



MINUTES

Special Concurrent Hybrid Meeting City of Reno Parks and Recreation Advisory Board City of Sparks Parks and Recreation Commission Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission

Thursday, April 30, 2026 • 6:00 PM

**Washoe County Chambers
1001 East Ninth Street, Building A
Reno, NV 89512**

Public Meeting Notice – Meetings are open to the public and notice is given in accordance with NRS 241.020.

1. Call To Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m. by Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission Chair Neal Jones.

City of Sparks Parks and Recreation Commission (Sparks PRC):

Present in person: Sheena Harvey, Terry Frugoli, Councilmember Donald Abbott

Via Zoom: Melanie “Jill” Short, Matthew Robinson

Absent: Vice Chair Megan Mentzer, Tracy Gale, Mobby Michael

City of Reno Parks and Recreation Advisory Board (Reno PRAB):

Present in person: Chair Ian Anderson, Vice Chair Marie Krueger, Karla Werninghaus, Tara Webster, Councilmember Miguel Martinez

Via Zoom: Jerry Wager, Elise Domingsil, Cheryl Guinan

Absent: Lucas Ingvaldstad, Kathleen Schneider

Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission (Washoe County OSRPC):

Present in person: Chair Neal Jones, Vice Chair Sean Hill, Tracy Kuczenski, Timothy Dake, Nicole Flangas, Commissioner Mariluz Garcia, Chaz Lehman, DDA

Via Zoom: Miles Kinsler, Kevin Joell

Absent: Chris Baker, Jennifer Uvira

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Comment

Ms. Julie Conway spoke about her history in Washoe County and expressed support for Agenda Item 6. She thanked the members of the three boards for their work. She looked forward to hearing the presentation, saying she supported developing a service plan and identifying funding sources. She suggested that funding be sustainable over time; that it be sufficient for new facilities, maintenance of existing facilities, and the continuation of recreation services; and that it be fair for all parties. She noted the City of Reno invested in the system 100 years ago with the development of parks like Stewart Park.

6:10 p.m. Sparks City Councilmember Donald Abbott arrived in person.

Via Zoom, Ms. Iris Jehle-Peppard, Executive Director of One Truckee River, indicated that her organization recognized the need for sustainable and sufficient funding for capital improvements and ongoing maintenance for open space regionally. She expressed excitement for the prospect that will be explored in Agenda Item 6.

4. Approval of the Agenda for the April 30, 2026, Joint Parks Commission Meeting

There was no response to the call for public comment.

For the Washoe County OSRPC, Vice Chair Hill moved to approve the agenda for the April 30 Joint Parks Commission meeting, seconded by Commissioner Dake. The motion passed with a vote of seven for, zero against, with Commissioners Baker and Uvira absent.

For the Reno PRAB, Vice Chair Kreuger moved to approve the agenda for the April 30 Joint Parks Commission meeting, seconded by Board Member Guinan. The motion passed with a vote of seven for, zero against, with Members Ingvaldstad and Schneider absent.

For the Sparks PRC, Commissioner Harvey moved to approve the agenda for the April 30 Joint Parks Commission meeting, seconded by Commissioner Frugoli. The motion passed with a vote of four for, zero against, with Vice Chair Mentzer and Commissioners Gale and Michael absent.

5. Approval of the City of Sparks Draft Minutes for the Joint Parks Commission Meeting of June 26, 2025

There was no response to the call for public comment.

For the Sparks PRC, Commissioner Frugoli moved to approve the June 26, 2025, Joint Parks Commission minutes, seconded by Commissioner Short. The motion passed with a vote of four for, zero against, with Vice Chair Mentzer and Commissioners Gale and Michael absent.

6. Presentation and Discussion on Park District Service Plan with PROS Consulting

Nathan Ulyot, City of Reno Parks and Recreation Director, cautioned against visualizing what could be, saying this item would focus on what has already been done, including updates about public and stakeholder feedback, as well as some of the things allowed under the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). He believed that a framework would be ready to be presented in a few months.

Leon Younger, President of PROS Consulting, Inc., reminded the attendees that PROS was responsible for preparing a study evaluating the feasibility of a service district. He conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Agenda; Progress Update – Where are we today?; Meeting Objectives & Groundrules; The Case for a Special Service District (2

slides); Stakeholder Interviews; Shareholder Feedback – Key Themes; Survey Results; Q3; Q7; Q8; Q10; Q11; Q12; Q12a; Q13; Q13a; Q13b; Online Survey; Level of Service; Operational & Capital Costs; Staffing; Maintained Acreage; Nevada Parks, and Trails and Open Space Districts.

