

**CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 1**

A joint meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission and the Carson City Planning Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 2, 2004 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

**PARKS AND RECREATION
COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

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

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS
PRESENT:**

Chairperson Richard Wipfli
Vice Chairperson John Peery
Allan Christianson
Mark Kimbrough
Craig Mullet

STAFF: Steve Kastens, Parks and Recreation Director
Walter Sullivan, Planning and Community Development Director
Lee Plemel, Principal Planner
Vern Krahm, Park Planner
Barbara Singer, Recreation Superintendent
Melanie Bruketta, Supervising 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 (1-0006) - Chairperson Keeton called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Roll was called for the Parks and Recreation Commission; a quorum was present. Parks and Recreation Commissioner Curtis was absent. At Planning Commission Chairperson Wipfli's request, roll was called for the Planning Commission. A quorum was present. Commissioners Sedway and Semmens were absent.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS (1-0027) - None.

1. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA - None.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 2

2. AGENDA ITEM:

2-A. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN AND PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT UPDATES WITH MASTER PLAN CONSULTANTS CLARION ASSOCIATES AND WINSTON ASSOCIATES TO PROVIDE COMMENTS REGARDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A WORK PLAN FOR THE MASTER PLAN UPDATES (1-0035) - Mr. Krahn introduced the consultants, Ben Herman of Clarion Associates and Jeff Winston of Winston Associates. At Mr. Kastens' request, staff introduced themselves for the record. Mr. Krahn provided background information on the steps leading to the subject master plan updates.

Mr. Plemel commented on the effect of land use planning on parks and recreation programs and facilities. He provided background information on the City's existing land use plan, and discussed the purpose for developing a comprehensive master plan. He advised that the consultants will be developing a scope of work, and discussed meetings held earlier in the day with various groups, including stakeholders from downtown, economic development, Division of State Lands, etc. He advised that the consultants would be providing an overview of the comments received from the various stakeholders. He further advised that the Commissioners would be requested to assist in identifying issues for the public participation process. He referred to the staff report which identified key issues and included attachments outlining the consultants' background and experience.

Mr. Herman advised that he and Mr. Winston have done master planning work in lots of communities. He commented that it was a good move on the part of the City to take time to determine the goals and the best method to accomplish them. He advised that he and Mr. Winston had spent the last two days gathering information from various City officials and other groups to determine the big "Issues" and how to design a process to address those issues. Following this meeting, the consultants will draft an approach which will be submitted to City staff and the Commissions for review. Mr. Herman advised that this meeting represented an opportunity to provide input prior to the consultants drafting the scope of work. He advised that he will primarily focus on the land use component of the project; Mr. Winston will primarily focus on the parks and recreation component, and the two will work as a team. This will provide more than just an efficiency overlap, but also substance.

Mr. Herman advised that the input provided indicated this is an opportune time to begin the comprehensive master planning process because of the significant changes occurring in the community which need to be incorporated. He reviewed and discussed the following list based on the input provided at earlier meetings:

1. Get a handle on the big picture of what's going on in the community, i.e., the freeway, urban interface issues, downtown redevelopment, the hospital, and other issues;
2. Compile information on the evolution of the City, i.e., what has actually been accomplished, and "telling the story of where we're headed as a community." Comments from the City Manager indicated that the master plan should be the document to look to;

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 3

3. Economic development and fiscal issues are very important because of regional dynamics, development to the south, changes in the downtown, and employment. The scope of work should include a focus on the economy as a large part of the master planning process;

4. Public process is a “big deal.” There are high expectations about the range of people which need to be and want to be involved in the process. Mr. Winston recommends a “shotgun approach,” using many different methods to involve the citizens. Possibilities include the Internet, establishing a dedicated and/or interactive website, conducting surveys, establishing an umbrella advisory committee, and targeted outreach;

5. Important to engage the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in the ongoing process. Possibilities include designating liaisons from the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the Parks and Recreation Commission to the umbrella advisory committee, and scheduling joint briefings where the deciding bodies would meet together;

6. Important to keep the process simple. Mr. Herman advised that this comment came from individuals involved in the economic vitality study. Other comments indicated the importance of communicating the process and keeping public participation opportunities simple.

