

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the April 5, 2005 Meeting

Page 1

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

PRESENT: Chairperson Tom Keeton
Vice Chairperson Donna DePauw
Donna Curtis
John Felesina
Charlene Herst
Michael Hoffman
Pete Livermore
John McKenna
Tom Patton

STAFF: Roger Moellendorf, Parks and Recreation Department Director
Scott Fahrenbruch, Parks and Recreation Director of Operations
Vern Krahn, Park Planner
Barbara Singer, Recreation Superintendent
Lee Plemel, Planning and Community Development Principal Planner
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 5:30 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Commissioner Patton arrived at 5:39 p.m. Vice Chairperson DePauw arrived at 5:47 p.m.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS (1-0013) - None.

1. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - March 1, 2005 (1-0016) - Commissioner Livermore moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Felesina seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (1-0020) - None.

3. AGENDA ITEMS:

3-A. ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE SCHULZ RANCH (RACE TRACK ROAD VICINITY) SPECIFIC PLAN AREA GENERAL POLICIES FOR CIRCULATION AND ACCESS SPA-RR-2.3, AND SPA-RR-4.1 THROUGH SPA-RR-4.6 FOR PARKS AND OPEN SPACE (1-0025) - Mr. Krahn provided an overview of the presentation, the staff report, and the attachments. [Commissioner Patton arrived at 5:39 p.m.]

Mr. Plemel explained the specific plan areas identified as part of the Citywide master planning process, and discussed various aspects of the subject area. He advised that a neighborhood meeting was conducted at which Mark Rotter, of Capital Engineering, and the developers provided a presentation on conceptual ideas for the proposed development. In addition, a public workshop was conducted as part of the March 28th

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the April 5, 2005 Meeting
Page 2

Planning Commission meeting. Recommendations of this Commission will be presented, together with the final application, to the Planning Commission at their April 27th meeting.

Mr. Plemel defined specific plan areas (“SPAs”), and advised that the subject SPA includes proposed land use designations, various setbacks and a variety of lot sizes, plan phases, park and trail facilities, neighborhood park requirements, and more specific residential design standards than would typically be included in a subdivision setting. Mr. Plemel referred to a color map, included in the agenda materials, and oriented the Commissioners to the Carson City / Douglas County boundary. He pointed out the area of the Douglas County North Valley Specific Plan which has been adopted and will include residential and commercial development. [Vice Chairperson DePauw arrived at 5:47 p.m.] Mr. Plemel pointed out the project area, the Stewart facility, Clear Creek and its flood plain, and Washoe Tribe property. He advised of discussions with regard to the State rehabilitating portions of the Stewart facility and constructing additional buildings over the next 1-3 years. He reiterated that this Commission’s recommendations would be forwarded to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Krahn advised of having attended the neighborhood meeting in December 2004 and the Planning Commission workshop on March 28th. He reviewed comments and input regarding park and trail facilities, and the park policies included in the agenda materials.

Mark Rotter, of Capital Engineering, advised he was representing Reynen & Bardis and Barker Coleman Homes. He pointed out, on a displayed map, the areas of interest to Reynen & Bardis and Barker Coleman (Area A), the race track parcel, and five parcels which make up what used to be the Schulz Ranch. He provided background information on discussions with Planning and Community Development staff regarding the SPA. He described the location of the property in relation to Highway 395, Topsy Lane, Center Drive, Bigelow Drive, and Race Track Road. He pointed out, on the displayed map, a parcel previously owned by the Bureau of Land Management which was recently released for commercial development. Two other BLM parcels will be released for auction in the near future, and are planned for residential development. He pointed out open space areas primarily related to steeper terrain and drainage terrain, the Stewart facility, Clear Creek, and the State Prison Farm. He advised that, in accommodating a number of policies and goals, a medium density residential designation had been proposed for the master plan, specifically single family 6,000-type zoning.

