be another venue for specific showings. They had also spoken of office space, although he did not think it would come “without quite a bit of work.” However, with some paint and charm a visual arts space could be created that would be remarkable.

Commissioner Linda Deacy referred to Mr. Procaccini’s earlier statement that he had talked to the school district about the facility location and the street closure. She asked if he had talked about programming or opportunity for the school district and the BAC venue to work together on projects. Mr. Procaccini clarified he had spoken to Broderick Bray School, and prior to them making any formal commitment to him he assumed they had to get some approval at a higher level. He added they had always worked closely with that school on an after-school “Dolphin Club,” and they had hosted programs for three years for children. The BAC had a television and had taught them some video, as well as craft-type activities, mechanical arts, and some performance. Once the conceptualized space was a reality—when it was warmer outside that was where kids wanted to be, they were more creative in an outdoor “no boundaries” type of environment—there would be opportunities to do more with the children. In essence, he said that they had discussions, not formalized, however, they endorsed what BAC was doing, were satisfied they had considered traffic patterns, and they were happy with what the BAC directors had been doing with their children after school.

Mr. McCarthy remarked that the community at a grass roots level had gone through a number of initiatives that were presented to the Board of Supervisors by various work groups, one of them being a civic investment work group whose recommendation seemed to be the focus on the downtown central library being a primary civic investment. He asked Mr. Procaccini to pass on to the BAC board that during those discussions the BAC and its potential for expansion, for reinventing itself both indoors and outdoors was absolutely at the top of their list. As far as civic investment was concerned they could not think of anything better. Therefore, he assured, just because it had not been mentioned at a public meeting did not necessarily mean that BAC was not on their “radar screen” as far as the kinds of efforts behind the scenes that would continue to see that BAC reached its goals. Mr. Procaccini explained that he had watched a Board of Supervisors meeting last week where the Downtown Consortium made certain presentations and he had a “paranoia attack,” and sent a hasty note to Joe McCarthy, thus the reason for Mr. McCarthy’s assurance at this meeting that BAC was indeed being supported.

Commissioner Livermore said he was the same supervisor who would offer the same motion twice to fully support what the Brewery Arts Center had proposed. It was the cornerstone of the arts and culture of this community and what was available to it.

Mr. Procaccini thanked the Commission and said he was very appreciative. Chair Barton commented that the next bridge for BAC to cross was the Planning Commission meeting on Wednesday, October 29, at 3:30

**CARSON CITY CULTURAL COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2008**  
**Page 5**

p.m. and asked any commissioners who could do so to attend to show support.

**F-2 Action to endorse the conceptual master plan of the Brewery Arts Center. (1-401)**  
**Commissioner Livermore moved that the Carson City Cultural Commission recommends to the Planning Commission and to the Board of Supervisors the conceptual plan for the BAC as presented. Stephen Lincoln seconded the motion, and carried unanimously.**

**G. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ADOPT BYLAWS FOR THE COMMISSION.**

**(1-421)** Chair Barton recognized that Joe McCarthy had already begun the process of creating bylaws for this commission. He had the bylaws reviewed by the supervisors and by the district attorney and had received comments from Joel Benton. There were a “lot of mechanics of membership and terms” that came out of the enabling resolution for this commission but its focus would primarily be on Section 1-Mission and Purpose and Section 9-Powers, Duties and Functions of the Commission.

Joe McCarthy reported that the comments he got from the district attorney were primarily mechanical and intended to make sure we were not in violation of the Open Meeting Law. He then distributed those comments and said he was looking for feedback from the commissioners as to how he had structured the mission and the purpose of the commission. In Section 9, what the powers, duties and functions were, and duties and functions could overlap. He pointed out that bylaws, a “living document,” could always be amended. Chair Barton did not feel it was necessary to go into detail on the Section 9 issues at this time, however, he asked for comments on the mission statement. He suggested the word “to *facilitate* and implement strategies” could be inserted in that text. Mr. Barton also said the bylaws would not be finalized at this meeting. Mr. McCarthy said for anyone to send him any comments on this before the next meeting, commissioners should “cc” each other so comments/changes could be synthesized in the case of conflicting wording.

Commissioner Livermore noted regarding the mission statement that he would like to see an addition to that statement that would address the support for the “fledgling or lifelong artists who make up this community.” While it was important to stress the improvement or advancement of new businesses and community prosperity, he hoped that someday there would be a budget that would allow the commission to support artists, therefore he wanted to see some recognition of that in the mission statement.

