

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the May 16, 2005 Meeting
Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Open Space Advisory Committee was scheduled for 6:00 p.m. on Monday, May 16, 2005 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Steve Hartman
Vice Chairperson Dan Jacquet
Laura Bird
Michael Fischer
Wayne Perock
Howard Riedl
Bruce Scott

STAFF: Roger Moellendorf, Parks and Recreation Department Director
Juan Guzman, Open Space Manager
Vern Krahn, Park Planner
Lee Plemel, Principal Planner
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and is available for review during regular business hours.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL (1-0007) - Chairperson Hartman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. A quorum was present.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS (1-0010) - None.

1. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - March 28, 2005 (1-0011) - Member Bird moved to accept the minutes. Member Scott seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (1-0017) - None.

3. AGENDA ITEMS:

3-A. REVIEW AND ACTION TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE REGARDING THE MASTER PLAN LAND USE SCENARIOS (1-0019) - Mr. Plemel provided an overview of his presentation, and background information on the Citywide master plan and parks, recreation, and trails plan process. He referred to the agenda materials, and advised that staff and the consultants will be receiving public input over the next six weeks from community interest groups, advisory committees, and various other stakeholders. A presentation will be made to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors at a joint meeting on July 7th. Mr. Plemel advised that staff anticipates receiving direction from the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in order to narrow down the three alternative scenarios and begin developing a preferred land use plan. From that point, additional public input will be solicited.

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the May 16, 2005 Meeting
Page 2

Mr. Plemel reviewed the agenda materials pertinent to this item. He explained that more detailed land use had been added to the maps, but clarified that the maps were still relatively conceptual in nature and representative of how the various scenarios may appear in specific areas. He reviewed the survey which accompanied the overall plan and detail maps, and encouraged the Committee members and any citizen to complete one. He reviewed the locations at which the survey and maps were available.

Member Perock inquired as to methods for ensuring that surveys are being collected from Carson City residents only and that no one is able to submit multiple surveys. Mr. Plemel explained that submitting multiple surveys via the website is prevented in that only one survey will be accepted from each e-mail address. In terms of written surveys, he advised there is no mechanism to limit surveys to Carson City residents or to prevent multiple surveys from being submitted by one person. He explained that the survey results will not be statistically valid as opposed to the Opinion Survey sent by the Parks and Recreation Department. As the survey results are communicated, the method by which they were collected will be made known. Mr. Krahn explained the survey is another method to collect public comment, to test what the community is hearing.

In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised there is no intent to propose increased densities on isolated parcels which are not contiguous to other development, nor for parcels along the Carson River or in other parts of the community. He explained that the rural residential zone includes five-acre zoning as well as larger parcels up to 20+ acres. The key, as with some other land use designations, is in the details of the policy document and ensuring that, as it moves forward, policies are included as to which areas should be five acres and which should remain at the 20+-acre designation. Member Scott noted that all the scenarios anticipate higher density, urban development, and suggested that participation from staff with regard to urban open space will be important. He offered the Committee's assistance as well. He anticipates a lot of "back and forth with developers" at the staff level, and encouraged emphasizing the importance of urban open space. He suggested including, in the master plan process, ideas and goals for developers, and that this Committee may need to provide guidelines.

In response to a question, Mr. Krahn advised that the Opinion Survey had been out for 10-12 working days. Approximately 450 surveys have been returned to the Parks and Recreation Department. The goal is for 600 surveys to be returned in order to have statistical validation. Reminder postcards will be sent over the next couple days. Mr. Guzman advised that staff was hoping to have the survey results available for review by the Committee at this meeting. He noted there will be one more Committee meeting prior to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors joint meeting. Member Fischer commented that this is a philosophical thought process. He agreed that considering survey results may be of some value, but suggested the Open Space Program philosophy should order the decision-making process. Mr. Guzman clarified that the survey results would be intended for the Committee's information with regard to making a decision.

Mr. Guzman referred to the Question #1 Project matrix distributed to the Committee members and staff prior to the start of the meeting. He reviewed the effect of the proposed master plan designations on the listed projects. With regard to the Jarrard parcel, he noted that Scenario 3 changes the density to medium density residential. He suggested that, given the environmental constraints of the parcel, particularly the

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the May 16, 2005 Meeting
Page 3

flood zone, it will be very difficult to justify medium density residential over the majority or the entire parcel. He reviewed effects of the proposed master plan designations on various other parcels, and offered suggested revisions to the maps.

