

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Open Space Advisory Committee was scheduled for 6:00 p.m. on Monday, May 7, 2001 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Steve Hartman
Vice Chairperson Dan Jacquet
Laura Bird
Ron Pacheco
Margaret Robinson
Bruce Scott

STAFF: Steve Kastens, Parks and Recreation Director
Juan Guzman, Open Space Manager
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary
(OSAC 05/07/01)

NOTE: Unless indicated otherwise, each item was introduced by Chairperson Hartman. A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office and is available for review and inspection during regular business hours.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM (1-0001) - Chairperson Hartman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. A quorum was present. Member Fischer was absent.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - APRIL 30, 2001 (1-0005) - Member Scott moved to approve the minutes. Member Robinson seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-1-0.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT (1-0015) - None.

D. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA (1-0018; 1630) - Chairperson Hartman modified the agenda to address item F-3 prior to item F-2.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0019) - None.

F. PUBLIC MEETING

F-1. DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST BY VIVIAN KUHN REPRESENTING THE CONCERNED CITIZENS TO SAVE FUJI PARK FOR THE OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO ADVISE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AS TO THE COMMITTEE'S CONCERNS AND SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITY REGARDING THE POTENTIAL RELOCATION OF FUJI PARK (1-0024) - Mr. Guzman reviewed the staff report and referred to the recommended motion included in the May 7, 2001 memorandum distributed prior to the start of the meeting. Chairperson Hartman opened the meeting for public testimony. He expressed appreciation for the citizens' attendance and participation.

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Meeting

Page 2

(1-0185) Vivian Kuhn thanked the Committee for agendizing this matter. She read from a prepared statement, and discussed the unique features of Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds. She requested that the Committee recommend to the Board of Supervisors to stop all efforts to commercially develop and relocate Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds. She advised that the Carson City Shade Tree Council took action to recommend to the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Board of Supervisors that the trees at Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds be saved. She introduced Jim Eidel of the Lahontan Audobon Society.

(1-0220) Jim Eidel, a Carson City resident, distributed a copy of his prepared notes to Chairperson Hartman. He provided background information on his experience, education, and familiarity with the birds and habitat at Fuji Park. He provided an overview of his comments, and discussed the riparian habitat at Fuji Park, including the willow component, opportunities for preservation and education, and the uniqueness of the area. He discussed various bird species which utilize the habitat for nesting, feeding, and molting, and advised that the density of the willow habitat allows for successful nesting. He continued reading from his prepared remarks regarding the unique natural values of Fuji Park. He expressed the opinion that the three proposed alternative sites “do not have any of these values nor could they constitute a wetlands riparian mitigation area.”

Mr. Eidel referred to the pre-application letter for permission to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which indicates there are 5.1 acres of existing riparian and undeveloped area at Clear Creek. He suggested this may be an understatement and discussed the components of a wetland. He advised that the Lumos and Associates plan refers to a JBR report indicating the existence of 2 acres of wetlands and .3 acres of U.S. Waters. These waters are defined as navigable and, therefore, subject to the jurisdiction of §404 of the Clean Water Act and wetlands protection legislation. He commented there are a “number of avenues and legal actions that need to be considered in any destruction of the wetlands within Fuji Park.” He advised that the Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Environmental Protection Agency are well aware of the protections afforded under §404.

Mr. Eidel referred to the conceptual plan developed by City staff which includes relocation of Clear Creek against the south bank of its channel. He discussed the importance of the willows to silted beaver ponds, and referred to the portion of the pre-application letter which discusses “restoration and enhancement of Fuji Creek.” He expressed the opinion that this would “destroy and decrease the existing riparian area.” He expressed the further opinion that the existing debris is “man made and could be easily removed.” He suggested that water quality would be worsened by increasing flow velocity and reducing impermeable area, and indicated that the willows constitute a riparian buffer. He commented that the statements regarding decreased aesthetic value of the Fuji Park wetlands and creation of a plan to promote additional development are contradictory. He expressed the opinion that habitat will be reduced, that placing additional fill on recently placed geologic fill will create a less stable condition, that erosion stability will be reduced by creating two bends in Clear Creek, that the large increase in impervious area will increase flooding, that open space protection will not be increased, and that walkways should be developed with care in the existing riparian area. He remarked that the statement “a complete and functioning protected riparian and stream environment away from the strain of existing and future planned development” is an “absurd and contradictory statement that reflects a misunderstanding of riparian environments that are stream environments.” He pointed out that the plan calls for a relocated stream adjacent to a developed area not away from urban development, and expressed the opinion that the purpose of the plan is false. He disagreed that the stream would be able to “meander naturally” if it is configured in a trapezoidal channel.

