

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 18, 2006 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 18, 2006 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Donna Curtis
Vice Chairperson Michael Hoffman
Sam Bauman
Greg Davis
John Felesina
Tom Keeton
Pete Livermore
John McKenna
Glenn Tierney

STAFF: Linda Ritter, City Manager
Roger Moellendorf, Parks and Recreation Department Director
Scott Fahrenbruch, Parks and Recreation Director of Operations
Juan Guzman, Open Space / Property Manager
Kathleen King, 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 ROLL CALL (1-0007) - Chairperson Curtis called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Chairperson Curtis introduced and welcomed Commissioners Bauman and Tierney.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS (1-0029) - None.

1. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - April 18, 2006, May 2, 2006, and May 16, 2006 (1-0030) - Commissioner McKenna moved to approve the minutes. Vice Chairperson Hoffman seconded the motion. Motion carried 9-0.

2. MODIFICATION TO THE AGENDA (1-0037) - None.

3. AGENDA ITEMS:

3-A. UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING THE STATUS OF THE RECREATION CENTER, INCLUDING: (1) STATUS OF PARTNERSHIP WITH WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE; (2) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MAY 18, 2006 ACTION APPROVING AN ADDITIONAL QUALITY OF LIFE QUESTION #18 BOND FOR \$3.5 MILLION FOR THE PURPOSE OF AN INDOOR RECREATION CENTER AND/OR OTHER RECREATION FACILITIES OR IMPROVEMENTS; AND (3) STATUS REGARDING THE PLANNING CONSULTANT TEAM FOR THE PROJECT (1-0040) - Chairperson Curtis introduced this item. Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the staff report. (5:33:04) Mr. Moellendorf advised of having met,

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 18, 2006 Meeting

Page 2

earlier in the day, with Senators Amodei and Townsend, WNCC Vice President of Institutional Advancement Helaine Jesse, City Manager Linda Ritter, Mayor Marv Teixeira, and Commissioner Livermore to discuss the project. He further advised of having received overwhelming support and endorsement from the two senators. A proposed scope of work was received late yesterday from Brent Tippetts, of VCBO Architects. Mr. Moellendorf will be meeting with Ms. Jesse, as soon as possible, to review the same.

Mr. Moellendorf referred to the Tentative Project Schedule included in the agenda materials. He emphasized the word "Tentative" and reviewed the schedule. He advised of a two-hour programming / brainstorming session with WNCC staff, scheduled for August 17th. Programs will inform, to a large extent, final design of the recreation facility and Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the format of the session. In response to a question, he referred to the public meetings scheduled to receive input on facility location and design. Chairperson Curtis noted the importance of adequately publicizing public meetings. She requested to agendaize review of the draft joint use agreement as soon as possible. Commissioner Livermore suggested holding the public informational meeting scheduled for September at or near WNCC rather than in the Sierra Room.

Commissioner Felesina inquired as to the likelihood of the project being funded in light of the Board of Regents' prioritization. He expressed concern over spending money "on the roll of the dice." Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged the City is spending money in hopes the partnership will succeed. He considered the expenditure an "investment toward an \$8 million partner." He advised that no work will have to be redone if the partnership fails. He expressed the opinion that developing two conceptual designs for two separate sites would be more of a gamble knowing only one will be needed. The work has to be done in order to move forward in applying for the special use permit, and in ultimately testifying before the Legislature.

(5:53:34) WNCC Vice President of Institutional Advancement Helaine Jesse advised of having received a "very clear signal" from Carson City leadership with regard to moving forward with the partnership. Senators Amodei and Townsend were also very supportive. Ms. Jesse acknowledged the project being prioritized at number 16 on the Board of Regents list translates to having "some work to do." She further acknowledged that the partnership is not "a done deal." She noted that concerns expressed over traffic, view obstruction, noise, etc. have been made very clear to WNCC representatives. She invited "one or two of the neighbors" to participate in the working group. She advised of Senator Townsend's offer to speak to Division of State Lands representatives about the additional three acres, which would provide for increased setback and separation between the recreation facility and the adjacent residential neighbors.

