

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting
Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission was scheduled for 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 4, 2008 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City.

PRESENT: Chairperson Donna Curtis
Vice Chairperson Pete Livermore
Commissioner Charles Adams
Commissioner Tom Keeton
Commissioner Steve Lasco
Commissioner John McKenna
Commissioner James Smolenski
Commissioner Todd Westergard

STAFF: Roger Moellendorf, Parks and Recreation Director
Scott Fahrenbruch, Director of Operations, Parks Division
Vern Krahn, Park Planner
Thorn Towler, Assistant Deputy District Attorney
Darlene Rubin, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the commission's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record, on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office. These materials are available for review during regular business hours.

CALL TO ORDER (4:02:49): Chairperson Donna Curtis called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM: Roll was called and a quorum was present. Commissioners Lasco and Westergard arrived at 4:10 and 4:12 respectively.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENIZED ITEMS: None.

1. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - October 7, 2008 (4:02:58) - Vice Chair Livermore moved to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and carried 6-0.

2. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA - (4:03:12): Chair Curtis reported that item 5-C on the agenda would be continued to the next meeting because Mitch Ames was unable to be present.

3. STAFF UPDATES - DISCUSSION ONLY - NO DELIBERATION (4:04:16): Chair Curtis asked to speak on a matter that was on the Board of Supervisors agenda regarding the facility use agreement between Carson City and the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education. She stated that the matter was not in the purview of this commission, however, she thought it was interesting and wondered what kind of revenue that type of agreement might produce. Roger Moellendorf responded

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 2

that the revenue was minimal. It was an interlocal agreement between Western Nevada College and the City to allow them to use Field No. 6 at the John D. Winters Centennial Park. The college had a new women's softball program. They originally looked at using that field this fall, however, they worked out an agreement to use the high school softball field. They were requesting to use the field starting January 12, 2009 for their spring program, through May 2009. They were also considering using the field again for their fall season. The agreement called for the college to supervise the activity using their personnel. They would charge admission of which the City would receive 25 percent and the City would operate the concession stand receiving 100 percent of the proceeds. The matter will go before the Board of Supervisors on Thursday, November 6, 2008.

4. NON-ACTION ITEMS - DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATION ONLY - (4:07:07):

A. **Discussion only regarding recipients of awards from the Foundation for the Betterment of Carson City Park.** Fred Stanio, Chair of the Foundation, introduced this item. He reported that Special Recognition Awards followed the month-long nominations process and voting which had taken place on Monday, November 3, 2008. The Special Recognition Awards were given to people who had volunteered their services to the community for parks and their names would be inscribed on the memorial at the Pony Express Pavilion, at a dedication ceremony on December 6, 2008, at 2:00 p.m. at the monument. It would be hosted by Commissioner Pete Livermore.

The Volunteer of the Year Award went to Wilbur Earl (Will) Wiebrecht for his many years of service to the Historical Society at the Roberts House. He was also a founding member of the Landmark Society and responsible for writing and placement of the Nevada Historical markers seen around the state. He also worked for the Parks Department for 17 years. Mr. Weibrecht passed away about one year ago.

The award for the Organization of the Year went to the Friends of Silver Saddle Ranch. They organized a group of citizens interested in the future of the Silver Saddle Ranch and took the lead in obtaining funding. They organized and designed a Charette-type workshop and visualization process and invited people to participate. The organization also worked with the Carson City Parks Department helping to identify land use within the Carson River corridor from Deer Run Road to the Prison Hill Recreation Area.

The award for Business of the Year went to Bodine's Casino for partnering with Carson City to develop the newly renovated Carson City Fairgrounds and donating \$1 million toward the construction of a shared parking lot with the City and Bodine's. They would also share the ongoing maintenance and operating costs of the parking lot in future years.

The award for Volunteer of the Year went to Scott Fahrenbruch for his time and skill in acquiring people and engineering that helped the City stay a clean and recreation-friendly community.

Commissioner Livermore commented that the event was always fun and he was honored to continue to be asked to host it and to recognize people who contributed to the community. Roger Moellendorf

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 3

complimented Scott Fahrenbruch for the great job he had done and said that he worked several weekends a month, and that he often had to tell Scott, and also Vern Krahn, to “go home.”

B. Discussion only regarding potential changes to Resolution 2007-R-28, “A Resolution changing Existing or Adding New Fee Policies.” (4:12:12): Roger Moellendorf introduced this item and stated that in the past numerous resolutions governed the fee structure for different programs and the rental and reservation of parks and facilities. It had been confusing to administer and to determine the intent or to understand the conflicting policies in those resolutions. In 2007, an attempt had been made to consolidate the fees and to add new policies into one overall resolution that would govern fees and charges for the City. It had been based on input and information they received by going through the Parks and Recreation Master Plan process recommended by the Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) and adopted by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) in April 2006. The goal, with some exceptions, was that Parks and Recreation programs should recover 100 percent of their direct costs. A definition of “direct costs” had been included in the master plan. Mr. Moellendorf said that the reason for this new resolution had been to consolidate the various resolutions that governed fees and make the current fees and charges in line with the Master Plan intentions. They had been operating under the new fees and charges resolution for approximately 14 months and for the most part it had worked well.

The fees and charges resolution provided for percentages of cost recovery and offered guidance on how they should recover their costs, from a minimum of 25 percent for some types of reservations, rentals and programs to 100 percent for others. Mr. Moellendorf and Mr. Fahrenbruch had been working on park and facility rental and reservation fees and believed that resolution would allow them to implement those fees. However, they found that there were two areas that needed some clarification or additional thought. They also had a discussion with Commissioner Livermore who expressed concern about what appeared to be “built in” inequity in terms of the theater use. For example, paragraph three in the resolution stated that special events operated by a nonprofit user “. . . shall be set at a rate at a minimum of 25 percent of direct costs.” Then, number 9 in the resolution stated that the Aquatic Facility “. . . shall be set at a rate such that . . . recovery was at least 50 percent of the costs . . .” Number 7, however, stated that “. . . resident nonprofit use of the Community Center Theater shall be set at a rate that equals 75 percent of the direct costs . . .” Thus, a fairness issue seemed to exist. Mr. Moellendorf felt this meeting would be a good opportunity to discuss the issue with the Commission.