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Meeting

Page 3

He pointed out that there is no mention in the report of white top control, and referred to the white top introduced by NDOT into the northern portion of Washoe Lake. He commented that bank stabilization should already have taken place, and indicated that the removal of willows will cause a significant decrease in wildlife.

Mr. Eidel referred to an article published in the May 2, 2001 Reno *Gazette-Journal* by Carol Vogel, which "provides considerable misinformation." He discussed the article and disagreed with various comments contained therein. He described the composition of a wetland, and advised the Committee to recommend protection and management of the Fuji Park wetlands as a wild area for its natural inhabitants, and to be used to fulfill the wildlife viewing goals and education needs of the community. He further advised the Committee to recommend adding the perennial Clear Creek drainage to the Carson River corridor plan so that the drainage can be studied and managed in a manner consistent with wetlands legislation. He discussed his recent involvement in revisions to Chapter 3 of the Carson River Master Plan element.

Mr. Eidel referred to a letter addressed to Nancy Kang of the Army Corps of Engineers, written by Charles Kuhn, a consulting engineer to the City. He advised that the letter refers entirely to the pre-application letter for permission by Lumos and Associates. He reviewed the contents of the letter, and advised that it itemizes sixteen deficiencies in the application. He discussed incompatibilities with introduction of new wildlife to the area. Chairperson Hartman requested a copy of the letter, and thanked Mr. Eidel for his comments.

(1-0655) Susan Hoffman, a 37-year resident of Carson City, reviewed the language of Question #18 from the sample ballot distributed by the Carson City Clerk-Recorder in 1996. She requested that the Committee recommend to the Board of Supervisors "to improve and not move Fuji Park."

(1-0708) Tina French discussed feedback she received with regard to Question #18 while obtaining signatures for a petition.

(1-0739) Jon Nowlin, a 25-year Carson City resident and retired District Chief of the U.S. Geological Survey, provided background information on his experience in civil engineering, geology and hydrology. He discussed his frustration over the decision-making process with regard to Fuji Park. He referred to the feasibility study and the alternative sites being considered, and expressed concern over not hearing any formal discussion regarding investment in the existing park. He displayed photographs depicting a portion of the creek which has been "filled in with waste from Costco after building Costco." He advised that this portion of the park will become the new park, stream channel, grass and trees, and that all the existing grass and trees area as well as the willow habitat will go to development. He commented that this is not "a limited development option" and that it is very "disconcerting that this is the only other option to relocating the park that's being discussed." He distributed the photograph for review by the Committee members at the request of Chairperson Hartman.

(1-0812) Marilyn Potter, a Carson City resident, expressed the opinion that relocating Fuji Park/Fairgrounds would in effect be a destruction of the park. She referred to the conceptual plan developed by Parks and Recreation staff and discussed settling problems which will be caused by removal of the trees. She suggested considering a portion of the Silver Saddle Ranch for a new fairgrounds to be phased over a period of years. She expressed the opinion that Fuji Park can be saved and improved in the interim. She

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Meeting

Page 4

discussed the “impossibilities” of the three proposed alternative sites, and suggested that a fairgrounds should be developed which would accommodate various large events and possibly the State Fair.

Chairperson Hartman called for additional public testimony and, when none was forthcoming, comments from the Committee members.

Member Bird expressed appreciation for the involvement of the citizens at this meeting. She displayed photographs of her daughter and a two-page essay regarding an event which took 2.9 seconds. She reviewed the Committee’s mission statement for the benefit of the citizens present, and provided comments from a prepared statement with regard to the same.

