LATE MATERIAL
Item: Public Comment
Meeting Date: 1/5/23

From: Marianna Greeson
To: Public Comment
Subject: Tanamera Construction 306 multi unit
Date: Saturday, December 17, 2022 9:28:08 AM

Hello all,
This is in concern for the land use of the area between Menlo Dr, Airport Rd, Lompa Lane and I580.
The density plan for that 23.98 acres to too great. The neighborhood to the east has only 160 homes in an area of approximately the same size, no where NEAR the 306 planned for the area.
What about the Wetland Zone that was specifically created because of the freeway to the west? That area will be compromised because of more human activity. The land to the west of I580 is already being developed.
Can't we leave some open space around our designated wetland area??

Sincerely,
Marianna Greeson
3183 Florentine Dr.
Carson City, NV 89701
775-846-0342

From: Jeff Halpern
To: Public Comment
Subject: BOS Meeting Jan 5, 2023 Item 17.A
Date: Friday, December 30, 2022 2:02:23 PM

Hello. I originally sent the email below when Parks & Rec originally discussed this proposal, I would just like to make sure that it is included in the BOS discussion of the matter. Thank you.

From: Jeff Halpern <copcarcollector@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 10:59 AM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@carson.org>

Subject: Public Comment, Dogs Off Leash Updates - Specifically Mayors Park

Hello. I would like to voice my support for changing dog leash codes,
specifically at Mayors Park (Koontz & Center)

- Until VERY recently, signage at this park indicated dogs COULD be off leash
most hours. Signage was recently changed when new benches and
informational signs were added.

- I have used this park for several years with my dogs, off leash, with zero
issues. I find the usage of this park to be very light and regular visitors with
dogs are respectful of others, with their dogs on or off leash, I have not
witnessed any problems at this park. Most dog owners also

pick up their dogs
droppings

- When activities such as volleyball or soccer have been taking place at the
park, myself and other dog owners have been respectful of those activities,
keeping our off leash dogs off to one side, or in some cases, leaving and
going to another park.

- I can not think of a good reason to mandate dogs be on leash at all times at
this particular park, and I would encourage you to make a change in the code
to update for more modern usage.

Thank you for your time and efforts on behalf of the city

Jeff Halpern
Carson City NV

From: Bill Larkin
To: Public Comment
Subject: dog policy - Carson
Date: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 12:03:54 PM

Hi! I saw an article about a proposed dog policy - I have been complaining and seeing MANY issues that would be amazing to be resolved.

Mostly the trails and neighborhoods, we have a bunch of really rude people walking their dogs with no leash, and in the neighborhood (Spring Dr area) - the dogs run rampant through everyone's yards, causing the homeowners dogs to bark (rightfully so if theres a dog running in it's yard) - and on the trails, the dogs CONSTANTLY run in front of me on the bicycle, causing me to have to stop - and even caused me to crash once.

Please please please make some sort of public leash law for neighborhoods and trails. It's horrible how awful people are and unable to control their dogs.
I am a signmaker and I'd donate signs to put on the trail if necessary to get people to put the dogs on a leash, it's a horrible nuisance.

Thanks and have a great day!

Bill Larkin
CVP Studios
cvpphoto.com

From: Robyn Orloff
To: Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment, BOS meeting January 5, 2022: Agenda Item 17A
Date: Wednesday, January 4, 2023 1:31:09 PM

Thank you for the excellent job by Parks and Rec and Open Space staff, and OSAC and Parks and Rec Committee, and BOS, and the Public — for your hard work developing the dog Ordinances. These Ordinances are the result of a lot of time, thought, discussion, consideration — over many meetings.
We dog folks certainly appreciate the more expansive allowances. And I am personally totally thrilled with allowing the dogs off leash in most of the Open Areas!
And on leash in THs for safety and consideration to others, makes total sense. Thank you again.