The other matter involved the reservation of the parks and the different types of events held there. One type would be a “community wide” event—like the Rendezvous, the RSVP Carnival, or the recent Nevada Day activities—and those events were produced primarily by local nonprofit organizations and were intended to have a wide appeal to the community. Those events were normally free to community members who could go there and stay all day; there would be a charge for food or games or the carnival admission, but that was just part of the community event. The other type was smaller in scale, referred to in the resolution as “special event,” and they tried to draw a distinction between the two. Mr. Moellendorf and Mr. Fahrenbruch had developed a working definition that “special events” were smaller and geared toward a more specialized interest group—such as dog agility drills and shows, primarily located at Fuji Park, and car shows, located at

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 4

Mills Park and Fuji Park. Those events were generally free, they tended to appeal to a more specialized audience (car enthusiasts or dog fanciers) and did not have widespread appeal. As a result, it seemed to make sense to have a different level of cost recovery. Mr. Moellendorf referred to number 3 of the resolution which stated that “. . . fees for the rental of parks, facilities, or equipment for a special event operated by a nonprofit user shall be set at a rate that is a minimum of 25 percent of the direct costs. . .” He believed that definition would be more appropriate to a community-wide event, and that rate should be at 25 percent. In moving more toward the specialized event, that rate should jump up to 50 percent, which would be more consistent with the cost recovery rates that they had determined were sufficient for the pool and for what Commissioner Livermore had proposed for the theater, and more consistent across the board. Mr. Moellendorf said that if a change was needed in those two areas, the resolution could be brought back at another meeting, perhaps the December meeting, with proposed changes. Or, if the resolution was deemed to be satisfactory, it would be unchanged. Overall, the resolution worked very well, it provided administrative flexibility—they did not have to come before the Commission every time they wanted to change a program fee (\$1 or 50 cents) to keep up with their current expenses. They could work within the parameters set forth in the resolution and respond quickly.

Scott Fahrenbruch echoed Mr. Moellendorf’s comments about the resolution. The other benefits, he added, were the flexibility and adaptability; they did not need to burden the PRC and the BOS with fee schedules, so long as both bodies understood that the action taken and approved was such that they stayed within the parameters of the resolution. Additionally, depending upon the funded levels of service, whatever the general fund gave the Parks Department and whatever they could support, dictated the range (50 percent to 100 percent, or 25 percent to 100 percent) of what they tried to recover. If sales tax and revenues continued to dwindle for the general fund, and given the hypothetical scenario that the Parks Maintenance Division had its staff cut 50 percent, they might have to seek more recovery costs from the special events. But, they had the flexibility to do that based on the fiscal conditions of the City and what kind of manpower and resources they could put toward the special events. Also, they had the Master Plan in which they had established levels of service. There might be a time when they had to make the decision between staff and the PRC and the BOS whether they wanted to support and subsidize the special events as much as they were now doing, or could they, if they had to make a 25 or 50 percent cut in staff. Mr. Fahrenbruch believed the resolution had the flexibility to carry them through the good times as well as some of the tough times. They liked the resolution as written and understood there were certain percentages that might be warranted to change in order to be equitable. The theater fees allowed for 75 percent of direct costs for nonprofit groups. If that were reduced to 50 percent that would be more equitable with the special events and still recognize community events and not “hit them so hard.” The philosophy in dealing with the community events was to help them thrive because they were primarily supported by volunteers, and they did bring considerable sales tax revenue into the City and provide recreational opportunities for the community.

Chair Curtis said she was looking at the resolution anew, based on the experiences that the City has had with the resolution for the past year, and the experiences she has had in the past. From the standpoint of the public and the users, one of the things the resolution had not done was to allow them to have a place where they could come and have input and talk about the fees they were paying. The resolution stated that, unless they changed anything within it or did not stay within the parameters, “you do not even need to come to the PRC

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 5

or the BOS,” so there was no opportunity for the users to voice their opinion. She added, however, that they could come to the meetings at any time and address the board about the fees during general comments. Chair Curtis went on to say that in practice they had seen all the fees this year. She asked if that was because they went outside the parameters.

Mr. Moellendorf said Chair Curtis was correct that any person or organization who had a concern about the fees and charges for the facilities or programs had the right to talk to staff and to come to the PRC and air their concerns. Beyond that, they had the right to bring their concerns to the BOS, and he would encourage them to do so. He pointed out that the fees did not have dollar amounts attached to them, just a percentage of costs recovery, and that was the point they were trying to make –if they stayed within those parameters they would be doing their job and recovering the correct cost for each program or rental. The resolution also stated that the Parks and Recreation Director would annually review the fees and charges and, Mr. Moellendorf pointed out, that would be done in conjunction with all the people who were involved. He and Scott Fahrenbruch would meet annually to look at the park fees, rental fees, and reservation fees. He also met with the recreation staff to go over the fees and the costs of the programs, and what kind of rate had to be set to recover those costs.

Mr. Moellendorf pointed out that the PRC had reviewed most of the fees this time. First, because they were implementing some large fees. In the case of the fairgrounds fees, they had a new fairgrounds facility and new fees that were substantially different from those in the past and he had wanted the Commission’s input on those fees. Second, because of the City’s budget situation this past year or so, significant budget cutting measures had been mandated. They had cut about \$400,000 from the budget. At the same time, they were given a mandate to increase their fees by 10 percent. There was something of a disconnect in that, he said, because it was hard to raise fees at the same time as cutting services or personnel. Although he could not foresee what the budget situation would be next year or beyond, he believed as long as they maintained the fees as approved by the commission and recommended to the BOS, which they then adopted, it would all work out smoothly.

Commissioner Livermore commented that he had requested that this resolution be placed on the PRC agenda. He explained that when a resolution was adopted it was generally considered sound policy until people were charged for a service or fee, and if they thought it was too high they would go before the BOS and ask for forgiveness of the fee. Management then had to do the best it could but, he said, in the last year it had been very difficult for him to justify the differences in percentages charged. For example, questions were raised as to why they recovered 25 percent for dog show events by nonresident/nonprofits at Fuji Park. At the same time, nonresidents who used the theater had to be charged 75 percent cost recovery. It was not equitable, and most of the people that used the facilities, especially residents of the City, all paid some type of tax to support the endeavor which nonresidents did not pay. Mr. Livermore said he had no problem with nonresidents paying the full fee. He pointed out that the resolution did not limit the percentage of the increases. There was a resolution a few years ago that called for 100 percent recovery for the theater. The Board of Supervisors offered a new resolution that called for a 25 percent reduction. There was a joint use agreement between the City and the school district that benefitted both parties greatly, not the least of which was that the replacement costs of materials and so forth was borne by the general fund of each entity, which he believed it should be.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 6

However, that could not be the case with the theater or other facilities users who were generally unfunded, or underfunded, and their activities were generally seasonal or once a year. The symphony probably had the most performances, but in any case, those productions, Senior Follies, and so forth, provided a better quality of life for Carson City residents and others. Other productions like the Wild Horse Children's Theater could not afford fees and currently performed at the Children's Museum (but they would much prefer to be at the Boldrick Theater). The Western Nevada Community Musical Theater brought a great benefit to the community. In addition, Mr. Livermore believed there was ancillary revenue in the form of sales tax to the community from their events. There should be a reasonable balance among all the users and all facilities. He added that while he could have made those suggestions at the BOS level, he wanted to start the process here at the PRC.