Mr. Younger mentioned that if a special service district were created, part of PROS' work would be to determine the life cycle of all participating agencies' assets. Knowing that would help set a baseline for creating priorities. He noted that younger residents were moving into the area, and they expected parks services to be available to them.

Andy Belknap with Baker Tilly continued the presentation by reviewing the following slides: Nevada Parks, Trails and Open Space Districts; Service Plan – NRS 318A.090; Public Hearing – NRS 318A.120; Formation – NRS 318A.170; and Powers – NRS 318A.300. He stressed that there were not huge economies of scale when operating regional parks districts because most of the work was done at the ground level. Areas where economies of scale could be achieved included management, tech support, and human resources (HR). Most money is not spent in those areas, though. He said Nevada has no existing parks district, so there was no model to follow. Because Washoe County has its own planning commission, he remarked, it would make the final decision about establishing a special service district based on the actions of the other local governments.

Mike Shellito with PROS summarized that a special service district was feasible, though it would be up to the jurisdictions to decide whether they should do it. He reviewed slides entitled Summary of Key Findings and Guiding Principles & Goals. He noted that certain funding elements would be determined in the Service Plan, and he expected PROS to propose several options to fund it, among them forming Joint Powers Authority. Mr. Younger concluded the presentation by reviewing the What's Next slide.

OSRPC Chair Jones stated that 75 percent of most organizations' budgets go towards personnel costs, and he wondered how to balance that without losing any employees. Mr. Younger replied that part of PROS' work will be to evaluate the cost per experience and cost per acre to determine the effectiveness of the agencies. Partnerships also contribute greatly to making parks districts work, he stated, and there are great organizations in the area.

OSRPC Commissioner Flangas asked about the options provided to survey respondents pertaining to possible additional charges. Mr. Younger felt that the survey results showed people were willing to pay more money into the system, even without knowing what it would be spent on. Regarding the relationship between the potential Board of Trustees and the jurisdictions' existing planning commissions, Mr. Belknap responded that that is currently unknown since there are no other parks districts in the state, but ultimately there would be independently elected trustees on the Board. He anticipated that local planning commissions would review the projects proposed by the parks district, and details about that could be included in the agreement between the three governmental agencies.

Washoe County Commissioner Garcia believed the significant number of respondents to the two surveys provided a good litmus test for the proposal. She wondered when consideration would be given to the various labor unions involved with all the combined employees. Mr. Belknap emphasized the importance of involving employees early in the process. While one goal was to ensure that no employees would be worse off, he recognized that it would be challenging since each jurisdiction uses different collective bargaining agreements, so a working group of HR executives and collective bargaining group representatives would be important. Attorneys would also need to be involved as the process of consolidation was very challenging.

In response to OSRPC Vice Chair Hill's question about the makeup of the parks district staff, Mr. Belknap said the idea was that all employees would transition to be employed by the new district under terms that were no worse than their current terms. Pursuant to NRS, cities and counties can

dedicate resources, land, and facilities to a new district, though that was also challenging because some land holdings were originally dedicated to the agencies with certain requirements. He added that land could be transferred by fee titles, leases, or through some type of agreement that is faithful to how the lands were originally conveyed to the public. This would be complicated, as would respecting the existing contracts between each jurisdiction and various vendors.

Replying to additional board member questions, Mr. Younger said inequity can only be overcome by identifying areas where it exists and overcoming it, possibly through a master plan. PROS tries to build any adopted plans into the service district. He was heartened to see the willingness of users of all three park systems as well as the leadership of each agency to share.

Reno PRAB Member Webster asked how the creation of a parks district would affect implementation of the heat mitigation plan pursuant Assembly Bill 96. Mr. Belknap said he expected parks to play a large role in any heat mitigation plan by being included in regional planning; he thought that could be included in the foundational agreement for the district.

Commissioner Flangas thought it would not be wise to set a ceiling for funding by tying contributions to an arbitrary rate. Mr. Belknap agreed and felt it would be prudent to work with the State to loosen restrictions on what local governments can do. The State created this statute with the specific hope that a special district might be created. He acknowledged that revenue options were very limited, particularly with property taxes being at the cap.

