

Please accept this as Public Comment (Agenda Item #3) re questions of compliance by the NV OHV Commission/Program of NAC 490.1435 and NAC 490.146, as applied to the 2 Carson City Prison Hill projects. Grantor: NV OHV Commission/Program. Grantee: NOHVCC, w/RecConnect as Contractor.

And a request for discussion of this (and action?) in a future NV OHV Commission meeting Agenda. Yes the Grants have been closed, but perhaps re-review could help education for the future NAC compliances — and possibly creative resolution of present contradictions on the ground with (IMHO) NAC expectations?

Sorry to submit this comment so late. If you cannot admit it as Public Comment (Agenda Item #3) on the 9/3/24 Agenda, please provide a copy to each Commissioner.

And, I hope you will consider it in your internal review and reorganization of the OHV Program.

I would appreciate a response to my questions — and/or being included in the discussion, as a Stakeholder who knows the Prison Hill OHV area ‘intimately’ -

per my on foot explorations, and dirt bike (and Roxor, VW Sand Bug, Jeep Cherokee and Dodge Ram) travels on ALL the trails (single and double track, and

Crawler Routes) and in ALL the Open Areas — and study of the NOHVCC Grant applications extensively — and literature related to ephemeral stream washes,

OHV erosion impacts, and Tread Lightly/NVORA/and Stay the Trail OHV ethics. Who among you reading this, has done the same?

The project is above and beyond well done. My question is with a few features that were included, that IMHO are not consistent with the Grant application

verbiage of goals/tenets for the project. Yes, there must be a ‘balance’ of protection of natural resources with protection of the recreational opportunities.

However, IMHO that implies compromise, not sacrifice. For the project to be the best it can be, compliant with the Grant application verbiage, upon which the

Commission approved the grant — the few contradictions, IMHO, should have been (and should still be) acknowledged and reviewed.

Several of you at this meeting, have been out on site visits with me — and have seen the few areas (boots on the ground) that I feel are not compliant with

the Grant as written. And, you have expressed concerns yourselves after seeing them. The Grants have been closed — but I feel they should be revisited,

with attention to compliances with NAC 490.1435 and NAC 490.146 (the former NACs for Grant #1, and the updated NACs per Grant #2).

Sadly, the Commissioners have not responded to my many requests to walk the property and visit the areas of the public's concern — despite this being possible to

coordinate, complying with OMLs. And the Program Manager has not been out with the public, since Spring 2020. However, the Commission and Program have

‘monitored’ ‘approved’ and ‘closed’ the Grant — per the mandated NACs?

As you are well aware, the Commission reviewed (exhaustively, many hours) the NACs, revised them, and changed them - as recorded in the R122-20, dated 9/28/22

(see attached below). As was explained to me by one of the Legislature departments, the R122-20 NACs are now the formal NACs for the OHV commission/program.

**I am requesting that in a future agenda item, you review:**

1) Compliance by the Commission/Program - specifically the monitoring/oversight (NAC 490.1435) and closure (NAC 490.146) of the first grant you awarded to

NOHVCC for the Prison Hill OHV area. That closure should have been done in a Commission meeting (Discussion and Action Agenda Item), approved by majority vote —

after discussion (during which certainly the public would have spoken). There are 'no responsive records' to the public records request for such a meeting, and

2). Compliance by the Program Manager, re the monitoring/oversight and closure of the second NOHVCC Grant - which was subject to the new NACs.

And along the way, you might look into NRS 338 — requiring (mandate) a Professional Engineer input in Grant Projects on public lands? (an Engineer/City Planner suggested this NRS should have been applied to the Prison Hill Grant from the get go).

My hope is that the review would acknowledge and include past and ongoing public comments. These comments describe several (only a few) features that were implemented in the project, that in our opinion, violate the verbiage in the Grant application regarding goals/mission statements (that the Commission approved unanimously) - 'protection of natural resources', 'protection of wildlife habitat', 'mitigation of erosion', 'repair of past damages' (with attention to fall line routes), 'promotion of responsible riding per Tread Lightly

principles', 'sustainability', etc. There was no mention of protection of hydrological resources — which IMO is paramount in our arid Great Basin environment. The comments of concern were made by members of the community, stakeholders in the project's grant-identified and implemented Working Group (w/NOHVCC Facilitator), and users of the OHV area. I would expect (IMHO) that the Grantor — in their mandated 'monitoring' and 'oversight' — would require compliance of the Grantee, with their application statements of intent for the project. Not just an automatic (in office) reimbursement of quarterly 'reports' which were basically just invoices for payment. Or based only on tours taken with the

City or NOHVCC, which (per one of the Administrators who went out with me) were '**very different**' from the tour he took with me.

The features of concern are few (4 features) and would be easily remedied (closed) now, by a appropriate signage and maybe a fence section or two. **They are NOT needed for connectivity or as a unique riding feature, and they violate (in the public's opinion) the above tenets/goals/language of the NOHVCC Grant.** It would not require any

more funds than what the City already has in grants, and in fact, they already have the signs and fencing up and ready to go — thanks to the recent generous RTP Grant

(specifically for signage/fencing I believe). Certainly, to address and resolve some of the inconsistencies with the proposed grant goals, would not require an outside

501c3 organization/a lot of money. The City has everything they need to address the issues, per current Grant funding (by RTP).

Thank you in advance for your consideration. The Legislature staff has advised me regarding the path towards resolution of NAC compliance questions, and I have followed their

recommendations — to this point in their stated hierarchy. I am hoping that the buck stops here, and there will be transparent discussion — and finally, resolution.

I look forward to communication, cooperation, collaboration... and resolution. So we can all move on.

Respectfully, and thank you for your time and consideration,

Robyn Orloff

NV taxpayer, OHV sticker/registrant, Stakeholder (neighbor and grateful user, of the Prison Hill OHV area),

and member of the 'de-functed' (by whom?) Grant recommended Working Group.