

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the October 18, 2005 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 18, 2005 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

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

STAFF: Roger Moellendorf, Parks and Recreation Department Director
Vern Krahn, Park Planner
Lee Plemel, Planning and Community Development Principal Planner
Michael Suglia, Senior Deputy District Attorney
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. Vice Chairperson DePauw and Commissioners Felesina, Herst, and Hoffman were absent.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS - None.

1. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES (1-0014) - None.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (1-0161) - At Mr. Krahn's request, Chairperson Keeton modified the agenda to address items 3-D and 3-C prior to item 3-B.

3. AGENDA ITEMS:

3-A. ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO APPROVE THE ALLOCATION OF \$20,000 OF RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION TAX FUNDS TO CARSON CITY BMX FOR THE BMX TRACK LIGHTING PROJECT (1-0022) - Commissioner Livermore moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to approve the allocation of \$20,000 in residential construction tax funds to the Carson City BMX for the BMX track lighting project. Commissioner McKenna seconded the motion. Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged that the funds would be earmarked in a City account. Chairperson Keeton called for a vote on the pending motion; **motion carried 5-0.**

In response to a question, Mr. Suglia provided background information on, and reviewed, the October 5, 2005 letter included in the agenda materials. He discussed the importance of specifically-worded agenda items which provide sufficient notice to the public. Discussion followed.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the October 18, 2005 Meeting

Page 2

(1-0131) Jay Meierdierck expressed the understanding that residential construction tax funding is required to be used within a certain time period of its allocation. He requested the commission to request a legal opinion regarding whether the recommended action would be allowed pursuant to residential construction tax requirements. Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged he would discuss the question with Mr. Suglia and report back to the commission.

3-B. ACTION TO REVIEW AND RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS GUIDING PRINCIPALS, GOALS, SUGGESTED POLICIES, AND POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE “PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN” AND THE “UNIFIED TRAILS MASTER PLAN” WITHIN THE “POLICY FRAMEWORK” DOCUMENT (1-1627) - Mr. Plemel reviewed the staff report and provided an overview of the Policy Framework. Mr. Krahn referred to page 11, and reviewed the “Suggested Policies” section.

Commissioner McKenna expressed concern regarding the tone of Goal 4.1, and the opinion that “disparity in the amount and types of parkland available” is not the problem. He suggested the Policy Framework document should stand on its own in order to serve as a guide for future policies. He recommended removing “judgement words” from the document. Commissioner Livermore discussed concerns expressed by citizens regarding single-track trail opportunities on the west side of town. He expressed concern with regard to closing certain areas, and the hope that equitable recreation opportunities will exist throughout town. Mr. Plemel advised that the Policy Framework, as a “snapshot in time,” would not be further modified; that comments and input would be incorporated into the draft comprehensive plan.

Commissioner Patton advised of having recently attended a downtown charette and a workshop. In reference to the responses to question #22 of the opinion survey, he inquired as to how staff reached the conclusion that urban sprawl is not wanted. Mr. Plemel reviewed the various surveys associated with the comprehensive land use master plan. He advised that comments received on the compact growth versions of the land use scenarios predominantly outweighed those received on the urban expansion scenarios. In addition, responses to survey questions specifically associated with Highway 50 East indicated a desire to not grow into adjacent federal land. In terms of the efficient use of City resources, including water, road maintenance, snow removal, etc., the compact form of development is the result and direction at this point. Commissioner Patton commended staff and the consultants on all their efforts. He suggested that the responses regarding future growth and development are somewhat divided and that it will most likely depend upon demographic pressure and interest. He expressed concern over language in the Policy Framework document which may be unduly restrictive and “works to ... close the door.” He suggested considering the opportunity for managing and guiding “some really quality ... additional growth up the slope a little bit.” He suggested that the north side of town may be a prime location for “passive solar, energy efficient home building and high quality development that could include parks and recreation opportunities.” He expressed concern over the language of goal 3.2(a), and recommended changing it to “guide and regulate future hillside development ... by encouraging positive, visually appealing hillside development through the use of cluster development...” He referred to communities in Reno, the Oakland, Berkeley and Los Angeles hills, and expressed concern over the City foreclosing the possibility of developing the hillsides. He advised he would put his comments in writing, and expressed appreciation for staff’s consideration.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the October 18, 2005 Meeting