Mr. Rotter reviewed planning accomplished for the site which accounts for a number of different issues, including parks and traffic circulation. He discussed a connection between Topsy Lane and Center Drive, which will provide a transportation network to Highway 395, alleviate many traffic issues associated with Center Drive and Bigelow Drive, and provide an interconnection as part of the existing Carson City Bicycle Plan. He advised that bike paths are proposed for the connection which correspond with Douglas County’s plans for Topsy Lane where on-street bike paths are also proposed. Mr. Rotter pointed out a proposed linear park facility along Topsy Lane whereby a large width landscape area and pathway system would be provided. In addition, the north side of Topsy Lane will be landscaped. Mr. Rotter advised of having worked with the Parks and Recreation Department staff for a period of approximately six months. The engineering design includes detention facilities in the northern and southern portions of the site. A detention facility is proposed immediately adjacent to Clear Creek which will also allow access to Clear Creek, the Clear Creek corridor, and the Stewart facility.

Mr. Rotter discussed the 3.5-acre park proposed for the center of the proposed development, and reviewed connectivity to the linear park, the existing development to the east, the open space to the west, and a north/south parkway and pedestrian pathway. He advised that the one-acre detention basin designs are

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the April 5, 2005 Meeting

Page 3

proposed for very passive recreation. He pointed out the approximately four neighborhood developments which would surround the proposed 3.5-acre park. He acknowledged that all the developed streets will include curb, gutter, and sidewalk. He pointed out the buffer lots which will surround the one-acre parcels on the perimeter, and described access to the park facilities.

Mr. Rotter advised that most of the policies included in the proposed development relate to the comments and input received during development of the SPA document. He noted that horses will not be allowed on the medium density residential or the buffering lots. He advised that, of the 90 homes in the area, there are approximately 18 properties which keep horses or some other form of livestock. He reviewed existing equestrian routes to access Prison Hill and the Carson River, and advised that the development plan will provide for access routes to the east.

Mr. Rotter advised that if the plan proceeds and is approved, as presented, a more specific plan will be presented, including drawings of the linear park, neighborhood, and detention basin facilities. He responded to questions regarding delineations of the entire SPA and specific areas identified on the displayed map.

Commissioner McKenna noted that the Topsy Lane area of Highway 395 is fairly heavily traveled, and that a new access would be created through the residential development. He inquired as to how much the increased traffic will impact the proposed park sites. Mr. Rotter advised that the proposed park location was purposeful in order to allow Citywide access to the park. He pointed out access points on a displayed map.

Mr. Rotter acknowledged that the residential development will have City sewer and water. In response to a further question, he advised that the proposed configuration would allow for development of an effluent line to serve as the irrigation source for the park. He responded to further questions regarding connectivity via Center Drive and Bigelow Drive. Commissioner Livermore expressed a preference that the design include connected pathways which would discourage use of Topsy Lane and Highway 395. In response to an additional question, Mr. Rotter explained that the SPA document is intended to be more general. The next agenda item includes more specific details.

In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised the SPA document policies include that no homes will front Topsy Lane. In response to a further question, he advised that the intent of the phasing program is to have the park and recreation facilities completed by the time half the development is completed. The development agreement will clearly define the phasing program through the project, including all associated facilities. In response to a question, he advised of the goal to provide "a street tree scene."

In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised that the lot sizes will be similar to both the Landmark subdivision and the Silver Oak planned unit development. Vice Chairperson DePauw expressed concern with regard to the proposed park size and sizes of the detention basins. She advised that the park site at Silver Oak was allowed to be smaller because of the green space provided by the golf course. Mr. Krahn advised of having spent much time discussing the proposed park size with Mr. Rotter and with parks, recreation, and trails master plan consultant Jeff Winston. He advised that Mr. Winston has indicated Carson City is below the national average of a three to six-acre park facility per 1,000 people. He noted that the typical Carson City neighborhood park is 2-2.5 acres, and that the proposed park size is larger than the City's average. He discussed the Northridge subdivision, comprised of approximately 400 homes, which includes detention facilities, the 3-acre Blackwells Pond Park and the 2-acre Steinheimer Park. He advised that for the proposed development and density, the proposed 3.5-acre park is reasonable. Vice

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the April 5, 2005 Meeting

Page 4

Chairperson DePauw reiterated the opinion that the proposed park size should be larger to provide more green space for the development. In response to a question, Mr. Krahn advised that the street frontage landscape will be managed by the Parks Department. Anything to be maintained by the City will be built to Parks Department standards, including irrigation and landscape. The parks will be mostly turf with trees to provide shade. Mr. Plemel advised that the developers will be required to present landscape schemes for the individual front yards. Mr. Krahn acknowledged that the Parks and Recreation Department landscape standards are more detailed than the Planning and Community Development landscape standards.

