

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 22, 2001 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Glen Martel
Vice Chairperson Jim Dunn
Lou Cabrera
Ken Elverum
Larry Osborne
Jon Plank
John Simms
Stacie Wilke
Charles Wright

STAFF: Steve Kastens, Parks and Recreation Director
Scott Fahrenbruch, Parks Superintendent
Vern Krahn, Parks Planner
Andrew Burnham, Development Services Director
Tom Hoffert, Utility Operations Manager
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary
(PRC 05/22/01)

NOTE: Unless indicated otherwise, each item was introduced by Chairperson Martel. 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.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL (1-0001) - Chairperson Martel called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Commissioner Wilke arrived at 5:35 p.m.

ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - APRIL 17, 2001 AND MAY 1, 2001 (1-0006) - Commissioner Osborne moved to approve the minutes as submitted for the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission. Commissioner Cabrera seconded the motion. At the request of Mr. Kastens, Commissioner Osborne amended his motion to indicate approval of the April 17, 2001 and May 1, 2001 minutes. Commissioner Cabrera continued his second. Motion carried 8-0-1-0.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0020) - Edward Neidert stated that comments made at a previous meeting "in no way reflected upon the people who mow the lawns ... upon the fine staff who do such a good job on a shoe string budget." His comment that Fuji Park has been the "neglected step child of the Carson City Parks Department" referred to decisions made by the Commission and by the Board of Supervisors regarding the lack of funding provided for Fuji Park. He expressed the opinion that money has been "lavished" on other parks and facilities while Fuji Park has been allowed to deteriorate. He reiterated that his comments in no way reflected on any of the Carson City Parks employees.

(1-0065) Mike Hoffman, Vice President of Concerned Citizens to Save Fuji Park and Fairgrounds ("Concerned Citizens"), referred to a memorandum from Ken Dorr of Capital Engineering, dated May 22,

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 2

2001, which was distributed prior to the start of the meeting. He commented that even though the cost estimates reflected in the memo are not a part of the site plans, it would still be an extension and is possibly fueling the City's need to construct the sewer line ahead of time. Chairperson Martel indicated that the information contained in the memo would be discussed as part of the agenda item. Mr. Hoffman expressed the opinion that the "move is precipitated by a million dollar shortfall that the City Manager has predicted in the upcoming budget." He discussed the State of Nevada's budget shortfall which is possibly due to California's Indian gaming. He remarked that the State "didn't look to its borders and say, 'Well, let's sell Sand Harbor and build a mega-gambling resort in order to make up those shortfalls,' and tell people 'we'll move Sand Harbor east' probably to Lake Lahontan." The Governor and the State legislators are working hard to cut \$80 million out of Nevada's budget. Mr. Hoffman expressed the opinion that Carson City needs to do the same thing. "Selling public property and especially an existing and much-loved park like Fuji is not a solution. It's insane." He commented that if the park is sold to meet next year's shortfall, "we'll be right back here next year, same place and same problem." (Commissioner Wilke arrived at 5:35 p.m.)

(1-0109) William Goni advised that he was Chairman of the Ormsby County Commissioners when Fuji Park was established. He provided historic information on development of the park and its uses. He protested commercial development inside the park and especially moving the live stream. He suggested using the funds from the Costco deal to upgrade the park. He stated there is "lots of commercial ground in Carson City and these stores will find a home." It is not proper to use open space to balance the budget. "There's lots of ways to balance a budget but there's not many ways of acquiring open space and a park like Fuji." He expressed the hope that the Commission would vote in favor of keeping the park, and suggested that the Open Space Advisory Committee should make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. As a former politician, he expressed the opinion that any Supervisor intending to run for office after selling the park will be "2 or 3,000 votes down before they even start." He requested the Commissioners to keep Fuji Park in its present location and allocate funds to improve it.

In response to a question, Chairperson Martel advised that a meeting to address the possibility of relocating Fuji Park and/or the Fairgrounds will be scheduled in the near future. He stated that the focus of this evening's meeting was the feasibility study.

(1-0193) Vivian Kuhn, reading from a prepared statement, advised that over 4200 signatures have been gathered by the Concerned Citizens. She provided background information on the members of the Concerned Citizens and their affiliations with Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds. She advised that the Concerned Citizens would be presenting information on the reasons they feel the proposed relocation sites are unacceptable. She stated, "the only acceptable site is the current site," and requested a show of hands from the citizens present supporting that statement. She advised of conversations earlier in the day with Mayor Masayko and Mr. Krahn who both indicated that "it is within the Commission's power tonight to vote against all proposed relocation sites." She requested that the Commission "just say no to the proposed relocation sites for Fuji Park and leave Fuji Park where it is."