Mr. Livermore also noted that the item that was continued to the next meeting regarding theater fees would be introduced by Mitch Ames, Theater Operations Manager. He believed many of the theater users would be in attendance to voice their opinions because they were concerned about their ability to continue their productions if fees were increased.

Chair Curtis asked if the reduction of the cost recovery to 50 percent resolved the theater fee issue, or was there something separate about the theater fees. Mr. Livermore said it would resolve the inequity in the fees. He still did not understand how or why the fees were set at those levels, but did believe there had to be some cost recovery. Chair Curtis asked if an agreement to set the fees at 50 percent would mean that the issue of the theater fees would not have to come back to the Commission. Mr. Livermore said he felt that would be an ongoing issue, because that was what the resolution allowed. He said he did not know what the resolution had recommended about new fees, but, he noted, at the Arts and Culture Coalition the resolution stated that the fees had to be justified when they came before the Board. He said that Mr. Moellendorf and Mr. Ames could put together what the increase needed to be based on their knowledge of the programming and costs involved and that number could be part of their presentation. He did not know whether that would be acceptable to everyone.

Commissioner McKenna said the issue at hand was an ongoing problem when a government decided to raise a tax and called it a "fee." It did not cost any more if the facility was closed or open and used by the entire community. If a charge was assessed for the use of any part of the facility, he believed, the only fair way would be to charge for 100 percent of the cost. "It was political. It is whatever the supervisors want to do. If you want to charge 25 percent for the theater and 75 percent for the pool, that's why you are elected. But don't get into fair and equitable . . . and say this direct fee is different from that direct fee . . ." He added that it was a tax and the intention was to raise revenue on the various facilities, and that could be justified any way they wanted. But, whether there were more direct costs in one building or facility over another, the taxpayers paid for all of them.

Commissioner Smolenski asked if it would be a good idea or necessary to have a definition in the resolution as to what the direct costs were. Mr. Moellendorf responded that he was not certain if it needed to be included in the resolution but it definitely could have been included in the staff report. That definition was contained in the Master Plan. A "direct cost" was a cost assigned to a program for specific services provided, without

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 7

which that program would not exist. For example, for youth basketball, the basketballs had to be purchased, referees hired as well as time keepers, and those elements would be some portions of the direct cost. If an individual was assigned to supervise that activity, a portion of their pay was also figured into that direct cost as well. In the case of Joel Dunn, who oversees many programs, they did not assign a portion of his cost to that program, nor a portion of the cost for heating the facility, providing lights, or the utilities involved with that facility, because they viewed those as “indirect” overhead costs. Administrative overhead would include Joel’s time, his cost in overseeing the program, the cost of administrative office personnel, administration of the program; all were part of the indirect costs. It would not cost significantly more if the gymnasium was being used or not, and Commissioner McKenna was correct that it was an indirect cost not charged back to the user, however, when specialized or specific materials, supplies or manpower was required to carry out the program, that was considered a direct cost.

Commissioner McKenna asked why different percentages were charged on additional direct costs. Mr. Moellendorf said that was exactly what Commissioner Livermore had brought forward. Some was “carryover from the previous resolutions; an attempt to consolidate those resolutions, and that partly was where the 25 percent versus the 50 percent versus the 75 percent came from.” He explained that he often used the example of a pyramid: the lower costs in fees and charges were at the base of the pyramid and that was the area that had the widest appeal to the public (usually a free or very low cost activity to participate in or reserve space for). Further up on the pyramid was where the theater came in; services were more specialized and costs increased because technicians were involved and sophisticated equipment (lighting and sound systems, curtains and so on) needed. Also, too, those programs appealed to a smaller percentage of the population. Theater productions provided an important function in the community, but the number of people drawn to that type of event, compared to the number attending the Rendezvous, an RSVP Carnival, or Nevada Day, was much smaller. Thus, fees tended to rise and a higher percentage of costs needed to be recovered because more costs were involved. It was neither right nor wrong. It was a philosophy that could be debated forever. But, Mr. McKenna said, it came down to who had the most people who would complain, and “who had the ear of whomever was making the decisions.” He added that he could just as easily argue that 100 percent of the costs should be recovered from everybody, or that it should be free to any theater group that wanted it, because it was part of improving the quality of life of Carson City.

Chair Curtis questioned Mr. Moellendorf about the “range.” Using the example of a dog agility event, she had paid \$500 to use Fuji Park on one occasion, then, due to a budget crunch people had to be laid off, the next time the fee was increased to \$1500 (from 25 percent to 75 percent recovery). Did all fees work that way, was it at the discretion of the Parks and Recreation administration based on what was going on in the real world? Or, was the theater fee a flat 75 percent, aquatics a flat 50 percent, and for events designated as “special events” and “community-wide events” there was a “range.” Commissioner Livermore interjected that he had two dozen reservation forms for different events around Carson City. One reservation rented a facility for a three-day weekend at a charge of \$300, but another reservation rented another facility for three days at a charge of \$9,000. How was that justified or explained to the public who believed it was their right to use it? He added that he was “tired of justifying why the Fuji Park dog people get to come into town, operate an event, the park is full of people, it’s a special use, they don’t charge admission, and you can’t even drive in the parking lot, you can’t park in it, or even use it that day, and they collect all the money. . . a special

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 8

operator picks up their profit and leaves. The park doesn't have anything." That was one of the issues which Mr. Moellendorf was trying to resolve, he added.

Commissioner Livermore then cited an article that had appeared in *The Nevada Appeal* last week about special events and how much they brought to Carson City. He noted that Joel Dunn had done a tremendous job of emphasizing the cost of tournaments and the benefit to the community in terms of taxes recovered indirectly. One of the issues that the Cultural Commission and the Arts and Cultural Coalition would address would use that same model to correlate the number of people drawn to events in Carson City and how much they spent while there. He added that the Convention and Visitors Bureau had been inspired to "step it up" in funding personnel from their money because the returns were so great. In summation, he said that it was at the pleasure of the Board to determine what the budget was and how much would be spent in that area.