In response to a comment, Mr. Moellendorf advised of commission action to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to pursue a partnership with WNCC. He referred to the Tentative Project Schedule and noted the December 5th meeting at which action on the joint use agreement will be agendaized. Chairperson Curtis suggested that "actual drawings" will be more helpful to the Legislature. She agreed that the City is still pursuing the partnership with WNCC and will continue to do so until December. Mr. Moellendorf agreed with the earlier suggestion to agendaize review of the draft joint use agreement as soon as possible. Chairperson Curtis called for public comment.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 18, 2006 Meeting

Page 3

(5:59:30) In response to a question from Bob Lytle, a resident of Harvard Drive, Commissioner Livermore explained the additional \$3.5 million available through Question #18. In response to a further question, he advised there is no additional cost to the taxpayers. He acknowledged that the bond is for 20 years. Mr. Lytle reviewed figures which he associated with the bond, and expressed the opinion that the recreation facility project will leave the City in a deficit. Chairperson Curtis expressed the understanding that wherever the recreation center is constructed, "we're going to do everything we can to make it pay for itself." She acknowledged that the recreation facility will require some general fund support. Mr. Moellendorf advised that a report to which Mr. Lytle referred was based on the City operating a recreation facility without a partnership with WNCC. A partnership with WNCC would mean that operational costs would be shared. Mr. Moellendorf noted that the report represented a very conservative estimate. Including a leisure pool in the facility design will significantly reduce and possibly eliminate the general fund subsidy required. Similar projects across the country which have been studied and visited indicate that leisure pools add significantly to the revenue-generating capabilities of a facility. Mr. Lytle referred to a July 4th *Reno Gazette-Journal* article regarding an indoor soccer facility. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the facility referred to in the article is privately operated. He anticipates no gang-related problems in a publicly-operated City / WNCC recreation facility.

(6:04:28) Steve Myers, President of the University Heights Homeowners Association, expressed appreciation for the invitation extended by Ms. Jesse, and requested to become involved in the working group. He advised that traffic is a big issue among the homeowners, and that the recreation center is a major concern. He acknowledged that WNCC would be a good location for a public meeting.

In response to a comment, Mr. Moellendorf advised that requests for qualifications were sent to Nevada consultants as well as to consultants in neighboring states. Qualifications and experience with similar projects were considered. Brent Tippets, of VCBO, was "head and shoulders" in experience above other architects. Mr. Moellendorf noted that Lumos and Associates is part of the consulting team. In response to a further question, he advised that the proposals did not include costs; only the firm's qualifications. After determining those firms which met the qualifications, a scope of work was developed and sent to the various firms for proposals. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that work requested from the consultants will not be complete until December. Staff will provide updates along the way to the commission and the public in order that an informed decision can be made at the December 5th commission meeting. Commissioner Keeton requested to review a "firm project schedule" at some point. He expressed concern over increasing construction costs. He thanked Ms. Jesse for inviting the neighbors to participate in the process. Mr. Moellendorf advised that the project schedule will be confirmed. He responded to questions with regard to responsibility over letting the bid.

Commissioner Livermore provided historic information on Question #18. He anticipates that some of the operating costs for the recreation facility will be allocated from Question #18. He complimented current and past commissioners for considering the community's recreation needs as a whole. He provided background information on WNCC's offer of partnership for the recreation facility. He expressed the hope that the commission and the City will deliver to the community the recreation center which was voted on in 1996. Vice Chairperson Hoffman expressed the opinion that the bond was a smart decision on the part of the Board of Supervisors. With regard to operating costs, he advised that the recreation facility will never make money. He noted the need for a recreation center within the community, and advised that City staff, the City Manager, the Board of Supervisors, and WNCC representatives are considering ways to mitigate the operating costs. Commissioner Keeton noted concerns expressed over increased traffic. Mr.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 18, 2006 Meeting

Page 4

Moellendorf acknowledged that traffic will increase with construction of a 40,000 to 55,000-square-foot building that is open to the public. In order to apply for a special use permit, a traffic study will be required and will most likely be conducted by consultants.

(6:18:22) Ms. Jesse advised that City Engineer Larry Werner has indicated improvements were already planned for that portion of Combs Canyon Road which is of concern. She further advised that the WNCC architect / project manager plotted out the project with a 12.79% inflation rate in order to consider 2008 construction costs.

3-B. ACTION TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO APPROVE THE FIRST READING OF TITLE 17, CHAPTER 17.15, LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE DISTRICT ORDINANCE (6:20:06) - Chairperson Curtis introduced this item. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf explained that the Board of Supervisors approves ordinances after two readings, as a matter of procedure. He reviewed the staff report and the draft ordinance included in the agenda materials.