Responding to Commissioner Garcia's query about whether the district would need to be put before voters, Mr. Belknap said the jurisdictions had the authority to create one, but voters would likely need to approve measures to increase the revenue necessary to support it.

Sparks City Councilmember Abbott wondered whether the general improvement districts (GIDs) were contacted. Mr. Belknap responded that they reached out to the Sun Valley GID, who had previously implemented an assessment to support parks, and they planned to contact the Incline Village GID. There were not many other options under NRS. He confirmed that the additional \$25 charge referenced in the presentation was only one option, and the consultants planned to explore at least four different options for funding. Under a consolidated parks district, all ratepayers would eventually pay roughly the same amount, though that would not occur immediately.

Reno City Councilmember Martinez inquired about the level of trustee involvement in the land use process. Mr. Belknap noted they would not have land use authority, but they could work closely with the entities' planning departments. PROS will review all existing parks' master plans and use them as a starting point for the new district, though he imagined the new district would eventually create a regional parks master plan. They could then share that with the planning commissions to inform them of their vision. He stressed the importance of intergovernmental coordination. Mr. Younger spoke about his experience as a special service district director in Ohio and how that district worked with planning commissions.

Councilmember Martinez inquired about the makeup of the trustee board. Mr. Belknap explained that the NRS spells out how the initial appointments are made by the local governments, noting that it would eventually transition to an independent district where trustees are elected every two years. Some trustees would start with two-years terms and others four-year terms. The legislation was very general and did not specifically consider three agencies forming one district.

Vice Chair Hill asked about staffing. Mr. Belknap said the district could contract with Washoe County for HR and payroll services, but they should have freedom to determine the best way to deliver support services. It would make sense to contract with one or two agencies, though they could opt to provide those services internally. There will be many ad hoc committees to determine those details.

OSRPC Commissioner Kuczenski wondered whether the staff members who were interviewed were interested in a consolidated district. Mr. Belknap thought they would have a lot of questions, but he reiterated the pledge to ensure that nobody would be worse off afterwards. In fact, some could end up better off under one district.

Councilmember Abbott asked about a potential exit plan. Mr. Belknap stated any created district could be dissolved, and he believed the local governments would want to know what would happen if it did not work as intended. Because the governing bodies would appoint the first five trustees, there would be a close link between the district and the agencies at the beginning. He thought that was intentional. Amendments addressing dissolution could be included in the district's founding documents. He pointed out that other districts had dissolved, usually due to insolvency or looming insolvency.

Chair Jones recognized that handling things like land acquisition and cooperative agreements between the governmental agencies would be complex, but the public seemed to enthusiastically support the idea. All three bodies need to seriously consider this, he felt.

7. Public Comment

Ms. Julie Conway thanked the members for their thoughtful questions. She knew when this was passed in 2017 that it would not be easy. She commended the consultants for their work, adding that she was encouraged by the results. She spoke about collaboration between the three governments in addressing the unhoused crisis and transportation issues. She expressed gratitude to the elected officials for their support, opining that not doing anything was not an option. She said it took Bozeman, Montana, five years to create their district and thanked everyone for their time on this important issue.

Mr. Mac Rossi felt that charging renters, many of whom used regional parks, a fee could be an additional source of revenue.

Ms. Tina Nappe recalled that Rancho San Rafael Park required a vote of the people. She expressed excitement for the process, which she thought was worthwhile because the parks were desperate for attention. She was unsure whether all parks would ever be fully maintained, and there was already a lack of amenities like soccer fields, pickleball courts, and spaces for events. She expressed concern that the directive to focus on maintenance over expansion would result in no new park acquisitions.

Ms. Karen Mullen expressed appreciation for PROS Consulting's recognition of the strained budgets and their assurance that staff would be protected. She encouraged the Board to proceed and hear all options for funding, adding that people in the community had a desire for new parks, more open space, and better facility maintenance. She felt that a parks district would be beneficial for young people and future generations, and it would help address environmental concerns.

Ms. Iris Jehle-Peppard stressed the importance of this issue on the Truckee River, which is critical to the region as it comprises 80 percent of the area's drinking water. There are currently very few resources available for the river, she noted, and though the issue is complicated, the region and the community deserve for the process to be pursued.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:38 p.m. by Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission Chair Neal Jones.