(1-0221) Jon Nowlin stated he is a 25-year resident of Carson City and "one of those 4000+ signatures on the petition that has a background in professional natural resource science." He advised that many experts in various fields are represented among the signatures, and that the signatures represent a wide spectrum of the community. He distributed a prepared statement to the Commissioners. He referred to comments by "Supervisors and City staff" indicating that no one other than taxpaying citizens of Carson City should

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 3

be allowed to comment on this issue and that the petition should be screened on that basis. He stated that “if it comes to legal action by the citizens, it’s not taxpaying citizens that have status, it’s registered voters.” He expressed the opinion that the petition contains the signatures of a large number of registered voters in the community. He commented that since the waters of Clear Creek are under the jurisdiction of the State of Nevada and the United States, every citizen has the right to address environmental issues with regard to the same. This would be verified by the approval required for any plan to relocate Clear Creek. Mr. Nowlin expressed the opinion that no decision can be made with regard to moving the park because the costs to dismantle it have yet to be determined. In addition, the final sale price for the land has yet to be determined. He advised that Costco was sold for \$3.67 million and that the budget approved by the Board of Supervisors on Monday, May 21st reflected a line item for relocation of Fuji Park in the amount of \$2 million.

Mr. Nowlin proposed that the Commissioners consider recommending to the Board of Supervisors removing the park from the real estate market until the freeway is completed. He estimated this to be an eight-year period of time, and suggested that the value of the property would skyrocket as other private land develops. The option of developing the park would not be foreclosed, but at the same time the value of the park as a “green jewel between the developments” would also skyrocket. Effects of development along the freeway and along Highway 50 will be evident by then and a more rational decision can be made about passing on resources to future generations. Mr. Nowlin further suggested that, in the interim, some of the available funds from the Quality of Life Initiative and the Costco deal should be invested in the current park location.

(1-0315) Eileen Cohen, a member of the Concerned Citizens, advised that she lives in Sunridge, a “bedroom community of Carson City.” She further advised that she “spends most of [her] money in Carson” and has always felt a part of Carson City. She discussed the amount of traffic from the “bedroom communities” into Carson City on a daily basis to “spend money or to work.” She provided background information on her history in Carson City and discussed her goals to make it a better place to live. She stated, “a healthy democracy requires that we hold ourselves and not just our elected officials responsible for these hard decisions.” She requested that the Commissioners recommend to the Board of Supervisors and the City Manager that Fuji Park remain in its current location.

(1-0377) Diane Barnes, President of the 4-H Leaders Council in Carson City, the Western Area State Ambassadors Leader, and the County Ambassadors Leader for Carson City, read into the record the mission statement of the 4-H Youth Program. She advised that approximately 350 youth projects are taking place “at any given time” and that the Cooperative Extension reaches approximately 4200 youth in Carson City alone. She stated that Fuji Park is a very important part of the 4-H program, and listed examples of and participation in youth projects. She discussed the importance of a 300-yard shaded grass area, an exhibit hall with kitchen facilities, livestock pens, and an arena. She provided historic information on a parcel of land held by the Ormsby County 4-H Leaders Council and the purpose for the same. The land was transferred back to the City at the request of the Ormsby County Commissioners who “promised 4-H that the land would be there for our use and that promise had no end date. That promise was an inheritance for our young people to have that land for their use from time on.” She advised that 4-H played a role in development of the park, by planting many of the existing trees, and in development of the park’s master plan. She stated the master plan never mentions the land could be sold for commercial gain. She expressed the opinion that 4-H is the most frequent user of the park and “probably stands to lose the most.” She

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 4

reiterated the facility needs of the 4-H in order to maintain its programs. She stated that “five years of missing these kids is a generation lost in 4-H. Ten years could devastate our program to the point where we may not have one if we don’t have the local facilities at hand with everything we need in order to run our programs.” She acknowledged that the Board of Supervisors can legally “change the resolution at any given time” but stated, “ethically and morally, that should never be done.” She indicated a preference that the resolution be changed to put “some kind of restrictive language so that we don’t have to go down this road ever again.” She requested the Commissioners to recommend not moving the park, and that the funding set aside for the park be used to enhance the existing facilities.

Commissioner Cabrera expressed a concern that the comments were going off the agenda. Chairperson Martel pointed out that the Commission has heard similar testimony during the last two meetings and requested the citizens to provide public comment on a different topic.

(1-0517) Mike Hoffman requested that the public comments be reflected in the minutes, especially those of Mr. Goni.

