



Reno Arts & Culture Commission DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Date: January 25, 2021

Time: 4:00 p.m.

*Meeting via teleconference only pursuant to
NRS 241.023*

Commission Members
Geralda Miller, Chair
Erik Fong, Vice Chair
Eric Anderson
Debbi Engebritson
Doug Erwin
Lisa Genasci
Dana Hatjakes
Bhie-Cie Ledesma
Shaughn Richardson
Melanie Rudnick
Mark Salinas
Naomi Duerr, City Council Liaison

AGENDA

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Geralda Miller, Chair; Erik Fong, Vice Chair; Eric Anderson, Debbi Engebritson, Doug Erwin (arrived at 4:08 pm), Lisa Genasci (arrived at 4:18 pm), Dana Hatjakes, Bhie-Cie Ledesma (arrived at 4:05 pm), Shaughn Richardson, Melanie Rudnick, Mark Salinas (arrived at 5:06 pm).

Also present: Megan Berner, Acting Manager of Arts, Culture, and Events; David Pritchett, Recreation and Parks Commission liaison.

2. Public Comment on Agenda Items or Other Matters –none

3. Approval of the Minutes – December 2021, 2020 Reno Arts & Culture Commission Meeting

Engebritson made a motion to approve, seconded by Richardson. All in favor, motion carries.

4. Approval of the Agenda – January 25, 2021

Hatjakes made a motion to approve, seconded by Engebritson. All in favor, motion carries.

5. City Council Liaison Report – Council Member Naomi Duerr

CM Duerr was absent.

6. Financial Report and Budget Update

a. Review and possible acceptance of the FY2019/20 Commission Budget Report

b. Review and possible acceptance of the FY2019/20 Public Art Budget Report

Berner reviews RACC budget. A&C grants are going to Council on the 27th. Nothing else has changed.

Berner reviews PAC budget, nothing has changed. PAC did not meet in January. Staff is looking into the situation with the Keystone Bridge and the timeline for maintenance on the bridge to see if that project is still feasible.

Rudnick asks about the Space Whale, if there are any updates. Berner says no, the situation remains the same. However, there is a potential piece that we may want to look into placing there.

Engebritson asks about the Maintenance line item. It is an interest bearing account, we can't remove that from our total budget and it can only be used for maintenance on ReTRAC. Not sure if it can be used for maintenance of other pieces aside from ReTRAC.

Engebritson moves to approve, seconded by Andersen. All in favor, motion carries.

7. Discussion and possible approval of FY21/22 Arts & Culture Grants timeline and process

Berner summarizes that we are behind on putting out the grants applications for next fiscal year. This is usually done in November. However, there is still time to go through the normal process and get them approved before July 1. The new timeline could be applications open on February 1, applications due on March 1, grants panel scoring in March, review by RACC in April, approval to Council in May.

Miller says looking at the timeline that if we are going to make any changes it will have to happen before the panel meets. Berner says her understanding was that the scoring part was not the issue it was the process of allocating the funds based on rankings. That is separate from scoring. Miller says then it would have to happen before the RACC allocates the funds.

Engebritson says she thinks that the smaller organizations probably don't realize that they can ask for more. Maybe we should let them know they should keep in mind that it's unlikely that they won't get the full amount. Berner says the organizations know what they can ask for. Most organizations scale it based on what they can afford to match or the size of the event/project.

Miller asks if we are going to do workshops for the grants, is there time for that. Berner suggests holding optional virtual grants workshops. Staff also is available to meet with organization individually. Miller asks if the workshops have been a safety in the past so if anyone complains after the fact. Berner says yes, however, if folks weren't able to attend staff has always been available.

Rudnick asks if February 1 is too soon.

Erwin says we very rarely give 100%. People are scaling it to their match but then they aren't getting 100%. If you know historically, we never give 100% why wouldn't they ask for the full amount. It seems unfair for them to ask for less and then receive less on that smaller amount.

Berner says this is the way that most grants work. You rarely get the full amount you ask for. We have also never had anyone score 100%.

Miller says we will definitely discuss this further at a future meeting. Miller asks if we push the timeline back will it mess up the timeline.

Berner says that is fine. One month for the applications to be accepted should be plenty of time. There is time to put together workshops as well.

Engebritson suggests pushing it to a period of February 8 – March 8.