Mr. Winston commented that the consultants feel as if they’ve been “drinking from a fire hose.” He discussed his involvement in development of the Open Space Master Plan Element. He explained that the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Element will serve as a working document for the Parks and Recreation Department, and that a 7-10 page summary of the same will be incorporated into the comprehensive master plan. He advised that the goal is to align the mission, the vision, and the policies. After discussions with City staff and members of the Board of Supervisors earlier in the day, Mr. Winston advised that the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Element will have several components, as follows: It will serve as a policy document. He noted that there are many policies in place which are operating perfectly well, but advised that not many of them are written down. These include policies applicable to joint use of school district properties, residential construction tax, the methods by which programs are subsidized and costs are estimated, special events, non-resident users, etc. It is helpful to simplify policies so that corporate knowledge is never lost and expectations are clear. Mr. Winston advised that discussions also included a regional approach to recreation and cooperation with agencies in neighboring counties. He further advised that the master plan will consider facility and programming needs, and industry trends. He indicated that the survey may be helpful in identifying interest and potential. He discussed service to the ethnic components of the community, and advised that the consultants are considering a bilingual approach to outreach. He advised that the consultants’ goal is to create a document that is both visionary and practical. He noted that parks and recreation is a powerful aspect of the community, and advised that the consultants will work to demonstrate the economic development component.

Mr. Herman solicited input from the commissioners and staff.

**CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 4**

Planning Commission Chairperson Wipfli expressed appreciation for the “down-to-earth” approach to involving the general public in development of the master plan elements.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 5

Planning Commissioner Christianson commented that expectations need to be realistic about what will actually work in Carson City, particularly in the downtown area. He suggested considering the existing urban boundaries, and how they might be changed to ensure adequate service to outlying areas.

Parks and Recreation Commissioner Herst discussed the importance of public input, and requested more detail regarding what has been done in other communities to receive public input. She advised of Native American tribal representatives in the area and inquired as to methods by which they will be reached.

Planning Commissioner Mullet noted that representatives of the consultants' respective firms will be more locally involved than will Mr. Herman or Mr. Winston. He expressed appreciation at discovering that these representatives have public outreach experience. He advised that efforts are constantly made to involve the community in advisory committee meetings. He commented that the issue of reaching the Hispanic community is very real. He discussed the economic development aspect of parks and recreation, and the need to calm traffic on Carson Street until the freeway bypass is completed. He reiterated the importance of soliciting input from "all the different facets of this City," and discussed the importance of considering the overall vision.

Parks and Recreation Commissioner Patton expressed an interest in better understanding the process, and provided an overview of discussions which took place during meetings held earlier in the day. He inquired as to whether new projects and other issues associated with conducting business will be put on hold during the master planning process, which the consultants indicated will take between 18 months and 2 years.

Planning Commissioner Kimbrough requested the consultants to consider regional management issues in developing the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Element. He listed the Carson River, BLM's purchase at the Silver Saddle Ranch, and the V&T Railroad as examples. He discussed the lack of developable space for commercial corridors and housing, and noted that the Carson River and Open Space Master Plan Elements should be integral to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Element. He expressed the opinion that the economic development component will be a big deal in twenty years. He advised that the BLM's Pine Nut Mountains Plan Amendment is nearly finished, and suggested that there may be opportunity to consider some of the BLM properties surrounding the community.

Parks and Recreation Commissioner McKenna discussed the need to make parks more friendly to youth who are not involved in traditional sports. He advised that the community has a very active Youth Sports Association, but noted that it doesn't represent every interest in the community. He advised that a new skateboard park proposed last year "was basically frowned upon." He discussed the need to realistically consider the recreational needs of children and youth. He advised that the School District is a separate entity with a separate tax base, and emphasized the importance of involving the School District.

Planning Commission Vice Chairperson Peery noted that the consultants had worked in Fort Collins, Colorado which shares interesting parallels with Carson City, including explosive growth between 1970 and 1990 and the resulting associated issues. He commented that it is comforting to know the consultants have this type of experience to address issues such as redevelopment, downtown beautification, and traffic

**CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 6**

flow.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 7

Parks and Recreation Commissioner Livermore commented that parks are an investment in the wealth of a community, “the fiber and soul of Carson City.” He requested the consultants to consider the health, welfare, and safety of the community, and commented that parks are an integral part. He discussed the cultural diversity represented in the community, and expressed concern that completion of the freeway will not result in segregation. He commented that the community lacks sufficient minority programming, and discussed the importance of continuing to consider the investment in existing facilities.