Chairperson Hartman commended staff on the agenda materials, and commented that the examples provided are helpful for people to understand the intent of the vision. Member Riedl agreed, and advised of having attended several of the public meetings. He commended staff on the method by which public input has been received and, in subsequent meetings, communicated back. He agreed with Member Scott's earlier comments in that many of the scenarios are unique from an urban open space perspective. He suggested that the planning development phase of the master plan will be key. He expressed the hope that the Committee's decision will provide the area the best economic and healthy environment.

Discussion took place regarding the open space designations on the maps. Vice Chairperson Jacquet suggested comparing the three alternative scenarios to the existing Open Space Master Plan element to determine significant deviations. He noted that the eastern portal area is incompatible with the Open Space Master Plan element. In response to a comment, Member Scott suggested determining a general scenario preference, together with specific elements which represent open space goals and priorities the Committee would like to have included in any scenario. Member Perock discussed the importance of considering the community's quality of life.

Chairperson Hartman expressed support for "scenario 1½." He discussed the importance of focused areas which more appropriately address everything from traffic to utility issues to improved development. He noted that redevelopment is critical, and expressed the opinion that, as the community moves forward and the bypass is completed, more attention should be focused on the downtown area. He agreed that urban open space becomes a very real issue. He advised that the redevelopment plan incorporated areas which might transition out of existing uses into potential open space or mixed use with open space. He noted the importance of economic activity to provide the funding to create the open space to preserve the quality of life. He expressed concern over the high level of employment spaces in Scenario 2 because of the affordable housing issue. Discussion ensued.

Member Bird expressed concern that Scenario 2 will result in the creation of redevelopment districts in various places other than the downtown area. Chairperson Hartman advised that the original redevelopment plan area included the downtown and an adjunct, potential phase 2 in the Empire area because it fit the classical definitions under the statute at the time. There were issues of water and sewer which needed to be addressed. Chairperson Hartman commented that redevelopment districts shouldn't be created because something "can't be done any other way."

With regard to earlier comments regarding population, Mr. Guzman advised that the intent is to keep the population cap relatively low for each one of the three alternative scenarios. It is assumed that because of water and sewer constraints, the maximum population cap will be 80,000 to 85,000 for each of the three scenarios as opposed to one scenario growing rampantly with more population. Mr. Plemel explained that,

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the May 16, 2005 Meeting
Page 4

in terms of a 20-year master plan, with current Carson City growth management and the existing 56,000

population, the 80,000 to 85,000 population cap is most likely a realistic range. In terms of water and sewer planning, the Utilities Department has projected 80,000 as a population cap. Mr. Plemel indicated that “it’s more a question of the shape of the City, what we want it to look like rather than how fast we want to grow.”

Member Bird referred to the Key Choices associated with Scenario 3, and commented there is a big difference in how the City will look between public conservation land use designations in Scenarios 1 and 2 and the block of low density residential on the east side of Deer Run Road. Mr. Plemel explained that the map depicts the area as an example. Other areas have tentatively been identified in the northern and southern parts of town. Mr. Guzman commented that the principle is the same.

Member Scott expressed support for the downtown emphasis. He expressed the opinion that it is critical, and suggested incentives, such as development bonuses, for parking, urban open space, connectivity, etc. He discussed two substantial economic engines, the first being the hospital and medical complex and the second State government. He discussed the importance of “sending the right message” and “fostering their ability to grow in a positive way.” He expressed the opinion there should not be any residential density proposed, other than very large lots, in places where infrastructure is not proposed.

Vice Chairperson Jacquet discussed the key focal points, over the years, of downtown redevelopment and development along the freeway. He suggested that the eastern portal concept is “something new on the horizon,” and expressed concern that it is “way ahead of the game.” He advised that the area north of Highway 50 in the eastern portal is identified in the Open Space Master Plan element and the BLM’s Land Use Plan as open space. He expressed a preference for focusing on “unknowns like development along the freeway and downtown redevelopment before we jump off into trying to compete with Lyon County for commercial interests.” He noted that the Open Space Master Plan element and the BLM Land Use Plan identify the area south of Highway 50 at the eastern portal for disposal and development. He advised that the alternative scenarios indicate both sides and the narrative describes a preference for north of Highway 50. Member Fischer expressed disagreement with Vice Chairperson Jacquet’s comments, and expressed concern with regard to development taking place just over the City’s eastern border. He commented that the City has “dropped the ball on the south end of town financially.” He expressed the hope that some analysis will be done with regard to the best place for manufacturing development. He suggested that the reason for Scenario 1 is because of a lack of funding for infrastructure.