Mr. Moellendorf responded to questions regarding Section 17.15.080(5)(a) and (6). In response to a further question, he advised that an existing development could petition the City to create a landscape maintenance district. He acknowledged that the common areas of the development would have to be open to the public in order to meet the conditions of the ordinance. Commissioner Livermore expressed the hope that adopting the ordinance will not result in loss of business to private landscapers. Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged the need to consider this issue. In terms of practicality, he advised that accepting a petition for a landscape maintenance district will consider contracting out landscape services. He responded to questions regarding various scenarios. Commissioner Livermore suggested including a business impact statement as part of the Board of Supervisors agenda report.

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf referred to Section 17.15.050(2)(a) and noted that 51% of the property owners within a development would have to agree to petition the City for a landscape maintenance district. He advised that a landscape maintenance district may be advantageous for a new subdivision. In response to a question, he advised that the ordinance will pertain to new developments for the most part. The above-referenced section makes it possible for an existing development, with CC&Rs, to petition the City to create a landscape maintenance district. Mr. Moellendorf reiterated that the common areas would have to become publicly accessible. He acknowledged that landscape maintenance districts will not be created for facilities currently maintained by the City.

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised there may be no public benefit or advantage to the City becoming involved with maintaining security walls. Costs of constructing and maintaining security walls would be allocated to the petitioner. The City would not share at all in those costs. Mr. Moellendorf responded to additional questions regarding the method by which ownership is determined and the method by which the maintenance district assessment would be determined. He emphasized that a petition to create a landscape maintenance district would be presented to the City by a developer or by property owners within a development. Commissioner McKenna expressed a preference that the ordinance specify the method by which costs will be allocated among "units benefitted by the plan." He expressed the opinion that City staff should not be responsible for making the determination over the method by which assessments are determined. He expressed an additional preference that costs associated with any hearing before the Board of Supervisors would be allocated to the maintenance district. In response to a question

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 18, 2006 Meeting

Page 5

regarding Section 17.15.070(2)(c), Mr. Moellendorf advised that apartment owners, not the renters, would be considered property owners. He referred to the provision allowing for petitions requesting to become part of existing maintenance districts. In response to a comment, Commissioner McKenna reiterated that the landscape maintenance district should be incurred a charge for “everything the City does for them.” With regard to Section 17.15.070(3), Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged that parks constructed as part of new developments are dedicated to Carson City. Commissioner McKenna expressed a preference that the ordinance require property owners to dedicate the land or pay value in order to get out of a landscape maintenance district. He acknowledged a preference for leaving the option of a dedicated easement out of the ordinance language. Discussion followed. Mr. Moellendorf explained the purpose of the language in Section 17.15.090(3) in response to a further question. Commissioner McKenna expressed the opinion that some type of City standard should be included in the language. He noted, however, that each property “is going to be sufficiently unique where they may want to tweak their particular assessment, how they pay for it differently.” Mr. Moellendorf advised of the requirement that each development adhere to the development standards set forth in Title 18 of the Carson City Municipal Code. This will ensure that the City doesn’t inherit substandard landscape. The draft ordinance also provides for an annual audit to be conducted by the Parks Department to determine the benefit to the City of the assessment. In response to a question regarding Section 17.15.111, Mr. Moellendorf explained the intent of the language to ensure no lapse in maintenance. He acknowledged that snow removal could be included in the maintenance responsibilities. The petitioner will be responsible for describing the level of maintenance. Commissioner McKenna expressed a preference that snow removal for maintenance districts be assigned the lowest possible priority in light of the Parks Department’s responsibilities for snow removal throughout the City. Mr. Moellendorf anticipated that most of the work for landscape maintenance districts will be done by contractors. Commissioner McKenna expressed a concern that City resources would not be diverted to take care of landscape maintenance districts prior to thoroughfares.

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf provided background information on development of the draft ordinance. He acknowledged that research was conducted with regard to similar policies and procedures in other counties. He advised that the ordinance will provide for the long-term, proper maintenance of facilities that could be available to the public. In addition, the ordinance provides for a funding source to pay for maintenance of the facilities. Mr. Moellendorf noted the statutory provisions for landscape maintenance districts, and advised that they could be imposed upon the City even without an ordinance.

