

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the Special January 6, 2005, Joint Meeting with the
Carson City Board of Supervisors - Page 1

A special meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was held on Thursday, January 6, 2005, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, during the regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Board of Supervisors session that began at 8:30 a.m.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairperson John Peery, Vice Chairperson Mark Kimbrough, and Commissioners Craig Mullet, Roger Sedway, Roy Semmens, Steve Reynolds, and William Vance

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Marv Teixeira, Supervisor Ward 1 Robin Williamson, Supervisor Ward 2 Shelly Aldean, Supervisor Ward 3 Pete Livermore, Supervisor Ward 4 Richard S. Staub

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager Linda Ritter, Development Services Director Andrew Burnham, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Chief Deputy District Attorney Mark Forsberg, Principal Planner Lee Plemel, Parks Planner Verne Krahn, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (B.O.S. 1/6/05 Tape 2-0007)

JOINT MEETING WITH THE CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION - STATUS REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON "ENVISION CARSON CITY," THE COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN AND PARKS, RECREATION AND TRAILS PLAN, AND MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO INCLUDING POSSIBLE DIRECTION TO STAFF FOR THE NEXT PHASE OF THE MASTER PLAN PROCESS (2-0007) - Principal Planner Lee Plemel; Consultants Jeff Winston of Winston and Associates, Ben Herman and Darcey White with Clarion Associates; Dwight Millard, James Parker - Mayor Teixeira reconvened the Board of Supervisors session at 1:30 p.m. (The entire Board was present, constituting a quorum.) Chairperson Peery convened the Planning Commission session by indicating that the entire Commission was present, constituting a quorum.

Mr. Plemel began his introduction by welcoming the Board, Commission and audience. He introduced Messrs. White and Winston and explained their roles. The purpose of the meeting and a listing of the documents contained in the Board packet were limned. Public Works Operations Manager Tom Hoffert's updated informational sheet was distributed to the Board, Commission, and Clerk. (A copy is in the file.) All of the materials are allegedly available online. The website address was listed.

Mr. Herman explained that the task just completed had developed a snapshot of the City. The second phase envisions how Carson City will look in the future. The third phase is the road map to reach that plan. The website is up and running and being added to on a weekly basis. The public was encouraged to continue to visit and use the site. Ten "snapshot" reports indicate the City's current status. The first round of neighborhood meetings have been completed. The purpose of the meetings was limned. He felt that it was a successful effort and that the feedback was positive. The attendance was described. Individuals who do not normally attend were present. Twelve focus groups had met and discussed the Parks and Recreation element. A trails workshop was conducted. A map illustrating their ideas was displayed. A map used to illustrate the development capacity was described. They had used the current land use zoning to develop it. Future amendments to it will change the capacity. No assumptions had been made regarding releases of the public land owned by the BLM and the Forest Service. The development capacity analysis tables were then

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the Special January 6, 2005, Joint Meeting with the
Carson City Board of Supervisors - Page 2

highlighted. Mayor Teixeira pointed out that his information matches that which the Board/City had been using for many years—a development potential of 75,000. Mr. Herman indicated that his buildout estimate was lower as they had used 2.5 people per household which established a total buildout population of 69,000. Clarification indicated that a small residential component had been included in the commercial areas. Discussion explained the limiting factors involved with topography and infrastructure which will prevent some of the zoning potential from being developed as envisioned. A correction was made to Footnote 2 on the packet's Page 10 to read: Residential development potential reduced by 15% to allow for development inefficiencies. Mr. Herman explained the tables. His explanation also noted that nationwide projections indicate that the City's growth rate will be 1.5%. The State Demographer's estimate is at a 0.8% rate. The City will reach its buildout in ten years if the national projections are used. Mr. Herman felt that the City's job growth would grow at two times the population rate due to the number of individuals who live outside the City and work in the City. This will require additional streets and road improvements. Issues related to this included: where will new development occur; the land uses; the funding source for parks, recreational facilities, roads, etc.; and how will redevelopment in the downtown area occur. Discussion pointed out the need for additional low income housing; the rapid residential growth in the surrounding counties; the impact of this growth on City resources and facilities; and the City's commercial development opportunities and challenges. This stage of the planning process develops more questions than answers. Chairperson Peery felt that there will be a refocusing of uses as there is a limited amount of land available for development. Redevelopment programs may assist with this refocusing.