Commissioner McKenna said that the Fuji Park dog group users were "given a deal by Carson City government and the people who wanted to use this [Community Center] building were not." Mr. Livermore did not believe that was the intent, but it may have been the result. Mr. McKenna countered that if that had not been their intent, then the entire issue should be looked at again and a different way found to assess fees. If it was an accident caused by history, it should be changed. He felt it was a simple matter of "government budgeting where the taxpayers' dollar goes."

The discussion continued with Mr. Moellendorf reiterating that the percentage formula worked, as the previous questions and responses revealed. Using the hypothetical situation that Mr. Fahrenbruch's workforce was cut by a third or some other number, the level of services would necessarily be reduced. Nevertheless, the user would still be charged a percentage of the direct costs of the facility. If it was 50 percent, using the dog agility event, perhaps there would not be people to set out the cones, provide a trash pick up during the event, and so on, because there was not the manpower. They would still be charged the same percentage but at a reduced level of service. "Our costs go down, but what we are charging them also goes down." Additional services, like setting up bleachers, if requested, would be an extra charge. It was possible, if there were staff cuts, that those services could not be provided. If they wanted a particular service they would have to hire it from outside or do it themselves. Using the percentage formula, it was all built-in, whether the level of service was decreased or increased.

Chair Curtis asked for confirmation that the percentages stayed the same. Mr. Moellendorf said the percentage could change because of these discussions, but it could also happen, as it had last year, that due to budget constraints the BOS could say that Parks and Recreation had to increase fees and charges by 10 percent, or they may say they could no longer afford the subsidy for the Aquatics Facility. They would have to address that by increasing the percentage to 60 percent or more in order to get the revenues where the Board wanted them. At that time, the Parks Department would have to come back "through the gauntlet" to the PRC and present the new fees and charges, and "that's when the room would be full of swimmers and swim team members and others" who would say they could no longer afford to use the facility. The tension came when a governing body wanted increased fees and the people did not want to pay them.

Scott Fahrenbruch confirmed that the resolution did not allow staff to arbitrarily increase percentages, it did

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 9

not eliminate the public process. What the resolution accomplished was to create a policy where the PRC and the BOS or the City Manager could say that a fee increase was needed, and Parks staff had the ability to do that without changing the resolution every time a fee adjustment was made. Historically, fee changes had to go before the PRC and onto the BOS. They wanted to create a philosophy that everyone agreed with as to how they charged users. He noted that Carson City was charging much less than the City of Reno or the City of Sparks for the services provided and as a result may be giving many things away. For example, because they had been charging per event and not per day, five-day events paid the same as one-day events. The resolution took care of that inequity to the City and was more fair to the users because if they ever challenged a fee there was the resolution to refer to.

Commissioner Keeton recalled that the fee discussion started many years ago. Because the resolution was out of date, there were many different charges, and the goal was to change it and eventually work into 100 percent recovery of direct costs (no indirect costs). Those fees were intended to be increased on a regular basis. Somehow the goal was skewed; the nonprofits did not want to pay for it, and the for-profit users said if they could not use that facility there was no place they could go. The goal was to recover 100 percent of the direct costs of anything. It was fair. "If you are going to go to the 100 percent (or whatever that percentage was determined to be) level, go to the same level for everybody." But to pick and choose, in his opinion, was not fair. He added that perhaps the only thing to do was to reconsider the entire resolution unless the same percentages were going to be set for everyone. If any user group could not afford the 100 percent of direct costs charge, they would have to go elsewhere. They had the opportunity to go before the BOS to make their case.

Commissioner Westergard asked Mr. Keeton if "the same for everybody" meant resident and nonresident. Mr. Keeton said if there was an equitable way to charge a resident more money—and he did not have a problem with charging a nonresident more money (for example, the landfill where nonresidents were charged more), but primarily he was referring to Carson City residents using the facilities. He felt it would also be fair to charge nonresidents 125 percent of direct costs, which would help to make up the indirect costs for the people in the City. Mr. Westergard acknowledged that residents also paid taxes to help support the facilities. He was among those who did not understand why the fees and percentages seemed to be driven by the particular facility or activity, rather than simply across the board. He offered the possibility that instead of the percentages being driven by the facility they were driven by the four variables: resident versus nonresident; profit versus nonprofits; a public event versus a closed event; and, a free event versus an admission-charge event. The user who paid the least would be the resident nonprofit for a free public event. At the opposite end of the spectrum would be the nonresident for-profit admission-charge event. Then there were the obvious combinations in between. He suggested that, for example, on the resident end of the spectrum the fee would be 50 percent of direct costs, while at the opposite nonresident end it would be 100 percent.

Mr. Moellendorf believed that it was more "art than science. Based on what was traditionally done in other communities, what had been done here, and you meld all those together to come up with a fee structure that made sense." He offered the following scenario based on Mr. Westergard's supposition: "The reservation of a park or the fairgrounds, and a fee of 100 percent of direct costs is set for the resident for-profit organization. Built into that was an allowance for a reduction for nonprofits, and an addition for

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting
Page 10

nonresidents, so that would be the middle or the base. Then you would have a resident nonprofit get a 25 percent discount because that was an action that was set by the BOS with the theater. Then you go to the other side of that base, a nonresident nonprofit, and you add 25 percent to that, and then a nonresident for profit gets another percentage added on top.” He believed it came down to what was acceptable by the community, the people who paid, and the people who implemented the fees, the BOS.

The discussion continued regarding equitable fee schedules, the return of those fees to the general fund, and the equipment replacement fee, particularly for theater equipment, that was built into the fees charged. The question Mr. Moellendorf and Mitch Ames had discussed between themselves and their user was why were they charging an equipment replacement fee if it just went back to the general fund, and it was not a designated fund that could be drawn from when the need arose. Mr. Moellendorf said it was a logical and strong argument, to which their response was: If they were not going to put that in a designated fund then they should not be charging it. In the past when talking to former finance directors, Mr. Moellendorf said they were not allowed to have that designated fund; they had one at one time but it was discontinued and went to the general fund. In the finance director’s opinion it was not an appropriate use of funds. Now, the city manager and the finance director thought it would be appropriate to have a designated fund to draw from.

Commissioner Westergard asked if the BOS determined a certain amount of revenue for the Parks Department. Mr. Moellendorf said the city manager’s recommendation was to increase revenues by 10 percent and it was approved by the BOS. If revenues were \$1 million for all functions then they wanted a 10 percent increase over that, and that was how the budget was balanced.

Chair Curtis suggested changing the resolution to specifically designate an equipment replacement fund, it would not be up to the city manger to determine every year whether it was appropriate or not. Commissioner McKenna suggested forwarding the resolution to the BOS with the recommendation that the Parks Department charge whatever the market would bear, meaning that if a theatrical production took place in summer high seasons, they might pay more than in the middle of winter.