Chairperson Martel thanked the citizens for their input, and advised that a specific item regarding the possible relocation of the park and the fairgrounds will be agendized at some time in the future.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON REVIEWING THE FEASIBILITY STUDY AND ESTABLISHING A PRIORITY SITE FOR THE POSSIBLE RELOCATION OF THE FAIRGROUNDS/FUJI PARK (1-0531) - Mr. Kastens reviewed the staff report and referred to the feasibility study booklet included with the agenda materials. He advised that the booklet was offered to several members of the Concerned Citizens on Friday, May 18th. In addition, staff invited anyone from the Concerned Citizens to a meeting on Monday, May 21st to review the feasibility study. Mr. Krahn distributed an executive summary to the citizens present. Mr. Kastens reviewed staff’s recommendation as reflected in the staff report.

Chairperson Martel reviewed the purpose for this meeting and advised that, at some time in the future, a meeting would be scheduled to compare the Fuji Park/Fairgrounds Master Plan to the feasibility study. He acknowledged that public comment in favor of saving Fuji Park would be most appropriately received at that time as opposed to during review of the feasibility study. Mr. Kastens requested that the meeting focus on the feasibility study, the associated costs, and the conclusion of the Commission with regard to the same. Commissioner Plank commented that he would be separating consideration of Fuji Park from review of the feasibility study.

Carol Dotson, Director of Planning with Lumos and Associates, introduced Rich Shock, Landscape Architect; and Ken Dorr and Ralph Wenziger, of Capital Engineering. She reviewed the purpose of the meeting to present the feasibility study and provided a brief overview of the presentation made at the May 1, 2001 meeting. She referred to an overall map which was displayed and described the locations of all three sites. She discussed the value of the public input received at the May 1st meeting, and provided an overview of the report format. Mr. Shock reviewed changes to the designs based on comments received at the last meeting. He advised that the budgets were increased for trees, park elements, shade structures,

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 5

etc., and that the design includes a single events pavilion and a covered warm up area instead of an exhibit hall and an events pavilion at each site.

Mr. Dorr discussed the role of Capital Engineering to develop preliminary designs based on the three conceptual site plans and to determine the on- and off-site infrastructure costs. He explained that all three sites have basically the same needs with regard to elements of construction, including grading, drainage, on- and off-site roadway improvements, water and sewer line improvements, power, telephone, and natural gas. On-site reclaimed water line improvements were considered for site one because reclaimed water lines exist at the site. In order to determine anticipated costs for the sites, an inventory of existing utilities and roadway infrastructure in the vicinity was done. From that information, necessary and reasonable improvements were extrapolated using the layouts developed by Lumos and Associates. Mr. Dorr indicated that worksheet grading and utility/street layout plans were included in the report instead of specific designs. From the layout plans, an attempt was made to determine all of the infrastructure improvements. He referred to drawings for each site and reviewed the anticipated improvements. All the utility companies and the Carson City Utilities Department were contacted to obtain information regarding requirements which have been incorporated into the report. Mr. Dorr referred to the May 22nd memorandum, previously distributed, and reviewed the same. He acknowledged that the estimates provided reflect provision of water and sanitary sewer to the sites only. Reserve capacity and/or future extension into Lyon County is not reflected in the estimates.

Mr. Shock reviewed additional changes to the site designs, including golf course netting at sites 1-A and 1-B, and perimeter fencing to control wild horses at each site. He referred to the Opinion of Probable Construction Cost, included in the Executive Summary, and reviewed the same. In response to a question, Mr. Shock explained that the phase one improvements would replicate existing facilities at Fuji Park/Fairgrounds, and bring them up to Code requirements and current design standards. He referred to the pros and cons listed in the Site Compatibility Assessment section for each site (pages 23, 43, and 63) and reviewed the same. Mr. Shock advised that the consultants have concluded site two is the most compatible for recreational development and, therefore, the most feasible. As an alternative, site three would accommodate all the facilities and, with some mitigation, also be feasible for development.

Mr. Shock acknowledged that the expense associated with site two has to do with extensive infrastructure costs. At the request of Commissioner Osborne, Ms. Dotson reviewed the Bureau of Land Management process necessary to acquire the land designated as site two. In response to a question, Mr. Kastens advised that the Recreation and Public Purpose ("R&PP") lease process takes approximately six months. The plan amendment process would take place prior to the R&PP process. In response to a further question, Mr. Kastens advised that there are no costs associated with a plan amendment. There are costs associated with a R&PP lease, but they are fairly minimal and would be covered in the contingency amounts included in the cost estimates. He referred to the R&PP lease application for the Edmonds Sports Complex and advised the overall cost for environmental, mineral, and cultural studies was approximately \$10,000. Commissioner Cabrera inquired as to whether it would be in the best interests of Carson City to apply for the R&PP lease regardless of the possible relocation of Fuji Park. Mr. Kastens indicated that this could be done, but stated there are additional issues outside of Parks and Recreation regarding BLM's Urban Interface Plan.

