

From: Webmaster Carson.org
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 1:51 PM
To: Jennifer Budge
Subject: Part 1: Objections to proposed course of action in Nov. 15, 2018 Meeting -- Agenda Item 19.A.

LATE MATERIAL

Message submitted from the <Carson City> website.

MEETING DATE 11/15/18

ITEM # 19a

Site Visitor Name: Dan Mrvos

Site Visitor Email: [REDACTED]

To: Carson City Board of Supervisors

Cc: Jennifer Budge -- Parks, Recreation and Open Space Director (sent via Carson City Website, no actual e-mail published)

Subject: Objections to proposed course of action in Nov. 15, 2018 Meeting -- Agenda Item 19.A.:

For Possible Action: To adopt a Resolution expressing support of the proposed technical corrections to the Carson City Lands Bill

with specific objections to the proposed actions for:

Federal Lands Bill Map Reference Number: 2, Assessor's Parcel Numbers 008-128-02, 008-128-03, 008-123-35, 008-123-36

I live at and own the property located at 1001 Arrowhead Dr. (APN 008-108-01), which is roughly 185 ft. from the nearest APN's referenced above.

I purchased my house in 2016, and thoroughly researched the surrounding area – including the allowable land uses for the open land along Arrowhead Dr., between my property and the Airport / Goni Rd. I was pleased to learn that this open land (APN's 008-128-: 02,03,35, 36) was restricted by the 2009 Lands Bill to be used ONLY for:

“(i) undeveloped open space; and

(ii) recreation or other public purposes consistent with the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926.”

As well, I learned that this land was further protected by the Lands Bill, such that: if it were ever to be used for a different purpose, ownership would revert back to the Federal Government / BLM. This (seemingly) strong safeguard around the open land's preservation and continued existence strongly influenced my decision to purchase in this neighborhood.

From: Webmaster Carson.org
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 1:53 PM
To: Jennifer Budge
Subject: Part 2: Objections to proposed course of action in Nov. 15, 2018 Meeting -- Agenda Item 19.A.

Message submitted from the <Carson City> website.

Site Visitor Name: Dan Mrvos

Site Visitor Email: [REDACTED]

Part 2: Continued because of e-mail limitations on Carson City website:

The proposed "Technical Corrections" for APN's 008-128-: 02,03,35, 36 are not specific enough in their wording or limitations – and would potentially open the door for future commercial use / development of this land. I think such imprecise language would not guarantee preservation of the character of the area, and would break a de facto covenant and expectation between nearby home owners and the City (as well as the Federal Government). When asked about plans for commercial development (in the Parks and Rec. Committee Meeting several weeks ago), the Airport Director did NOT say "No, it would never happen...", but instead said "Not at this time...". This raises alarm bells for me and speaks to the need to be very clear about how this land can be used in the future.

I have no objection to the specified APN's being categorized as an Airport Buffer Zone. Such a land use would continue the Open Space that exists there today. However, I do have two suggestions on how to provide an Airport Buffer Zone, while ABSOLUTELY preserving the character of the area for the current and future home owners:

Insert specific language in the proposed Lands Bill language changes which clearly specifies that the Airport "may only use the land as an Open Land Buffer Zone" and "may not engage in any sort of commercial, industrial, or any other use of the property --- other than an Open Land Buffer Zone."

OR

If the goal is simply to have open land (which is all the a Buffer Zone is...), then why not just allow the land to revert back to BLM?

I think these suggestions are very reasonable, and I can see no reason why the the City or the Airport would not find one of them acceptable -- unless there really ARE plans for other uses.

From: Webmaster Carson.org
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 1:54 PM
To: Jennifer Budge
Subject: Part 3: Objections to proposed course of action in Nov. 15, 2018 Meeting -- Agenda Item 19.A.

Message submitted from the <Carson City> website.

Site Visitor Name: Dan Mrvos

Site Visitor Email: [REDACTED]

Part 3: continued because of e-mail limitations on Carson City website:

Separate from my suggestions on how to proceed with the proposed language, I would like to raise two procedural points which – as a citizen – I think are extremely important:

I think the proposed alterations to the Lands Bill amount of an actual Change of Land Use, and as such, this meeting and this Agenda Item should have been "noticed" to the surrounding property owners. If this were a Zoning Change or a Special Use request.... then noticing would have occurred. As it stands, I think the surrounding property owners should have been notified. Changing the wording of an item does not alter its underlying intent.

Beyond the above "noticing" issue, the description of the Agenda Item itself is misleading. Anyone reading the phrase "proposed technical corrections to the Carson City Land Bill" would be inclined to think that some small administrative language change is being made. The average person (myself included) could never extract from that description what is actually being proposed, I.E. a change of land ownership to allow leasing to 3rd parties, a change of land use, and removal of protections specified in the Lands Bill. In any business contract such changes would -- without question -- be considered material and substantive.

– Dan Mrvos