In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised that Long Ranch Park is seven acres, 3-4 acres of which are more developed than the rest. He acknowledged that the developers will be responsible for constructing and installing the detention facilities, pathways, the connectivity, and the park. He clarified that development of the facilities is relative to the residential construction tax associated with the 500 units. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised of no other applications for development in the southern portion of town.

In response to a question, Mr. Krahn pointed out the Bently property. Commissioner Livermore expressed concern with regard to connectivity from the development to the open space. Mr. Krahn advised of the multi-use trail along the old V&T right-of-way which is included in the Bicycle System Plan. He described connectivity opportunities via the multi-use trail into the Bently conservation easement in Douglas County. Discussion ensued, and Commissioner Livermore requested that the development agreement include connectivity as a requirement.

Commissioner Herst inquired as to connectivity to the Edmonds Sports Complex, and Mr. Krahn described the route using a displayed map. Mr. Rotter responded to additional questions regarding the proposed width of Topsy Lane. Commissioner Patton expressed support for trail connectivity to the Edmonds Sports Complex. He advised that pedestrian and bicycle access via Bigelow and Snyder is "absolutely horrible." He suggested a more direct route straight up to the west side of the Edmonds Sports Complex somewhere along Bigelow Drive. Mr. Krahn pointed out a route on a displayed map. He agreed with Commissioner Patton's comments, and advised that a multi-use path has been identified on the Bicycle System Plan.

In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised that detention basins can be developed to accommodate more than passive recreation. He referred to Mayor's Park and Blackwell's Pond Park as examples. The northern detention basin will be landscaped in such a way as to fit appropriately with the vegetation of the Clear Creek corridor. Mr. Rotter described the method by which detention facilities are designed to be more usable.

Commissioner Curtis provided an e-mail message, from Sue Newberry, President of Muscle Powered, to Mr. Rotter, staff, and the Commissioners. In response to a comment, Mr. Plemel advised that comments and input are being received with regard to the direction of the Citywide master plan. The SPAs with development potential may lead to policy decisions in the overall master plan. The Planning and Community Development Department is responsible to respond to applications as they are submitted, while incorporating them into the master plan process.

Chairperson Keeton expressed concern that there is agreement between the SPA, the proposed development, and the parks, recreation, and trails master plan as each moves forward. Mr. Plemel commented that Ms. Newberry's remarks were excellent. He advised that the proposed development in the SPA is an opportunity to provide required amenities. He expressed the opinion that the proposed development plan provides for excellent connectivity to coordinate with any future planned trails under any

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the April 5, 2005 Meeting
Page 5

scenario. He advised that the form of trails, open space, parks and recreation will directly respond to any scenario presented in the master plan. Mr. Krahn acknowledged that the Muscle Powered organization will have another opportunity to provide comments and input. He suggested that their representatives attend the April 27th Planning Commission meeting. Chairperson Keeton expressed support for the design, in that it includes connectivity and recreation facilities.

Commissioner Livermore requested the developers to consider designating one of the two detention basins as a dog park. In response to a question, Commissioner Felesina and Chairperson Keeton provided background information on the race track. In response to a question, Mr. Krahn described the sidewalk and landscape design for the area from the south detention basin to Clear Creek, and along Race Track Road. He acknowledged that sidewalks in the residential area will be directly adjacent to the curb. Mr. Plemel advised that landscape plans will be submitted.

Chairperson Keeton opened this item to public comment.