Planning Commission Chairperson Wipfli requested that sufficient attention be given to preserving the downtown and historic districts.

Parks and Recreation Commissioner Hoffman discussed the importance of parks to the community, as demonstrated by the passage of Question #18 and Question #1, and responses to City surveys.

Parks and Recreation Commission Vice Chairperson DePauw discussed the importance of aesthetically pleasing smoking areas on government property. Mr. Sullivan advised that this issue will be addressed if public buildings are included in the comprehensive master plan. He acknowledged the need to work more closely with State government representatives in design and development of State buildings.

Planning Commissioner Christianson referred to the “eastern portal” in which the land fill is located. He suggested that once the land fill is filled, it will be an excellent location for a State fairgrounds, an eastern extension of Fuji Park, a medical research facility, a highly productive industrial area, or a portion of the V&T Railroad. He expressed the opinion that the potential of the area has never been fully considered, but that it should be. Parks and Recreation Commissioner McKenna expressed the opinion that the same area, particularly the River, should be protected, turned back to a wild state, and that all development in Carson City should be restricted to the west side of the River with the exception of Deer Run Road. Discussion took place with regard to the same.

Planning Commissioner Mullet requested the consultants to consider Carson City’s portion of Lake Tahoe. He referred to a plan developed by the consultants in another community, and noted that the public comment portion was done towards the end of each section. He acknowledged the need to have something to present to the public, but requested that public comment be incorporated back into the draft documents or be done earlier in the program.

For the benefit of those Commissioners and citizens who had not been involved in the various meetings held earlier in the day, Parks and Recreation Commission Chairperson Keeton advised that an integral part of the consultants’ plan is a constant stream of public contact and opportunity for input. Every possible means will be used to solicit public input as early in the process as possible.

(1-1105) David Ruf noted that the freeway master plan does not indicate any off ramps in the area of the Edmonds Sports Complex. He advised that a school is being considered in the same area, and suggested that an off ramp would be good. With regard to the Ross Gold Pond, he suggested that aeration and/or a filter system may be a solution to the stagnant water. He commented that dead fish in the pond are difficult

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 8

for children to deal with. He requested the consultants to consider the possibility of indoor playing fields, and discussed indoor facilities in Sparks. He expressed the opinion that the Aquatic Facility is under utilized, and compared it to Douglas County's aquatic facility.

(1-1222) Chas Macquarrie commented on the opportunity to consider the recreational trail system in conjunction with the freeway construction as part of the master planning process. He advised that the freeway corridor represents an opportunity to connect the City's trail system from the north to the south end of town, in addition to a number of recreational, educational, and open space facilities. He encouraged the consultants to consider this aspect.

(1-1237) Judy Larquier requested the consultants to consider the environmental aspects of development. She expressed the opinion that "not every piece of land has to have a complete development plan." She discussed the need to conserve open space for various activities, and to consider the environmental aspects of areas such as Clear Creek.

Chairperson Keeton called for additional public comment; however, none was provided.

Mr. Herman referred to Commissioner Patton's comments and advised that the process is driven by the public, the various advisory boards, and the Board of Supervisors. He explained that there are four components to development of a master plan. The first is analysis of and understanding the issues; the second is considering alternatives; the third is determining the preferred direction; and the fourth is the process of finalizing and adopting the plan. He advised that the process is fairly linear, each component could be done in 1-2 months. He advised that the consultants will strive to complete the process in 12-14 months; nine months would compromise the public involvement opportunities. He further advised that seasons have to be taken into consideration because of holidays and summer vacations, and discussed additional challenges presented during election years. The challenge is to thoroughly provide public input opportunities without extending the process so long that people lose interest. He advised that the most recently completed master plan was done in Boulder City, Nevada, and that it took 14 months. With regard to what happens in the mean time, Mr. Herman advised that "life goes on." Rules and policies are already in place; however, if issues can be identified early, some things can be "jumped out of line" to be addressed immediately rather than waiting until the master plan is finalized. He advised that the consultants and staff will consider the time line over the next few weeks.

Mr. Winston referred to comments by Commissioner Christianson regarding the visual preference survey, and advised that the consultants had received many comments along this line. He noted that ordinances are in place as a result of the visual preference survey, and that this communicates the importance of aesthetics. He advised that the consultants will focus on aesthetic implications as they present themselves, and acknowledged an understanding of the aesthetic quality of the community.