Mr. Winston explained that few areas have actually reached buildout. Boca Raton, Florida, was cited as an example of such a community. It now emphasizes redevelopment. Planning allows for better development of the community. The community is interested in that development. A comprehensive master plan allows for orderly, rational development to occur which meets the quality of life standard desired while providing economic development and competition necessary to sustain the community. Mayor Teixeira explained that the City cannot annex additional land for growth as it is a consolidated municipality. He also pointed out that the City is acquiring open space which will make it hard to acquire federal land. Discussion ensued on the possibility of having federal land along the eastern portal opened for development and the recent acquisition of the Horse Creek Ranch for open space as part of the viewshed. The community may want to maintain the federal land for open space. This question will not be solved today. The consultants acknowledged the need to focus on this issue and develop a balance between the needs and desires. Supervisor Williamson felt that this was part of the City's uniqueness. The residents want it all. This is the reason for developing a comprehensive master plan. It will allow them to maintain the historical resources, provide a variety of housing options, and not be a "cookie cutter". She suggested that work force housing and high end housing with lovely views be mixed to allow everyone to benefit from the uses. Supervisor Aldean felt that the City's growth rate had slowed down after 20 years of fast growth. She suggested that some Federal land which is easier to reach should be allowed to be developed without the current prolonged acquisition process now required. Mr. Herman explained that they had met with BLM on this topic. The community needs to sort out its desires and then discuss a potential exchange with them. He felt that BLM will support the community's decision.

Commissioner Kimbrough explained his employment history and expressed his belief that BLM is easier to work with than the Forest Service. He pointed out the large group of open space supporters in the community and the disagreements regarding what sites should be developed. He felt that there are BLM sites which could potentially be developed. Mr. Herman agreed and indicated that BLM has some maps delineating areas

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the Special January 6, 2005, Joint Meeting with the
Carson City Board of Supervisors - Page 3

which “may be on the table”. These will be discussed later. The current phase of the project looks only at the status quo. Commissioner Kimbrough felt that Northern Nevada needs its own Federal land buyout program similar to Clark County’s program.

Mr. Herman indicated that the neighborhood meetings had indicated that the community has a lot of pride in being the capitol city and its appearance. Concerns voiced at the meeting were about the downtown area and its future and the loss of the rural area in the southeastern section of the community.

Mr. Winston then described the City’s park statistics; the need for an additional trails and a regional park; and the lack of small neighborhood parks. A community-wide survey will be conducted in February to probe these areas for better feedback. Discussion between the Board and Mr. Winston questioned the validity of such a survey and its accuracy. Problems Mr. Winston had observed with telephone surveys were noted. He expressed an intent to work with Cooperative Extension in developing the survey. Supervisor Aldean pointed out that the City’s senior population is exploding. These individuals benefit from small neighborhood parks as they are unable to walk distances. Horse Creek Ranch will be used by young people for this reason. She encouraged him to direct his survey to different segments of the populations; otherwise, it will provide biased results. Mr. Winston agreed and explained how the demographic questions could be written to provide a better report. Discussion also indicated that seniors may not respond if the demographics appear to be slanted. It was felt that the City’s surveys have been answered primarily by female senior citizens. The need to develop a process to reach the community’s Hispanic residents was emphasized. Mr. Winston explained the effort to contact the Hispanic sports groups of the community and the success of that focused effort. It had provided a very interesting prospective. He planned to have a focus outreach and agreed that a random sample would not obtain a response from the Hispanic community. The current and projected growth in Hispanic soccer was cited to illustrate the need for their participation. He also pointed out the current use of vacant lots and the impact infill will have their availability for recreational uses. City staff has also done a great job of maximizing the use of recreational facilities which includes school facilities. Some City programs now have waiting lists. Question 18 funds will be used to build another gym. He also urged the City to study the need for other recreational facilities. He felt that the City could use two or three more gyms. Infill at the Com-munity Center could provide for efficient additional facilities.