(1-1411) Jon Nowlin expressed the opinion that approving the SPA in advance of settling on the master plan vision is “almost a pre-emptive strike.” He described the SPA as “one of the last significant, rural-flavored areas in this valley with acre and larger lots and a fair amount of livestock on some of those lots.” He suggested that the proposed medium density development is “really quite high density when you look at some of the lots.” He expressed the opinion that, before the decision is made, the master plan visioning process should be completed. He advised that the proposed development will change the rural aspect and view shed of the southern part of Eagle Valley. He expressed agreement that the proposed park is not large enough for the planned population of the area, and given the fact that the nature of the view shed will be changed so significantly. He expressed concern over bike / pedestrian access. He referred to the presentation which indicated that a revised Topsy Lane will be a major pedestrian / bike route. He stated, “No one’s going to take that to go to 395 to go to Carson City.” He advised that the intersection of Topsy Lane and Highway 395 “is a large disaster area now prior to doubling the commercial development around that intersection.” He suggested that, at best, Topsy Lane will be an access route to get to Center Drive and Bigelow Drive and then into Carson City for pedestrians and bicyclists. He expressed the opinion there should be specific requirements in approving the proposed plan for those portions of Center and Bigelow going through the development to provide for access. Then, in the future, the master plan for bike lanes and pathways could connect to that. In response to a question, Mr. Nowlin expressed appreciation for the consideration given to details by City staff and the developers. He reiterated his objection to the proposed development being approved prior to conclusion of the master plan visioning process.

Chairperson Keeton called for additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, closed public comment. Commissioner Felesina pointed out that the proposed development only appears to border Center Drive, not Bigelow Drive. He expressed agreement with requiring the developer to provide for bike lanes on Center Drive, but not on Bigelow Drive. Discussion followed, and Chairperson Keeton entertained a motion. Additional discussion took place with regard to the appropriate action. **Vice Chairperson DePauw moved to recommend to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors approval of the Schulz Ranch (Race Track Road vicinity) Specific Plan Area general policies for circulation and access SPA-RR-2.3, and SPA-RR-4.1 through SPA-RR-4.6 for parks and open space, providing that the park is made larger. Commissioner Curtis seconded the motion. Motion carried 9-0.**

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the April 5, 2005 Meeting

Page 6

3-B. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING THE DESIGN CHARACTER AND SITE AMENITIES FOR PARKS WITHIN THE SCHULZ RANCH (RACE TRACK ROAD VICINITY) SPECIFIC PLAN AREA (1-1638) - Mr. Krahn reviewed the staff report. Commissioner Herst suggested that a larger park will require more parking, and inquired as to how this will fit with traffic circulation. Commissioner Livermore expressed the hope that the park will be designed in such a way as to encourage people to bike or walk to it. In response to a question, Mr. Rotter discussed the developers' intent that the Edmonds Sports Complex serve as the regional park facility in the area, and to include a neighborhood park in the proposed development. He suggested that a larger park with more parking and expanded turf will begin to create a regional park. Mr. Rotter noted the importance of a neighborhood park from the standpoint of the development, and the four neighborhoods which will primarily be accessing the facility. He referred to the park design described by Mr. Krahn, and advised that determining the difference between a neighborhood and a regional facility has been a topic of much discussion.

In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised that a portion of the proposed development calls for entry level housing. He anticipates there will be some children in the area. Commissioner McKenna expressed a preference for park equipment to accommodate seniors, short walks, and sitting; places for families to gather; and some playground equipment for young children. He expressed support for "a place where the community can go to meet its neighbors, people that live in that area, and some minor recreational things for the little ones and, short of that, ... a bunch of grass."

Commissioner Patton expressed understanding for the developers' intent to construct a neighborhood park. He suggested the park may, in fact, be used regionally in that Edmonds is a sports complex, limited to soccer and softball. He referred to Ross Gold Park as the only other neighborhood park in the area, and expressed the opinion that the park will draw from much more than the proposed development. He expressed support for barbecue and restroom facilities. Mr. Rotter clarified that the developers did not want to create a large field area which would invite soccer, softball, etc. and scheduling of those types of activities. The idea is to include picnic areas, walking paths, seating, and places to meet.