Chair Barton referred to the interim sections of the bylaws that set up the mechanics of how the commission did business and asked for comments. As to the *Powers, Duties and Functions* section, Mr. Livermore distributed copies of *NRS 244.300* and other relevant sections pertaining to county governments and recreation centers. He noted that in the Parks Commission they had developed a book over many years that referenced the powers and duties as set forth in the statute. He wanted to make sure the current statute was available for inclusion, as he believed there should be some reference to *NRS 244.300* in the powers and duties section. He added that there was “a lot of discussion about arts and culture” in the statute and he felt it would be a great tool to have. Nevertheless he felt Joe McCarthy had done a great job in creating the bylaws.

Commissioner Livermore also distributed a copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors

**CARSON CITY CULTURAL COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2008**  
**Page 6**

regarding changing existing, or adding, new fee policies. He referred to a meeting held last week where staff member Mitch Ames made a PowerPoint presentation about a proposal to the Coalition about fees and charges, and also as those fees related to a “dark day” and its importance to the operating budget of a facility. He believed, too, that the resolution “set a higher bar” for the community center where the fees were levied at 100 percent of direct costs, except for resident nonprofit users (a 25 percent reduction). Other facilities went as low as 25 percent of direct costs which, he felt, was unfair; there should be an equitable balance. Reference was also made to the recapture of costs for “disposables” and “replacement costs” that should be considered. Once again he complimented Mr. McCarthy on doing a great job and said very little was left out of his draft. Bylaws could be reviewed annually and that provision had been included.

Mr. McCarthy took an opportunity to “walk through” *Section 9* as he wanted the commissioners to recognize what functions the commission may have, some of which were significant. On Page 3—*The Powers and Duties of the Commission*—the ordinance clearly delineated the commission’s powers and particular attention should be given to the wording “. . . the commission’s functions may include fostering public private partnerships . . .” A somewhat vague statement, he said, but the commission definitely wanted to see if private and institutional investment could be brought into the community, especially foundation investment to help the institutions, fledgling artists, and the larger institutions, promoting and advancing the artists and arts groups, celebrating the city for its ethnic diversity, creativity, and the leadership in art and culture. “Your mission,” he added, “was to continue that conversation loud and clear to the community.” Developing a re-granting program to leverage individual and groups of artists, cultural groups, and arts organizations, as Pete Livermore had alluded to, was also key. When a budget was created and “we have the ability to do a re-granting program” applicants would go before the commission and would have to make a strong case as to why they needed support for either an individual production or an organization, or in the visual arts just an installation. That section went on to discuss providing for cultural and artistic facilities and features in public and commercial construction; that spoke directly to what Mr. Livermore mentioned, as the commission may want to pursue enabling legislation (in the 2011 session) to partner with Las Vegas and Reno and other communities to allow putting into place, by ordinance, a 1 percent charge for new construction that required a public art component that was juried.

On Page 4, *Establishing an art in public places* policy that supported the installation of juried publicly significant art installations and public art components in private developments. Not only would that 1 percent go toward public art but it would be juried by artists who would control the aesthetics of that particular public art installation. *Design cultural districts*: that was important because there were communities (as Jeffery Scott who had lived in a cultural district could attest) like Pittsburgh that created the cultural trust. The Heinz Family was very successful over the years in supporting the cultural trust and they transformed a portion of Pittsburgh into a mixed use, both public and culturally vibrant area. “We can borrow from some of those ideas,” Mr. McCarthy suggested, “maybe we want to create a cultural district to support that kind of activity. It is long term but at least it is in your bylaws.” He continued, noting that the bylaws should include “promoting a cultural environment that stimulates economic development, cultural tourism, and enhanced public participation.” Cultural tourism was a way to continue to bring people into the community. “They do come, they stay longer, and spend more, and those statistics are stunning.” *Promote arts education in the schools and in the public domain* that furthered the missions of the

**CARSON CITY CULTURAL COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2008**  
**Page 7**

commission. Mr. McCarthy continued, adding that the duties may include acting to appoint peer panels which would be jurying those art installations; managing cultural facilities—"there may come a day when you will have a facility for which you will have some oversight"—reviewing and evaluating cultural and special events requests. That was significant because there were many special events in town. He referred to terminology used by John Procaccini that related to "raising the bar, having a set of standards by which events are approved; if there is any public funding associated with that kind of an event, there needs to be elements that meet aesthetic standards so you could have some influence in setting that standard."