Page 3

For words such as “limited,” Commissioner McKenna suggested substituting language and concepts which indicate the possibility for public involvement such as the word “planned.” He acknowledged the request to globally replace such words and concepts. Commissioner Patton agreed and discussed the importance of flexible language. Mr. Plemel discussed the balance between providing flexibility and direction with regard to community values. Chairperson Keeton provided comments and suggested revisions which he offered to submit in writing. Discussion took place regarding the language of the master plan in reference to a city or national standard for parks and recreation. Mr. Krahn explained that Consultant Jeff Winston had identified individual needs within Carson City neighborhoods, and then provided direction to staff to address those needs. He expressed the opinion that Mr. Winston’s park analysis moves the master plan away from imposing a national standard for Carson City parks and recreation.

With regard to the draft land use map, Commissioner Curtis requested that existing and proposed parks be distinguished. Discussion ensued, and Mr. Moellendorf advised that neighborhoods needing recreational facilities had been identified in the master plan. To show the locations specifically would be “very dangerous” and not something to include in the master plan. Commissioner Curtis expressed an interest in the method by which master plans are developed in other communities, and the opinion that the purpose of a master plan is to consider locations for future facilities. Mr. Plemel responded to questions regarding the “conservation reserve - public” designation. Commissioner Curtis requested that the thirty neighborhoods be overlaid onto the land use plan, including existing and proposed trails. Discussion took place regarding neighborhood activity centers.

(1-2962) Jay Meierdierck expressed concern that the Policy Framework document represents the guiding principles for the entire parks, recreation, and trails plan. He suggested there was only one guiding principle relative to parks, recreation, and open space, and only one goal relative to neighborhood parks. He advised there was no “discussion ... of open space other than in the title; there’s no reference or indication ... about regional parks, community parks, except in the implementation strategies.” He suggested that the Policy Framework needed to be “elaborated and expanded.” He further noted no reference to the concept of utilizing school district grounds as neighborhood parks. He expressed the opinion that the entire “parks and recreation program needs to be elaborated.” He further noted no reference to trails.

Commissioner McKenna expressed concern over whether anything had been accomplished because of the diverse opinions presented at this meeting. Mr. Plemel reiterated that the Board of Supervisors would not adopt the Policy Framework document. He expressed appreciation for the commissioners’ comments. Commissioner Livermore moved to delay action on this agenda item to the November 1st commission meeting. Commissioner Curtis suggested that a revised version of the Policy Framework document should be submitted to the commission for review. Motion died for lack of a second.

3-C. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING THE CITY’S ADOPTION SCHEDULE AND PROJECT TIME LINE FOR THE PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN OVERALL MASTER PLANNING DOCUMENT THAT INCORPORATES THE UNIFIED TRAILS MASTER PLAN, THE BICYCLE SYSTEM PLAN, AND THE PEDESTRIAN PLAN (1-0630) - Mr. Plemel distributed and provided an overview of the master plan meeting schedule. Mr. Krahn reviewed the staff report and details of the meeting schedule. In response to a question, he advised there are no time frames associated with those particular action items identified in the neighborhoods. Staff considers that the master plan will establish a direction; work plans

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the October 18, 2005 Meeting

Page 4

will be done individually. Mr. Moellendorf agreed that work plans must be separate from the master plan. He advised that the master plan will have implementation recommendations. Staff will develop work plans to include priorities associated with the master plan implementation recommendations. Commissioner Curtis expressed concern that the “meat of the plan ... is still out there.” Mr. Plemel referred to the “work plans” as a capital improvements program, and noted that master plans should not be amended in order to develop annual capital improvements programs. He explained that not every implementation strategy will be assigned a time line, but there may be some things identified as part of the master plan which are established as higher priorities. Discussion took place regarding the unified trails master plan, potential funding sources, and the bicycle path along the southern leg of the freeway.

(1-0959) Jay Meierdierck advised that the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Board of Supervisors adopted a Carson City Bicycle Master Plan in 1994.

Commissioner Curtis suggested that the unified trails plan will lend itself to implementation because of the CAMPO Plan. She recommended scheduling a joint meeting with the Regional Transportation Commission at the time the CAMPO plan is presented. She referred to a previous request for a NDOT representative to provide a presentation on the freeway bike path. She suggested developing a project matrix similar to that which was done for Question #1 opportunities. Mr. Moellendorf inquired as to Commissioner Curtis’ expectation regarding priorities and implementation to be included in the master plan. He reiterated the need for flexibility in the master plan to be able to address opportunities as they are presented. He advised that the master plan will identify needs within the community. In response to a question, Commissioner Curtis discussed the importance of ensuring that needs are identified, including specificity with regard to a trails “backbone,” connectivity, etc.