In response to a question, Mr. Rotter pointed out a neighborhood roadway which will have houses on one side of the street, and parking on both sides of the street to accommodate overflow parking for the park. Mr. Moellendorf advised that sizing a park is a "delicate situation" in order to meet the needs of the neighborhood, provide green space, and provide an area for pick up games, without creating a park that people will be tempted to program as soccer and softball fields. He pointed out that the streets in the proposed neighborhoods will not accommodate the type of traffic such activities would bring about. He suggested that "size matters" is not always true of park development. The amenities included in a park are more important than size. A well-designed park, even on a smaller scale, can be very functional. Mr. Moellendorf advised that staff will work closely with the developers to ensure the park is designed appropriately to allow for ease of maintenance and provision of the amenities needed by the neighborhood and the City. In response to a question, Mr. Rotter advised that the current size of the proposed park is 3.5 acres. He acknowledged that avoiding the wrong type of scheduling for the park can be done through design. Commissioner Hoffman suggested that developing the southern detention pond with turf only would make it a better place for a dog park.

Vice Chairperson DePauw suggested the opportunity to relocate the Mills Park tennis courts at the proposed park site. She expressed support for lots of trees and a pavilion, and emphasized that the park would belong to the entire community. Commissioner Livermore discussed the history of the Schulz Ranch, and suggested the opportunity to recognize its historic significance. Chairperson Keeton expressed support for lots of trees, exercise stations, a pavilion, and picnic facilities.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the April 5, 2005 Meeting

Page 7

Mr. Rotter requested additional input from the Commissioners with regard to the portable toilet enclosure. Commissioner Curtis suggested the Commission should develop a restroom policy, and expressed support for some type of restroom facility. Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged that restroom facilities are important, particularly to neighborhood parks. He discussed difficulties associated with maintaining fixed restroom facilities, and reasons for portable toilet facilities. Mr. Fahrenbruch agreed that fixed restroom facilities are “huge magnets” for vandalism and other crime. He advised they are necessary for regional park facilities, but are very inappropriate for neighborhood parks. He further advised that fixed restroom facilities change the dynamic of a park, and are “huge maintenance drains” for Parks staff. He expressed full support for the portable restroom facility at the proposed park. Commissioner McKenna expressed support for including water fountains. Commissioner Livermore requested staff to bring back some imaginative solutions for portable toilet enclosure designs. Mr. Fahrenbruch acknowledged that an ADA unit would be included.

Mr. Krahn reviewed the Detention Basin / Natural Area Parks portion of the staff report. Commissioner Felesina requested that the Clear Creek detention basin be designed as “natural and peaceful” as possible. He agreed with designating the southern detention basin as a dog park. Mr. Rotter acknowledged that each of the detention basins are slightly larger than one acre. He estimated the linear park area at 1.5 acres. Commissioner Hoffman noted that approximately 7.5 acres of total green area is proposed to be included in the development. Mr. Krahn responded to questions regarding the connector path between the two detention basins. In response to a further question, he advised that no lighting is proposed for the park other than what may be required in the parking lot. Mr. Rotter acknowledged that roadway lighting will be required along Topsy Lane. Discussion has included lighting the linear park pathway as well. Mr. Rotter acknowledged that shielded lighting to protect dark skies is now required. He thanked the Commissioners for their input.

Chairperson Keeton called for public comment; however, none was provided. [Chairperson Keeton recessed the meeting at 7:47 p.m. and reconvened at 7:55 p.m. Commissioner Herst had left the meeting; a quorum was still present.]