But, even as a dog lover — I feel that these Ordinances benefit the dog community to the detriment of our some of our Parks — and some of our Citizens who are not 'one of us dog people'. I love dogs — rescue them (birddogs — want one?: we have available a 1.5 yo English Pointer and a 11 year old English Pointer -- and several GSPs. They all have hunting instinct and potential — or are fine with just trail running…..and are great companions and house dogs)..

I called one Committee member about this before one of the first meetings, but was told there had to be a uniform law (for ease of Ranger education/enforcement) — so my opinion was not presented. And, in the end, the result is not 'uniform' — per the public's outcry, that was heard, thank you! I did fill out the survey, and speak up at one or two meetings (about this and my next public comment) — but my opinions were apparently in the minority. However, I will express them again —for the record!

Re the proposed Ordinance changes for dogs:
I don't see any of the 'neighborhood parks' — grassy, shade, picnic tables — that prohibit dogs (other than the more formal parks that allow athletics, cemetery, wetland areas, waterfall, cultural /historical sites, etc.). Kudos on designating (continuing) those areas as dog-free.

But, what about a nice grassy park with shade and picnic pavilions, that prohibit dogs? On leash or off.
Dogs on leash still pee and poop (and owners still don't pick it up) — impacting others' enjoyment of the area (sitting on 'clean' grass, not worrying about walking in poop). What about preserving a neighborhood park or two (or section) that do not allow dogs at all? How are we accommodating those Citizens who would like to enjoy a lovely neighborhood park (or 2, or section of 1 or 2) without dog impacts? Even I — a 'dog person' appreciates a dog prohibited 'park' area (other than the athletic fields or the cultural/historical sites/cemeteries). I assume others do as well?

Ideas:

1). **Grassy Fuji Park**: consider not allowing them in the ENTIRE park — designate a corner for them, on leash or off. Include picnic tables and trees so pet owners can sit/have picnic w/their dogs, in 'their' area without, contaminating the rest of Fuji's lovely grass.

I diverge: IMHO, grass is awful for finding and picking up poop — DG SO much easier (to see it before you walk in it). I hear the Fuji Dog Park will be replaced by grass???? 'Messy' and expensive change. Is grass for the dogs or the humans? We can go to Sonoma Dog park — and soon Mills Park for grass! And what about conserving water — and grass maintenance time? I was late in putting in that opinion (at the Fuji Park final BOS meeting). My bad.

Back to Fuji, I like to take my old dogs there, on hot days, absolutely LOVELY — Thank You Carson City Parks and Rec! — but IMHO just part of it would be fine. We don't need ALL of it, do we? I feel badly for the citizens without dogs, trying to walk on the grass — or sit on the grass— in a spot that is not 'reminiscent' of dog 'pee/poop'. Or have an undisturbed picnic. The dogs get to have dog shows there — great. Keep that going. Maybe keep that area as the 'dog area'. But preserve the rest of this lovely park — from dog impacts.

2). **Grassy Mills Park**: prohibit dogs, except a designated area — for on or off leash. Same reasons as above. This is a huge wonderful park, for all of our Citizens. Why do the dogs need the entire park? Preserve part of this lovely park — from dog impacts.

3). And what about the two parks north of Mountain St/south of Winnie — that did not allow any dogs? I guess those neighbors want dogs on leash there? Glad they were heard.

Summary: Why do dogs need to be allowed in the ENTIRE Fuji and Mills Park lovely shaded grassy areas.

Fuji and Mills are big areas. Why can't the dogs and their people have a corner unto themselves — fence it and identify/sign it — and leave the rest pristine?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

Robyn Orloff
Carson City, NV
Robyn.orloff@icloud.com

From: Robyn Orloff
To: Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment BOS January 5, 2022: Agenda Item #17A
Date: Wednesday, January 4, 2023 1:43:37 PM
Attachments: page4image2525433056.png
page4image2525433344.png
page4image2525434048.png

Please accept and consider my comments re Agenda #17a — specifically on the below points, extrapolating to the OHV area. To me, a logical segway.
i.e. address impacts to our natural resources: dogs yes, OHVs similarly.
Protection/restrictions/closures: dogs yes, OHVs similarly. I have presented this same 'theme', in Public Comment in OSAC and BOS meetings.
Please see my comments below, in Red : >))). Excerpts from Agenda Item #17A are in black.