Neal Scott Jones, L.S.
Neal Jones, Chair

MINUTES
Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission
May 27, 2026

The Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission met in a scheduled session on Wednesday, May 27, 2026, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. The meeting was televised live and replayed on Washoe Channel at: <https://www.washoecounty.us/mgrsoff/Communications/wctv-live.php>; also on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/user/WashoeCountyTV>.

Chair Jones called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Members Present: Chair Neal Jones, Vice Chair Sean Hill, Kevin Joell (Zoom), Chris Baker, Tim Dake, Tracy Kuczenski (Zoom), Jennifer Uvira (Zoom), Nicole Flangas, Miles Kinsler (Zoom)

Members Absent: None; Board of County Commissioners Liaison Mariluz Garcia not present.

Staff Present: Aaron Smith, Chaz Lehman, Stephanie D'Arcy, Davina Breese, Iryna Wilcox, Brandon Roman

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The pledge was recited by Commissioner Dake.

3. Public Comment

There was no response to the call for public comment.

4. Approval of the Draft Minutes for the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission Meeting of March 25, 2026, meeting.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Motion by Commissioner Baker to approve the March 25, 2026, Open Space and Regional Parks Commission minutes as written, seconded by Commissioner Flangas.

The motion passed with a vote of nine for, zero against.

5. Acknowledgement and recognition of Park Operations staff, Christopher Smyczek for his outstanding service and contributions to Washoe County.

District Park Manager Brian Harrower lauded Mr. Smyczek for his responsiveness, willingness to help coworkers, the educational opportunities he presented to the community, and his commitment. He presented Mr. Smyczek with a certificate.

6. Presentation by Nolan Yount on his Eagle Scout project at Davis Creek Regional Park.

Park Ranger Nick Steuer introduced Eagle Scout Nolan Yount, who conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Overview; Work Day 1; Demolition Day; Painting; Installation; Finished Product; and Why Davis.

Mr. Yount explained that the existing fire rings were very shallow and did a poor job of containing fires. The new rings were donated by a welding class at Truckee Meadows Community College, though work needed to be done on them before installation. He noted that the old rings were extracted on the first day of the project. Adults helped with the grinder to clean the metal before the rings were painted. He said he was proud to do the project at Davis Creek Regional Park, which was the site of his first Scout camp-out.

Chair Jones, Vice Chair Hill, and Commissioners Dake, Baker, and Flangas thanked Mr. Yount for his work given the importance of fire safety, stressing the value placed by the community on Davis Creek Park.

7. Presentation by Nevada Firearms Academy on the updates and operation of the Washoe County Regional Shooting Facility.

Parks Operations Superintendent Stephanie D'Arcy reminded the Commission that Washoe County entered into an agreement with Nevada Firearms Academy (NFA) in 2024 to operate and manage the facility. This partnership allows the County to offer additional services beyond what they are able to do alone. He conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: We are Nevada Firearms Academy; Since we took over operations; We are NFA; Hours of Operation; RSF Improvements; Community Involvement; photos; Goals; and What the community is saying now.

Scott Catron with NFA mentioned he was an Eagle Scout who cut the ribbon at the shooting range with his father in the 1980s. He noted that many firearms groups supported NFA's endeavor to operate the facility, and many of the concerns about this partnership did not come to fruition. The Single Action Shooters and Reno Rod and Gun Club are among the groups who regularly use the range, and events at the range were either held or will be sponsored by SHOOT Sig, Glock, Bergara, Barrett, Tactical Games, and Sheep Show.

Mr. Catron indicated that the range initially offered 15 steel targets, and now there are 47 steels to help people train. Anyone who finds and hits a specific target gets entered into a raffle to win a rifle or free range time. He noted that a community member donated the equipment to throw clays for a five-stand shotgun service, and Sheep Show has also offered to donate one stand. He said the cost to use the range increased for adults but went down for children. Educating children was one of NFA's areas of focus, as they have five different programs geared towards kids from ages 3 to 18. Many free classes are also offered to the community, and information about them is available on the group's website. He hoped to offer the opportunity for scouts to earn 14 or 15 merit badges at the property, helping kids who cannot afford to go to camps that are far away. He described the working relationships the NFA has with various local companies and organizations and some of the benefits that people can receive for patronizing those businesses.

Mr. Catron spoke about the plan to build berms that would protect shooters at bays 4 through 12 from shooters on the thousand-yard gallery. NFA is working with members of the community to transport dirt to the area to allow for more opportunities for training and development. He shared his goal to make more regular presentations to the Commission and thanked everyone for their support.