Chairperson Hartman expressed the hope that the citizens present could appreciate the difficulty of the “fuzzy line.” He acknowledged that riparian areas are considered open space which is why the River has first priority in the master plan element. He commented that the Fairgrounds and Fuji Park should be considered separately as the existing fairgrounds location is most likely not the best place “in the long run.” He stated, “Clearly the riparian area is part of what our quality of life is all about.” He discussed the three-pronged aspect of Question #18, as follows: 40% was to be allocated to those specifically enumerated projects; 40% was to ensure a say in future considerations; and 20% was to take care of existing and committed areas. He commented on the difficulty of the issue because parks have open space characteristics, and discussed the criteria for establishing open space. He indicated that the Parks and Recreation Commission has clear purview over Fuji Park, but commented that the components are well mixed.

Vice Chairperson Jacquet expressed agreement with the citizens who commented regarding displacement of currently designated open space to be used as a pool for undeveloped land. He objected to developing designated open space, and expressed the opinion that the issue will be presented to the Committee over and over in the future. “That is the challenge of managing open space. It’s an ethic … something that tells you a lot about the community that you live in. Where is your heart? You have to draw the line in the sand and say, ‘These lands are open space in perpetuity,’ and make the sacrifices, financial or otherwise, to make that happen.” He pointed out that the Committee has spent many years working on this issue, is committed to that principle, and the master plan element clearly states the objectives.

Member Robinson discussed her involvement at Fuji Park over the years. She suggested that the community needs to address “what they want in ten years.” She expressed a desire to see people involved in Fuji Park get together with Parks and Recreation Department staff and outline what the community can support. She expressed a concern that the City may not be able to support a State Fair.

Member Scott referred to the Committee’s charter and suggested that the Committee does not “have a place in making a recommendation with regard to the use of Fuji Park because it is a park and not an open space in the definition that we’ve utilized or been utilizing for open space.” He expressed appreciation and understanding for many of the points made by the citizens, and expressed agreement with the importance of riparian and wetlands habitat issues. He reiterated that this issue should come under the purview of the Parks and Recreation Commission.

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Meeting

Page 5

Member Pacheco concurred with Member Scott's comments, and discussed his use of the park over the years. He expressed a concern over the jurisdiction of the Committee, and commented that there seems to be two sides to the issue. He expressed a desire to ensure that the Committee's purview has been established prior to taking action.

Mr. Kastens concurred with Chairperson Hartman's earlier remarks, and commented that City staff knew difficult situations would arise from Question #18 between Parks and Recreation and Open Space. He described the research conducted in other, similar communities with regard to Question #18, and provided background information on its development. He reiterated that the Committee does not have a "place in the process" at this point. He advised there has been no decision to relocate Fuji Park, and that staff, the consultants, and the Parks and Recreation Commission are presently considering the viability of an alternate site. Once that decision is made, a new question may arise with regard to the actual relocation of the park.

Mr. Kastens addressed some of the comments made by the citizens present. With regard to the improvements for Fuji Park referenced in the ballot question, he advised that these primarily referred to irrigation. He assured the citizens that the funding is still available; that it has not been reallocated. He stated that should the Fairgrounds remain in their current location, allocated funding will be spent there. If the park/fairgrounds are relocated, the funding will be reallocated to the alternate site. With regard to a plan to utilize the existing park/fairgrounds, Mr. Kastens advised that shortly after the Costco deal was consummated, Parks and Recreation Department staff and the Fuji Park Users Coalition developed a revised plan, together with cost estimates. He advised that the plan is available for review at the Parks Department office by any interested citizen. With regard to Member Robinson's question, Mr. Kastens advised that staff has been working with the users to determine what they want for a fairgrounds. He indicated that the feasibility study was based upon a "wish list" and that the decision will be made based upon whether the alternate sites or the current site will accommodate those facilities. With regard to the comment regarding utilization of the Silver Saddle Ranch, Mr. Kastens advised that the Bureau of Land Management has already developed a master plan which does not accommodate the intense use/development needed for a fairgrounds facility. He indicated this type of development was considered; however, through the public hearing process, a preference was indicated to not turn the ranch into a fairgrounds or rodeo arena.