Mr. Moellendorf wished it was that simple, and that they were working within a free market system. If users did not like what was charged they could go to Douglas County or Lyon County, however there were few options especially in terms of the theater. They currently charged the lowest rates of any city or county around, as would be seen when they presented the theater fees to the Commission. If, as suggested, they were to charge what the market would bear, people who used the theater would say it was too much, and they could no longer afford to use the facility. It was a difficult situation.

Chair Curtis asked to bring the lengthy discussion to a close. It had been primarily philosophical and was a difficult thing to get a handle on. The matter was posted for next month’s agenda, and she asked Mr. Moellendorf to take a look at the equity issue and bring it back. She asked everyone to be thinking about it. She then asked for comments from the audience. There were none.

Finally, Chair Curtis said it was up to the director whether any user could rent the entire park. She reported that her experience during the summer was to be involved with people who were using Fuji Park more and

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 11

more and that park had been closed down more often to the public. Looking at parks as a business was very foreign to her; it was a public park and she did not comprehend why someone could take it over for a rental fee, “put cones around it,” and say “this is for us, and if you’re not involved in our event you can’t come in.” That was happening more and more. She acknowledged that staff was looking at that and wanted to come up with some directives, and said she would appreciate a report coming back to PRC outlining what staff intended to do. Then at least the public and the users would be aware that the situation was being addressed.

Mr. Moellendorf responded that the resolution did state that it was up to the Parks and Recreation Director whether a park was closed for a private rental. There were only a few cases at Fuji Park where they had officially closed the park for a rental. It was usually for a corporation having an employee picnic or party, or an event that was closed to the public but entrance was by paid admission. The dog agility shows were not closed to the public, however, the park appeared to be closed. Part of that problem was the result of staff cuts over the last year and one-half; formerly there was a caretaker at the facility all the time, and present staff was not there often enough to monitor and safeguard that the park was open. He acknowledged they needed to get a handle on that. In short, if the user had not paid for or had permission to close the park, that park was open to the public and had to have all appearances as such. With regard to the dog agility events, they were considering limiting the number of times those events could be held at that facility in a year. That would be an administrative action and should not be in the resolution.

Scott Fahrenbruch said that they were sensitive to the fact that the resolution as now written would result in significant fee increases for theater users. Also, carnivals and other events that had a fairly long run of five to seven days and had typically paid per event (not per day) would have a substantial increase as well. That would greatly increase revenue to the City, and more so if a policy of 75 percent or 100 percent recovery of direct costs were adopted. Therefore, in summation, they felt the resolution still gave them the flexibility to go up to the 100 percent of direct costs, if that was the choice of the PRC and the BOS, but it could do it incrementally.

Chair Curtis felt it should be left at that, and if they wanted to bring it back in December with proposed changes they could do so. If the Commission had any suggestions, they should let Roger Moellendorf know.

5. ACTION ITEMS (5:20:43)

A. Action to recommend a Joint Use Agreement between the City of Carson City and the Boys and Girls Club of Western Nevada for the use of the proposed Indoor Recreation Center to be located on Boys and Girls Club property at the corner of Northridge Drive and Russell Way. Chair Curtis noted that it was the second time this had been reviewed by the PRC. Roger Moellendorf confirmed they had brought the agreement to the PRC on September 2, 2008. They had expressed seven concerns at that time which he had itemized in the staff report attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.

As a team, which included Joel Benton, Joel Dunn, Mr. Moellendorf, and Commissioner Todd Westergard, they met with the Boys and Girls Club (BGC) consisting of Hal Hansen and Jason Woodbury, who was the

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting
Page 12

chairman of the BGC, to review the joint use agreement, also attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference, and addressed those concerns as followed:

Concern for the safety and security of the children was addressed in paragraph number 7. Concern regarding the need for an arbitration process was addressed in number 10. A successor's interest was addressed in number 8. Concern about the phrase "traditional school" was addressed in number 2. Concern that the binding contract was a detriment to the City had been brought up by Commissioner Westergard and they basically agreed and therefore eliminated that section. The need for addressing a dissolution of the agreement was identified in paragraphs 8 and 20, and the need for specific times the City could use the club house and the outdoor facilities was addressed in paragraphs 3 and 4. Mr. Moellendorf noted that all parties referred to above were present and open for questions, if any.

Chair Curtis had a question about the term "primary gymnasium," and if that meant the BGC would be using the double gym. Then there was an "add alternate gym," which was a half-gym, and she asked whether it was necessary to define that because, if they built the add alternate gym and the BGC needed just half the gym, they could use that one and leave the double gym open for programming.

Mr. Moellendorf said it was a good question because the auxiliary gym was an "add alternate gym" and it was unknown whether there would be funding for that. If funding was not available, they would only build one gym then that term was unnecessary. If there was enough money to build the auxiliary gym there would be two gyms; the first gym would be designated a "primary gym" and allowed to be used by the BGC. If the numbers were not sufficient to justify the use of that big gym, there were two options: drop the curtain dividing the gym in half, or, move them to the auxiliary gym. That would be monitored over time and if it looked like the primary gym was too large, there was a provision to change the definition of the primary gym and label the auxiliary gym as the primary gym and move the BGC into that gym. He added that what they intended was to move people around as needed because they wanted to make sure they had some available gym space for drop-in use. During the times of day that the BGC would be using the facility, the use by the City would be drop-in use, because it would not be at times when league play would be scheduled.

Chair Curtis next asked about the outdoor facilities. It appeared that in the clubhouse, during the hours BGC had it, if it turned out they did not need it then the City could use it. Likewise, in the gym, during the hours that BGC had it, if they did not need it then the City could use it. However, for the outdoor facilities it was more specific; there was a certain time that the City would have the use of that. There was more than one field and if the BGC would not need all that the City would have the same provision there.

Mr. Moellendorf said it was their understanding that it was workable. They felt that while the BGC activities were going on they would need the use of that. He reiterated that would be during the times of day that the City would probably not have the need for that facility. But if they were using just a small portion of that field and the City had drop-in use, he felt it could be worked out jointly to cohabit the same field or some way work around it. They hoped to have management and operational flexibility tied into the use options. He did not know if that should be written into the agreement, and added that it was difficult to foresee every possibility. They intended to be reasonable people.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 13

Commissioner Westergard wanted it on the record that when they had discussed the joint use agreement it had come up several times whether to put one thing or another into it, or simply trust the directors of the Parks Department and the BGC to work it out. It went both ways depending on the issue, however, the reason that some things were left out was because it was assumed they were things that could be worked out between the parties. It was a mutually beneficial situation that had resulted in the joint agreement. He stressed that in the future people should know that was the intent.