Commissioner Davis expressed concern over the City taking on the responsibility of landscape maintenance districts. He suggested a better approach would be prior planning to ensure maintenance before permitting new developments. Mr. Guzman provided background information on the enabling statute. Commissioner Davis described landscape easements which have been included as part of new subdivisions in Douglas County. Mr. Moellendorf noted conditions in the ordinance to which the petitioner is required to adhere. He advised that every petition will not be automatically accepted. The enabling legislation provides for petitions to be submitted to the City without an ordinance. The ordinance allows for conditions above and beyond what is provided for in the statute in order to protect the City from being forced into accepting a landscape maintenance district. Mr. Moellendorf described landscape maintenance districts in Douglas County, the City of Sparks, and Clark County.

Commissioner Livermore discussed benefits of the ordinance, and complimented staff for developing the same. He suggested including language regarding set aside funds for replacement of trees, turf, equipment, etc. He inquired as to who would be responsible for the year-end assessment. Mr. Moellendorf reviewed

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 18, 2006 Meeting

Page 6

Section 17.15.110(1)(b) and (d), and advised that reserve studies will be conducted for each maintenance district to determine the useful life of facilities. A portion of each maintenance district's assessment will be set aside for replacement costs. Commissioner Livermore suggested including language in the ordinance to cover the cost of landscape medians. Mr. Moellendorf advised that the Parks Department will conduct the annual review of landscape maintenance districts to determine whether assessments are sufficient to cover maintenance costs. The ordinance language provides for increases in assessments by ten percent or more to be presented to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that developers are not required to petition the City to establish a landscape maintenance district. Developers can form landscape maintenance associations, address maintenance through CC&Rs, through homeowners association regulations and fees, etc. In response to a comment, Mr. Moellendorf discussed the function of development agreements in construction of neighborhood parks. In response to a question, he advised that increasing operating costs would be considered as part of the annual review. In response to a further question, he referred to Section 17.15.111, and agreed that appropriate language should be added allowing property owners to petition to leave a landscape maintenance district. Discussion took place with regard to the appropriate action. In reference to the new language to be added to Section 17.15.111, Commissioner McKenna suggested "weighing the whole clause as protection for the City and compensation for the City for the efforts put into it if the homeowners want to opt out of it." Commissioner Livermore suggested that opting out of a landscape maintenance district which was a condition of approval for a development may not be permissible. He requested staff to look into the issue. Discussion followed, and Chairperson Curtis suggested taking action to re-agendize this item for a future meeting. **Commissioner Keeton so moved. Commissioner Livermore seconded the motion. Motion carried 9-0.** Chairperson Curtis recessed the meeting at 7:48 p.m.

3-C. ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS A REVISED PRIORITIZED LIST OF QUESTION #1, STATE OF NEVADA CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES PROTECTION GRANT PROGRAM PROJECTS (7:56:45) - Chairperson Curtis reconvened the meeting, and introduced this item. Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the staff report and, in response to a comment, discussed the purpose and the outcome of the Question #1 subcommittee meeting. Mr. Guzman provided background information on Question #1 for the benefit of the new commissioners. He reviewed and described the Question #1 priorities, as listed in the staff report and displayed in the meeting room on the Question #1 Opportunities map. In response to a question, he advised that two Question #1 applications will be submitted in July: one for the Potter property and the other for the combination of the Andersen and Jarrard properties. The property owners will have to sign the applications before they can be submitted. Mr. Guzman explained the application process and Question #1 funding which has already been allocated. He further explained the importance of "closing deals" in the near future. In response to a question regarding the trails projects, Mr. Guzman advised that applications will be submitted for the next cycle. Vice Chairperson Hoffman expressed disappointment that the Lake Tahoe Bike Trail is listed "at the bottom." He expressed confusion over the designation as a bike trail, and recalled that Question #1 had designated it as a non-motorized trail between the Lake and Highway 28. He noted that Carson City has the only opportunity to develop the trail because of private properties in Washoe and Douglas Counties. He advised of a trail head in Carson City along the shore in addition to a road on public land, which is used for fire and private residence access, which represent approximately 25 percent of the trail. He further advised of a demand for trails in the area. Mr. Guzman suggested that Vice Chairperson Hoffman may want to become directly involved in the process surrounding the Lake Tahoe

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 18, 2006 Meeting

Page 7

trail. In response to a question, Mr. Guzman provided background information on and explained the memorandum of understanding entered into by Carson City, Washoe County, and Douglas County authorizing Washoe County to take the lead on the Lake Tahoe trail. He responded to additional questions with regard to paving the trail. He acknowledged that the Carson River Advisory Committee will most likely take the lead on River projects associated with management.