Mr. Burnham advised that City staff anticipates updating its land use plan over the next couple years, and that the BLM Urban Interface Plan will be included in the process. He acknowledged that the R&PP lease

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 6

for site two could be included. In response to a question, Mr. Kastens explained that the Urban Interface Plan includes open space areas and areas available to local governments or agencies for recreation and public purpose. He indicated that R&PP leases don't automatically designate a park site; they allow development for schools, fire stations, etc. and limit development to public purpose and recreation. Mr. Kastens advised there are other public purpose uses which other City entities are considering for the area. He acknowledged that commercial developments cannot apply for R&PP leases. Mr. Burnham acknowledged that the V&T Terminal development will be subject to the same process. He advised that Douglas County recently went through a process for their North Valley plan to designate lands for disposal.

Chairperson Martel recessed the meeting at 6:50 p.m. and reconvened at 7:00 p.m. He opened the meeting for public comment, and requested that the citizens focus on the feasibility study.

(1-1360) Mike Hoffman referred to the Opinion of Probable Construction Costs and requested consideration of the possibility that costs will most likely increase due to purchasing construction materials from California and to increased gas prices. He expressed disagreement with the phase one improvement costs being a reflection of existing facilities at Fuji Park because of the \$740,000 allocated to Fuji Park, together with funding which has been generated over the past four years from Question #18. He suggested considering the build out improvements as a more accurate representation of replacing the "bare minimum of what we have at Fuji Park." He further suggested considering other costs, including environmental impact studies, and expressed the opinion that \$10 million is a more accurate figure when factoring in the relocation of Clear Creek. Mr. Dorr responded to questions regarding the traffic signal anticipated for site three, and traffic controls proposed for site two. He acknowledged that costs for the signal at site three are included in the estimate. Mr. Hoffman discussed the definition of feasible, and expressed the opinion that spending "millions of dollars to replace something that the majority of Carson City residents oppose is basically not logical; therefore, not feasible." He expressed the hope that the Commissioners would relay this to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. At the request of Commissioner Cabrera, Mr. Hoffman clarified his comments regarding the phased costs. He explained that phase one improvements refer to the existing facilities at Fuji Park. He referred to page 102 of the City's tentative budget under capital acquisitions and stated that the \$740,000 allocated to Fuji Park will "go with it." He expressed the opinion that those funds and any Question #18 funds should be considered in the "total package" of Fuji Park. "That takes us away from phase A on these things and puts us up to the higher numbers on phase B."

(1-1492) Edward Neidert requested that the V&T Railroad not be linked to the discussion of relocating Fuji Park. He expressed the opinion that there are two existing parks which could accommodate the V&T Railroad, and inquired as to the reason the V&T has been included in the plans. Chairperson Martel referred to the explanation provided at the May 1st meeting regarding the possibility of providing assistance to concurrently phase the V&T project improvements. He indicated that the Commissioners, staff, and consultants felt it prudent to consider the possibility and attempt to accommodate the project. Mr. Kastens noted that no costs have been associated with the V&T project. The site designs only reflect the facilities in relation to the proposed development in the event there is a desire to merge them in the future. Commissioner Osborne referred to comments provided by the consultants at the last meeting indicating that the V&T in no way hindered, hampered, or had any impact upon development of the site designs as depicted. Ms. Dotson confirmed that the V&T facility was included after the sites were fully designed in response to coordinating efforts in the eastern portion of town and in consideration of the potential to combine the recreational amenities. She advised that the V&T facilities were in no way included in the

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 7

costs, were entirely conceptual, and no other facilities were moved to accommodate them. Mr. Neidert commented that the V&T Railroad is a “very popular issue.” He suggested that opposition to the relocation of Fuji Park could be construed to involve the V&T if it is included in the site designs. “It would be best not to be discussing it under the same venue.”

Mr. Neidert inquired as to the type and maturity level of the trees being proposed. Mr. Shock advised that the allowance for purchase and installation of trees and other landscape shading elements has been increased since the last meeting. The consultants recommend planting a variety of tree sizes and maturity levels in key locations within the park. Mr. Shock responded to questions regarding the height of the proposed trees, the number, and the landscape budget. Chairperson Martel reviewed the cost estimates provided in the feasibility study. Mr. Neidert discussed traffic safety issues at site three, and Mr. Dorr acknowledged that site three includes a traffic signal. He advised that a more thorough traffic study at site two will be required in order to determine whether a signal is needed. Mr. Neidert expressed the opinion that the critical movement at site two is “traffic coming up from Carson City and turning left fully loaded into that park up a hill against traffic coming down the hill at speed.” Chairperson Martel advised that the left turn lane allows stacking distance which is what NDOT and the traffic engineers will consider. It is the difference between the left entrance to the park on the north side and the left exit from the park on the south side.