Chair Jones wondered whether local vendors took issue with NFA offering free classes. Mr. Catron replied that these classes were not offered elsewhere, and they were recommended by the U.S. Concealed Carry Association to be offered for free. Responding to the Chair's follow-up query, he provided a description of five-stand shooting.

Citing his desire to increase use of the facility, Commissioner Baker asked about NFA's outreach efforts. Mr. Catron stated there were issues with the facility before NFA took it over, and they are trying to overcome some reputational concerns. They offer free classes at the range, along with voter registration. Many of the events they hold and giveaways like free range time are intended to get people to come to the facility, though he was open to other ideas. He noted they have a strong social media presence, and most of their classes are taken by at least one individual court-ordered to do so because they were caught shooting in illegal areas.

Commissioner Flangas offered to connect Mr. Catron with the organizers of an upcoming archery event in Tahoe. Mr. Catron spoke about an employee who used to be the archery instructor at the University of Nevada, Reno, but he recognized the challenges of shooting arrows in the wind. He hoped to expand the facility's archery offerings once they can build more berms.

8. Presentation, discussion, and recommendation to approve the revised Parkland Easement Policy, to be effective immediately.

Park Planner Faye-Marie Pekar conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Overview; Background & Policy History; Goals of Revised Policy; Parkland Easement Policy Update; Application and Review Improvements; Annual Rent & Long-Term Stewardship; Application and Review Improvements; Benefits of Revised Policy; and Parkland Easement Policy Update.

Ms. Pekar highlighted that much of the property received by Washoe County in the past was Land-Water Conservation Fund constricted, and some Bureau of Land Management areas had patents that would limit what could happen on those properties to outdoor use only. Additional review processes outside of County jurisdiction may need to occur. She noted the old fixed application fee was \$100, but they would be moving to an adopted fee schedule. Having a flat rate associated with annual rents, she continued, would eliminate the need for case-by-case negotiations. With respect to the suggested motion, she said the 2012 Parkland Easement Policy contained language about compensation and mitigation which she wanted to carry over to the new policy.

Chair Jones expressed support for the County's initiative to keep its rules and regulations up to speed. He remarked that most lawsuits are filed over easements, not boundaries.

Responding to Vice Chair Hill's questions about easements, Ms. Pekar indicated that most easement requests received by the County were for utilities, primarily underground. Access easements were also occasionally sought, though they were rarely approved because they needed to provide public benefit. She explained that leases were fixed contracts that could be renegotiated, while easements are meant to be in effect in perpetuity. She said the proposed annual rent fee was comparable to the ones implemented by adjacent land managers; rent would be either 3 percent of the appraised value or a minimum of \$200. Staff gets an appraisal on most easement requests, and that value is included in staff reports. She provided the example of a gas main through Sierra Sage Golf Course as one which received an appraised value of \$12,000, and if that were done today, rent would cost 3 percent of that. Applicants are allowed to select the appraiser from a list of approved appraisers provided by the County; if one is not selected, appraisers are chosen in list order.

Commissioner Flangas inquired about the cost for appraisals. Ms. Pekar replied that the preliminary title report happens when the applicant is not in escrow, and it is intended to give the value of the land. That cost ranges from \$1,500 and \$2,000 and, per the compensation and mitigation language mentioned earlier, it is to be borne by the applicant. The five-year changes in value are based off the U.S. Housing Index, and if that is not a usable figure, staff uses another cost index within the policy. She reiterated that the minimum rent is \$200 or 3 percent of the appraised value, and that language should be included in the policy.

Commissioner Baker wondered what happened to the revenue generated from rent. Ms. Pekar said the revenue did not go into the General Fund; it went into a general obligation fund with the Parks Department. The revenues stay with whatever park the fee is generated through, and if there were no need in that park, they would stay within that park district. Staff could also request that the fees be used elsewhere.

Commissioner Dake thought the new policy would provide the Commission with guidance for future decisions.

Chair Jones pointed out that non-use does not equal abandonment, and he asked whether abandonments needed to be in writing. Ms. Pekar responded that abandonments are determined at the Board of County Commissioner (BCC) level, and the result is a recorded document showing that the easement has been relinquished. This is specific to parkland easements, not necessarily utility easements. Operations Division Director Aaron Smith added that any agreement the County enters into must be approved by the BCC, and parkland easement agreements would contain language explaining how they would need to be abandoned, which could be done without BCC approval.