Member Riedl moved that, in discussion and developing an alternate recommendation, the Committee no longer consider Scenario 3. Member Perock seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0. Member Riedl moved to adopt Scenario 1 for the downtown area. He responded to questions regarding the intent of his motion. He expressed the opinion that the downtown redevelopment area needs the emphasis provided by Scenario 1. Discussion took place with regard to procedural matters, and Chairperson Hartman called for a second on the pending motion. **Member Perock seconded the motion.**

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 5

Motion carried 7-0. (1-1051) In response to a question of clarification, the Committee members acknowledged the recommendation was not broadly, Citywide Scenario 1, but specifically for the downtown.

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 6

With regard to Scenario 2, Vice Chairperson Jacquet referred to the specific plan area boundary along the eastern portal. He suggested “something consistent” with the Open Space Master Plan element and existing federal land use planning. **Vice Chairperson Jacquet moved to promote the specific plan area for the area south and east of Highway 50, and recommend that the area north of Highway 50 remain as open space. Member Bird seconded the motion.** In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that the recommendation to shift the development to the other side and keep the open space would be supported. He indicated there was no specific reason for including development on the north side of Highway 50. Member Scott suggested the Committee may, at some point, need to consider giving up open space areas for development. Chairperson Hartman reiterated Vice Chairperson Jacquet’s comments that the area to the south of Highway 50 has been designated for potential disposal. The Open Space Master Plan element includes the gateway concept at all entries into the community. Chairperson Hartman noted that the Open Space Master Plan element and the BLM Land Use Plan are compatible with the community’s direction. Member Scott agreed, and commented on the importance of understanding there is some flexibility in some locations where change may be appropriate. Chairperson Hartman suggested the Committee is “resolute but probably not absolute.” He called for a vote on the pending motion; **motion carried 7-0.**

Member Fischer reviewed the effect of the Committee’s actions. He expressed the opinion that, based upon development of the Carson-Tahoe Regional Medical Center, “what’s going to happen around the Pinion Plaza, and what should happen around the other interchange near Colorado Street and at Highway 50 and 395,” those areas should be developed commercially. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel defined mixed-use commercial. **Member Fischer moved that, in Scenario 1½, the areas that need to follow the downtown Scenario 1 are the areas at the interchanges of the freeway.** In response to a question, Member Fischer explained that Scenario 1 includes a highly concentrated area of community regional and commercial, not so much mixed use. In those areas he previously referenced, Scenario 2 designates freeway entrance and exit ramps as mixed-use commercial. He expressed the opinion they should be somewhere in between; that those areas will be developed commercially “because it just makes sense.” He suggested that the existing area of the present hospital, in light of Scenario 1, may become a highly developed residential area. **Member Fischer restated his motion that the pattern of Scenario 1 should be followed with identification of the entrances to the freeway as commercial regional.** Member Bird noted that the College Parkway interchange will be significant with the Wal-Mart development. Member Perock suggested an amendment to include mixed-use activity centers. Member Riedl referred to the Highway 50 East activity depicted in Scenario 2. He recalled, at the May 9th workshop, that the area was particularly attractive in light of the amount of available developable space. He acknowledged that Highway 50 could be “very weighted toward community commercial and less so on mixed-use residential.” He expressed the opinion, however, that the area around Highway 50 will have a more diverse type of development. He expressed more of a preference toward Scenario 2 in the Highway 50 area. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that the Highway 50 area has a lot of potential to be different than it is today. Member Fischer reiterated that areas around the interchanges will be more commercial than residential. Chairperson Hartman noted that the areas are not precluded from being mostly commercial, but a residential component will be allowed. He expressed the understanding that, by 2020 or 2025, the Dayton corridor will have a population of 70,000. Taking the mixed-used activity centers principally out the Highway 50 corridor, some of the commercial will be captured but some residential will reduce the commute and pollution. Chairperson Hartman expressed a preference for mixed-use development because

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the May 16, 2005 Meeting
Page 7

the details will be refined once specific plans are presented to Planning and Community Development.

Member Scott expressed the opinion that development will be market driven, depending upon the perception of the need for mixed use or the need for straight commercial. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that mixed-use commercial would allow residential but not mandate it. In response to a question, Chairperson Hartman expressed the opinion that Scenario 1½ “in this particular component” is mixed-use commercial because it provides a potpourri of uses and, hopefully, decisions will be made based on design. He expressed the hope that design will become a greater and greater element of approval.