(1-1261) Marilyn Potter suggested that no one was considering relocating the fairgrounds at the time the BLM was developing the Silver Saddle Ranch. Mr. Kastens agreed and reiterated that a fairgrounds-type atmosphere was considered nonetheless. Ms. Potter commented on the give-and-take nature of the Committee's meeting process and expressed appreciation for the same.

Chairperson Hartman agreed that recognizing the jurisdiction of the Parks and Recreation Commission over Fuji Park is appropriate. He further agreed that expressing concern over the riparian/wetlands issues and the potential effect on open space if a relocation takes place is appropriate. He suggested the possibility of scheduling a workshop between the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Committee. Vice Chairperson Jacquet agreed and suggested making a recommendation regarding the riparian area and flood plain to the extent that if the land were made available to the open space program, it could be managed as open space. He pointed out that the land has qualities which fit the criteria outlined in the master plan element. Chairperson Hartman concurred and commented that "but for the commercial opportunities, were this another parcel down on the River that had all the riparian issues and was part of the trail system ... we'd

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Meeting

Page 6

be all over this." He acknowledged that the Committee does have an interest in the riparian/wetlands area and that it does fit the criteria of the open space master plan. Mr. Kastens discussed the differences between the general fund, which currently owns, operates, and manages the Fairgrounds/Fuji Park riparian area, and the Question #18 open space funding source. He concurred that if the parcel was privately owned, the Committee would most likely consider it for inclusion in the open space program.

(1-1398) Jim Eidel advised of a presentation he made comparing the marsh in Lemmon Valley with one in Sackville, New Brunswick. He concurred with the idea of "breaching this fuzzy area and maybe getting the Open Space Committee to manage a couple wild areas within the City." He advised of a presentation, together with Rob Scanland of The Nature Conservancy, at the February 10, 2001 meeting regarding the Goni marsh. He suggested that since this marsh will be located within the City, perhaps the riparian/wetlands area at Fuji Park could be managed concurrently. He commented that the riparian area is part of the Carson River corridor.

Member Pacheco acknowledged that the Fairgrounds can probably be relocated, but requested the Committee members to keep in mind that Fuji Park is an original and cannot be replaced. Mr. Guzman requested the Committee members to keep in mind that resources don't follow boundaries or jurisdictions. He commented that "we are trying to protect the resource even when we do recognize that the Parks and Recreation Commission has the management of those lands."

Chairperson Hartman commented on the resource-driven nature of the Committee. **Vice Chairperson Jacquet moved that the Committee recommend to the Board of Supervisors and other advisory boards that the open space program would like the Board of Supervisors to consider the natural and open space qualities of the Clear Creek riparian corridor in Fuji Park and that the open space program may be the appropriate venue to manage those lands in the future.** In response to a question, Vice Chairperson Jacquet explained how the jurisdiction of the Parks and Recreation Commission relates to the motion. He indicated that the motion provides notice to the Parks and Recreation Commission that there are open space qualities in Fuji Park. He explained that he was attempting to convey recognition of the natural values in order to ensure the Board of Supervisors and the Parks and Recreation Commission are aware of them. If alternatives develop in the future that would allow for it, the open space program may be relevant to management of the Clear Creek riparian area. Discussion took place with regard to the intent of the motion, and **Member Scott seconded the motion.** Mr. Guzman requested the Committee to direct him to convey the information. Chairperson Hartman provided a summary of the motion and called for a vote. **Motion carried 6-0-1-0. Member Scott moved that all actions of this Committee be made available to Mr. Guzman to share with any and all people for here and for the foreseeable future. Member Pacheco seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-1-0.** Chairperson Hartman thanked the citizens for their attendance and participation. He recessed the meeting at 7:35 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 7:42 p.m.

F-2. DISCUSSION, ACTION, AND STATUS REPORT REGARDING THE CONSIDERATION OF THE NATURE CONSERVANCY OFFER TO TRANSFER OWNERSHIP OF A WETLAND LOCATED WEST OF NORTH LOMPA LANE AND NORTH OF NORTHRIDGE DRIVE, APPROXIMATELY 17.6 ACRES, APN 2-571-25 (1-2377) - Mr. Guzman advised that the phase one environmental assessment has been received. He is continuing to work on the gift deed from The Nature Conservancy to the City and intends to present it to the Board of Supervisors

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Meeting

Page 7

in the near future. He provided an overview of the assessment, and advised that he would make it available to the Committee members. Chairperson Hartman requested a copy. No formal action was taken.