Berner says that is fine. If it's later we will have to move the rest of our timeline. The workshops can happen the first week or two that the application is open.

Miller wants to make sure that we give enough time for the zoom meetings so people can get registered, etc.

Engebritson made a motion to approve the process with a timeline for applications from February 8 – March 8, seconded by Richardson.

Miller asks about the grants committee. Berner says she has a list to reach out to and will work on getting them on board.

All in favor, motion carries.

8. Review, discussion and possible recommended edits to the Reno Arts & Culture Commission bylaws

Berner says this is back on your agenda. The attorneys are concerned because there are a bunch of things in here that don't match up with your ordinance—that is not allowed. Bylaws are supposed to be a fairly bare bones document that governs how you run your meetings. It cannot contradict the ordinance—which contains your make up. Ex officio officers in bylaws is not acceptable because it is not in the bylaws. Assigning the Clerk's Office obligations is not something we can do—we can't make up rules for what the Clerk's Office does. The Clerk's Office does notify us about term expirations, etc. but we can't write that into our bylaws.

Miller says that Duerr mentioned that she wanted to make some changes to the ordinance/code. Is that still happening?

Berner says that would be the first step, to make changes to the code and have that approved and then to revise the bylaws. It may be good to have the attorney attend the next meeting when this is discussed.

9. Review, discussion, and possible recommended edits to the DRAFT Procedural Requirements to Name or Rename City of Reno Facilities

Berner says that public comment was received on this item from Alicia Barber and was sent out to Commissioners prior to the meeting. (See attached.)

Miller says she thought that the RACC decided this wasn't relevant to them and they maybe should not be a part of it. Miller says the whole time she was reading Alicia Barber's letter she was thinking why are we a part of this—it's more city planning not arts & culture.

Erwin says it may have some impact in terms of moving art or a monument. Rudnick says that naming things is culture, we could think of it from that perspective.

Berner says that anything that is in our jurisdiction as arts would have to come through our Commission.

Erwin asks what if you are placing something into a public place that is historical or contextual—would that count as arts & culture.

Miller says that the RACC was working with the Historical Resources Commission to create historical plaques but that went nowhere. Berner says that actually, the HRC created a program and has placed a 2 plaques so far. It lives with them as they are the appropriate body for that.

Pritchett asks why the Jesse Reno statue would be the arts jurisdiction versus the monument in Newlands. Berner explains that the Jesse Reno statue was brought through the RACC and we accept things into our art collection. There is no record of the Newlands Monument—it is a Parks project.

Erwin is in agreement with Rudnick on this.

Andersen is asking where the idea that this might be relevant to the RACC came from.

Berner explains that City staff included the RACC initially because they thought it might relate. The idea is to create a policy for renaming facilities. It's not about removing objects. The initial commissions identified were the Recreation and Parks Commission, the Human Rights Commission, the Historical Resources Commission, and the Reno Arts & Culture Commission.

Engelbritson suggests adding in verbiage that indicates if is arts related that the RACC should be involved. Just going through the draft, it doesn't really make sense for us to be involved on a very deep standpoint.

Erwin asks if the issue is needing quorum or just representation. Berner says all that it requires is having a representative from the Commission on the committee that reviews renaming applications from the community.

Berner says she gave the draft to the Commission along with the notes from the joint meeting last August. We are not seeing any comments or suggestions from the most recent reviews by the individual commissions. This is the first step and there will be a follow-up public meeting for review.

Fong says that this draft explicitly states that art and monuments are not addressed by this policy.

Erwin asks is there a reason why we wouldn't want a representative. If we think it won't ever be an issue then we shouldn't bother but if there is an instance why not have representation.

Hatjakes thinks the RACC should have representation.

Engelbritson asks if we have a representative would their vote count. Berner says yes that in the policy they are a member of the committee.

Pritchett says that some of the concern at the joint meeting was that staff would load up the committee. It's a committee that would eventually make a motion to council.

Berner says that you don't have to pick someone for this today. It's best to do it on a case-by-case basis. We will appoint as needed.

Erwin says just because you have one person representing they wouldn't represent the Commission as a whole.

Berner says that the committee member would absolutely be representing the RACC as a whole—keeping in mind our ordinance and what we are here to do. It sounds like you all think you should be a part of this so the next step is to make suggested edits if you have any. You will have another chance to review at the next joint meeting.