Mr. Herman asked for comments from the Board and Commission regarding alternatives which they should look at beyond BLM and open development. Chairperson Peery indicated that special planning areas should include recreation development even though it will impact the developers’ profitability. Justification for the requirement was indicated. Supervisor Livermore indicated a need to plan the freeway corridor, to provide new hotels, and to provide methods for recycling the hotel/motel stock. Mr. Herman agreed that growth in new areas will create new opportunities and shift competition. The motels on South Carson Street were cited as an example of how changing markets and traffic patterns could be impacted in the future. Supervisor Livermore explained that they are used as weekly/monthly rentals in the wintertime. He questioned their future and the impact their loss could have on the current users. Supervisor Aldean felt that another view is for the motels to become condos. The downtown area is a separate community with integrated uses. Elimination of traffic in the downtown area may provide a tremendous opportunity for it. She also urged consideration of the displaced persons issues.

Discussion indicated that they had not studied the freeway’s impact. The current mapping illustrated the corridor across Lompa’s property as being medium residential. This use may not occur. This will reduce the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the Special January 6, 2005, Joint Meeting with the
Carson City Board of Supervisors - Page 4

number of future housing units in the community. Commissioner Reynolds pointed out that the freeway may create neighborhood communities who will use one park over another. He also indicated that retail development is now occurring on the southern end of the community while the northern end will be medical and the eastern commercial. He questioned whether the community will be better served with a swimming pool at Centennial or one in the southern area of the community. Mr. Winston agreed that an analysis of the location needed to be made.

Supervisor Staub pointed out the need for a buffer between the residential uses and the freeway. The residential objection to the Walmart site was noted to illustrate the need to balance highest and best uses against residential and commercial uses. He also suggested that they analyze how buildout without the BLM land for residential development could occur. The southeast corridor was cited as an example of an area which is surrounded by BLM property. He questioned the reasons for BLM's desire to have the City determine what area(s) should be developed. He felt that BLM has already determined what areas should be disposed of and the property's value. Commissioner Semmens suggested that they include the BLM property above Goni Road in this analysis. Discussion indicated a need for every City map to include the V&T Railroad line and for the study to include its impact on the community. Commissioner Kimbrough suggested that the Prison be contacted and its plans for the property be determined. The City's plans for the Corporate Yard should also be analyzed. Commissioner Reynolds pointed out that the freeway could create relocation of commercial development that would allow some nice facilities to be developed. Consideration should also be given to the location of the access/egress points for those buildings. He also felt that the Planning Commission is concerned about the effect and rules that will be in place in when the freeway opens. Mr. Herman concurred and indicated that the study will include the corridors, freeway, and the Highway 50 and 395 gateways. He pointed out issues the freeway will create and its impact on transportation, orientation, etc. Mayor Teixeira explained the need to analyze how the freeway development and interchanges should occur, the changes that will occur along Highway 50, etc., so that the freeway is a positive addition rather than a detriment to the area it abuts. The freeway should be completed by 2010 or 2012 at the least. The tourists' viewshed should be developed correctly. Mr. Herman concurred with the need to ensure that the development is orderly and fashionable. The first project must be done correctly and maintained by those that follow. Mayor Teixeira suggested that the Commission tour the freeway route and urged the Commissioners to keep its view in mind when the Walmart project is presented to avoid a large black roof. The cost of improving its appearance will maintain a vista desired by the community.

Supervisor Livermore encouraged them to study the commercial zones and where and how many utility substations are needed to meet the community's need. His believed that substations for growth in surrounding counties are being constructed in Carson City. He questioned how much of such uses should be allowed; whether undergrounded transmission lines should be required; the proper location for utility corridors; etc.

Chairperson Peery supported Mayor Teixeira's comments regarding the vistas. Mayor Teixeira suggested that City Manager Ritter provide the Commission with an opportunity to tour the freeway site. Additional comments were solicited.