(1-1675) Jon Nowlin discussed an accident involving a Nevada Highway Patrol trooper and a motorcyclist at Flint Drive on Friday, May 18th. He strongly recommended considering the costs of a traffic signal at site two given the blind curve, the hill, traffic patterns, and types of traffic. With regard to the V&T Railroad, he discussed potential problems working with animals in the same vicinity as a steam whistle. He expressed strong support for the V&T, but suggested removing it from the plans to be considered as a separate issue.

(1-1717) James Parker discussed the increase in traffic on Highway 50 in the last two years, and suggested consideration of traffic signals at both sites two and three. He provided information on his and his wife’s involvement in the community over the years, and pointed out the location of his home on the overall site plan. He discussed traffic impacts with regard to site three, and requested that the eastern portal be considered as a whole. He advised he has developed maps since the last meeting which he reviewed with Open Space Manager Juan Guzman. He discussed his proposal to develop the eastern portal.

(1-1868) Charles Kuhn thanked the Commissioners for the opportunity to address them. He also thanked Mr. Kastens, Parks Department staff, and the consultants for taking time to meet with members of the Concerned Citizens last evening. He respectfully disagreed with the \$10,000 estimate for the R&PP lease application because of the complexity involved in each of the three sites. Since the documents will be subject to public comment, an environmental assessment and possibly an environmental impact statement may be required; the time and cost involved in that process may be extreme. With regard to site three, Mr. Kuhn advised that he has been involved in siting, planning, and engineering landfill designs for fourteen years. He advised that litter is presently scattered across the site three property, and expressed concerns regarding methane production from the landfill during the post-closure, thirty-year monitoring period. He advised that prevailing winds blow directly at site three. He discussed existing and potential bird problems in the area, the potential fault line which will require further investigation, and traffic volumes. He commented on the “cons” listed in the Site Compatibility Assessment sections for each site, and pointed

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 8

out that the sites are not marked for disposal by the BLM. He advised that this will “complicate, slow and increase the cost of the R&PP lease application.”

Mr. Kuhn respectfully disagreed with Commissioner Plank in that the purpose of the feasibility study was to identify costs associated with relocating Fuji Park. He suggested that closure costs for Fuji Park should be factored into the entire feasibility study. He disagreed with comments indicating that the City has available funding to relocate the facilities and stated, “the numbers simply do not add up.” He reviewed the cost estimates and discussed “cradle to grave costs,” including development costs which will be incurred at Fuji Park. He suggested that estimates should be included for a “full life-cycle analysis of the project moving.” He indicated that the feasibility study stated “this was an expansion of existing recreational facilities. If that’s the case, this City can’t afford it.” He commented that “realistically this is not an expansion; this is a replacement. Therefore, the replacement costs must be total life-cycle costs.” Mr. Kuhn reviewed the Commission’s possible action, and requested that the Commissioners consider the best possible situation for Carson City. He requested the Commission to recommend that none of the sites are acceptable due to the costs, time, and suitability of “each of these being turned into a fairgrounds and park; and that the recommendation that continues on up the line would be that the fairgrounds and park stay exactly where they are.”

(1-2060) Mike Eckley inquired as to the source of alternative funding for extending sewer/water lines to the sites. Mr. Burnham reviewed the possible funding sources, including the Carson Water Subconservancy District and the Carson City Utilities Department. He indicated that no decision has been made regarding the funding source, and advised that staff has been directed by the Board of Supervisors to consider extending water/sewer to the eastern part of the community. He referred to the May 22nd memo from Capital Engineering, and advised that the cost estimate provided would extend water/sewer service to the park site only. He acknowledged that the City could initially pay for extending the utilities and collect from property owners as they hook up. He discussed additional alternatives, including a special assessment district. He acknowledged that the City would “have to come up with the money” initially. He further acknowledged that no determination has yet been made as to the funding scenarios. Mr. Shock acknowledged that the “numbers proposed for the improvements are today’s numbers.” Mr. Eckley inquired as to whether cost inflation has been factored into the estimate. At the request of Mr. Kastens, Mr. Shock reviewed the contingency fund calculation. He advised that a contingency of 20% was used, together with a 20% prevailing wage allowance. Mr. Dorr advised that 15% was allowed for engineering, architecture, and study of both the building and infrastructure improvement aspects. He commented that the numbers are very conservative, and indicated that all the additional studies can be easily accommodated within the percentage allotted. In response to a question, Mr. Dorr advised that a 20% construction contingency was factored in for the site structures. In addition to that, 21% was allotted for hiring consultants, conducting studies, and construction management. A 15% contingency was added to the infrastructure aspect because of the changes necessary for the pipes. Mr. Eckley inquired as to whether these are “safe figures” over the next several years, and requested that consideration be given to this matter.