3-C. ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO APPROVE MILLS PARK AS THE LOCATION FOR THE NEW RECREATION CENTER, SPECIFICALLY LOCATED ADJACENT TO THE EAST SIDE OF THE CARSON AQUATIC FACILITY (1-2537) -

Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the staff report. He acknowledged that parking is a big issue, and advised that the west side parking lot is important to the Community Center regardless of where the recreation center is constructed. He advised that if the west side parking lot is not constructed, other parking options would have to be identified in order to facilitate locating the recreation center at Mills Park. He acknowledged that if parking issues can't be solved, locating the recreation center at Mills Park would become infeasible. He advised that a parking plan will need to be developed as part of the planning process for the recreation center. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the Land and Water Conservation Fund issue has more to do with a time element than anything else. He advised there is no reason to begin to address the issue if the recreation center will not be located at Mills Park.

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf reminded the Commission that three sites were selected as part of the planning charrette. The Mills Park site graded out, through the matrix system, as the highest; however, two other sites can be considered: Centennial Park and property across the street from Eagle Valley Middle School. Commissioner Patton expressed concern that the site, in large part, will determine the type of facility to be constructed. He expressed additional concerns with “the sequence of events” and whether the recreation center will accommodate racquetball. He inquired as to whether the site will limit

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the April 5, 2005 Meeting

Page 8

the design from including racquetball facilities. He advised that the racquetball organization is insistent that six courts are needed. Mr. Moellendorf advised that the site could allow for a lot of amenities, including multiple racquetball courts depending on the amount of Mills Park to be used. Commissioner Patton discussed the square footage needed for a facility that would include racquetball courts and all the other amenities discussed at the March 15th Commission meeting. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf reiterated that the site, in large part, will determine the cost of the facility as well as amenities to be included. He explained the statement was based on the premise that, at the time of the planning charette, Mills Park represented the most cost-effective location for constructing the facility. Construction costs associated with building a new facility on a green field site would be higher because of bringing infrastructure to the site. This could limit the type of amenities and recreational components to be included in the facility. Mr. Moellendorf advised that the size of the facility depends upon the appetite of the public, the Commission, and the Board of Supervisors for using the green space at Mills Park for initial construction and any future phases.

Commissioner Livermore complimented Mr. Moellendorf on the ten items listed in the staff report. He listed his top four priorities as #8, #3, #4, and #7. He recognized the limitations of parking, traffic circulation, loss of the green space and amenities, and needs for other recreation amenities. He noted that the Commission has, in past years, challenged itself with regard to providing recreational facilities for the community. Mr. Moellendorf clarified that the items in the staff report were not listed in priority order. He agreed that #8 would be his first priority.

Commissioner Patton inquired as to whether six racquetball courts could be accommodated at the proposed Mills Park site. Mr. Moellendorf advised there would first have to be an understanding that six racquetball courts would be included in the plan. If that was a recreational amenity this Commission wanted to include, and if the Board of Supervisors approved the recommendation, the answer would be “yes, we could include six racquetball courts if the public and the Board of Supervisors wanted to give up the adequate space in Mills Park to accomplish that.” Commissioner Patton suggested holding public meetings first to get more of a “feel” for what amenities should be included before asking for approval of the proposed site. Mr. Moellendorf expressed the opinion that having the site determined will have a big effect on the cost of the facility and, therefore, the type of amenities which can be provided. Considering a new site would require “going back to the drawing board” to develop new cost estimates and a determination of the type of facility \$6.2 million will purchase. Mr. Moellendorf anticipates that, based upon the planning charette and discussions with the consultants, the facility would be considerably less than the facility proposed for the Mills Park site.

Commissioner Curtis expressed surprise that this item was agendaized in that her understanding from the March 15th meeting was “everything was very conceptual still.” She expressed understanding and agreement with the reasons for proposing the Mills Park site, but was under the impression that various alternatives and plans would be explored in public meetings. She suggested the master plan survey results will be important to review. She expressed the opinion that the parking issue needs to be explored prior to taking action. She advised of Commissioner Herst’s concurrence. Vice Chairperson DePauw expressed the hope that the neighbors had been notified of this meeting. Mr. Moellendorf advised there was no notification provided to the neighbors of Mills Park. He expressed the opinion that the recreation center has had plenty of media attention. Vice Chairperson DePauw expressed the opinion that adjacent neighbors should be notified of decisions which may impact their neighborhood. Chairperson Keeton advised of an article which appeared in this morning’s paper.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the April 5, 2005 Meeting
Page 9