3.1.2 The Department shall reasonably protect the health and safety of the natural environment and reduce dog and wildlife conflicts.

3.1.3 The Department shall reasonably protect environmentally sensitive areas which may include seasonal nesting habitat, wetlands, riparian areas with critical cottonwood galleries or similar areas.

All admirable goals. I continue to beg The Department to "protect the health and safety of the natural environment" in the very sensitive
West Basin ephemeral stream wash section of the OHV area. Seems to me the damage caused by Rock Crawlers going up the washes -- (at least the
1.5 that are narrower than they are) -- is contrary to any natural resource protection tenet? Worse than dog poop and pee that might be left behind there
(that decomposes like other animals' pee and poop). And impacts of wide tires supporting heavy vehicles, on intact soil and vegetation is far more
extreme, than paw prints??? Where are our priorities? Why weren't these very protections part of the on the ground OHV Management Plan?
The verbiage is there — but are we honoring the 'talk', with the 'walk'? We protect our water sources, Carson River Watershed, wetlands, environmentally
sensitive areas — from DOG impacts. Why is the OHV area less important, when the impacts are greater?
Upland sagebrush ecosystems in the Clear Creek and Carson River watersheds are important, aren't they? Especially in an Open Space that has a
Conservation Easement which IMHO supports protection of it (while allowing recreational opportunity — in a 'BALANCE').

And who among you has walked the West Basin, all the designated OHV roads and trails, in the wash trails and Open Riding Areas (free style Cross country riding on any/all of the terrain within the boundary signs)? Who of you know first hand what I am talking about? Those of you 'dog people' and 'trail people' and staff who are Resource and Water Specialists, Ecology trained, Soil/Hydrology Professionals, Trail Builders, knowledgeable about Conservation Easements…….Please speak up for the OHV area impacts, as strongly as you have for the dog impact!

3.1.7 The Department shall provide an education campaign in conjunction with community partners, encouraging responsible ownership and best management practices.

Education shall be provided through a variety of mediums encouraging community stewardship, volunteerism and responsible pet ownership.

Please allow me to make a parallel again, to the OHV area. Great goals above — for ALL our Open Spaces. Re the OHV/multi-use south end of Prison Hill: why not enlist users (ALL of us nonOHVers who love it — and us OHVers who love it just as much). The Department can encourage all of us to be responsible users, ESPECIALLY us OHVers. E=Education. YES. Get us all involved in community stewardship. Many of us want to volunteer — and are volunteering on our own. Encourage responsible OHV use and responsible care of our land!!!! I believe this language is all in the NOHVCC OHV Management Plan, RecConnect Site Assessment, and Grant Applications: let's get it into the Ordinances (13.06?) and E=Educate and E=Enforce! — just as The Department is doing so well with the dog issue. Enlist the support of the Working Group (a part of all the documents, through the entire life of the project).

3.1.8 The Department shall provide opportunities for sponsorships, volunteerism, adoption programs (Adopt-A-Park, Adopt-A-Trail, Adopt-An-Open Space, Adopt-A-Watershed, Adopt-A-Spot, Adopt-A-Dog Waste Station, Park and Trail Ambassadors) to encourage community stewardship, and reduce impacts to the City's staff and financial resources.

Great idea re community stewardship! Let's do it at the OHV area. Reinstate the Working Group! Adopt a wash, Adopt the Sand Lot, Adopt Off the Trailer, Adopt Toad Loop, etc. E=Evaluate the project, its trails, its positive, its impacts. This spirit and language is already part of all the above documents. The Department can (shall) Ordinance it and put it in place!

3.1.9 The Department shall reasonably provide clear and consistent signage, compliant with the Department Signage

Master Plan, to assist users in making informed decisions prior to recreating within Carson City's Park System.