10. Parks and Recreation Liaison update

Pritchett reports that Rec & Parks Commission met last week, having not met since February last year. The item just discussed was on their agenda too. His fellow commissioners like art in the public parks, they are glad that David is willing to be the liaison. Updated them on the Space Whale. Reminded people that the other side of the plaza is also an art installation place.

11. Updates on ongoing projects

- a. Midtown Public Art – Update on lighting, they are supposed to get to this the first week of February. Also wants the Commission to think about the fact that the sculpture is in a roundabout. It's a small roundabout and there have already been cars that have gone through it. The sculpture has not been hit but Berner is going to talk to Public Works to see if it is possible to put up bollards or something to help keep cars from crashing through the ring and the sculpture. This is something we should be thinking about with future installations. Berner does not think that Public Works will pay for it and doesn't know the cost. Miller suggests doing some research on this and bringing it to the Public Art Committee. Engebritson asks about the directional signs—people posting about it blocking a nice picture. Is that something someone is looking into? Berner says we already had a conversation about that here. She reached out to Public Works about but they said there are strict regulations on where the signs go and how high they are placed, etc.
- b. Gates at Wingfield Amphitheater – almost completely installed. They look really great. The artist we worked with didn't seem to have much experience with this kind of project. There were some design flaws and the contractor had to fix some of that so it is costing a little more than anticipated. That may have to come from our budget.

12. Announcements not anticipated at notice date - none

13. Set date, time and agenda for the next meeting

February 22, 2021 at 4:00 pm

Agenda items: Ordinance/RMC section 2 article XI, strategic goals and possible retreat items.

Hatjakes mentions a year-in-review, might pertain more to the Community Engagement Committee. Miller says to put it on our next agenda.

- #### **14. General Public Comment**
- James Alder tried to make public comment but did not have access to a camera or microphone. He followed up in email “I did attempt to listen in on today's meeting but had to take a call that caused me to miss most of it. Then at the end I raised my hand to communicate through “chat” as my office pc does not have a camera or microphone. Apparently the “chat” part of zoom was not working..... In any event I had wanted to see what was happening with discussion of name change for the Newlands Park. My position is not in favor of any name change unless the majority of the Reno residents and or neighborhood residents want to make such a change. I do not want the City of Reno and associated government entities giving in to pressure from entities or groups from outside the City and or State. Because of the call I missed most of the discussion and do not know where that ended up.”

Staff followed up with him and explained the discussion at the meeting was only on a draft policy and process for renaming, not specific to Newlands.

15. Adjournment

Hatjakes made a motion to approve, seconded by Richardson. Meeting adjourned at 5:11 pm.

Date: September 15, 2020

To: Claudia Hanson, Office of the City Manager, City of Reno (*with permission for distribution*) **From:** Alicia Barber, PhD, Stories in Place LLC (alicia@storiesinplace.com)

Re: Proposed procedural requirements for naming and renaming public facilities

In reading the draft of “Procedural Requirements to Name or Rename City of Reno Facilities” including streets, parks, trails, buildings, and other facilities, I find a number of areas in which the draft as written lacks some critical safeguards to ensure community participation, fairness, and proper justification regarding the policies for renaming in particular. I will elaborate on these concerns and suggestions in the following pages, but in short, they include the following:

1. The policy regarding the renaming of streets should require a different process than that pertaining to buildings, parks, and other facilities. Specifically, any proposed street renaming should require approval by a majority of that street’s residents (at least 50%) and involve a different process of notification, since renaming streets impacts each affected resident personally, in a way that renaming other public facilities does not.
2. The applicant who is proposing that a public facility, street, etc. should be renamed should be required to provide justification for the proposed renaming along with the current requirements of providing a history of the current name and explanation of the proposed new name. As written, the burden of justifying the removal of a current name is placed solely on the naming/renaming committee rather than on the person or people suggesting the change.
3. There is a complete absence of any identified criteria that would warrant the renaming of a city parkland, trail, building, streets, or other public facility or an explanation of how those criteria would be applied. Without such criteria or required findings, the discussion of any renaming would not be based upon an accepted set of standards or specific series of questions to be considered and answered, leaving any name changes potentially open to charges of arbitrariness, political motivation, or favoritism.
4. The language of the policy has been changed from the original so that it no longer discourages renaming of public facilities and streets or indicates that names established through legal deeds cannot be changed. These changes are not appropriate, and the discouragement of renaming and the indication of the primacy of legal deeds should be reinstated.
5. The complete rewriting of this policy seems ill-conceived at a time when the City of Reno is suffering from a severe curtailing of public involvement and participation in governmental activities due to the regulations and restrictions required to ensure public safety during the COVID-19 pandemic. A policy like this would normally be the subject of open public workshops to ensure the broadest possible public awareness and participation in the formulation of a policy with the potential to impact every single resident of the City of Reno. There has been practically no notification regarding the ongoing revision of this policy, and the vast majority of residents are likely completely unaware that it is even under consideration. The process of revising this policy should be delayed until widespread public awareness and active participation in the policymaking process can be guaranteed.