Commissioner Felesina referred to the freeway bypass, and expressed concern with regard to “splitting the City and putting everything great on one side and not on the other.” He expressed the opinion that if Mills Park is designated as the site for the recreation facility, consideration should be given to constructing a similar facility at Centennial Park within the next ten years. He expressed opposition to tearing out trees and turf, but noted that the decision has to be made soon “no matter how hard it is.” Mr. Moellendorf agreed there may be another facility needed in one of the other two possible locations mentioned previously. In response to previous comments, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the recreation facility is still in the conceptual stage. However, in order for the planning process to continue forward and construct a building in a timely fashion, the Commission must take on the difficult task of selecting a site. Commissioner Curtis suggested that the Commission give direction regarding constraints to the site rather than making a decision to select a site at this meeting.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that, with regard to public access, there are two routes into Mills Park and it's on the bike plan. Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged that the summer programs still transport children to this site. Commissioner Livermore suggested the charette should have included cost estimates for the proposed sites. He discussed the importance of cost estimates in the decision making process. Mr. Moellendorf advised that cost estimates were considered as part of the charette. The green field site was close to \$1 million more than the Mills Park site for comparable recreational amenities and square footage. Mr. Krahn acknowledged that infrastructure costs would be included at both the Centennial Park and Fifth Street sites. In addition, the architectural design for the building was more plain because of the need to trade off site improvements costs for reducing the square footage of a building. Mr. Krahn noted that the Mills Park site already has infrastructure.

Commissioner McKenna advised he was not convinced that “destroying Mills Park is the right thing to do.” He noted that the Pony Express Pavilion has never fulfilled its design criteria and “never will.” He expressed the opinion that constructing more buildings in Mills Park shows no vision as to the direction for Carson City over the next twenty years. He advised of not having sufficient information upon which to base a decision. He noted the limited space for expansion of a facility at Mills Park. He expressed an interest in hearing from the public first. He noted that the original proposition was sold as the facility being an isolated, community gym, not enhancement of an existing facility. Mr. Moellendorf advised that the Pavilion was included as one of the sites considered. It was ruled out early for various reasons. Mr. Moellendorf suggested that the idea of a multi-purpose gymnasium, on the Question #18 ballot, has evolved since 1996 as recreation needs have changed in the community over that period of time.

Commissioner Patton shared the concerns expressed by his fellow Commissioners. He expressed an inclination to believe in the recommendation, based on Mr. Moellendorf's experience and the many good reasons for choosing the Mills Park site. He discussed concerns over traffic and circulation, and advised of having received insufficient information with regard to the feasibility of the site. He expressed an interest in reviewing the results of the master plan survey, and more information regarding cost estimates and comparisons. He expressed support for the recommendation, but was unwilling to take action until additional information can be provided. Vice Chairperson DePauw suggested visiting the proposed site.

(2-0100) Chairperson Keeton agreed there may not be enough information upon which to base a decision. He suggested that part of the Commission's job should be to identify another funding source if necessary to choose another site. He expressed support for the Mills Park site because of its central location, but agreed with earlier comments by Commissioner McKenna that future expansion may become an issue. He

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the April 5, 2005 Meeting
Page 10

expressed the opinion that the City is not so large the recreation facility cannot be placed in the very best site. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that staff will work hard in providing additional information. He requested additional input as to the information being sought.

Commissioner McKenna requested the opportunity to first hear from the public with regard to the City's vision and the best location for the recreation center. Commissioner Patton agreed, and expressed an interest in reviewing concepts and rough cost estimates depending upon the site selection. In addition, he requested the opportunity to review the previously completed traffic study and information regarding the forecasted traffic patterns. Commissioner Curtis expressed an interest in reviewing a rendering of Mills Park and "what all of this would look like as phase 1 and phase 2." She requested staff to consider how to fund the west side parking lot. Vice Chairperson DePauw expressed concern with regard to the parking. Commissioner Felesina pointed out that no site will be perfect. Commissioner Livermore suggested including discussion of Question #18 and residential construction tax, and reviewing income revenue. Chairperson Keeton expressed doubt that the facility will be different if constructed at Mills Park versus an alternate location. He called for public comment.