F-3. DISCUSSION, ACTION, AND STATUS REPORT REGARDING THE CONSIDERATION OF PROPERTIES OWNED BY ALEXANDER BERNHARD, APPROXIMATELY 61.5 ACRES, APNs 10-072-08 AND 10-072-09, LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE CARSON RIVER, NORTH OF SILVER SADDLE RANCH (1-1626) - Mr. Guzman invited Mr. Bernhard to the meeting table. He referred to the displayed Land Ownership map and pointed out the subject property. He provided background information on this agenda item, the details of which were presented at a previous meeting. He advised of the \$850,000 offer to be made by the City with the condition that the water tank remain. He explained reasons for the condition, and discussed alternatives to make the deal work. He advised that the parties are about \$25,000 and a water tank away from closing the deal. He further advised that Mr. Bernhard has been working with the City and has granted several extensions of time. Mr. Bernhard's concern is that he will miss the building season if a deal is not closed soon. Mr. Guzman clarified that the deal is contingent upon acceptance by the Board of Supervisors. He advised that the intent is to pass the land through for sale to the Bureau of Land Management for fair market value. The purchase is important to the City in the context that the BLM will preserve it as open space immediately adjacent to the Silver Saddle Ranch, excluding all private holdings within the eastern slope of Prison Hill.

Chairperson Hartman inquired as to the capacity of the water tank and its purpose. Mr. Bernhard advised that the water tank would serve 190 units. Jack Randall, Mr. Bernhard's surveyor/engineer, has conducted an analysis which indicates there is no need for a water tank because Carson City has adequate storage. Mr. Randall has expressed the opinion that incorporating the two injection pumps from the Hidden Meadows system with the City's existing system would be a better utilization of water from the well provided in the second phase of the Hidden Meadows development. Utility Operations Manager Tom Hoffert's response was that the water tank was committed to in the development agreement and therefore required. Mr. Bernhard stated, "That's about the only thing we're off as far as our dollars and cents go." On behalf of the Committee, Chairperson Hartman thanked Mr. Bernhard for his patience and understanding. He explained the fair market value requirement and advised that, although the water tank condition cannot be waived by the Committee, it can be waived by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Bernhard acknowledged that there are less than 190 units in the four phases of the Hidden Meadows development. Mr. Guzman acknowledged that this is where the 25% figure originated. He further acknowledged that the 33 units covered in the subdivision portion of the property were taken into account in the appraisal process. He advised that the instructions to the appraiser were to consider all the comps necessary to attempt to bring the values together. He acknowledged that the preliminary number for the land is \$850,000.

In response to a question, Mr. Guzman advised that the most appropriate next step would be to discuss the water tank issue with Mr. Hoffert and then proceed to the Board of Supervisors. He reiterated that the matter is time sensitive, and advised that staff felt the discussions were going so well, other than the water tank issue, they were willing to provide a refundable deposit toward opening an escrow account in order to assure Mr. Bernhard. Mr. Guzman has an appointment with District Attorney's staff to discuss how to accomplish this. He advised that additional time will be needed to discuss the matter further with Mr. Hoffert and his staff. In response to a question, Mr. Bernhard advised that covered in the \$850,000 are the 33 units and an additional 31 acres. In response to a further question, Mr. Bernhard indicated he did not