(1-2217) Beth Theuret, member of the 4-H Leaders Council and co-leader of the dog club, requested clarification with regard to the phase one and build out improvements. Ms. Dotson referred to page 1 of the feasibility study and reviewed the Inventory of Existing Facilities. In response to a question, she referred to the Executive Summary and advised that the Inventory of Existing Facilities are included in the phase one improvements. She acknowledged that the referenced building will include a kitchen facility

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 9

and conference rooms. Ms. Theuret inquired as to whether the enhanced landscaping improvements will be included in phase one or in the build out. Mr. Shock advised that cost estimates have been provided for phase one, which includes six acres of turf, trees, park facilities, and park shelter. The full build out estimate includes ten acres of turf, trees, landscape, and park facilities. Ms. Theuret requested that the V&T Terminal be kept totally separate from the plans, and expressed the opinion that it would be a liability for the City. With regard to the traffic light for site two, she requested consideration for the many vehicles entering and exiting the fairgrounds with heavy horse trailers attached.

Ms. Theuret inquired as to a plan for relocating 4-H events during construction of the new park. Mr. Kastens indicated that, ideally, a transition period will be included to accommodate all the fairgrounds users. He advised that City staff would work with the users to determine alternative sites during the transition. In response to a question, he advised that other arenas in the area have been considered, and that staff has talked with Douglas County and Dayton Parks and Recreation staff. Prior to getting to that stage, Mr. Kastens indicated that Carson City staff would talk with 4-H in greater detail as to the viability of alternative sites. Ms. Theuret expressed the opinion that the conversations need to take place now. She discussed difficulties in making trips to Douglas County and Dayton and potential conflicts with those facilities on the weekends. She suggested the possibility of the same contentions arising on the "eastern boundary that are now on our southern boundary," and requested an assurance that this would not happen. Mr. Kastens advised that the proposed sites have been moved away from the desirable commercial frontage along the highway. He discussed the possibility of including deed restrictions at the site and, in response to a comment from Ms. Theuret, advised that there are no deed restrictions at Fuji Park. In response to a question, Mr. Kastens advised that the title search conducted on the Fuji Park/Fairgrounds property is a public document accessible to anyone. Ms. Theuret expressed a concern that "what the City perceives as pressure for commercialization from an adjacent county comes as a priority above and beyond any assurances they've made that we will have a parks and recreation fairgrounds and public place for our kids and our folks in the City."

Commissioner Cabrera inquired as to whether NDOT would provide direction on what to do with the Flint Drive/Highway 50 intersection. Mr. Dorr advised that a right-of-way occupancy permit is required from NDOT in order to do any work within the Highway 50 corridor, and NDOT would require approval of any proposed improvements. As a condition of the report, a traffic study would be required. He anticipates NDOT's initial stance will be not to have any more signals than necessary. It will be the proponent's responsibility to provide sufficient information to convince NDOT that a traffic signal is warranted at the location. Commissioner Osborne inquired as to the general cost for adding a signal light, and Mr. Dorr advised that a signal consultant recommended approximately \$250,000. He advised that this was the figure used for site three.

(1-2472) Roger Rackow, a Carson City contractor, discussed problems he has experienced at the landfill and at Conti Drive due to the Rifle and Pistol Range. He expressed a concern over safety with regard to ricocheting and misfired bullets. He advised of mosquito problems originating from the Darling Ranch, and related an incident involving horses on Conti Drive which were bitten and subsequently died.

(1-2507) Judy Larquier pointed out that in all the "discussions on the relocations and replacement of the facilities at Fuji Park you continually neglect to acknowledge the fact that you cannot relocate the stream

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 10

at Fuji Park.” She discussed experiences at the creek with her daughter and friends, and requested that the Commissioners acknowledge that the creek cannot be replaced.

(1-2525) Susan Hoffman discussed the property tax increase suggested by the Board of Supervisors, and read a quote by Supervisor Robin Williamson from the *Reno Gazette-Journal*. She requested that the Commissioners not approve any of the sites, “thereby saving the community millions of dollars that it would take to move a park that is perfectly wonderful where it is.” She read a quote into the record from Mayor Masayko, as follows: “They [the Commission] have the option to make any decision that they believe befits their interest and the City’s interest.” She displayed the copy of the feasibility study belonging to the Concerned Citizens, and stated that the option which best befits the interests of the City is to leave Fuji Park where it is. “The citizens of this community have made it clear that what they want is to have this beautiful park improved in its present location.” She requested that the Commission not approve any of the sites “because none of them are acceptable or feasible.”