Mr. Plemel explained the location of the four special planning areas (spa) and the status of the racetrack spa. He also indicated that additional work on them is needed and that they would not be discussed today. Mr. Herman indicated that some policies are being developed for the Vicee Creek, the downtown, the Brown Street, and the eastern portal spas. Some neighborhood meetings have been held on these spas. Public

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the Special January 6, 2005, Joint Meeting with the
Carson City Board of Supervisors - Page 5

comments were solicited.

Discussion indicated that the water rights and infrastructure needs are being considered by City staff for a population growth of 80,000 to 90,000. Additional water rights will be needed. Staff is in the "response mode" at this time. Mayor Teixeira felt that this growth level should be a parameter to work within rather than being established as a footprint of how to get there. He did not believe that the community would shoulder the development necessary to reach that capacity. Natural resources will restrict the population. The City is currently at 80% of its sewer capacity. Effluent storage creates a battle with the Feds even though the City is putting more clean water in the river than the river itself has. Mr. Plemel concurred and explained that the alternative may be to not allow additional growth until additional resources are found. Supervisor Livermore pointed out the Subconservancy's regional plan which would transport water to Lyon County through Carson City. Commissioner Semmens explained the Commission's request that Sierra Pacific develop and submit a master plan for its utilities. Supervisor Livermore explained his desire to have its master plan considered with the City's master plan.

(2-1490) Mr. Millard expressed his appreciation for Mr. Russell's placement of powerlines underground at his development. Sierra Pacific had made the poles taller and bigger along Carson City's freeway route. He then indicated that he was commenting as a member of the Convention and Visitors Bureau rather than as a developer. As the City becomes more tourist oriented, the V&T railway should be a large red line with planned housing, parking, and an arterial right-of-way. This should allow the tourist to get from A to B in the community. A corridor traffic and tourist housing studies are required.

Mr. Parker also felt that maps are a necessity. He supported the idea of a spa for the eastern portal. This will allow them to avoid eminent domain under Redevelopment, reappropriation of tax funds, and sensitivity issues. The principles he had worked with to develop a spa for the area were then explained. Hannafin Darney Architects have developed a map starting at Deer Run Road and ending at the County Line containing some suggested land use ideas. The topography makes it important that the area be developed as one unit. He also suggested that a southern Highway 50 route be developed. An informal group of land owners are meeting on the concept. He felt that they supported the plan. It could be a jewel for the City. This transformation would not take a great deal of time to accomplish. Additional public comments were solicited but none were given.

Mayor Teixeira felt that the community has a sense of whom it is and where it is going. The final project may be applauded by 95 percent of the community. Mr. Herman stressed that the plan should be the community's and not the consultants. He then indicated that the next task order is to consider the alternatives. A second round of workshops will commence in February. Mayor Teixeira indicated that, once the recommendations are established, a second joint meeting should be conducted. The necessity of having a harmonious presentation was indicated. Mr. Herman agreed to having another meeting at that time.

Commissioner Sedway asked for a timeline indicating key dates for meetings. Commissioner Mullet urged the Board/Consultants to change their terminology when discussing the freeway. Justification for not using words like bypass was provided. He also suggested that negative terms like "dump hill" be eliminated. The downtown improvements should not be bypassed by tourists. Supervisor Livermore pointed out that in the future the freeway will be called the 580 freeway.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the Special January 6, 2005, Joint Meeting with the
Carson City Board of Supervisors - Page 6

Mayor Teixeira justified his reasons for wanting to have meetings throughout the process rather than have a stalemate at the end of the process. Both Mr. Herman and the Commission agreed.

Supervisor Livermore complimented Messrs. Krahn and Plemel on their efforts to develop the program and their communication skills. He felt that they were talented and worked well together.

There being no other matters for consideration by the Planning Commission, Commissioner Mullet moved to adjourn. Commissioners Reynolds and Semmens seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0. Chairperson Peery adjourned the Commission at 3:18 p.m.

A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's office. This tape is available for review and inspection during normal business hours.

The Minutes of the Special January 6, 2005, Joint Meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission and the Carson City Board of Supervisors

ARE SO APPROVED ON January 26, 2005.

/s/
John Peery, Chairperson