Mr. Herman referred to comments regarding public outreach, and discussed changes in public involvement over the past 25 years. He advised that community issues are becoming more focused and more strident; however, people don't have the patience to get involved. This is the reason for the "shotgun approach."

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 9

Some people attend meetings, some prefer receiving information by e-mail. One purpose of the survey is to get feedback regarding how people are interested in receiving information and providing input. Mr. Herman referred to the challenge of reaching the Hispanic community. He acknowledged that language can be an issue, but advised that cultural differences are more of an issue. He discussed issues associated with mistrust of government, issues of community. He has found that religious institutions and social activities are important avenues by which to reach out. He advised that the Native American community had not been discussed much to date. He requested input from the Commissioners with regard to contact information, and Chairperson Keeton advised that it would be provided. Mr. Winston commented that the Hispanic community is usually not used to being asked questions, so trust and interest will have to be developed. He advised that the consultants will work through bilingual staff members to make contacts, and then determine the most appropriate action.

Mr. Winston referred to comments by Commissioner Kimbrough regarding regional parks and regional issues, and advised that the consultants will consider this as they are able. He acknowledged that the regional context is important, and the consultants want to ensure that “the map goes beyond our boundaries and that we show what’s happening adjacent to us.” He expressed appreciation for the opportunity to meet with BLM representatives, and anticipates opportunities to review recreation and public purpose issues.

Mr. Herman referred to comments by Commissioner Christianson and discussed the significance of change which has occurred in many western cities in terms of anticipated build out. He advised of having met with downtown redevelopment and State Capitol representatives, who provided input regarding mixed use, infill, making the community walkable, and preserving the historic district. He commented that there are many cities which Carson City can look to as examples. Mr. Winston advised that the consultants are finding that big box development is currently popular, but that it also has a 10-15 year life span. He suggested that the neighboring counties will find those same problems, and advised that Carson City is ahead of the curve in considering mixed use in the downtown area and implementing forward-thinking land uses and regulations.

Mr. Winston referred to comments by Commissioner McKenna, and acknowledged an understanding that the School District is a separate entity. He expressed the hope that mutual interest and benefits will be identified, and expressed the opinion that there are many opportunities. He commented that both entities have “massive resources” to offer each other, and that these should be used efficiently and effectively as possible.

Mr. Winston advised that the staff has contact information for the consultants and that they are happy to receive e-mail. He suggested sending e-mail through Mr. Krahn or Mr. Plemel, who will forward it to the consultants.

Commissioner Kimbrough commented on the value of the joint meeting between the Planning Commission and the Parks and Recreation Commission. He thanked Mr. Kastens for his years of service to Parks and Recreation.

3. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT OF PLANNING COMMISSION (1-1588) - Commissioner

**CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 10**

Christianson moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m. Commissioner Mullet seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Chairperson Keeton recessed the Parks and Recreation Commission for five minutes.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION AGENDA

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS (1-1593) - None.

1. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - February 17, 2004 (1-1602) - Commissioner McKenna moved to approve the minutes. Vice Chairperson DePauw seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (1-1608) - None.

3. AGENDA ITEMS:

3-A. ACTION TO APPROVE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (“MOU”) BETWEEN THE STATE OF NEVADA, ACTING BY AND THROUGH ITS DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE, AND CARSON CITY. THIS MOU IS INTENDED TO BE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE NEVADA DIVISION OF WILDLIFE’S QUESTION #1 FUNDS FOR THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF AN URBAN FISHING POND AT THE CARSON CITY FAIRGROUNDS and 3-B. ACTION TO APPROVE AN URBAN FISHING POND FUNDING CONTRACT BETWEEN THE STATE OF NEVADA ACTING BY AND THROUGH ITS NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE, 1100 VALLEY ROAD, RENO, NEVADA 89512 AND CARSON CITY, 201 NORTH CARSON STREET, SUITE 2, CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701 (1-1614) - Mr. Kastens reviewed the staff report. He advised that the City has not allocated any funding for the project, other than that which has been provided by City staff in the form of in-kind services. He noted that the City is very fortunate to be able to utilize Question #1 funding to pursue the project.