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Meeting

Page 8

know how many of the 190 units to be supported by the water tank are within and outside the Hidden Meadows development. Discussion took place with regard to the number of units included in each of the four phases. In response to a question, Mr. Bernhard advised that the Hidden Meadows Estates development was to provide a well site. The unit two estates triggered a portion of a water tank, and unit three definitely required the water tank. Mr. Bernhard advised that he was talking with Dorothy Timian-Palmer at that time, who thought the Silver Saddle Ranch was going to be developed. Ms. Timian-Palmer planned to upgrade the tank to accommodate the Silver Saddle Ranch. Member Scott inquired as to how the tank fits into the bigger picture without the Silver Saddle Ranch. Mr. Guzman acknowledged that the Utilities Department wishes to have water storage in "that part of town." He advised of the original proposal to oversize the tank and for the Utilities Department to pay the difference. Subsequent conversations resulted in a decision to construct a 200,000 gallon tank. In response to a question, Mr. Bernhard advised that he is not getting credit against connection fees for the water system development. He acknowledged that the improvements are in addition to the regular connection fees. Discussion took place with regard to whether or not connection fees can be purchased and sold. Mr. Bernhard expressed the opinion that purchase of connection fees buys storage and hookups to the system. The Utilities Department, in turn, purchases individual water rights to construct tanks and maintain the water system. Mr. Bernhard suggested that requiring him to construct a new tank is "like paying twice." He advised that he has asked for an opinion on this matter and that Mr. Randall included it in his report, but no answer has been provided. In response to a question, Mr. Bernhard advised that he pays a \$3200 connection fee for a single family residence. He acknowledged that with the number of lots in the development, more than \$200,000 has been paid.

In response to a question, Mr. Guzman advised that Mr. Hoffert has made himself very available to meet with regard to this issue. Mr. Kastens advised that the next available meeting of the Board of Supervisors is May 17, 2001. Vice Chairperson Jacquet suggested agendizing the matter for the next meeting as the parties are "close enough on the land value side." He further suggested that the water tank issue can only be decided by the Board of Supervisors. Chairperson Hartman acknowledged that the development agreement can be modified based on the changes proposed by Mr. Bernhard. He inquired as to the possibility of Mr. Hoffert having time enough to prepare for the May 17th meeting. He expressed a preference to present the entire proposal to the Board of Supervisors at their May 17th meeting and ask them to address all the issues. Discussion took place regarding Mr. Randall's report and Mr. Hoffert's concerns, the purpose of the water tank, and the need to have the Board of Supervisors make a final decision. Member Scott inquired as to a way the Open Space Advisory Committee could work with the Utilities Department to meet its needs if Mr. Hoffert's review indicates additional technical issues. Chairperson Hartman suggested discussing the proposal with the District Attorney's staff. He referred to the issue of water for the Silver Saddle Ranch and indicated that it has come up previously. He suggested that the Committee may be able to acquire water rights to create a cash source which could be made available to the Utilities Department. Vice Chairperson Jacquet suggested bearing the cost of extending the effluent line to the Silver Saddle Ranch. Chairperson Hartman suggested further consideration of Member Scott's proposal. **Member Scott moved that the Committee request the Board of Supervisors to proceed with the purchase of the property based on the final appraisal from Johnson, Perkins & Associates, and also ask them to review and consider a proposal that will be put together between now and the Board meeting, hopefully with approval of Utilities, to deal with the water tank issue and ultimately subject to Mr. Bernhard's approval. Vice Chairperson Jacquet seconded the motion.** Mr. Bernhard acknowledged that a final decision by May 17th will be fine. Member Robinson expressed a concern

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Meeting

Page 9

regarding fire protection as part of the water tank's purpose, and suggested checking with the Fire Department. Mr. Bernhard advised that Mr. Randall addressed the fire issue in his report. At Mr. Guzman's request, Mr. Bernhard acknowledged that he was not accepting the \$850,000 offer without the water tank requirement; that he would like staff to consider the possibility of \$875,000 without the water tank requirement; and that opening an escrow account can wait until after the May 17th Board of Supervisors meeting. Chairperson Hartman called for a vote on the pending motion; **motion carried 6-0-1-0**. Chairperson Hartman thanked Mr. Bernhard.

G. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMITTEE MEMBER STATUS REPORTS (1-2432) - Mr. Guzman proposed meeting next on June 4th unless something critical comes up. The Committee members concurred.

H. STATUS REPORTS FROM STAFF (1-2465) - Mr. Guzman advised that he and Mr. Kastens attended a conference in Long Beach, California. He will be providing a summary memo to the Committee regarding the information received.

I. ADJOURNMENT (1-2506) - Member Pacheco moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:23 p.m. Member Bird seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

The Minutes of the May 7, 2001 meeting of the Carson City Open Space Advisory Committee are so approved this _____ day of June, 2001.

STEVE HARTMAN, Chairperson