1

1. The need for a separate process regarding the renaming of city streets vs. other facilities

When it comes to the potential renaming of a city street, the opinions of affected property owners deserve formal consideration and prioritization for a number of reasons. It would be difficult to think of a city policy that would literally hit home for more residents than the policy governing the naming and renaming of the streets where they live. The absence of special consideration for the residents of the street(s) in question would leave

affected property owners without a significant voice in decisions immediately impacting their homes, property, and potentially their livelihood.

It is critical that a street name change be supported by a majority of the property owners along that street in order to demonstrate that this change is desired by at least a simple majority of those most directly affected. This is vital not only to reflect buy-in from the community, but to acknowledge that changing one's address impacts multiple aspects of property ownership, in addition to the often longstanding and deeply-held ties of tradition, continuity, and history.

More directly and pragmatically, a permanent change to the name of one's street requires changes to legal paperwork including bank accounts, wills, trusts, deeds, and utilities, and countless other paperwork and agreements. In the case of commercial property owners, it can also necessitate changes to branding, licensing, advertisements, logistics, collateral, and more.

The requirement that a proposed name change be supported by a majority of that street's affected property owners is standard for most city policies of this nature. A quick Internet search produced the following policies, with the percentage of affected property owners required to rename a city street:

- In Mobile, Alabama, changing a street's name requires the approval of 90% of the property owners abutting the street:
<https://www.cityofmobile.org/uploads/200625031009Policytorenamestreets.pdf>
- In San Jose, California, the required approval for a street name change is 50% of property owners:
<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showdocument?id=12817>
- In Harrisonburg, Virginia, the requirements is for 51% of affected property owners to approve such a change:
<https://www.whsv.com/2020/07/15/harrisonburg-city-council-hears-new-naming-and-renaming-policy-for-city-spaces-and-facilities/>
- In St. Louis, Missouri, renaming a city street requires a petition to be signed by at least 51% of property owners: https://www.stlouis.mo.gov/government/departments/planning/documents/upload/StreetRenaming2018_Revision.pdf
- In Phoenix, Arizona, changing a recorded street name requires support from 75% of affected property owners. For a street impacting 12 or fewer properties, the approval must be 100%: https://www.phoenix.gov/pddsit/Docs/Trt/dsd_trt_pdf_00023.pdf

Not only are the residents of affected streets not given prioritized formal input in the policy draft currently under consideration by the City of Reno, but the notification process for any name changes as written doesn't make sense when it comes to streets.

2

The language in Section "D.g." currently requires the City of Reno to send a postcard to "all property owners within 750 feet of the subject site." While that measurement may make sense for a park, building, or other facility, it does not make sense for a street or thoroughfare, where its interpretation would be unclear. Would this require notifying residents of neighboring streets within 750 feet on either side of the affected street? What about the entire length of the street itself?

The required notice for the renaming of a street needs to be separated out from that regarding the renaming of a park, facility, or building, and the wording regarding streets should indicate that every resident who owns property abutting the affected street would be notified directly, in addition to requiring that a simple majority of them approve the change, as indicated above.

2. The need for the applicant to provide language justifying the removal of an existing name

In the current draft of this policy, section “C.d” the applicant is required to provide the history of how the existing name was established and explain the reasoning behind a proposed new name, but not to provide a justification for why the existing name should be removed. The implication seems to be that the reasons for renaming would be self-evident, when that is not necessarily the case. The justification to remove the original name is an important step that must also be a part of the original application.