In response to a question, Chairperson Hartman advised that the new construction at Silver Oak Golf Course is residential and office. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that the commercial zoning district allows residential uses by special use permit. He further advised that development which is permitted by right is easier to finance and that more projects will most likely be proposed. Chairperson Hartman suggested that creating density bonuses based upon design components will result in even better product. The Committee members acknowledged a preference for mixed-use without the intense focus of activity centers which detract from downtown. Chairperson Hartman cautioned against creating enough carrots outside the downtown that developers “go out there instead of trying to retain history.” In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that the intensity of use in mixed-use activity centers would be a factor of their location. There may be a different focus on implementation strategies in that mixed-use activity centers are different than scattered mixed use. Incentives and Code revisions will be required to stimulate development “where you want it and like you want it.” Mr. Krahn suggested that the mixed-use activity centers will require a higher standard of landscape, architectural review, etc. to create living spaces where people want to spend time. Discussion took place with regard to the same.

Member Scott expressed the opinion that downtown is a “case by itself” with special and enhanced incentives to help bring it about as a much larger center. He suggested two or three other centers, the hospital being one. He expressed a preference for the quality of the City to be raised. He envisions the downtown area with a unique mixed-use emphasis, that some of the other mixed-use areas have incentives but not in the same way, and that the market will “sort things out” as demands are evaluated by developers. He expressed support for mixed use as an option, but expressed the opinion that the downtown area should be treated differently. **Member Fischer moved to recommend the mixed-use areas especially around the interchanges of the expressway, but don’t see any problem with them all the way out to the Lyon County line.** He expressed the opinion that the mixed-use development will take place at the freeway interchanges. Member Bird clarified that Scenario 2 will be considered for “everything except for downtown and what we haven’t excluded by the second motion that we made on this topic as far as Highway 50 is concerned on the northern part.” **Member Bird seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.**

In response to a question regarding the downtown area, Mr. Krahn advised that the Parks and Recreation Department will be considering more street frontage landscape, at a minimum, together with an events plaza. Another consideration will be improved connectivity to the downtown area. Mr. Moellendorf agreed, and commented that the Parks and Recreation Department response to Scenario 1 is making downtown public spaces more attractive. Member Perock noted the many residential areas on the west side

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 8

of town which either do not have sidewalks or have sidewalks in disrepair. He suggested improving pedestrian access in the downtown area. He inquired as to whether the City is doing anything to partner with the Brewery Arts Center. Mr. Plemel advised that Economic Development / Redevelopment Manager Joe McCarthy, former director of the Brewery Arts Center, is considering connections from the downtown to the area of the Brewery Arts Center. Mr. Krahn advised that a consultant has been hired to develop a pedestrian plan which will eventually be part of the City's Unified Trails Plan. Member Fischer discussed the importance of a mass transit system.

Mr. Guzman noted the Open Space Master Plan element emphasis to protect the River corridor from development, protect the hillsides and scenic views, and protect irrigated pasture lands. Mr. Plemel acknowledged that the rural residential zoning designation assigned to those areas named by Mr. Guzman is appropriate for the master plan. He explained that the rural residential zoning designation does not include a range. As the master plan policies are developed, he advised of the need to ensure that the rural residential zoned areas are identified for the lowest densities. Member Scott discussed the need to be "sure and clear" that this Committee is making a recommendation that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will understand relates to open space, as well as other areas that relate to the ability to allow for growth and to improve the community's quality of life while, at the same time, not adversely impacting open space. He suggested requesting Mr. Guzman to work with Mr. Plemel or Mr. Krahn to ensure that the summary recommendation from this meeting is consistent and to review the same prior to it being submitted to the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors. Chairperson Hartman agreed, and requested staff to present the summary at the next Committee meeting. He thanked Mr. Plemel and Mr. Krahn for their participation.