*Advising funding allocations for a cultural trust fund and other general funds appropriated for cultural purposes.* "There was no doubt that eventually you would try to get yourselves into the general fund of the City's budget and have some resources to work with." That meant creating a cultural trust fund that was "married" with private sector investment."

*Advising the selection of professional service firms in the cultural development field:* "In other words, helping the BAC and [its directors] to be able to determine who could come in and help them design and possibly implement a facility and long-term strategic planning for an organization." Additionally, to collaborate with many organizations.

In essence, Mr. McCarthy said he had created a duties, functions and responsibilities guideline that would carry the commission for a long time into the future.

Commissioner Livermore asked if the foregoing had been "run past Joel Benton," which had been done, and suggested that it should be compared to *NRS 244* to look for missing elements. Mr. McCarthy asked Chair Barton for permission to work with Commissioner Livermore to make sure those elements had been included. Chair Barton said "absolutely" and suggested the simplest solution might be to cite *NRS 244* by reference.

Commissioner Deacy asked about the reference to the "work plan." She noted that in requirements from the federal government, when they talked about a work plan, a strategic plan, they required that be an annual planning document that extended at least three years or five years into the future. She asked if it might be wise to work close to find what the work plan would look like in a time frame.

Joe McCarthy said one of the models he proposed was the comprehensive five-year plan with an action plan every year by which the comprehensive plan was updated. That action plan tended to amend the long-term plan.

Vice Chairperson Karen Abowd commented on "providing for cultural and artistic facilities and features in public and commercial construction." She believed that as a new commission she would like to see more "green" thinking, so that in some way that philosophy was incorporated into the commission's efforts. Mr. Livermore responded that there was a charter review committee that met in odd election years. They met last year and made recommendations to changes in the City's charter. "We might consider when we do our strategic planning meeting to discuss issues that we want to present to the charter review committee.

**CARSON CITY CULTURAL COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2008**  
**Page 8**

If we need legislation that we feel strongly about, that is the process to begin with it.”

Chair Barton encouraged the dialogue to continue with comments back to Joe McCarthy, and said there would be an updated version of the bylaws at the November meeting and the committee could move for adoption then.

**H. NON-ACTION ITEMS - DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATION ONLY (1-859)**

**H-1 Presentation by the Nevada Arts Council regarding the October 27, 2008 “Carson City Community Conversation” scheduled in the Sierra Room.** Chair Barton introduced this item and strongly encouraged everyone on the commission to participate in the “Community Conversation” to be held next week. He said the Nevada Arts Council (NAC) was doing some of the “heavy lifting” for the commission in sponsoring the community meetings. He then invited William (Bill) Russell to make his presentation.

William Russell, Nevada Arts Council, said the upcoming forum was very timely because of what the commission was talking about at this meeting and what was going on in Carson City. The NAC was in its strategic planning mode and one of the elements of that was to go across the state and get input from the various communities on the state of the arts—what was needed, what the artists, organizations, educators, audiences wanted—basically to hold informal town meetings. There would be a facilitator to go through the basic questions people should ask. Also they could divide into small groups that would allow people to better communicate with one another. There would be a scribe to write down ideas on what was working, what was not working, and what the views were for the future. All of the material collected from those “Community Conversations” would be compiled and a major report would be delivered which would be centered around the Governor’s Awards for the Arts and an Advocacy Day in March. He, too, encouraged all commissioners to attend next Monday’s “Conversations,” pointing out the importance of having their opinions heard along with community input, to let the public know that “we care about arts in Carson City.”

Mr. Russell also pointed out that in difficult economic times art flourishes because artists were entrepreneurial and knew how to get things accomplished. He believed that “The arts were the soul of the community and if there were no arts the community had no soul.” He was very impressed with what was already being offered in Carson City which was significant for a city that was relatively small. Having a community arts center like BAC could offer something for everyone. Added to that, the development going on in Downtown Carson City, plus the new highway, among other things, was very fertile ground. He added that “you might be surprised what you hear from people.” It was a diverse community and the arts might not be dealing with that as well as they could. For example, “I don’t see a lot of things for the Hispanic community and that may be something that comes to the forefront.”

