

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 15, 2005 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 15, 2005 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Tom Keeton
Donna Curtis
John Felesina
Charlene Herst
Pete Livermore
John McKenna
Tom Patton

STAFF: Roger Moellendorf, Parks and Recreation Department Director
Scott Fahrenbruch, Parks and Recreation Director of Operations
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

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

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL (1-0007) - Chairperson Keeton called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Vice Chairperson DePauw and Commissioner Hoffman were absent.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS (1-0015) - None.

1. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - October 4, 2005 (1-0020) - Commissioner Livermore moved to approve the minutes, as presented. Commissioner Curtis seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (1-0027) - Mr. Moellendorf recommended deferring items 3-A, 3-B, 3-D, and 3-E. He explained that the wrong agenda had been posted and that individuals representing the items were not available to attend this meeting. He apologized for any confusion. In light of the situation, Commissioner McKenna suggested placing the item "Changes to the Agenda" prior to "Citizen Comments on Non-Agendized Items" on future agendas. He further suggested reopening public comment, and Chairperson Keeton did so. No public comment was forthcoming.

3. AGENDA ITEMS:

3-A. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' BOARD COMMUNICATION POLICY - Deferred.

3-B. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING THE EAGLE CREEK DETENTION BASIN NATURAL PARK AND TRAIL SYSTEM PLAN - Deferred.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 15, 2005 Meeting

Page 2

3-C. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING THE NEW FUJI PARK MASTER PLAN (1-0077) - Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the staff report. He advised that the proposed joint use agreement included the following conditions: that the Fairgrounds parking lot could only be used during times when there are no previously scheduled activities or events in the Fairgrounds arena; that the parking lot could only be used if the use does not interfere with the public's enjoyment and use of the Fairgrounds arena; and that the Parks and Recreation Department Director would have the sole right to determine use of the parking lot. Mr. Moellendorf responded to questions regarding the purpose of this agenda item.

In response to a further question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that approximately \$600,000 is currently budgeted for the Fuji Park / Fairgrounds Master Plan. Most of the budget would be tied up in necessary street frontage and drainage improvements along Old Clear Creek Road. Mr. Moellendorf advised that \$250,000 in Question #1 funding had been granted through the Nevada Department of Wildlife for development of the Fuji Park urban fishing pond. The project is on hold pending issuance of a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Moellendorf advised that the developer's donation will, in a sense, double the existing budget. The hope is that adding the donation to available funds will effect all improvements to the park and fairgrounds.

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf explained of all the costs involved in public improvements, i.e., purchase of land, equipment, manpower, materials, etc., generally 50% is allocated toward equipment and labor. The other 50% is generally allocated toward providing amenities, such as turf, irrigation system, playground equipment, etc. Leveraging the current \$600,000 budget with the developer's donation of equipment and labor, staff is hopeful to effect all improvements outlined in the Fuji Park / Fairgrounds Master Plan. In response to a further question, Mr. Moellendorf advised there is no cost estimate, at this point, because the conceptual plan was only recently developed. Commissioner Livermore advised that the developed portion of Fuji Park was funded through land sale proceeds from Costco and through Question #18. Additional funding was allocated to phase 2 of the project. Staff has determined, based on Carson City Municipal Code requirements, that expenditure of the \$600,000 is required to be allocated toward street frontage and drainage improvements. The \$250,000 in Question #1 funding was granted for the purpose of developing the urban fishing pond. Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged the developer's proposal to enter into a cooperative agreement to complete the park improvements.

Mr. Moellendorf noted the potential of a unique public / private partnership to facilitate improvement and development of Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds. The developer is requesting use of the parking area around the Fairgrounds arena to serve as overflow parking for the casino. Included with the previously reviewed conditions, Mr. Moellendorf advised that routine maintenance of the parking lot would be shared between the City and the casino developer.

Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the conceptual plan displayed in the meeting room and included in the agenda materials. He discussed the proposal to rearrange the orientation of the Fairgrounds arena. The planned location for the urban fishing pond will remain the same. Consideration has been given to relocating the horse barn to the south end of the park, and enlarging it to accommodate approximately 144 stalls. In addition, approximately 17,000 square feet would be designated for an exercise area. Mr. Moellendorf pointed out a proposed RV parking area, and discussed stream environment enhancements for Clear Creek. Consideration has been given to improving the Civil War-era cemetery, and providing nature and interpretive trails around the Clear Creek stream environment. Perimeter fencing would be installed from the present caretaker's residence, around the arena to contain livestock. Mr. Moellendorf advised that the

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 15, 2005 Meeting

Page 3

plan also calls for additional parking on the west end of the park. A new announcer's booth would be located on the south side of the arena across from the bleachers. The sound system would be installed on the bleacher side of the arena, with sound directed across the front of the bleachers and to the south. The present exhibit hall would remain, as well as the existing parking lot, gazebo, and playground equipment.

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the proposed amenities are the same, with some relocation and rearrangement. Nothing is lost and, in fact, a livestock holding pen was added outside the arena. Mr. Moellendorf responded to questions regarding the net gain on the horse stalls, and the proposed relocation of the cool down area. He pointed out the benefit that livestock will be separated from the public. He pointed out the entrance into the casino at Clear Creek Road and Highway 395, and a maintenance / emergency access to the south of the urban fishing pond. In response to a question, he advised that horse trailers would have access from Clear Creek Road. He anticipates no additional encroachment to Fuji Park. The only encroachment which differs from the existing plan is the additional parking on the west end. In response to a further question, Mr. Moellendorf pointed out two gates which would connect the adjoining parking lots. He acknowledged the casino owner will have to consult with the City's Reservation Coordinator for use of the parking area. The City will have priority use. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the City would purchase materials and equipment and the developer would provide the labor. In response to a further question, Mr. Moellendorf advised there are no detailed plans yet, but he anticipates some kind of wall, fence, or landscape to serve as a barrier to the overflow parking area. He advised there would be a total of 252 parking spaces.

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised the casino project would not necessarily be "scrapped" if the City does not agree to the overflow parking arrangement. Commissioner McKenna noted the commission's purview over the Fuji Park Master Plan, "but not the traffic on Old Clear Creek Road, whether or not the project gets built." He suggested the discussion should be framed around the commission's purview. Mr. Moellendorf agreed. Commissioner McKenna expressed concern that the citizens in attendance be aware the commission has no purview over traffic on Clear Creek Road. Commissioner Patton expressed curiosity with regard to the timing of the Bodine's property development. He expressed concern that commitments not be made in a joint use agreement ahead of the permitting process for the development. Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged that approval of any joint use agreement will be contingent upon sale of the property, project permitting, etc.

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf pointed out the proposed relocation of the concession stand and the restroom complex. Commissioner Livermore expressed concern with regard to designating amenities which may not be included due to cost restrictions. He suggested limiting the number of events, in the joint use agreement, which would require overflow parking by the casino. He further suggested the joint use agreement should include assurances that existing uses will be allowed to continue. He expressed concern with regard to fencing the urban fishing pond. Mr. Moellendorf agreed that the number of events held at the park will have to be balanced with non-structured, drop-in use, and that historic events will be allowed to continue. The joint use agreement will specify the casino can only use the overflow parking area at times when there are no previously scheduled events. Mr. Moellendorf suggested the developer may be interested in sponsoring events. Other than during "extremely large-scale events," he didn't foresee locking the fishing pond. In response to a question, he pointed out a maintenance / emergency access to the park. He acknowledged the possibility it could be developed into an ingress / egress point for the fishing pond.

Commissioner Felesina commented that the new master plan appeared to indicate a decrease in turf area.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 15, 2005 Meeting

Page 4

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the size of the fishing pond will remain at one acre pursuant to stipulations associated with the Question #1 grant funding. He pointed out that the proposed parking area on the west side also includes RV parking. He reminded the commissioners the plan was still conceptual. Staff will be submitting input from the commissioners and the public to the developer to finalize the plan. Commissioner McKenna inquired as to the appearance of diminished open space. Mr. Moellendorf advised that the new plan has a formalized parking area around the arena. In response to a comment, Mr. Moellendorf reiterated the goal to separate livestock from the public. He responded to additional questions regarding equestrian and RV access.

