

1) CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Sutton at 6:02 PM

Members Present: Chair Sutton, Commissioners Jones, Hokeness, Vernon and West

Members Absent: None

Also Present: City Administrator/Clerk Terry, Public Works Lead Derek Cavanaugh, and Planner Malecha

2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Sutton led the Commission and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3) ADOPT/APPROVE AGENDA

City Planner Malecha advised the Commission that there were no changes to the agenda.

MOTION by Commissioner Vernon, second by Commissioner Jones to approve the agenda.

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0

4) PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

5) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Commissioner West, second by Commissioner Hokeness to approve the minutes of the October 8, 2025 meeting as presented.

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0

6) GENERAL BUSINESS

a. 2026 Meeting Dates

Planner Malecha explained to the Commission that the proposed Parks Commission Meeting Dates for 2026 are reflective of when the Commission has held meetings traditionally, on the second Wednesday of each month. The month of November the Parks Commission will hold their meeting on the first Wednesday of the month due to the Veterans Day Holiday.

MOTION by Commissioner Hokeness, second by Commissioner Jones to approve the 2026 Parks Commission Meeting Dates.

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0

b. Eagle View Meadows Park Dedication Discussion

Planner Malecha began a presentation regarding the Eagle View Meadows Park Dedication discussion. Malecha stated that this development was presented to the Commission at the August Parks Commission Meeting. He reminded the Commission that at the August meeting, the Commission recommended denial of the park layout based on the lack of continual usable park area due to proposed stormwater ponds and potential topography issues.

Malecha continued his presentation and gave Staff recommendations. Staff recommendations were as follows:

- Full Park land dedication for the proposed Eagle View Meadows development (8%).
- Park land location to be centrally located along the southerly edge of the plat, so that as properties to the south develop, additional land can be added to the park through additional park land dedication.
- Land to be dedicated for park purposes must have topography and configuration conducive to developing the park facilities typically found within a neighborhood park.
- Construct 5' sidewalks adjacent to all local streets, 10' trail on the north side of 255th street, 5' sidewalk on the east side of Nevada Avenue, and a 10' trail on the west side of Dakota Avenue.

Commissioner Jones asked if it would make more sense to have the 10' trail on the south side of 255th Street where the park will be located, City Administrator/Clerk Terry stated that it is recommended to be located on the north side of the street because a section of that trail is already constructed to the west, thus recommending continuation of the currently constructed trail.

Commissioner Hokeness stated that the parking lot depicted should be shifted closer to the pickleball court and stated that trees should not be used as a windscreen. He also stated the gazebo should be located closer to the playground. Hokeness finished by stating that he likes that they are depicting the baseball field and pickleball court and hopes that those features come to fruition. Hokeness asked Malecha about the timeline. Malecha stated that his best guess for when this plat will be complete with final plat would be in 2026.

MOTION by Commissioner Vernon, second by Commissioner Jones to approve the Eagle View Meadows proposed park land configuration, and the following Staff Recommendations:

1. Full Park land dedication for the proposed Eagle View Meadows development (8%).
2. Park land location to be centrally located along the southerly edge of the plat, so that as properties to the south develop, additional land can be added to the park through additional park land dedication.
3. Land to be dedicated for park purposes must have topography and configuration conducive to developing the park facilities typically found within a neighborhood park.
4. Construct 5' sidewalks adjacent to all local streets, 10' trail on the north side of 255th street, 5' sidewalk on the east side of Nevada Avenue, and a 10' trail on the west side of Dakota Avenue.

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0

c. Highlands at Eagle View Park

Planner Malecha began the presentation by reminding the Commission they had reviewed the Highlands at Eagle View Concept plan back in 2024 and recommended full park land dedication. Now, the streets are constructed, and the developer is preparing for Spring 2026 construction of the first phase.