The onus to justify a name change currently lies entirely on the naming/renaming committee. Sections “D.e.” and “D.f” indicate that the committee should solicit comments from the general public and those with knowledge of or expertise in local or state history, geography, or culture in order to formulate their recommendations to City Council, specifying that the committee is tasked with providing justification, explanation, and historical facts to recommend approval or denial of a name change.

While it is appropriate for this committee to consult with the community and relevant experts in formulating their recommendations, it should also be incumbent upon the applicant to provide a clearly stated justification for the removal of the original name, in order to provide the committee with better direction in how to evaluate those assertions and to ensure that the applicant has supplied ample argumentation to warrant the initiation of this process.

3. The need for clearly-stated and agreed-upon criteria that might warrant the removal of a name

The policy draft for renaming includes no language to indicate what might warrant the renaming of a street, park, trail, building, or other public facility. This is a major problem because the establishment of a process including various committees and avenues for input, leading to a City Council vote, but with no mention of required findings to guide such critical and impactful deliberations could threaten to leave the process open to charges of arbitrary or politically-motivated decision-making.

The requirement of consultation with historians and community members as referenced above is essential, and yet provides no direction for what questions that consultation would be attempting to address. Vague references to “consultation” can be open to significant interpretation if not accompanied by explicit direction to ensure that the consultation is both substantive and relevant. Both the committee, when formulating its recommendations, and the City Council, when considering a vote, need to be governed by standards to which everyone can refer, standard guidelines on which to base

3

their decisions. In other jurisdictions, the equivalent of a City Historian or Historical Resources Commission is tasked with the coordination of the required historical and place-based research to assist in this effort.

Other entities that have formulated policies for renaming buildings and other facilities have been explicit in delineating the factors that should be considered when taking on such a momentous decision. Stanford University, for instance, provides an excellent statement of principles regarding such matters: <https://campusnames.stanford.edu/renaming-principles/>. In terms of the names gracing city streets, parks, trails, buildings, and other public facilities, relevant factors should include the demonstrated harm and hardships caused by retaining the name and the potential harms and hardships of renaming.

If associated with a pattern or incident of offensive or morally repugnant behavior or beliefs by the named individual, relevant factors could include (as inspired by Stanford’s policies):

- The centrality of the person’s offensive behavior to his or her life and/or public persona as a whole.
 - The relation of the name to the history of the city and/or neighborhood.

- Community identification with and attachment to the name.
 - Perceived contemporary association of the name with the individual with whom it originates.
 - Strength and clarity of historical evidence regarding the name.
 - The city’s original and any subsequent consideration of the name and relevant issues.
- Possibilities for mitigation (through interpretation, programming, signage or other means) of any harm should the name be maintained.

4. Discouragement of renaming and reinstatement of language regarding primacy of deeds

The current policy draft has changed some of the original language that discouraged renaming in favor of stating in “H.a.” that “the renaming of any facility should be considered with much deliberation.” Such dilution of language is not appropriate for this policy. Indeed, renaming of any public facility including streets should rightfully be discouraged for the logistical, financial, and potentially political reasons discussed above, and only initiated under rare circumstances—another reason to explicitly lay out what factors might warrant such measures.

The discouragement of renaming of public streets and facilities is a common component of most relevant city policies, in order to hold such actions to the highest standards of justification and community benefit. Such language does not prevent any applicant from proposing a name change, but draws attention to the seriousness and widespread implications of such changes, which are not to be taken lightly.

The naming policy followed by the city of Mt. Pleasant, Michigan contains very effective language explaining why this is the case:

“The intent of naming is for permanent recognition. The renaming of parks and facilities is strongly discouraged. It is recommended that efforts to change a name be subject to the most crucial examination so as not to diminish the original justification for the name or discount the

value of the prior contributors. Parks named for subjects, other than individuals, may be changed in name only if the current name is ineffectual or inappropriate.”

<http://www.mt-pleasant.org/docs/board/policies/Park%20Naming%20Policy-Procedure.pdf>

4

The current policy draft also dilutes the language regarding the primacy of legal deeds, stating in “H.a.” that “Any facility named through deed restriction shall be reviewed on [a] case by case basis as all deeds are uniquely worded.” While it is clearly important for all deeds to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, it is also critical, for the sake of precedent and legal standing, to clearly state that public facilities explicitly named through a legal deed shall not be renamed.