Chairperson Keeton provided direction regarding public comment, and opened this item. (1-0848) Joseph Lopez, an advocate of Question #18, expressed opposition to sharing “one inch” of the park with any casino.

(1-0862) Gilbert Yanuck expressed concern over the urban fishing pond and its associated amenities. With regard to the conceptual plan, he discussed concerns over access from the parking lot to the fishing pond, horses “mingling in the open area ... and what effect that might have on the ground water.” He expressed the opinion that the conceptual plan is “extremely workable.”

(1-0904) John Crawley, a resident of Clear Creek Road, inquired as to historic background of Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds. Mr. Moellendorf responded to questions regarding the original conveyance of the park to the City. There were no restrictions placed on the deed regarding improvements to the park. Commissioner Livermore provided historic information on the City’s acquisition of Fuji Park. Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged the joint use agreement would not involve any transfer of property. It would simply be a contractual agreement between the casino owner and the City.

(1-0964) Dave Morgan discussed benefits of public / private partnerships, and encouraged the commissioners to consider future opportunities.

(1-1000) Jay Meierdierck inquired as to the reason the Clear Creek stream environment zone was indicated to end at the bridge. He expressed the opinion the wetlands should be continued through to Highway 395 and enhanced rather than making a gravel parking lot, as indicated on the conceptual plan. He suggested fencing the pond from domestic livestock, and expanding pathways and trails into the area of the pond. With regard to the joint use agreement, he suggested the City has “been there and done that” at Fuji Park. He referred to a long-term agreement with Bar-One, and cautioned that definite time lines and limits should be included in the joint use agreement. Mr. Moellendorf pointed out the wetlands portion of the fishing pond, and described the proposed landscape. He agreed that extending a pathway along the stream merits consideration. He acknowledged past controversy associated with Fuji Park and “disappointments ... with joint use agreements.” He pointed out that past disappointments shouldn’t dictate future actions. He discussed the importance of ensuring specificity in the joint use agreement, and advised he has a lot of faith in the District Attorney’s staff. Staff is in the process of negotiating with the developer over the terms of the joint use agreement.

(1-1086) Jim Alexander inquired as to whether the most recent plan was drawn by the developer or Mr. Krahn. Mr. Moellendorf advised the plan was largely drawn by the developer’s design team following meetings with City staff. Mr. Alexander pointed out the boundaries of Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds, and provided background information on the City’s acquisition of the Fairgrounds. He discussed his

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 15, 2005 Meeting

Page 5

involvement in, and the activities of, the Northern Nevada Gated Horse Club. He reviewed details of the 2003 Fuji Park / Fairgrounds Master Plan which he was involved in helping to develop. He suggested that the subject plan appeared to have been drawn by a developer "who is concerned with having his parking ... adjacent to his casino. It is not drawn with the idea of the users of this City and this park." He suggested that the 2003 master plan should be blended with the proposed master plan. He emphasized that the Fairgrounds arena "is the only remaining, functioning rodeo and ... equestrian event center in this whole part of the country." The daily cost of the Reno Livestock Events Center is over \$1,500. The only place with barns is east of Fallon or the Reno Livestock Events Center. Mr. Alexander suggested the proposed fire access lane is too narrow. He discussed the importance of a covered arena, and disagreed with the proposed orientation of the arena. He proposed changes using the displayed conceptual master plan.

Mr. Alexander acknowledged having participated in developing the design of the 2003 Fuji Park / Fairgrounds Conceptual Master Plan. In response to a further question, he expressed the opinion that involving the user groups would end up with a different plan. He stated, "You're forcing the people that use this thing all the time into a corner if you don't give them a chance to help reorient this thing to where it works. ... We may spend the money building it ... and build ourselves into a corner with an almost unworkable facility."

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the user groups had not been contacted during the process of negotiations with the developer. He noted this was the point at which the proposal was being presented to the public. He agreed the possibility of reconvening the user groups merited consideration, and advised that everything is open for discussion at this point.