Malecha stated that the planning of the park is what prompted this discussion. Malecha stated that the discussion has two facets:

The first, Park naming process. Malecha stated that since he is the newly designated Staff representative to the Parks Commission and that this is the first new park being constructed (other than Boulder Heights Park which had unique circumstances), that it would be a good opportunity for the Commission to take a policy stance on how they want new park processes to go. Malecha stated that historically, parks have been named after the development unless the land was donated (Wagner Park) or the City has owned for decades (Historic Elko Park). Examples include but are not limited to Rowena Ponds Park (Rowena Ponds subdivision), Pete's Hill Park (Pete's Hill subdivision). Malecha asked the Commission if they want to remain true to that theme or to take a different approach?

Commissioner Hokeness asked if we have a park naming policy currently in place. City Administrator/Clerk Terry stated that we do not currently have a policy, and feedback received from the Commission from this discussion will be used in formulating a new policy to be used going forward.

Chair Sutton stated that years back the Commission had this discussion and decided that naming parks after the development is a safe option and can prevent potential issues. City Administrator Terry stated that his suggestion is that you name the park based on the neighborhood, then have a discussion regarding an opportunity for park naming rights if the land is donated. Commissioner Hokeness stated that the City should create a policy based on what Terry just suggested. Commissioner Jones stated that the policy should state that the park is to be named after the development but not necessarily named the exact name as the development, Staff concurred.

The Parks Commission concluded the discussion by directing Staff to bring back a draft policy as it pertains to the park naming process for City parks.

The second facet of this discussion brought to the Commission pertained to the park establishment process for new parks. Planner Malecha stated that for existing parks, when it is time to replace equipment, the City would procure opinions from citizens living in the neighborhood for what should go into the park, and Malecha does not recommend a change to this process. The question Malecha is presenting to the Commission is in regard to new neighborhoods that don't have citizens residing there yet. Malecha presented the Commission with two options – should the Commission/Staff wait for a certain number of residents to move into a new neighborhood, then procure opinions from them as to what facilities should be implemented into the new park or should the Commission/Staff implement park facilities (if funding is available) before or as residents move into the neighborhood?

The Staff recommendation is to utilize the institutional knowledge of the Parks Commission and City Staff to make decisions on new park facilities based on the perceived greatest needs in the neighborhood and the community as a whole. This approach also gives new residents access to a park near their home rather than waiting for an unknown amount of time for a park to be built.

The direction from the Parks Commission is to continue to procure opinions on new park facilities located within existing neighborhoods, and to proactively build the parks located in new developments.

d. Historic Elko Park Playset

Planner Malecha began the presentation related to the Historic Elko Park Playset discussion. Malecha reminded the Parks Commission of a decision made by them in conjunction with the former City Staff representative to shift the replacement of the playset in Historic Elko Park from 2028 to 2026 and to utilize charitable gambling funds for the new playset.

Malecha presented the following questions to the Commission for consideration – What kind of features should be implemented into the new playset, and which color scheme should be utilized? Is the Commission interested in implementing a policy for color scheme going forward?

City Administrator/Clerk Terry stated that traditionally the color scheme decided upon for a new park facility was based on what the best price was. He continued by stating traditionally, the City would go out for RFP's, give them a budget, and then choose from the options presented by the vendor. He rephrased Malecha's question by presenting it as, does the Commission want to continue with that practice, or does the Commission want to dictate the color scheme of new park features?

Commissioner Jones stated that he would prefer to discuss color scheme on an individual basis as park feature replacements are to come to fruition. Commissioner Vernon stated that she would be in favor of using earth tones for park facilities as it is more conducive to the needs of children with disabilities. Chair Sutton said that he would be hesitant to give specific color schemes to vendors because it may limit the options presented to the Commission and/or up the price. Commissioner West stated that heat retention in park equipment should be a more important consideration than the color scheme.

The Commission decided to forego implementing a uniform color scheme throughout the Community. Instead, that will be part of the discussion on an individual basis as parks are set for replacement.