Commissioner McKenna moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Joint Use Agreement between the City of Carson City and the Boys and Girls Club of Western Nevada for the proposed Indoor Recreation Center to be located on Boys and Girls Club property at the corner of Northridge Drive and Russell Way. It was seconded by Commissioner Smolenski and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Westergard acknowledged Joel Benton, Deputy District Attorney, who had been very helpful in structuring the joint use agreement.

B. TIME SPECIFIC TOPIC - 5:30 P.M. Action to recommend to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors the conceptual building floor plan and elevations and conceptual site plans for the proposed Indoor Recreation Center to be located on Boys and Girls Club property at the corner of Northridge Drive and Russell Way. (5:31:13). Roger Moellendorf was joined at the table by Tom Grundy, Engineer, Public Works Department, the in-house city engineer/manager and whom Mr. Moellendorf said was a “Godsend for us on the Recreation Center project,” and Vern Krahn, Park Planner. Mr. Moellendorf referred to the staff report, attached hereto and made a part here of by reference, which detailed the presentation made on October 7, 2008 to the PRC of the conceptual floor plan and the building elevation of the Recreation Center. At that time, staff had wanted to get a sense from the PRC whether they were heading in the right direction as far as what the building would look like, its amenities for the community, and so on. Since that time, staff had taken the Commission’s input and met with the architects who had then completed a 30 percent schematic design package. That included both the site, civil engineering, landscaping plans, building and floor plans, and elevations for the Recreation Center; it was an enhanced view of what had been presented previously. It was staff’s intent to bring the schematic design package to the BOS on November 20, 2008 for approval by the BOS, and Mr. Moellendorf hoped to have the PRC’s positive recommendation.

On May 7, 2008, the Parks and Recreation Department and its consulting team conducted a neighborhood meeting. They sent out notifications within a 300-foot radius from the project site inviting residents to come to the meeting to discuss the project with them. Six people were present, two of whom were from outside the neighborhood. At that time the vision of the project was that it would be a co-joined building. However, further investigation revealed problems in adherence to building codes as related to one building with two separate owners. A decision was made to separate the buildings but continue to have the BGC site as the site for the Parks and Recreation Indoor Recreation Center.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 14

Mr. Moellendorf noted that the “time specific” had been set for this meeting to accommodate people in the neighborhood and throughout the community who were interested in seeing what was planned for the site on the corner of Russell Way and Northridge Drive, as well as to express any concerns they might have regarding the project. A letter had been sent to the six individuals who attended the last meeting.

(5:36:34) Mr. Moellendorf next pointed out items in the meeting packet, all of which are attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference: First, an Executive Summary of the traffic study; Tom Grundy and Mike Bennett, from Lumos & Associates, were available to answer questions regarding that traffic report; the Public Hearing Index—the list of agenda items—which had been brought to the PRC and the BOS regarding the project and the various dates on which those were discussed; and a list of Recreation Center Project newspaper articles.

Mr. Moellendorf then made a PowerPoint presentation, particularly so that the neighborhood residents and others in the audience would have a clearer understanding of the project. He detailed the elevations, floor plans, and so on for the Indoor Recreation Center, marked Exhibit A in the packet attached. He also described the color palette that gave a sense of what architect Brent Tibbitt (Valentiner Crane) had in mind for the interior aesthetics of the building. Regarding the landscaping, Mr. Moellendorf highlighted the site plan which included natural plantings as well as more formal plantings closer to the building. He stressed that in designing the building, they had made a concerted effort to have continuity between the existing BGC building already located on the site, and the new Indoor Recreation Center, parking lots, and landscaping, so that the overall effect was a cohesive complex with a “campus” feel.

Mr. Moellendorf explained that an undeveloped portion of the overall site (3+ acres) was owned by the BGC and the intention was to sell that property to help fund some of the improvements to their facility as well as operating expenses. Vern Krahn pointed out that they had tried to be sensitive to the neighboring properties by installing a chain link fence the entire length of the western property line, along with landscape berms, and trees, screening and evergreen plant material, with the idea, too, that it would provide some noise buffering. Mr. Moellendorf reported that in a previous special use permit obtained by the BGC to build their facility, it was agreed that there would be a solid block wall along the property line. He said the Parks Department would like to have that changed to the chain link fencing/landscaping to soften the look, because in their experience block walls were negative attributes to a project. “People could hide behind them, they can do things they should not be doing, they were high maintenance due to graffiti, and so on.” Fencing that allowed visual observation coupled with landscaping was a good compromise that provided security between the properties. He pointed out that similar fencing/landscaping had been done successfully in the Ronald D. Wilson Park.

Mr. Moellendorf next pointed out the parcel map: Parcel A would be retained ownership by the BGC and would include the existing club house, allow room for future expansion on the east and west side of the facility, room for some outdoor facilities such as tennis and basketball courts. They would deed over to the City parcel B, which would allow the City to build the Indoor Recreation Center and parking lots. Parcel D would be retained ownership by the BGC and allow them to have a grant to build the play fields. There was discussion that perhaps in the future they might consider transferring the ownership of that property over to the City as well. Parcel C was the 3.48 acres the BGC intended to sell.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 15

As to the site plan, Mr. Moellendorf pointed out room for future expansion which would include a future gymnasium, if needed, a plaza area, an outside playground associated with the child care area of the facility, the outdoor splash pad, parking area, and a central walkway that tied in the outdoor facilities with the indoor facilities. He detailed other features as well, all as depicted on the sheets attached to the agenda packet.

He spoke at length about the first floor plan and the comments made at the last PRC meeting which had been forwarded onto the architects for assessment. Level 1 floor plan represented the base bid which included the double gymnasium, without the auxiliary gym or the splash pad. He pointed out several features of the floor plan such as the administrative/staff offices, control desk, locker rooms, climbing structure (more of a climbing den or cave that could be more safely accessed), an aerobic/fitness classroom with a "floating floor," a receiving/warehouse area, and a mechanical room. Additional space was devoted to a party room, a good generator of rental revenue. The gym area featured bleachers on both east and west sides of the gym wall.

Vern Krahn pointed out that the design helped greatly to minimize staffing, accomplished by having views throughout the building from a variety of control points, open spaces, and glass partitions. Mr. Moellendorf emphasized that the overall design was highly efficient with very little wasted space. An article from the *NRPA Magazine*, included in the packet, pointed out the importance of designing rectangular shaped buildings for recreation centers, which architects Valentiner/Crane had done.