Good. Let's do this in the OHV area soon. Again, I am bringing that in, because it is part of the Park System — that would benefit from 'assisting users in making informed decisions prior to recreating' --- as The Department is doing with the dog Ordinances. Refine the 'Know Before you Go Rules' to be consistent with how you want to protect the area. Carson City owns and manages this property, not the Users. Be assertive and protect your property. Put the use and restrictions and rules into the 13.06 (or Title 13?) Ordinances. Have it clearly 'on the books' and then extrapolated to (more) on the ground signage throughout the area. Have the volunteers assist with sign installation! - they have the trucks to bring in signs and tools! Reinstate the Working Group to provide a forum for users to assist in making decisions through all stages of the OHV project (per the verbiage in all the documents) — and assist with projects.

3.2.1

Dog owners shall be stewards of Carson City's public lands; protecting

parks, trails, open space and the watershed from preventable

contamination related to dog waste. It is the responsibility of dog owners to

pick up after their dog and properly dispose of the dog's waste. (CCMC

7.13.080(3))

Again, apply this to the OHV area. OHVs — as dogs — impact our Open Space (or more?). OHV users shall be stewards of the

Carson City public OHV land. This south end of Prison Hill is designated Open Space for multi-use, with OHV use allowed on top of multi-use! ALL of us are privileged to have access to this land. Let's all protect it and the watershed (Clear Creek AND Carson River watersheds BOTH are hosted in this property)! Let's prevent contamination and impacts on this property (fluid spills, impacts from tires in wet areas). CWSD could be involved to guide us to protect the watershed! Muscle Powered could be involved to protect trails, Open Space — and consult re the around Prison Hill Trail: let's make it sustainable and integrated into the environment as all the MP trails are in our Open Space properties. Why are you wanting to put in the 'highway' extension of CRT II? Visual and on the ground real impacts to our upland sagebrush ecosystem. Incompatible with the spirit of the Conservation Easement. Is this stewardship/protection of our natural resources — in our public lands/Open Space? Muscle Powered has done this so well, in all directions, in all our Open Space land. Why are they not involved in the stewardship of the multi-use south end of PH. They know sustainability principles — that can be applied to ANY recreational use. And we can ALL enjoy and protect and steward the many many trails through the varied ecosystems within the 900 acres. Why is Muscle Powered looking the other way, when their resource specialists could be so helpful in consulting?

3.2.2 Dog owners have a duty to restrain their dog, maintain voice command/control and keep their dog within sight distance; Owners shall ensure that other Park System users shall be provided the opportunity to recreate in a safe and reasonable manner without fear of conflict from owners or their dogs.

OHV users also have a duty to be responsible and respectful of other users, right? Evolving well!!! This is in the rules, and generally there is a spirit of cooperation and good communication among all users. Multi-users and OHVers are co-habitating this property and doing well at it. In fact, I think the 'ethics' should be that the multi-users stop/ move off the trail / control their dogs — get them off the trail when an OHV is coming / let the OHVs proceed rather than the OHV stopping to let the multi-user proceed (except perhaps w/Horses). We multi-users can hear and see the

OHVs before they hear or see us! And easy for us to step off the trail (or ride or move our mtn bikes to a spot off the trail). I don't think we should expect the OHVers to stop for us. Slow down yes, if / when the see us. A cooperative dually responsible ethics? Working really well so far.

4.2 The Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 2023-R-_____ on January 5, 2023, exempting all the parks, trails and open space areas, except the following locations, pursuant to CCMC 13.02.090:

4.6 The parks, trails
to Resolution No.2023-R-_____ are subject to the rules set forth in this policy, CCMC and NRS.

DOG RULES AND REGULATIONS POLICY DRAFTand open space areas that are exempt from CCMC 13.02.090 pursuant

Will you be using the Title 13.06 for the Open Space Ordinances? And 13.02 for Parks?
Or 13.02 for both? Can you enforce issues in Open Space (13.06), with a Parks and Rec Ordinance 13.02 citation?
Why not update/indicate the respective Ordinances now, while you are in the process? Or, as was suggested to me,
will you be using "Title 13" to cover both .02 and .06 lumped together?
Will you do that ("Title 13") with the upcoming posted Dog Ordinances on signage in Parks and Rec AND Open Space properties —
for uniformity and ease of enforcement/citations etc?