(1-1317) Beth Scott, of the Carson City Equestrian Alliance and the Carson City Sheriff's Mounted Unit, echoed Mr. Alexander's concerns over the proposed design. She expressed the opinion that shared use is possible, but advised the proposed design "severely impacts equestrian use at the Fairgrounds facility." She suggested it would be incorrect to characterize the proposed covered arena as a barn. It was intended as a covered arena in which stalls could be set up and events held. Ms. Scott discussed problems associated with the big arena, including slick and dangerous conditions during wet weather. She advised of a dire need for a dedicated equestrian facility that could be shared with canine events, covered and enclosed on two sides with a warm up area outside. She further advised that turning the arena into a barn is "totally unacceptable." The existing barn facilities need to be retained. She advised of no qualms with a casino adjacent to the Fairgrounds, and suggested the uses would be fairly compatible. She expressed the opinion "something could be worked out, but this plan is real far from satisfying the needs of equestrians." She suggested resurrecting the users coalition and also considering those who were not included in developing the 2003 plan. She recommended retaining locally-available experts in design of equestrian venues. She requested the commissioners to be mindful that "equestrian interests are most impacted by the proposed design." She advised that equestrians do not need paved parking; "it's dangerous."

(1-1427) Barbara Alexander concurred with Ms. Scott's criticism of the proposed plan and the need to resurrect the users coalition. She expressed concern that the \$600,000 "would not do half of what is proposed." She suggested the street and drainage improvements will be constructed, leaving insufficient funding to complete the park improvements. She expressed an interest in scheduling users coalition meetings and requested that more sufficient notice of meetings be provided.

(1-1442) Karen McCarthy, a Carson City Equestrian Alliance member, expressed the opinion the proposed

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 15, 2005 Meeting

Page 6

bridge crossing represents a dangerous situation in conjunction with vehicle traffic. She suggested an auxiliary bridge for livestock and their handlers. She further suggested the proposed parking adjacent to the stables may be slightly inadequate “combined with the size of rigs people bring to shows these days.” She inquired as to the possibility of overflow parking for trailers in the north lot. She expressed the opinion that the area east of the bridge should be left alone; it would give the fishing pond a more naturalistic environment. She suggested a footbridge from the east side parking lot, and expressed the opinion that the proposed orientation of the grand stand would be “diabolical.” She further suggested leaving the existing playground for park users. She reiterated Mr. Alexander’s and Ms. Scott’s comments in that “we may be designing ourselves into a corner ... without the ability to, in the future, change anything.”

(1-1521) Rick Taras, of the Northern Nevada Gated Horse Club, expressed the opinion that the amount of funding allocated to curbs and gutters is appalling, and that the developer should pay for the hardscape. He suggested building the horse barns before any other improvements. He advised that the users coalition was “promised a new speaker system and announcer’s booth, and ... nothing happened.” He expressed the opinion the fishing pond should be fenced, and concern over the proposed fire lane design. He acknowledged a willingness to work on a plan. He expressed concern over pavement in areas to be used by equestrians.

(1-1616) Bruce Scott expressed appreciation for the potential of working with staff, and an interest in working with the casino developer. He suggested avoiding the mindset that there is only the City’s available funding and the potential funding from the developer. He expressed a preference for implementing a good, overall plan in stages, rather than trying “to get something that’s two steps better than what we have now but still isn’t ultimately what would be a good facility.” Many of the Fuji Park events have significant economic benefits, and other potential sources of funding could be considered for phases and portions of the master plan. Mr. Scott suggested that if the developer understands a good facility will bring more people, there may be room to work with him in encouraging changes; i.e., considering the location of the hardscape parking adjacent to his casino and some other things. He expressed understanding for staff’s position in working with the potential developer and designing facilities to a certain level. He encouraged the commissioners to lobby hard for that portion of Question #18 not allocated to open space to ultimately consider a bigger budget. He reiterated the importance of a good design.