(1-2577) Jack Anderson, of the Fuji Park Users Coalition (the “Users Coalition”), advised a copy of the feasibility study had been received last Thursday or Friday. He indicated that the Users Coalition has not yet had a chance to review the study in depth. He will be scheduling a Users Coalition meeting in the next week or two to review the study and provide input to the Commission. He inquired as to whether a provision can be made not to demolish Fuji Park until a new park is built if a site is approved. He commented that the three alternative sites “are the only choices that are left in Carson City because of the space.” He anticipates that if the Commission recommends a particular site, the City Manager will “sell off Fuji Park immediately.” He requested inclusion of a stipulation, if a site is selected, that the new park be constructed prior to selling Fuji Park. He expressed the opinion that this would take many years.

(1-2650) Edward Neidert requested that the Commissioners consider the possibility of a future budget crisis and the subsequent need to divert funds allocated to a new Fuji Park for other City services.

Chairperson Martel called for additional public comment and, when none was offered, closed public testimony.

Commissioner Osborne pointed out that the Commission is considering the feasibility of the three sites. He indicated that additional meetings would be scheduled regarding the possibility of recommending to the Board of Supervisors any action to be taken with regard to the Fairgrounds and Fuji Park. Mr. Kastens acknowledged that Commissioner Osborne had a correct understanding of the process. Commissioner Osborne suggested that attaching conditions to any recommendation would be most appropriate at that time. Commissioner Cabrera suggested disengaging Fuji Park from the feasibility study for the moment. He remarked that many other questions remain to be answered regarding Fuji Park, and expressed the opinion that it would be premature to provide a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding the result of the feasibility study. He suggested considering the feasibility study on its own merit for the moment, and considering Fuji Park separately. Chairperson Martel concurred and indicated that, based on discussions from the last meeting, the focus was to come to a resolution on the feasibility study and move forward with at least one additional hearing to discuss the existing park and fairgrounds. Commissioner Cabrera referred to his earlier comments regarding the wording of the agenda item. He suggested that an agenda item to consider Fuji Park would have resulted in “10 times” the attendance, and that there are other opinions which need to be heard.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 11

Commissioner Wilke stated she could not “divide looking at a park site or looking at relocating Fuji Park.” She expressed the opinion that the process is being prolonged “and Fuji Park that has been a stepchild of our poor parks system is still sitting there in disarray.” She requested clarification regarding the difference between considering a new park site or relocating Fuji Park. Commissioner Elverum referred to his previous comments with regard to the sale of the north parking lot creating pressure to sell the remainder of the park. He expressed the opinion that the feasibility study was putting the cart before the horse, and that none of the sites are feasible because they don’t replace the existing park. He suggested that the Commission should be directed to consider one of the three sites only if the Board of Supervisors decides to sell the park. He pointed out that the Board of Supervisors has more to consider than just the park, but the Commission’s charge is to weigh the best interests of parks. He remarked that relocating the park will be expensive and there is no indication the proceeds from selling the park will be available for construction of a new park. Commissioner Elverum concurred with Commissioner Wilke in that the feasibility study cannot be separated from the issue of relocating the park. He discussed the aspect of a park surrounded by commercial development, and described a similar situation in Salem, Oregon. He commented that Fuji Park could be improved using the money from the sale of the north parking lot. Commissioner Wright expressed the opinion that none of the three sites fit the criteria as a substitute for Fuji Park.

Commissioner Cabrera discussed the responsibility of the Commission to take action, to plan, and to offer recommendations. He clarified this does not necessarily mean the Commission should accept the feasibility study. He suggested additional planning, consideration of Fuji Park, and other options. Commissioner Simms expressed respect for the comments presented by the citizens, but stated, “if we gave you a gold mine, you would still find fault with it. If we found you an oasis, you’d still think that it wouldn’t replace the park that you have.” He concurred with Commissioner Cabrera’s comments and stated, “planning and preparation is better than desperation and failure.” He clarified that he would never recommend selling any park, but reiterated the importance of planning. He commented that Carson City is changing and evolving into a big city with development pressures. He remarked that a lack of preparation may result in having nothing. Commissioner Osborne expressed understanding for Commissioner Wilke’s comments and concurrence with an attempt to separate some of the emotion from the issue. He agreed that the reason for the feasibility study was to consider possible relocation of the fairgrounds and portions of the park. He expressed appreciation for Commissioner Cabrera’s comments, and referred to the commitment made to the Users Coalition to consider increased pressure for sale of the fairgrounds and park at the time of the north parking lot sale. He pointed out that pressure has increased for private property surrounding the park and land in Douglas County. Private property owners can develop as they wish within the City’s planning and zoning priorities. Commissioner Osborne discussed the need to look forward and plan, and expressed the opinion that the Commission would be remiss in not considering an alternative location.

