

PBRs: Comments from PAB 2/8/2019

Kevin Tyler presented PBRs information to the Clark County Parks Advisory Board on Friday, February 8, 2019. He shared information about what will stay the same in regards to forestry, farming and agriculture. The combined rating categories were then shared in the Parks & Recreation and Farm Conservation categories as modified on 2/5/19 by Kevin Tyler, Pat Lee and Laura Hoggatt. Members were asked to review the point system as presented before 3/8/2019.

Questions and comments from Parks Advisory Board (PAB) members:

Trail Linkages:

- Would equestrian use need another category beyond what is listed? Not necessarily, but would depend on how we define public access.
- Would like “Public Access” defined. Yes, working on this. Liability would fall on the county under this type of a relationship.
- If the County spends money to improve trail access on a property – what happens if the land owner sells, passes away – or chooses to pull out of the program? Depends on if a trail linkage or a trail segment. Regional trail system would need a permanent trail easement.
- Will language in the Land Owner agreement assure that the trail remains in perpetuity? Again, it depends on the relationship and if this is a connection to a trail or part of a regional trail system. An easement would score higher with a bonus.

Public Recreation Area

- Are “Pocket Parks” included in this category? Or – will a base acreage need to be devoted to qualify for this category? Would only apply to taxable properties. Pocket parks are usually not taxable.
- We have a Park Standard in our Open Space Plan – will this be followed for PBRs? This is how we could handle it.

Other:

- What about education? Could this be a bonus category? IE: Site used for Environmental education component, Farm / Soil conservation etc. Yes, environmental education could be considered part of public access.
- If a land owner is already in the benefit system – can the land owner apply for other categories for their property? Yes, there would be some flexibility within the Public Benefit Rating System, but only for Open Space categories.
- Who picks up the tax burden? Is it typically dispersed among middle income families that are already burdened? Would like to know more about what happened in other Counties. Tax burden is dispersed or shifted among other tax paying individuals within the same tax district. If widely applied how will this impact the big picture?
- How has this benefitted other Park systems? Not sure, would need to talk with other counties.

PBRS: Comments from PAB 2/8/2019

- PAB members will be reaching out to other Counties to learn more about PBRS implementation.
- PAB members would like to know what will be needed from them following the presentation in March.
- How soon is PBRS likely to go before the Clark County Councilors?
- If approved – how soon would PBRS be implemented?

Summary:

The Parks Advisory Board members were thankful for the information presented. Several felt they were supportive of the idea that could benefit trail development. Others were undecided. All members felt like they needed more information and look forward to the presentation in March.

Respectfully submitted: Laura Hoggatt, Resource Development Coordinator