Commissioner Livermore expressed concern that no additional funding sources were identified if the initial Question #1 allocation is insufficient to cover the cost of the project. He referred to a pre-design estimate which was presented to the Board of Supervisors at their February 19th meeting. In response to a question, Mr. Kastens advised that phase 2 of the Fairgrounds Master Plan would not be submitted to the bid process until late summer or early fall 2004. Commissioner Livermore expressed concern with regard to signing the agreement until exact costs are determined.

Commissioner Herst commented that every project includes the possibility of cost over-runs. From the time a contract is signed to the finished project, costs increase. She commented that this “is part of doing business,” and expressed concern with regard to not doing the project because of the possibility of cost over-runs. She noted that the project could not be started without first signing the MOU and the Contract. She expressed additional concern over how this will appear with regard to future collaborations with the

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 11

Nevada Department of Wildlife (“NDOW”).

Commissioner McKenna noted that the MOU addresses administration of the Question #1 funds, and has nothing to do with the urban fishing pond project. In response to a question, Commissioner Livermore advised that the MOU specifically indicates there will be no additional funds allocated to the project. Commissioner Patton read a portion of the MOU into the record. Commissioner Livermore acknowledged that one of his concerns was there was not yet a “hard figure” determined for project costs. He expressed the further concern that the City would be obligated to identify additional resources if the fishing pond cannot be constructed for \$250,000. He commented that there are other parks in the City, such as Ronald D. Wilson Memorial Park, which have been waiting for funding “for years.”

Chairperson Keeton expressed concern that \$250,000 will not be adequate funding for the project. He expressed support for the project as long as the \$250,000 Question #1 allocation will cover the costs of the entire project. He noted that there are other projects and priorities in the City, and expressed concern that the cost over-runs will eventually have to be covered by Question #18 funding.

Mr. Kastens invited NDOW Staff Habitat Specialist Laura Richards to the meeting table. Ms. Richards advised that she has been tasked with administering NDOW’s allocation of Question #1 funds. She provided background information on the public process by which NDOW decided to allocate Question #1 funding, including to the proposal submitted for the urban fishing pond. Based on the proposal submitted and support from Carson City staff and citizens, the Board of Wildlife Commissioners approved the \$250,000 allocation for the urban fishing pond at Fuji Park. Ms. Richards advised that the bonds were sold in the autumn of 2003, and that the funding is now available. She explained that the purpose of the MOU and the Contract were to provide for allocation of the funding from the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to NDOW and, in turn, to the City to build the pond. In response to a question, Ms. Richards advised that signing the MOU does not commit the City to the potential of providing additional funding for the project.

Discussion took place regarding the purpose of the MOU, and Commissioner Patton suggested combining agenda items 3-A and 3-B. **Commissioner Patton moved to combine agenda items 3-A and 3-B to be considered together. Commissioner Herst seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.**

Mr. Kastens provided background information on development of the \$250,000 cost estimate which was submitted as part of the proposal to NDOW. He emphasized that if the NDOW funding allocation is not accepted, the urban fishing pond will not be constructed. He advised that a bona fide engineer’s estimate will be required prior to the project being submitted to the bid process. He reviewed the various options depending upon the bid received, including additive alternates, plan modifications, and the possibility of approaching NDOW for an additional allocation of funding.

Ms. Richards explained that the Intrastate Interlocal Contract Between Public Agencies is a basic State contract. She referred to the two attachments, specifically Attachment B which included a “pre-design estimate of probable construction costs.” She advised that NDOW proceeded with the “notion that the

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 12

pond can be built for \$250,000.” Once the engineering work is complete, if the cost estimate is higher, the Contract provides for amendment. Ms. Richards advised that NDOW representatives would like to see the pond constructed for \$250,000. “If it turns out, during the engineering phase, that more funds are needed, we’re not going to let a half a pond sit out there. It’s too popular; it’s very popular with our Commission. We’re going to get the work done.” She suggested volunteer and sportsmen’s groups as possible funding sources, and advised that additional Question #1 funding may be requested. She assured the Commission that the project will be completed. She discussed the need to ensure that the funding is used efficiently and effectively, and expressed confidence that the City would do so. Ms. Richards acknowledged that design modifications would be acceptable as long as the pond satisfies NDOW’s urban fishery requirements. She advised that there will be constant communication between NDOW and City representatives once the designs are drafted. In response to a question, Ms. Richards advised that engineering fees would not have to be repaid if City representatives decided the project could not move forward once the design phase is complete. She reiterated that NDOW representatives would “try to make it work”; that NDOW and the Board of Wildlife Commissioners “want to see a pond done.”