Chairperson Curtis called for public comment; however, none was forthcoming. Mr. Moellendorf thanked Mr. Guzman, and explained staff's intent to consider reviewing the projects "in a bundle." He reiterated that all the projects are opportunity driven. He advised there is very little match funding available for trails projects, and that property acquisition is needed to construct trails. He explained that the approach to Question #1 funding has been "open space oriented" because of Mr. Guzman's success in identifying property and determining willing sellers. He reminded the commissioners that, although the project list is aggressive, there is only so much staff time and funding to accomplish it. Chairperson Curtis suggested that match funding may be designated through the partnership with WNCC. She noted that some of the projects listed were not included in the master plan.

In response to a question, Mr. Guzman advised that Question #1 projects are required to be approved by 2008. Project funding must be spent by 2010. Commissioner Livermore discussed the importance of the various aspects of Question #18 to the community. Chairperson Curtis entertained a motion. **Commissioner Keeton moved to approve the list. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. Motion carried 9-0.** Chairperson Curtis thanked Mr. Guzman for his presentation.

4. NON-ACTION ITEMS:

STATUS REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM STAFF (8:44:32) - Mr. Fahrenbruch described and reviewed the status of nine flood reparation projects which were funded by FEMA. He responded to questions regarding the depth of the detention pond at Long Ranch Park. He provided a status report on Silver Oak Park. In response to a question, he advised of the goal to have the park fully developed by winter.

Mr. Moellendorf reported that the Little League District Tournament was hosted at Governor's Field last weekend. He advised of having received many compliments toward Mr. Fahrenbruch and his staff for the fine condition of the fields. He further reported that the Babe Ruth Regional Tournament starts Saturday, July 22nd. He reported on the noxious weed abatement program and commended Mr. Guzman and Open Space Assistant Ann Bollinger for "thinking outside the box." He noted the use of goats on the Quill Ranch property, and advised they are doing a great job of taking care of the Russian knapweed. Adjacent county and city representatives are following the program with the intent of implementing similar programs. Mr. Moellendorf further reported that the final agreement with the Bureau of Land Management for Carson River Park Phase II will be presented to the Board of Supervisors at their August 7th meeting. A landscape architect has been selected to complete design of Ronald D. Wilson Memorial Park. Codega Design has submitted a proposal and the Wilson family will be included in the design process. Mr. Moellendorf further reported that the Recreation Division hosted the first-ever Family Fun Night earlier in the evening. He described details of the event, and circulated a flyer among the commissioners. He advised that approximately 80 people had signed up for the event.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 18, 2006 Meeting

Page 8

COMMISSIONERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

(9:00:45) - Chairperson Curtis advised that the Obesity Coalition had changed its name to the Wellness Committee. She noted one of the purposes of the Family Fun Night was to prepare people for a Wellness Committee-sponsored triathlon. Commissioner Livermore provided background information on an upcoming Board of Supervisors item to repeal an ordinance requiring bicycle licenses. He explained the reasons for doing so, and challenged bicycle users in the community to consider how to contribute to construction and maintenance of bicycle trails. Commissioner McKenna advised of a recent meeting at Eagle Valley Middle School wherein Division of State Lands representatives presented a proposal to construct houses on both sides of Fifth Street, from the Moffat property all the way to the bottom of Prison Hill. He requested staff to agendaize an item to discuss the possibility of requesting the Bureau of Land Management to designate the area, from Prison Hill to Fifth Street, as a recreation area. Chairperson Curtis advised of the intent to attend a Muscle Powered meeting on Thursday, July 20th where she will be talking to members of Muscle Powered who work as grant writers.

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

6. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (9:04:20) - Commissioner Livermore moved to adjourn the meeting. Vice Chairperson Hoffman seconded the motion. Motion carried 9-0.

The Minutes of the July 18, 2006 Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission meeting are so approved this 15th day of August, 2006.

DONNA J. CURTIS, Chair