(2-0226) Gladys Jesse advised of having lived in Carson City for the last five years. She further advised of not having known about the recreation facility until just recently, after reading newspaper articles. She expressed agreement with Commissioner McKenna's comments, and the opinion that "Mills Park is the diamond of Carson City." She advised of being a frequent user of recreation facilities at Mills Park. She expressed understanding that some of the trees in the park are old and need to be replaced, and discussed the aesthetic value of the park. She expressed the opinion the Commission was being hypocritical in discussing a larger park for the Schulz Ranch development and considering "chopping up" Mills Park. She expressed the further opinion that more, well-publicized public meetings are needed. She reiterated her agreement with Commissioner McKenna's comments that "Mills Park is beautiful just the way it is."

(2-0275) Mr. Nowlin referred to his comments provided at the March 15th Commission meeting. He advised of having lived in Carson City for thirty years, and that one of the City's biggest mistakes was not accepting from the Mills family all of the V&T property, from the roundhouse to the high school site. Having lived in Carson City thirty years "and seeing how much money really determines what happens in this community," he expressed concern with regard to fragmenting the Commission's efforts. He suggested that two recreation centers would be ideal, but expressed doubt this would happen in Carson City, given the current population and the conservative tax base. He suggested considering the opportunity for a more full-service family center, with available funding, in a central location that will have mass transit connections. He expressed the opinion that, given all the problems associated with Mills Park, "it's still the best site ... on the table today." He suggested requesting Regional Transportation Commission staff to provide a presentation on Roop Street. He agreed that operational costs are a serious consideration, and that the opportunity to lower them at this site is important to consider. He expressed understanding for the magnitude of the decision, and reiterated the opinion that Mills Park is the better of the three sites.

(2-0334) Dave Morgan discussed recent legislation regarding property taxes, and expressed concern with regard to the community's ability to "do another Question #18." He suggested a well programmed "for now" facility would push the Board of Supervisors to consider parking. He expressed the hope that marketing, location, taxes, will be considered.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the April 5, 2005 Meeting

Page 11

Chairperson Keeton entertained a motion. **Commissioner Hoffman moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to approve Mills Park as the primary of three possible locations for the new recreation center. Motion died for lack of a second. Commissioner Patton moved to table the item until staff can provide additional information along the lines requested by the Commission. Commissioner McKenna seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-1.**

Mr. Moellendorf responded to questions regarding the time table for gathering the requested information and reagendaizing this item.

4. NON-ACTION ITEMS:

STATUS REPORT ON QUESTION #18, RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION TAX, AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (2-0455) - None.

STATUS REPORT ON UPDATE OF THE PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT TO THE MASTER PLAN (2-0457) - None.

STATUS REPORT ON STATEWIDE BALLOT QUESTION #1 PROGRAM, GRANT APPLICATIONS, AND PROJECTS (2-0459) - None.

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM STAFF (2-0461) - Mr. Moellendorf advised that staff is proceeding with the Silver Oak neighborhood workshop meetings. Press releases have been published, and he reviewed the meeting schedule. He reminded the Commissioners of the meeting scheduled for Saturday, April 9th.

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS (2-0500) - Vice Chairperson DePauw reviewed the Arbor Day Celebration information included in the agenda materials, and requested the Commissioners' attendance. She reviewed information recently published in the newspaper, and expressed an interest in reviewing a copy of the master plan survey. Discussion took place with regard to the master plan survey. Commissioner Livermore commended the recent retirement of Administrative Assistant Sandy Tschumperlin.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS (1-0695) - None.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM STAFF (2-0682) - Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the tentative agenda for the April 19th meeting.

5. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (2-0695) - Commissioner Livermore moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m. Vice Chairperson DePauw seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

The Minutes of the April 5, 2005 meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission are so approved this 21st day of June, 2005.

THOMAS N. KEETON, Chair