(1-1702) Jon Nowlin echoed the disappointment of the equestrian users in that there were “hundreds and hundreds of volunteer man hours” invested in developing the 2003 conceptual master plan. He inquired as to a dollar amount, and suggested the joint use agreement should include “an upper level limit that the developer is willing to accept.” He advised that one of the past frustrations in the Fairgrounds improvement plan has been the “ever-changing cost targets.” When Costco was sold, the cost for a new announcer’s booth, which was the number one priority of the users and the Parks Department, was \$75,000. It’s now estimated at \$140,000 to \$160,000 and it hasn’t been built. Mr. Nowlin advised of having estimated that between \$150,000 and \$200,000 of the land sale proceeds for the Costco property “went to various consultants ... instead of building things.” He stated, “The longer we wait to start construction, the worse it’s going to be.” He was shocked, after having been involved in this process for more than three years, “to suddenly see ... the \$600,000 will only buy us street improvements.” He suggested determining specific

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 15, 2005 Meeting

Page 7

costs and expressed the opinion the users should be involved. He further suggested the process should include “how much money the developer is going to put up.” He cautioned the commissioners to “beware of Greeks bringing gifts,” and suggested considering very carefully the commitments and the costs. “There’s lots of questions that need to be addressed before you come up with the specific agreement.”

(1-1780) Jack Anderson, of the Fuji Park Users Coalition, provided background information on his involvement in developing the 2003 conceptual plan. He advised the plan was last reviewed approximately 18 months ago, and that the improvements were divided into phases. The first phase included street improvements that were supposed to be done within a year of the last meeting. Another phase included relocation of the caretaker’s residence. Mr. Anderson advised there were approximately six phases which were dependent upon costs and available funding. After Fuji Park was improved, the project seemed to have been put on hold. He advised of having been involved in the Fuji Park Users Coalition since the early 1990s. He discussed the importance of reconvening the users coalition. He expressed the opinion, “It’s taken us years to get this far and to try to get it done within the next thirty days” is infeasible.

Commissioner Livermore agreed with Mr. Anderson’s comments, and advised that the delay in constructing the improvements was associated with permits required for the urban fishing pond. He further agreed with involving the users. He clarified that the City did not seek the proposal; the developer approached City officials. In response to a question, Mr. Anderson expressed the opinion that the developer’s offer represents a great opportunity. He reiterated the importance of involving the users coalition.

(1-1894) Vicki Cliff provided background information on her residence and involvement in equestrian interests in this area. She discussed the economic benefit, to the community, of a covered arena for equestrian usage. She expressed concern over “so much parking” around the arena. She suggested a combined-use covered arena, and agreed with reconvening the users coalition. She expressed the opinion that all user needs should be recognized and met. She suggested that a plan developed by the users may provide Mr. Coleman a more realistic outlook of “what this area is made of and what he needs to work with.” She expressed the opinion that the offer represents a great opportunity; that “it should be somehow worked out so everybody can take advantage of the situation.”

(1-1950) Ms. Scott discussed her involvement in development of the Aquatic Facility design, and the importance of considering latent demand.

(1-1983) Pete Stoelton expressed opposition to “so much concrete” in Fuji Park. He expressed concern over development of a casino because of the associated traffic, and that a southern California developer would have profits go to California rather than Nevada. He expressed concern over the developer’s agenda.

(1-2047) Claudia Taras expressed reservations over the developer’s agenda. She noted that Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds are primarily used in the summer, and suggested that casino patrons will want to enjoy the park during the summer as well. She advised of the requirement to schedule events at the park / fairgrounds at least one year in advance. She questioned the need for the overflow parking in light of the fact that the developer is proposing underground parking and parking adequate to the proposed development.

(1-2095) Loggia Lopez inquired as to whether another meeting will be scheduled at which the public will be able to provide input. Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged there will be plenty of opportunity for the public to provide input. Ms. Lopez inquired as to information on Question #18 and the funding allocated to Fuji

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 15, 2005 Meeting

Page 8

Park, as well as the outcome of the ballot question with regard to using the Fairgrounds or any part of Fuji Park land for commercial purposes. Mr. Moellendorf advised he would provide the information.