Commissioner Flangas asked whether the provision about a \$200 minimum would need to be included in any motion to approve the policy. Deputy District Attorney Chaz Lehman said that could be included in the motion.

Commissioner Kinsler wondered what would happen to the equipment in or above the ground should the easement be abandoned. Mr. Smith replied that those would be abandoned in place, though there have not been too many of those requests. It is highly cost prohibitive to dig the

equipment out, though staff was open to recommendations from the Commission. Ms. Pekar added that reclamation plans are required as part of the application process. Commissioner Baker thought that underground equipment would likely not be a problem, but things like overhead power lines could be unsightly and present negative impacts and safety concerns to the community.

Responding to a follow-up question about the failure to follow a reclamation plan after abandonment, Ms. Pekar explained that typically bond and reclamation plans are included with permits, but abandonments are not common with parkland easements, which are intended to live in perpetuity. Mr. Smith mentioned that there are construction agreements wherein the developer agrees to do the reclamation and restore the property.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Motion by Commissioner Flangas to approve the revised Parkland Easement Policy, including the Compensation and Mitigation section of the 2012 Easement Policy, and to allow staff to make an amendment under the Annual Rent section to include a \$200 minimum, seconded by Vice Chair Hill.

The motion passed with a vote of nine for, zero against.

9. Update on PROS Consulting's work to develop a Service Plan for the possible creation of a Park District.

Operations Division Director Aaron Smith provided a brief historical summary of the item, noting that while population growth was at 14 percent per year, park attendance increased by 66 percent. Each citizen contributes \$21.28 per year to park lands in Washoe County. A recent study showed that each dollar invested in parks and recreation yields \$3 in local economic benefit. As such, consideration is being given into how services are being delivered regionally.

Mr. Smith said results of the parks level service analysis can be found online, and there were opportunities to expand the parkland services desired by the community. The study also showed strong public support for more consistent services, as well as equitable access to parks. He reviewed statistics about respondents' thoughts on the importance of parks to quality of life, the consistency of park services between jurisdictions, and their supportiveness of a consolidated parks district.

Mr. Smith indicated that developing a service plan, including governance and funding models, would be one of the next steps, along with analyzing district boundaries, planning for staffing and asset transition, and preparing for statutory service plan requirements. He expected that the service plan would be delivered in November at the latest.

Chair Jones opined that deed restrictions on some of the parks might slow down the process, and leases might be more advantageous than fee transfers. Vice Chair Hill wanted requested copies of the survey results for when he speaks to members of the community. Mr. Smith responded that people can go to ourparksnv.org, the landing page for potential consolidation. He committed to providing links to the population figures he shared.

10. Parks Reports

Parks Operations Superintendent Stephanie D’Arcy noted that all three of the County’s aquatics facilities were opened by Memorial Day for the first time in years, and she praised those who were instrumental in getting them open. She reviewed the materials included in the agenda packet for this item, highlighting the Lazy 5 Regional Park Master Plan update and the 21st Lazy 5 Summer Music Series. She announced that all five of Davis Creek Regional Park’s existing electrical feeders were tested on March 16, and a report was provided to the insurance company for review. It was agreed that three of the five feeders needed to be replaced, those that serve the amphitheater, the wellhead pump, and the residential area. Power to the water system will be regained once these are replaced, which would need to happen before the campground could reopen. She did not have a date for when that would occur, but she would update the Commission.

Ms. D’Arcy remarked that a presentation on the fuel mitigation process and its effects on migratory birds will be added to July’s Open Space and Regional Parks Commission meeting agenda, as will a budget presentation.

11. Director’s Report to include updates on Board of County Commissioners actions, future meeting locations/Commissioner field trips, community sponsorship requests, department updates, and community partnerships.

Operations Division Director Aaron Smith indicated that Washoe County received an \$18,500 donation for Rancho San Rafael Regional Park from the Paul and Gwen Leonard Charitable Foundation. The Board of County Commissions will consider a purchase and sale agreement next month for a piece of land to serve as a trailhead for the Swan Lake Nature Study Area.

12. Commissioner Request for future agenda items

There were none.

13. Public Comment

There was no response to the call for public comment.

14. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor

Neal Scott Jones, L.S.

Chair Neal Jones