Suggesting that such language is not legally binding could indicate to future donors of property that any names agreed upon by the City in a mutually accepted deed could be subject to future re-evaluation. The application of a mutually agreed-upon name to a public facility may in fact have been the sole reason for the donation of such property in the first place. Perhaps some rewording of this section could clarify what aspects of deed language would be considered legally binding and which would not.

As Stanford University’s renaming policy indicates, “Today’s decisions about naming and renaming may become controversial in the future. Thus, today’s decision makers should give the same respect to previous decision makers that they would like their decisions to be accorded in the future....The proper investigation of requests for renaming, and the possible responses (including physical alterations and mitigation efforts) require considerable time and effort, and should not be undertaken lightly.”

5. Timing of this renaming policy discussion

The current effort to substantially revise the City of Reno's naming and renaming policy for public facilities is occurring in the midst of a global pandemic unprecedented in living memory. There is no provision for live comment at government meetings, no opportunity for citizens to meet or stand face to-face with their elected representatives, no Neighborhood Advisory Board meetings, and a myriad of issues making the lives of citizens incredibly stressful and difficult. Many members of our community, including seniors and those without stable technological resources are particularly impacted by the disruption to regular forms of civic participation and communication.

And yet despite these circumstances, the process to revise this policy appears to be proceeding very quickly. A draft of this policy was reviewed by three city commissions in August of 2020 without substantial public notification or any live public comment, and a revised draft of that policy is currently being undertaken by those commissions separately, again with no live public comment, with their suggestions to be incorporated by city staff, and then forwarded to Reno City Council for a vote.

The timing and speed of this process is highly problematic. This is not the time to go about finalizing a policy with the potential to affect every single city resident, without substantial public notification and input. There is no reason to expedite this issue under these restrictive conditions.

The last thing the City of Reno should want is for residents who find themselves and their homes impacted by this policy to learn, only after it has been approved, that they could have played a role in its formulation. With that in mind, I urge you to either pause this process, or initiate a public awareness campaign to ensure that all Reno citizens have the ability to contribute their thoughts, as I have here.

5

PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS TO NAME OR RENAME

CITY OF RENO FACILITIES

A. Purpose

- a. To establish a formal process and procedure for naming City facilities including but not limited to parklands, trails, buildings, streets, and other facilities. Monuments and art work are not addressed in this policy.

B. Objectives

- a. Provide name identification for individual facilities.
- b. Provide for citizen input in the process of naming/renaming facilities.
- c. Provide adequate process for the naming of facilities by the City Council with appropriate recommendations and input.

C. Applications - Filing of application required.

- a. All requests to name or rename a City of Reno facility, including, but not limited to all streets, parks, buildings, and trails requires an application to be submitted to the Office of the City Manager. The application form shall be made available at www.reno.gov
- b. All applications shall include a contact person(s) that will be available to represent the proposal.
- c. The application fee shall be established through the City of Reno fee resolution.
- d. At a minimum, applications shall contain:
 - i. For renaming - the existing name of the facility and the history of how the name was established.
 - ii. The proposed name and a detailed explanation of the reasoning behind the proposed name.
 - iii. Financial analysis of what the name change will cost and the funding source. Applicants should coordinate with City staff on this portion to determine what costs would be

associated with the proposal. Cost should not be a determining factor in a proposal, but it could impact the implementation of any approved application.

e. Any person, group, or agency may propose a change in or the addition of any name of a City of Reno facility through submittal of the application process and the associated fee. D. Review

a. A committee shall meet when applications are received. The committee shall be comprised of one member from each of the following:

- i. Human Rights Commission
- ii. Historical Resources Commission
- iii. Recreation & Parks Commission
- iv. Arts & Culture Commission
- v. Public Works Department staff
- vi. Parks & Recreation Department staff
- vii. Office of the City Manager staff

b. Staff members will serve as advisors providing recommendations and comments while representing their respective departments and The City of Reno on a whole.

c. Each commission shall annually appoint a representative and one alternate for this purpose. An applicant shall not be a member of the committee. Should the applicant be the appointed committee member, the alternate shall serve in place.

d. It will be the responsibility of this committee to evaluate all proposals for changes in or additions to names of City facilities to assist in determining the most appropriate and acceptable names for use on signs, maps, and official documents.