Commissioner Elverum concurred with the comments provided by both Commissioners Simms and Osborne. He agreed that planning was the reason for the feasibility study, but reiterated that the plans do not provide an adequate replacement for Fuji Park. He suggested advising the Board of Supervisors that the sites considered are not suitable for replacement of the park, that they should consider keeping it, and that, if they do decide to sell it, the Commission should be directed to consider additional plans and/or sites. He stated the Commission should not be making decisions based on economic concerns. He reiterated that the alternative sites and designs do not meet the expectations of what people seem to want in a park. Commissioner Wilke agreed that planning is prudent, and stated that the feasibility study does not represent something equal to or better than the existing park. She discussed her responsibility as a Parks

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 12

Commissioner to consider the betterment of parks. She stated that if the Board of Supervisors decides to sell the park, she would be more than willing to select a site. She expressed the hope that the Board of Supervisors will make a decision soon. In response to a question, Chairperson Martel stated that the comments indicate the Fuji Park decision will not proceed forward until the Commission is forced to do something. **Commissioner Elverum moved that the Parks and Recreation Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors that none of the sites proposed in the feasibility study are suitable as a replacement for Fuji Park and, if the Board of Supervisors decides to sell Fuji Park, they do so without the approval of the Commission. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion.** Commissioner Osborne inquired as to whether the motion was proper with regard to the agenda item. Mr. Kastens read the agenda item into the record and explained the possible action. Commissioner Osborne pointed out that the portion of the motion having to do with selling Fuji Park is beyond the scope of the agenda item. **Commissioner Elverum withdrew that portion of the motion having to do with selling Fuji Park,** and requested that an item be agendaized for the next meeting to discuss whether or not to approve the sale of the park for commercial reasons. Commissioner Osborne agreed that the matter should be agendaized as an action item at a future meeting. He commented that he would not want to see any action thrown out because of the Open Meeting Law. **Commissioner Wright continued his second.** Commissioner Elverum restated his motion. Commissioner Cabrera inquired as to the intent of the motion with regard to whether or not the Commission will again be discussing this issue. Commissioner Elverum explained the intent of his motion in that recommending approval of any of the sites sends a message to the Board of Supervisors that it is acceptable to sell the park. Recommending that none of the sites are acceptable at this time sends a message that the feasibility study didn't find an adequate replacement. Down the road, if the Board of Supervisors sells the park anyway, the matter will have to be revisited and the feasibility study may be the best option available at that time. Commissioner Osborne agreed that none of the alternative sites are feasible, but indicated that an aye vote would not indicate a message sent to the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Simms expressed a concern that the motion relate to the agenda item. Mr. Kastens commented on the intent of Commissioner Elverum's motion. Commissioner Simms suggested the proper action may be to take no action which would send a message that the Commission found the alternative sites infeasible. He commented it is not his responsibility as a Commissioner to send a message to the Board of Supervisors, and stated that "although we may all agree on a motion, we may not all agree on its intent." Commissioner Elverum stated it is the responsibility of the Commission to provide information to the Board of Supervisors in their consideration of the sale of Fuji Park for commercial gain and called for the question. At the request of Commissioner Osborne, the recording secretary read back the motion. Chairperson Martel called a roll call vote, the results of which were as follows: **Commissioners Wright, Elverum, Simms, Osborne, Wilke, Plank, Dunn - Aye. Commissioner Cabrera and Chairperson Martel - Nay. Motion carried 7-2-0-0.**

Chairperson Martel thanked staff and the consultants. Commissioner Elverum commended the consultants on a job well done and advised that the motion was no reflection on their work.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS (1-3576) - Commissioner Elverum requested that an item be agendaized for discussion and action on a recommendation of whether or not to sell Fuji Park. Commissioner Wright requested that the conceptual plan prepared by staff be agendaized for discussion at a future meeting.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 22, 2001 Meeting

Page 13

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS (1-3605) - None.

STATUS REPORTS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS (1-3640) - None.

COMMENTS AND STATUS REPORTS FROM STAFF (1-3643) - In response to a question, Mr. Kastens advised he had provided to the District Attorney's office the information on the action taken by the Commission and staff's recommendation regarding the Super Outlaw Karts at Champion Speedway. He requested the District Attorney's staff to draft an agreement between the City and the Speedway. The District Attorney's staff is concerned about contention over the special use permit, and further information is being pursued. Mr. Kastens acknowledged that the karts are racing at the Speedway. With regard to the bike path at Wellington Crescent, NDOT is in the process of developing the design. Surveying and staking is taking place at the present time.

STATUS REPORT ON QUESTION #18, RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION TAX AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT (1-3698) - Mr. Kastens discussed the request presented to the Board of Supervisors for additional funding at the Aquatic Facility. He expressed the hope that the costs will be recovered as a result of the litigation process.

ADJOURNMENT (1-3720) - Commissioner Wilke moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:41 p.m. Commissioner Simms seconded the motion. Motion carried 9-0.

The Minutes of the May 22, 2001 meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission are so approved this _____ day of July, 2001.

GLEN MARTEL, Chairperson