Commissioner McKenna advised he would have no problem with the City specifying that the engineering costs would be allocated from City funds. He expressed concern that Ms. Richards may not have the authority to bind NDOW with regard to engineering fees. He suggested that the question to be decided is whether or not to go forward with the urban fishing pond. Commissioner Livermore expressed a willingness to accept Ms. Richards’ commitment on behalf of NDOW.

Mr. Kastens suggested the following options: That the Commission move to deny the MOU and the Contract and request staff to negotiate with NDOW for a contract and an MOU for the engineering phase of the project only. NDOW would then be committing to certain engineering costs and, if an ultimate determination is made that there is insufficient funding to construct the pond, NDOW could not require repayment of the engineering fees. A second option would be for the Commission to recommend to the Board of Supervisors the allocation of Question #18 funding to cover the cost of engineering fees. In response to a question, Mr. Kastens advised that the engineering fees have been estimated at \$46,000. Mr. Kastens acknowledged that there is no cost associated with requests for proposals. He explained that once an engineering firm is selected, no further work will be done unless funding is committed. He noted that a request for proposal is completely different than a contract to design. He acknowledged that an estimate could be requested for the cost of engineering work.

Commissioner Patton suggesting having an engineering firm commit to providing an estimate for development of the engineering plans. He acknowledged that the engineers would not be able to provide a cost estimate for construction until the plans were completed. He suggested that this may be a two-step process to identify the funds being committed, and inquired as to whether this would be a problem for purposes of getting approval on the Question #1 funding. Ms. Richards advised that she would have to discuss this possibility with NDOW staff. She noted that the funding would be allocated toward a project beneficial to wildlife and recreation; however, an engineering study with no resulting project would compromise the legislation. Commissioner McKenna suggested a third option, that the Commission confirm pursuing the project and direct staff to develop an agreement which can be presented to the Board

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 13

of Supervisors and, in turn, receive the NDOW allocation. Mr. Kastens advised that this was the agenda item before the Commission. Commissioner McKenna disagreed with the Commission attempting to decide cost estimates for the project. He suggested that if the Board of Supervisors didn't have sufficient information with which to make a decision, it should have been sent back to staff.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 14

(1-2574) David Morgan inquired as to whether research had been done on the cost of similar urban fishing ponds in other areas.

Mr. Kastens advised that there are no “cookie cutter” urban fishing ponds with certain associated construction costs. He reviewed the specifications of the pond, including a 1-acre area and a depth of 15' in at least 1/3 of the total pond. He advised that the proposal included a path, benches, trees, and possibly a pier; however, the present direction is to “get a one-acre hole in the ground with at least 15' depth in one-third of the area, and then we'll worry about all the rest of this stuff.” He expressed the opinion that “the rest of the stuff” is easily attainable through donations and volunteers; digging the hole is what will cost the money.

(1-2627) C.K. Baily referred to Mr. Fellows' pre-design estimate, and expressed appreciation that NDOW and the Board of Wildlife Commissioners would consider constructing a pond in Carson City using Question #1 funding. He noted that the Commission voted in favor of the pond in June 2003 and the recommendation was forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. He discussed the popularity of urban fisheries in other Nevada counties, and suggested that the urban fishery at Fuji Park would draw people from neighboring counties. He expressed appreciation for the Commission's consideration of the MOU and the Contract, and requested them to move forward with the fishing pond.

Commissioner Felesina expressed support for building the fishing pond at Fuji Park. He reflected on participating in fishing derbies at Clear Creek as a child. He pointed out the opportunity represented by the \$250,000 Question #1 allocation to get the pond “in the ground” and suggested that it would be foolish to pass it up. He expressed the opinion that even an additional \$100,000 would not be difficult to raise through donations.

In response to a procedural question, Chairperson Keeton advised that the Commission forwards recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Patton moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the MOU and the funding contract. Commissioner Herst seconded the motion. Mr. Kastens requested that the Commission provide two separate motions for the MOU and the contract, and Commissioner Patton withdrew his motion. Commissioner Livermore reiterated his willingness to accept Ms. Richards' representation that NDOW will assist with additional funding to complete the project, if necessary.