e. The committee shall provide recommendations to City Council. Justification, explanation, and historical facts should accompany any recommendation which is forwarded to the City Council.

f. The committee shall, through outreach by City of Reno staff, solicit comments from the general public and those with knowledge of or expertise in local or state history, geography, or culture.

g. Renaming – When a request includes the renaming of a facility, notice shall be provided. This notice at a minimum shall include (1) postcards sent to all property owners within 750 feet of the subject site; (2) notice provided at www.reno.gov; and (3) posting of the notice on the subject site. All noticing shall take place a minimum of ten days prior to the second public meeting identified below.

h. The naming of new streets shall be decided through the Washoe County Street Naming Committee. The renaming of streets within the City of Reno shall follow the naming process outlined within this policy.

E. Public Involvement

a. The committee shall hold the first of three public meetings within 45 days of receipt of an application. This initial public meeting will be the presentation of the proposal, preliminary consideration of the proposal, and request for comments.

b. A second public meeting shall be held between 30 and 60 days following the initial meeting. This timeline may be extended by the City Manager or his/her designee. The purpose of this meeting shall be to receive public comment related to the proposal.

c. A third public meeting shall be held between 30 and 90 days following the second meeting. The purpose of the third public meeting is for the committee to discuss the proposal and public comments; and determine a final recommendation to City Council.

d. If a park or trail is the subject of a proposal, the Recreation and Parks Commission shall review the proposal and provide comments at one of their regular meetings a minimum of ten days prior to the third public meeting described in item “c” above.

e. Naming - When a proposal includes the original naming of a facility, the second public meeting is not required and the final committee meeting shall be held between 30 and 45 days following the initial meeting. If a park or trail is the subject of the naming proposal, the Recreation and Parks Commission shall review the proposal and provide comments at one of their regular meetings a minimum of ten days prior to the final committee meeting. F. City Council Decision

a. The recommendation of the committee shall be forwarded to the City Council within 30 days of the third public meeting.

- b. City Council may request additional information prior to any decision.
- c. City Council will make the final decision on the naming of any City facility.
- d. Whenever the City Council takes final action on a proposal, the City of Reno shall notify the person, group, or agency who submitted the proposal and anyone who submitted comments during the process, which were accompanied by a valid email address. The final decision shall also be published at www.reno.gov

G. Qualifying Names – It is the intent of these procedures to recommend names for the identification of City facilities to the City Council. These names should provide some form of individual identity related to:

- a. The geographic location of the facility;
- b. An outstanding feature of the facility;
- c. The adjoining subdivision or major street;
- d. Commonly recognized historical event, group, or individual;
- e. A concept which respects the past and present which has compelling community support;
- f. An individual or group who contributed significantly to the acquisition or development of the individual facility or provided a service in the interest of City facilities or services. It is strongly recommended that the name of any individual be considered posthumously. However, discretion may be given to consider a name of a living person under compelling circumstances.
- g. For an individual (excluding historically significant individuals) to be considered, that person must have contributed significantly to the acquisition or development of the park or facility or to the park system overall. A person providing volunteer work at a particular park would not typically be considered for naming unless the volunteer work was significant to the overall park system or the City as a whole.
- h. The naming or renaming of a facility from or to the name of an individual must be accompanied by a biographical sketch which shall provide evidence of the contributions to the facility or overall city facilities and services.
- i. Longevity in government service does not guarantee the naming of a facility after an individual.

H. Facility Renaming

- a. The renaming of any facility should be considered with much deliberation. Any facility named through deed restriction shall be reviewed on case by case basis as all deeds are uniquely worded.
- b. In order for a facility to be considered for renaming the following must occur:
 - i. The proposed name must qualify under this policy.
 - ii. The person, group, or agency proposing the name change shall enter into a written agreement with the City of Reno which outlines the responsibility of all costs associated with renaming including signage, brochures, publications, and administrative fees. City of Reno contribution to the associated costs may be approved by City Council but are not guaranteed. Timing of the changes may be delayed due to availability of funding.
- c. Consideration of a proposed renaming will be subject to the review process stated above.

I. Other Naming Alternatives

- a. Facilities that are donated to the City of Reno can be named by deed restriction by the donor. The naming and acceptance of land is subject to approval by the City Council per NRS.