Chairperson Keeton closed public comment. Commissioner Livermore expressed concern over ensuring the exhibit hall is retained for the existing users. He provided background information on the Bar-One agreement, and discussed the importance of expediency in negotiations with the developer. He advised that the Board of Supervisors passed a resolution last year permanently setting aside Fuji Park for recreation purposes. Commissioner Curtis expressed appreciation for the citizens' comments and willingness to participate in the development process. Commissioner Felesina thanked the citizens for their attendance and participation. He noted the importance of Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds to Carson City. He expressed disbelief that the developer hadn't considered the potential of the park and fairgrounds to generate business for his casino. He suggested the developer should be amenable to the participation of the users groups in developing the master plan design. "A proper fairgrounds next to his business is going to mean a lot of extra money for him." Commissioner Herst thanked the citizens for their comments and for their willingness to participate in the process. She expressed opposition to agendizing the master plan as an action item until the users have had an opportunity to provide input and reach consensus with staff and the developer. She agreed with the importance of expediency. Commissioner McKenna noted that Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds was designed for special users, and the importance of taking their interests to heart. He suggested considering the opportunity as a business proposal. If a win-win solution can be developed in a reasonable time frame, "let's do it. If not, let's walk away. Let's not spend a lot of money on it." Commissioner Patton thanked the citizens for their comments, and advised that the Parks and Recreation Department staff is very receptive. He expressed the hope that the citizens would avail themselves of the opportunity to reconvene the users coalition. He shared concerns with regard to what may be lost, and expressed an interest as to details of the joint use agreement. Chairperson Keeton thanked the citizens for their attendance and participation. He assured the citizens nothing would happen until additional input is received. He suggested the item would be inappropriate for the December meeting, and advised that sufficient public notice of future meetings would be provided.

Commissioner Keeton recessed the meeting and reconvened.

3-D. ACTION REGARDING APPROVAL OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AND DONATION OFFER BY DEVELOPMENT NET CO. FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF FUJI PARK
- Deferred.

3-E. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING A COMMUNITY OBESITY PROGRAM -
Deferred.

4. NON-ACTION ITEMS:

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM STAFF (1-2332) - Mr. Moellendorf referred to the November 9, 2005 memo included in the agenda materials, and suggested there may not be a need for a second meeting in December. He further suggested the commission could take action with regard to the same at the December 6th meeting. Discussion took place regarding the tentative agenda for the December 6th meeting. Mr. Krahn responded to questions regarding time frames associated with the Vicee Canyon special planning area and the master plan meeting schedule. He distributed the final draft of the parks and recreation master plan to the commissioners, and discussed various ways by which the public

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 15, 2005 Meeting

Page 9

could obtain copies. Chairperson Keeton provided an overview of the written comments from Lenore Cruz, Janice Ayres, and Patricia Cooper-Smith which were included in the agenda materials. In response to a question, Mr. Fahrenbruch provided a status report on this year's community garden. He advised that a coordinator was appointed to oversee the garden this year, and that the number of participants continues to increase. He described the location of the community garden, and advised that the program participants are interested in increasing the garden area. Mr. Moellendorf provided a status report on the recreation center site selection process. He anticipates presenting information to the commission in the near future. He referred to the Nevada *Appeal* article included in the agenda materials, and commended Recreation Supervisor Joel Dunn for developing the innovative drop-in sports program. He advised that participation in the program was very poor, and that the program had to be dropped. Staff will be considering marketing techniques in an effort to revive a similar program in the future.

STATUS REPORTS, COMMENTS, AND CONCERNS FROM COMMISSIONERS (1-2921)-

In reference to the recreation center site selection process, Commissioner Patton advised that he serves as legal counsel to Cinderlite regarding a mining lease. He advised of having been previously unaware that the recreation center site being considered is a BLM-controlled property and of a potential overlap to the Cinderlite mining lease. He anticipated no conflict of interest because the recreation center site choices will be presented based on availability. Mr. Moellendorf advised that the subject property is available for City use through a recreation and public purpose lease. Mr. Moellendorf discussed his understanding of the milling claim leased by Cinderlite. Commissioner Livermore advised that Ronald D. Wilson Memorial Park and the residential construction tax recommendations were agenda items for the November 17th Board of Supervisors meeting.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS (1-3056) - Previously covered.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM STAFF - Previously covered.

5. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (1-3064) - Commissioner McKenna moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:15 p.m. Commissioner Felesina seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

The Minutes of the November 15, 2005 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting are so approved this 3rd day of January, 2006.

THOMAS N. KEETON, Chair