5.0 Powers of the Department

5.1 Director

5.1.1 The Director may authorize temporary dog use restrictions within the Park

System and/or for health/safety reasons. This may include,

but is not limited to implementation of leash requirements, including seasonal or temporary closures. Restrictions may be enacted for environmental concerns, nesting habitat, grazing operations and protection of City resources (natural,

cultural, historic). Examples may include, but are not limited to, protections for sheep/goat grazing, ranching activities at Silver Saddle Ranch, nesting season along the Linear Ditch Trail or portions of the Carson River corridor, wetland enhancement projects, restoration, fire rehabilitation areas and fuels management. (CCMC 13.02.060, 13.05.040)

Again, will you be using 13.02 AND 13.06 for Parks and Rec and Open Space lands, respectively?

And again, there is SO MUCH EMPHASIS on the impacts that DOGS have on our properties. But what about the greater impacts
of the OHVs? I hope you will ADDRESS THAT SOON?
What about closures/restrictions in the OHV area for 'environmental concerns',
nesting habitat (I believe that is spelled out for the OHV area, should it be an issue — but that is the ONLY restriction for closure that I
know of). Until the recent closure. Why is the City so reluctant to close the OHV area/ temporary restrictions as needed
(the OHVers have 34M acres of BLM Riding throughout NV — right outside all our back doors - no lack of opportunity if PH is closed).
The OHV area is OWNED by and MANAGED by the City. Shouldn't the Director have the final say, not the Users.

What about restrictions/closures (as Director deems necessary), in the OHV areas — as you are stating will be done in the dog used areas
as needed — 'for environmental concerns ... protection of City resources'.
What about doing MORE of what you finally did on January 3 i.e. CLOSE the OHV area — you say for Safety/Hazards. But what about
closing it because the OHVs are churning up the soil, disrupting the washes, tramping vegetation and intact soil during this very wet time.
The washes are ALL flowing heavily on the SW slope (West

Basin). The Staging Area is muddy, and the Sand Lot is full of ponds.
OHV tire tread and disruption in these sensitive wet areas will be lasting: Rock Crawlers are invited/allowed in all the main ephemeral stream
washes on the SW slope and 'free riding cross country riding, across any of the terrain within the boundary signs is invited in 35+ acres of
Open Areas which host the main washes and their tributaries and at least 6 acres of intact soil and vegetation…. and in the 20+ acre Sand Lot.
These specific 'sensitive' areas are vulnerable all the time, but more so during heavy rain/snow (typical Winter storms or Summer thunderstorms).
Just as you advocate closure and restrictions for DOGS — consider the necessity for OHV impacts. What about restrictions/closures for 'Restoration,
fire rehabilitation areas'???? in the OHV areas, as you state for the dog areas?

Summary: I 'get' the big push to protect our areas from dogs — but please, let's extrapolate it to policies and Ordinances for the OHV area SOONER RATHER THAN LATER. Before it is too late to bring the West Basin back. And protect the
rest of the property, now, pro-actively.

I 'get' that Ordinances for dog use are important. Good coordinated effort by Parks and Rec, Open Space, their Commissions,
and the Public! I would respectfully request that the next area to be addressed in this detail, with resource and watershed protection/consideration and Ordinance clarification —could be the OHV area.

THANK YOU for reading and considering what seems to be a diversion — but IMHO is quite a logical segway.
You could write up Ordinances for the OHV area that mirror the excellent and comprehensive ones above for the Dog Areas. The 'template' is in place, well developed, well stated!
KUDOS.

Robyn Orloff
Carson City, NV
Robyn.orloff@icloud.com