(1-2828) Judy Larquier expressed support for the fishing pond and encouraged the Commissioners to move forward on it. She requested that the engineering studies be done in a comprehensive manner to include the drainage issues associated with run-off from the Wal-Mart site.

Chairperson Keeton called for additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. Commissioner Patton thanked Ms. Richards for her attendance and participation, and the citizens for their comments. **Commissioner Patton moved to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve a Memorandum of Understanding between the State, through the Department of Wildlife, and Carson City for the design and construction of an urban fishing pond at the Fairgrounds as**

**CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 15**

delineated in item 3-A. Commissioner McKenna seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

Chairperson Keeton entertained a motion on item 3-B. **Commissioner Patton moved to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve an urban fishing pond funding contract as presented in the agenda materials, entitled Intralocal Agreement Between State of Nevada Department of Wildlife and Carson City. Commissioner Herst seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.**

3-C. ACTION REGARDING THE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR'S JOB DESCRIPTION (1-2935) - Mr. Kastens reviewed the staff report and provided background information on this item. He acknowledged having reviewed the job description and provided an overview of the revisions made. He discussed the need to add responsibilities having to do with the park ranger program. Commissioner McKenna suggested including language regarding organizing and working with volunteers. In response to a question, Mr. Kastens discussed the importance of the bachelor's degree requirement. He advised that it will be difficult to find a candidate with the background listed in the job description. He explained that he learned about open space, cemetery operations, building maintenance, etc. as these things were added to his job responsibilities. He expressed the opinion that the Parks and Recreation Department is the most diverse with regard to areas of responsibility. He discussed the importance of identifying a candidate who can motivate staff, communicate with the community, be fiscally responsible, and manage well. He advised anyone involved in the interview process to consider the "big picture" of identifying a candidate that can do a good job "with the community not for the community."

Commissioner Livermore commented that Mr. Kastens had been one of the best administrators in the City over the years. He provided historic information on past Parks and Recreation Department Directors, and advised that City Manager Linda Ritter will be reviewing the organizational structure of the Department as part of the process.

Commissioner McKenna moved to approve, with Mr. Kastens' changes, the Parks and Recreation Department Director's job description and forward it to the City Manager. Commissioner Hoffman seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

4. NON-ACTION ITEMS:

STATUS REPORT ON QUESTION #18, RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION TAX, AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT (1-3242) - Mr. Krahn provided a status report on the Governor's Field irrigation replacement project.

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM STAFF (1-3310) - None.

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS (1-3313) - Commissioner Livermore referred to the minutes of the Strategic Planning Meeting of the Youth Sports Association ("YSA") which were included in the agenda materials. He advised that the YSA will be meeting in April to prioritize the listed items, and that a copy of the minutes was provided to Mr. Winston

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 2, 2004 Meeting
Page 16

and Mr. Herman. At the request of Vice Chairperson DePauw, Mr. Kastens circulated the Dundee Jones Award which was conferred upon him by the Nevada Recreation and Parks Society.

Commissioner Patton expressed a concern with regard to the anticipated time frame for the master planning process, and suggested designating a 12-month target date for completion with the understanding that it may take longer. Mr. Kastens advised that a debriefing meeting was scheduled with the consultants prior to them leaving town. He advised that staff would discuss with them the possibility of designating a shorter time frame with the understanding that it could be extended, if necessary. He further advised that staff will be discussing with Mr. Winston the possibility of moving forward with the park and recreation element more quickly than the comprehensive master plan.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS (1-3480) - Commissioner McKenna requested staff to agendize an appropriate recognition of Mr. Kastens. Mr. Kastens advised that budgets would be agendized for the next meeting. Mr. Krahn advised that a Sierra Front Recreation Coalition map would be agendized for review, and Deputy City Engineer John Flansberg would be presenting proposed changes to the bicycle system plan. Chairperson Keeton reminded the Commissioners to contact Mr. Kastens or himself with agenda items.

5. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (1-3578) - Commissioner McKenna moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:33 p.m. Vice Chairperson DePauw seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

The Minutes of the March 2, 2004 meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission are so approved this 6th day of April, 2004.

THOMAS N. KEETON, Chair