Highlights of the second level floor plan included a fitness area with exercise machines, a three-lane walking track 1/10th of a mile in circumference. Here again, Mr. Moellendorf said, the openness meant that only one monitor would be needed at that level. Glass windows provided views of the surrounding mountain peaks.

Chair Curtis referred to the article mentioned above which addressed what was in and out in terms of fitness equipment and placement. She asked for architect Brent Tibbitt (Valentiner/Crane) to consider ways in which to "cubby hole" equipment in areas around the track for privacy and avoid the "meat rack" effect. Mr. Moellendorf agreed, and perhaps the only downside of that very efficient design was that there were not a lot of those areas, however he pointed out a couple of spaces where equipment could be placed. Those same areas could also be used for stretching. There was also ADA access to the second level via an elevator, and in fact the entire complex was built with ADA accessibility. There was an outdoor emergency exit as well. He next detailed the add alternate auxiliary gym located north of the present gym and incorporated entrance via glass doors and an observation area. The floor composition would be a multipurpose synthetic floor (instead of the maple floating floor in the main gym). Consideration had also been given to providing as much natural light as possible cutting down on the amount of electricity needed. Mr. Krahn pointed out the building overhangs which added to its energy efficiency through shading. Mr. Moellendorf added that while the building could not be considered technically "green," they were looking at trying to implement measures and construction techniques that would help the sustainability of the building to reduce its energy consumption.

(6:06:53) Mr. Moellendorf noted that Tom Grundy had the idea to run some conduits into the roof/ceiling area so that as technology improved they could look into putting in some solar photovolt cells, in which case the conduit would already be in place. Mr. Grundy said that Nevada Power offered rebates to encourage people

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 16

to install photovoltaic equipment. He noted, too, that Commissioner Chuck Adams had been particularly helpful in providing the information. Currently the rebates were used up to 2010.

Commissioner McKenna asked when the facility would be built and whether they anticipated any “deal breakers,” in other words, would the supervisors vote for that concept. Mr. Moellendorf was reluctant to speak for five supervisors, however, he knew Supervisor Livermore would vote favorably and hoped the others would approve it as well. As far as “deal breakers,” there was always the economy, the budget, and so the potential existed. However, he felt they were currently in a favorable bidding climate. The goal was to have the project built and ready to open by July 2010. The BGC hoped to be in their facility by July 2009. Chair Curtis asked for comments from members of the audience. (6:13:48)

Gene Robinson, a Northridge Drive resident, said he would be impacted by the additional traffic flow past his home. Residents were already bearing the added traffic from Carson Crossing and the 24-hour Wal-Mart. He commented that while letters were sent to those within 300 feet of the complex, why were they not sent to the entire development who would be impacted by the project and whose “residential streets would be converted to thoroughfares.” He felt, also, that a community outreach coordinator should be reaching out to the community and those who might be affected by placing such a facility in a residential neighborhood.

Jennifer Pruitt, Planning Division, responded. Regarding the notification requirements specifically for the Planning Commission, pursuant to the *NRS Code* they were required to notify residents 300 feet around the subject parcel. Notifications would go out again when the matter went to the Planning Commission. She also noted that her division was available at any time to discuss resident concerns on any item on an agenda, as well as provide any information requested. The information provided was a public record and, she added, they were there to serve and that is what they would do. The Planning Division phone number is 887-2180.

Chair Curtis noted that Mr. Robinson was present so he did get word. However, he said he learned of the meeting via the media. His next question was how the BGC “got rebuffed on a property they owned near Silver Oak subdivision that had a multi-use zoning application and landed onto Northridge Drive?” Chair Curtis informed Mr. Robinson that question could not be discussed because it was not on the agenda. The only issue on today’s agenda was the project at the stated location and its effect. Mr. Robinson next turned to the construction vehicles anticipated at the construction site—what would be the primary access point? Mr. Moellendorf responded that had not yet been determined, however, he was assuming that most of it would come in from Highway 50/William Streets, access through Lompa Lane to get to the site via Northridge and onto Russell. Mr. Robinson pressed to discuss how the BGC “landed” on Northridge Drive. Chair Curtis said it had been discussed many times and as he had done his due diligence he was invited to meet with staff at any time and they would provide the history. Mr. Robinson next broached the subject of many “promotions from private sector entities who were trying to provide the same services being proposed by the rec center. Why was the City entering into direct competition with a dozen or more other entities?” Vice Chair Livermore said they were not competing with private industry. The Recreation Center would attract an entirely different clientele, and they had done extensive communications with those people. Mr. Robinson said he would have no use for that facility personally, therefore, he wanted to know how it would sustain itself financially without direct funding from taxpayers.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 17

Mr. Moellendorf informed Mr. Robinson that what he was asking was not agendaized and therefore could not be discussed, nor could be the merit of the Recreation Center, competition with private industry, or anything other than the discussion and action on the conceptual building floor plan which was agendaized. The questions Mr. Robinson was asking had all been discussed previously. Mr. Robinson felt that at some point it had to be open for discussion again because the residents needed the opportunity to comment on the impact of such a facility on the neighborhood. Mr. Livermore interjected that had been done with ample notification including newspaper articles of which he had copies, and no law had been violated regarding notification. Chair Curtis informed Mr. Robinson that the time would come when they would have a business plan for the project. She asked him to keep track of PRC's meetings and get agendas (she would make sure he got copies of those), because they would be discussing how the project would operate. In the past, when they were working with Western Nevada College they came up with a very good business plan that showed how it would pay for itself with a small subsidy from the City. Mr. Robinson pressed that the project should be located in a more appropriate location than in a residential subdivision. He returned to the issue of the traffic which he believed was considerable leading to the Carson Crossing, and wondered if any thought had been given to the additional stress that would create. Chair Curtis said that a traffic study had been done. Vice Chair Livermore said that Carson Crossing had nothing to do with the subject project. However, Mr. Robinson contended that the impact was cumulative.

Tom Grundy, Public Works Department, accompanied by Mike Bennett, Lumos & Associates, who had actually done the traffic study, spoke about the study. What the study revealed was that approximately 895 additional trips per day would be generated by the Recreation Center/BGC project. There would be 65 more trips during the morning rush hour and about 150 in the afternoon rush hour. Mr. Grundy said that intersections and traffic were rated by levels of service (LOS) A through F: A was an average delay per vehicle of 5-10 seconds, C was 15-25 seconds, F was a delay of more than 50 seconds. At the intersection of Russell Way and Northridge Drive, the vehicle delay expected from the Recreation Center/BGC project was increased by less than 1 second in the morning and less than 4 seconds in the afternoon. The impact was minimal. At the intersection of Lompa Lane and Highway 50 no change was expected. Lompa Lane and Northridge Drive at Carmine Street was expected to remain at the same level of service B, 10-15 seconds of delay in the morning. Improvements had been proposed to the roadway at Northridge Drive where it crossed under the overpass to add striping, which had been scheduled by the Regional Transportation Commission. That would improve from level of service D to C. In summary, Mr. Grundy said there would be some impact from traffic but it was quite minimal.