Joe McCarthy expressed his appreciation to Mr. Russell for his presentation and especially that the information gleaned from the “Community Conversations” would be made public at the Governor’s Arts Awards, which Carson City had hosted a few years earlier. He noted that Carson City’s relationship with the Nevada Arts Council started with the founder of the BAC, Betty Block. She had been the first recipient



**CARSON CITY CULTURAL COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2008**  
**Page 9**

of the Governor's Arts Award. Deanne Ridings, executive director of the BAC, also received an award, and most recently David Bugely for his contribution with the symphony, and Bill Couey, one of Nevada's great poets, for his contribution in the literary arts.

Mr. Livermore reminded that now that the commission was a public body, the possibility of a quorum at the "Community Conversation" would have to be noticed and posted.

Mr. Russell commented there was no need to preregister for Monday night's event, and there would be light refreshments. It would begin at 6:00 and end about 8:30 p.m. He would also provide information on the upcoming grant writing workshop, a daytime event, at a cost of \$10. It would be held at the State Library and Archives. A professional development grant was available to participants who traveled more than 100 miles that would cover the cost.

**H-2 Discussion on a potential work plan/strategy for the Carson City Cultural Commission to build community prosperity. (1-1012)** Chair Barton believed that hearing what the community had to say (in the Community Conversation) would be vital input for the commission to learn what it can and should focus on for the next year, at least. "What is it about this community, what are its assets, what's the story in the community, and how do we leverage those assets and tell the story. . . was a major task. . ." He added that the commission defers any further action until after hearing from the community on Monday, to make notes, and bring that back to the November meeting.

Commissioner Stephen Lincoln suggested, also, that notes from the Community Conversation would be a guideline to develop the strategic planning.

**H-3 Future agenda items for the next meeting on November 18, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. (1-1044)** Chair Barton noted that discussion and adoption of bylaws as well as strategic planning would probably be on the agenda. Vice Chair Abowd, recalling her work on the Beautification Action Committee, would like to see the hanging baskets (along Carson Street) be more showy, similar to Reno's River Walk. She had done some research and come up with a "Plan A and a Plan B" and felt it was an activity that the commission would probably have to act on right away—the reason the Reno baskets were so lovely was that they were planted in February. Mark, from Hungry Mother, would open his greenhouse to the project, and he also proposed the idea, based on his work as a special needs teacher, that the horticultural arts which had not been represented in the community and the special needs community could be encapsulated in such a program. She would like to bring that agenda item forward at the November meeting.

Commissioner Livermore suggested that an agenda packet be developed to include all the agenda items plus an action form for those items on which action would be taken. Mr. McCarthy said he would do that. Commissioner Jeffery Scott said that Mr. McCarthy had made reference to public art, and it was Mr. Scott's feeling that in order to inspire the community we needed to start work on a public art project. It would give the new commission visibility in the community, and he would like to see that on the agenda. He agreed to put something together to present. Mr. Livermore said he would like to see the commission establish a date for strategic planning, sometime between now and next April, so staff could start putting together

**CARSON CITY CULTURAL COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2008**  
**Page 10**

details. Perhaps, he suggested, have a working brunch/lunch.

Chair Barton reminded about Joe McCarthy's handout and homework assignment from last meeting, about The Creative Capitol Creative Arts Plan, which after reading he said to be an amazing level of attainment. The things that had been accomplished in this community were quite phenomenal. It was a good starting place for the strategic planning session.

Chair Barton asked Mr. McCarthy what his deadline was for having material submitted for inclusion in the agenda packet. He responded that 10 days prior to the meeting would be very good.

**H-4 Commissioner comments on non-agenized items. (1-1170)** Chair Barton invited comments. Mr. McCarthy reported that on October 20, 2008, the Convention and Visitors Bureau endorsed the Destination Development Inc. branding their development package for Carson City "A Taste of the High Sierra."

**I. ADJOURNMENT (1-1175)** Chair Barton asked for a motion. Commissioner Deacy moved to adjourn. It was seconded by Commissioner Livermore, and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Barton adjourned te meeting at 6:33 p.m.

The minutes of the October 21, 2008 Carson City Cultural Commission meeting are so approved this 18<sup>th</sup> of November, 2009.

---

Peter Barton, Chair