Commissioner McKenna expressed the opinion that the master plan should include broad, conceptual ideas. He expressed opposition to identifying connectivity because “that’s actually for the people who are going to vote the funds at the time.” The city planners need to know the community wants trails; that the locations should be suitable for transportation and recreation; that the designs should be suitable for various populations; and that wilderness and urban trails should be included. Mr. Moellendorf commented that Commissioner McKenna’s view was more compatible with staff’s direction. He discussed the survey results which indicated the community’s preference for natural parks, but noted the importance of incorporating a degree of flexibility in the master plan tied to funding and opportunities which present along the way. Commissioner McKenna discussed the importance of a master plan that includes adequate direction with as much flexibility as possible. Chairperson Keeton noted the commission’s focus on work plans.

Mr. Krahn continued reviewing the master plan schedule. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that the Parks and Recreation Master Plan would be agendized for action at the November 1st meeting. In response to a comment, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the word “policy” would be included in order to convey that policies are embedded in the body of the master plan. In response to a question, Mr. Krahn explained that recommendations provided by the Open Space and Carson River Advisory Committees will be presented to the commission for approval. He responded to additional questions regarding the meeting schedule and review process, and the reason for separating the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and the Unified Trails Plan. Mr. Plemel responded to questions, and discussion took place, regarding the federal lands bill.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the October 18, 2005 Meeting

Page 5

3-D. DISCUSSION AND REVIEW ONLY REGARDING THE HISPANIC SURVEY RESULTS (1-0169) - Chairperson Keeton reminded the commissioners that the Hispanic survey is not statistically valid. Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the staff report, and provided an overview of the attached exhibits. Based on the responses to Question 6 and the fact that the survey was distributed to residents near Empire Elementary School, Commissioner McKenna suggested there may be different recreational needs in the northeastern quadrant of the City than in the southwestern quadrant. Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the responses to questions 2P and 2Q, and discussion followed.

Mr. Krahn provided background information on distribution of the survey questionnaires. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf expressed the opinion that blending the results of the two surveys may be “dangerous.” He agreed with Chairperson Keeton’s suggestion to use the survey responses as a tool, similar to public input. Commissioner Curtis noted the large number of survey responses indicating the desire for restrooms in parks. Commissioner Patton compared the differences between the two surveys, specifically regarding the number of household participants in “sports through the city.” Mr. Moellendorf advised he would discuss, with Recreation Division staff, the possibility of determining whether a trend exists of Hispanic participation in recreation programs. Commissioner Patton expressed a specific interest in how the information may impact planning for the new recreation facility. Mr. Krahn advised of having worked as an AYSO referee since 1999, and that he has noted increased participation of Hispanic youth in AYSO programs. Discussion took place regarding responses to the survey questions. Mr. Krahn discussed his experience in distributing the surveys, and advised that he had been well received by the various business people in the Hispanic community. He further advised that the survey results would be presented to the Hispanic Advisory Board at their next meeting. He responded to questions regarding contacts with representatives of the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. Chairperson Keeton called for public comment; however, none was provided. He thanked Mr. Krahn for his presentation.

4. NON-ACTION ITEMS:

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM STAFF (1-3178) - Mr. Moellendorf provided an overview of the “FYI” items included in the agenda materials. He requested the commissioners to review the fees and charges materials, and advised of staff’s desire to correlate discussion of the same with the annual budget process and to subsequently develop recommendations to change existing fees and charges policies. At Chairperson Keeton’s request, Mr. Moellendorf agreed to provide copies of the resolution establishing the method by which fees and charges are to be revised.

STATUS REPORTS, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS FROM COMMISSIONERS (1-3228) - In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that neither the NDOT Park nor the Treadway Park would be included in the City’s park inventory. Commissioner Curtis discussed her intent to talk with a state legislator regarding the mechanism of residential construction tax legislation.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS - Previously covered.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM STAFF - Previously covered.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the October 18, 2005 Meeting

Page 6

5. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (1-3303) - Commissioner McKenna moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:14 p.m. Commissioner Livermore seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

The Minutes of the October 18, 2005 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting are so approved this 6th day of December, 2005.

THOMAS N. KEETON, Chair