(6:28:31) Mr. Robinson said since that was the case, why was more notice not given to residents. Chair Curtis felt the entire city would be impacted. Mr. Robinson said he was speaking only of the Northridge area residential corridor. He said he did not want one more car that did not belong there to come through. The central question, to him, was how that site was selected over many others where the impact would not be as great. Commissioner Westergard said the process was such that Mr. Robinson did have a forum to express his views, however this was not the forum at this time. The project still had to go before the Planning Commission and the questions he had posed would be appropriate before that commission. Mr. Westergard explained that PRC had to abide by the posted agenda and it was "narrow to the conceptual design." These meetings were governed by the Nevada Open Meeting Law and the City's legal representative was present to see that was

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 18

adhered to. He assured Mr. Robinson that no one was discounting his questions, many had already been raised and would be easily answered. Other questions may raise new issues to be addressed. Mr. Robinson asked the PRC to vote to reopen the question of where to have the Recreation Center to the public. Commissioner McKenna said that could not be done at this meeting. More discussion ensued concerning the site selected, the laws that seemed only to benefit the City, and why a wider area had not been considered to notify the residents of the project. Although Mr. Robinson was not placated by the answers he received, he did say he would wait for another meeting to express his views. Jennifer Pruitt said that if the application was submitted to the Planning Division by Thursday and deemed complete, it would go before the Planning Commission on December 17, 2008, at 3:30 p.m. It was at the discretion of the Planning Director to agendaize an item for a specific time and it could probably be agendaized at 5:30 or a time more convenient for the residents to take part.

Finally, Mr. Robinson asked if there was any role left for the supervisors to determine whether the project would go forward or not. Mr. Moellendorf said there was still a role for the supervisors and that would provide him more opportunity for his input regarding the project. The meeting today was agendaized for a recommendation from the PRC to the BOS for acceptance of the site plan for the Indoor Recreation Facility. He added that they hoped to bring it to the BOS on November 20.

Next to speak was Kathe Green, a Northridge area resident, who said it appeared to her that the north property line (the dark line) was not accurate as it was going through a house. Her concern was the accuracy of the line where the fence was to be located because, as discussed this evening, the chain link fence was apparently going to be moved and would directly adjoin the properties north and south. She noted that at one time there was going to be a space between the fence and the properties. Mr. Moellendorf said what they proposed was a chain link fence to be put along the property line, the height of which had not been determined. She said she would prefer an eight-foot fence. Mr. Moellendorf said that would be consistent with other projects. He knew her preference was for a solid wall, however, he did not believe there would be any greater security and in fact felt it made the neighborhood less secure. Ms. Green next asked about Belmont, which appeared on the site plan to have a gate, and was there access to that site from Belmont. Vern Krahn responded that the intent was to try to make the facility available to the neighbors, therefore, as a part of the design, there would be an alley of trees going through the campus between the two buildings and it would cross the fire access road and also going to Belmont Drive. It would be only pedestrian access from the neighborhood to the Recreation Center. He pointed out a gravel fire access road with gates at either end that would be closed except for emergency or maintenance vehicles, however, a pedestrian could go south to the *cul de sac* to the sports fields, or north toward Belmont Drive, or east to the BGC or Recreation Center.

Ms. Green next asked about the parcel which the BGC would later develop into athletic fields, but was it also possible they could sell that instead. Commissioner Livermore said no, because they had grant money which would probably prohibit them from selling it. He pointed out an area which would be a “no build” zone, even for the Recreation Center. Mr. Krahn said that was a concern expressed by the fire department and Parks Department had agreed to that “no build” zone.

Returning to the fencing, Ms. Green said she would prefer heavy foliage. Mr. Krahn said it would be an eight-foot fence with a berm of approximately two feet, heavy vegetation planting both deciduous and evergreen.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting

Page 19

Commissioner McKenna asked how much input the residents would have into what the fence looked like. Mr. Krahn said residents could call the Parks Department staff and discuss it with them, as they had in the past at the May 7 meeting when they went to the neighborhood. There was also an opportunity for discussion at the Planning Commission meeting. Audra, the planner at Lumos & Associates, had sent out 56 notices to property owners about the May 7 meeting. The addresses had been given by the Planning Department. It was the Parks Department's effort and desire to outreach into the community, although it was not a requirement as it was for the Planning Department, but they (Parks Department) wanted to inform the residents so they would not be surprised about the project. Of those 56 residents, only six came to the meeting. Walter Sullivan, Director of Community Services, recommended the Parks Department make that effort and so they had. Moreover, when they went before the Planning Commission in late May/early June, residents within the 300 feet designation were notified. When they go back to the Planning Commission again, Jennifer Pruitt and the other Planning Department staff would once again notify the residents within 300 feet. Mr. Krahn emphasized that they tried very hard to reach out to the community as explained above and also via newspaper articles.

Commissioner McKenna also asked about the Belmont Drive access to the property, and if that would cause security problems for the children at the BGC. Mr. Krahn deferred to Hal Hanson to answer the security issue. Mr. Moellendorf interjected that BGC staff would be supervising the children outside at all times. Mr. Hanson said it was always a concern that people would wander onto the property, however, for twelve years, the club had been located on Stewart and 5th Street and there was access for anyone. When the children were outside, staff was also outside. The policy would be the same at the new location.

Chair Curtis asked if there were any further questions. There were none. **Commissioner Smolenski moved to recommend to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors the conceptual building floor plan and elevations and a conceptual site plan for the proposed Indoor Recreation Center to be located on Boys and Girls Club property at the corner of Northridge Drive and Russell Way. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pete Livermore. The motion carried 6-0.**

Chair Curtis thanked all who participated in the discussion and who worked on the project, and the residents who attended and brought their concerns forward.

5-C Action to recommend to the Board of Supervisors fees and charges for the Bob Boldrick Theater. Continued to the next meeting.

6. MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION. (6:46:36) None.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS: None.

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the November 4, 2008 Meeting
Page 20

8. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT: Commissioner Livermore moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously. Chair Curtis adjourned the meeting at 6:47 p.m.

The minutes of the November 4, 2008 meeting of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission are so approved this 16th day of December, 2008.

DONNA J. CURTIS, Chair