City Administrator/Clerk Terry asked the Commission to what degree and how do you want to engage the neighborhood? He restated that this is the guidance Staff is seeking from the Commission, what type of a process does the Commission want?

Commissioner Hokeness stated that there may be a lack of input from the neighborhood because this park is mostly utilized during baseball games and by daycares, and that there are not a lot of people in the neighborhood that utilize the park facilities. Commissioner Jones stated that he would be in favor of presenting the neighborhood with a menu of options and gain insight from the community from that. Commissioner Vernon stated that she would like to engage the neighborhood first and see what they would like to see implemented as part of the playset. Commissioner West stated that he would also be in favor of providing the neighborhood with a menu of options.

Terry reiterated what he believed the conclusion of the discussion was and what the direction from the Commission is: Terry stated that the specifics of each park will be different, but the Commission is in favor of engaging the neighborhood for input on the discretionary items to the degree that we can.

Clarification and direction from the Parks Commission was as follows: The order of operations as it pertains to replacing existing park equipment within an established neighborhood is that Staff will reach out to vendors and get options, present the options to the neighborhood at a neighborhood meeting, and bring those findings back to the Parks Commission for formal direction.

7) UPDATES & REPORTS

a. November Parks Commission Update

Planner Malecha stated that the report is in the packet and would answer any questions. Commissioner Hokeness asked how many trees were being removed, Public Works Lead Derek Cavanaugh stated that there are approximately 1,100 trees being removed, with about 900 of those being ash trees.

b. November Parks Commission Financial Report

City Planner Malecha stated the report is in the packet and Staff can answer any questions; there were no questions.

8) PARKS COMMISSIONER'S QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

a. Discuss Park and Trail Security Lighting – Commissioner Hokeness

Planner Malecha began the discussion by outlining the discussion. Malecha stated that Commissioner Hokeness approached Staff with a conversation related to park and security lighting. Planner Malecha agreed to put this item on the Parks Commission agenda so it could be discussed by the Commission, thus resulting in this conversation.

Malecha stated that the stance of the Commission has been to not light parks and trails, although it is not formalized in a policy document. Malecha stated that some parks do have lighting due to adjacent streetlights. Public Works Lead Cavanaugh also stated that ice rinks also have lighting which is turned off at 10:00 PM when park hours end.

Commissioner Hokeness reminded the Commission as to why lighting was not implemented into the previous park brought up for this consideration a few years back, Boulder Heights Park. Hokeness stated that the Commission decided against lighting the pavilion because the cost was inflated due to the developer not implementing a transformer near the park. Hokeness recommends that it be a condition of future development to implement power/electricity availability to all new park land.

Commissioner Hokeness shifted the discussion to specify the desire from residents of Pete's Hill to implement a security light at the central gathering place of the trail heads, where the bench is located. He also stated the intent of those residents to implement a Little Free Library if there were to be a light constructed.

After discussion, the Parks Commission came to an agreement regarding park and trail lighting.

The decision made by the Commission is as follows: Park and trail lighting shall not be implemented throughout the City but there should be an opportunity for “one-offs”.

The Parks Commission directed Staff to draft a policy regarding park and trail lighting. The policy should include a basis that parks and trails are not to be lit, and an option for “one-offs” be provided that a petition from a neighborhood or group is submitted to the Parks Commission and the original cost of construction is covered with private funding. The City would maintain and pay for ongoing costs of the light, but the original construction would have to be funded by private capital. The policy should also include a caveat that lighting shall not impact adjacent homes. The first instance of someone petitioning for a light should be brought to the City Council for the final determination. This policy should also require a mailer to be sent out to properties within a certain distance of the park informing them of the incoming discussion.

9) NEXT MEETING

Regular Parks Commission Meeting
Wednesday, January 14, 2026 at 6:00 PM
ENM City Hall Council Chambers

10) ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Chair Sutton, second by Commissioner Jones to adjourn the meeting at 8:27 PM.

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0

Respectfully submitted by

Brandon Malecha, Planner I