3-B. STATUS REPORT REGARDING TIMBER SALVAGE OPERATIONS AT THE WATERFALL FIRE (1-1720) - Mr. Guzman narrated a slide presentation of the timber salvage operation taken during a recent helicopter tour. He reviewed a list of helicopter tour participants. He responded to questions, and discussion took place, regarding the general quality of the timber. Member Perock commented that the helicopter tour was very informational. He expressed concern regarding the marketability of the trees which the U.S. Forest Service will remove, and that there will be many hazardous trees left on the hillsides which will keep the community from accessing the area. He commended the City's efforts, and congratulated Mr. Guzman and all those involved in the timber salvage operation. Chairperson Hartman agreed, and commended Mr. Guzman, UNR Cooperative Extension Educator JoAnne Skelly, NDF State Forester / Fire Warden Pete Anderson, and RCI Consultant John McLain. He commented on how fortunate the City is to have worked with these individuals. He discussed the need to revise emergency procedures following a fire in order to apply seed within the designated disaster relief period.

Member Scott suggested agendaizing for the autumn Committee meetings discussion regarding the hillsides. He advised that the USFS is grazing sheep in southwest Reno to take care of the cheat grass while it's still palatable. He expressed a preference for having C-Hill and some of the interface areas grazed next year about this time, and to be set with the preliminary requirements so that it is not prevented due to approvals or considerations. He discussed the importance of being proactive in continuing to manage these areas. Chairperson Hartman suggested getting a permit attached to the City property. Mr. Guzman distributed

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the May 16, 2005 Meeting
Page 9

information on the fuels reduction project in the wildland urban interface area west of Reno. Member Scott noted there are not many sheep available in the area, and that shepherds should be scheduled early.

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 16, 2005 Meeting

Page 10

Mr. Guzman narrated additional slides taken during the helicopter tour. In response to a question, he advised that the drill seeded areas do not have a lot of invasive species. Most of the invasive species are growing along the road edges. RCI is preparing a management plan proposal to address invasive species as well as continued monitoring of the seeded areas. Mr. Guzman advised of receiving a number of calls from people interested in harvesting wood for personal uses. These requests are being considered. Mr. Guzman advised that 1,000 trees were recently planted, as part of a Boy Scout project, in a 55-acre area owned by the City. He further advised that the last of the drill seeding was accomplished last week by NDF Forester Jason Perock. Ms. Skelly continues to coordinate volunteers, and Mr. Guzman advised that the 1,000 trees planted on the 55-acre parcel will be marked by flags and that arrangements are being made to carry water to the trees. He advised that the USFS was very cooperative in allowing access through their land, and that the involved agencies are continuing to work together. He reported that the riparian area treatments are ready to begin and will be coordinated by NDF Forester Gail Durham. He advised that most of the loggers are gone. Once the USFS contract is in place, there will again be an opportunity to consider other areas.

3-C. STATUS REPORT REGARDING THE HORSE CREEK RANCH ACQUISITION (1-2245) - Mr. Guzman reviewed the staff report.

3-D. STATUS REPORT REGARDING APPLICATIONS FOR STATE BOND QUESTION #1, ROUNDS 1 AND 2 (1-2262) - Mr. Guzman reviewed the staff report and the agenda materials pertinent to this item. He hopes to move forward with the acquisitions as soon as possible. He advised that the Anderson project will most likely not go forward since Mr. Anderson is considering sale of his property to a private developer. He further advised that Mr. Bently is no longer a willing seller. Mr. Bently's attorney has indicated there is no fear of development. Mr. Guzman is beginning discussions with John Serpa regarding his properties at the Carson River and on the west side of town. Member Scott commended Mr. Guzman on getting the funding, and expressed appreciation for the Question #1 program.

4. NON-ACTION ITEMS:

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS (1-2322) - Member Perock discussed canoe trails along the River, and expressed an interest in some consideration of these opportunities. Mr. Guzman offered to request Mr. Krahn to provide a tour of these facilities and to discuss plans for future facilities. Mr. Moellendorf discussed the Whitewater Festival in Reno, and advised that Gary Lacey, a whitewater facility designer, will be visiting Nevada in the near future. Parks and Recreation Department staff will visit the Carson River with Mr. Lacey to consider possible facilities. Member Scott suggested that Member Perock serve as this Committee's liaison to the Carson River Advisory Committee ("CRAC"). Mr. Guzman agreed to provide Member Perock the CRAC agendas.

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM STAFF (1-2458) - Mr. Guzman reported that he represented the City at the Carson Valley Subconservancy District meeting. The Board of Supervisors approved the Committee's recommendation to sell the Bernhard property. Parks and Recreation Department staff assisted Boy Scout Mike Otterstrom with his project to organize volunteers to plant 1,000 seedlings at a 55-acre parcel of land owned by the City near Lakeview. Mr. Guzman reported having

CARSON CITY OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the May 16, 2005 Meeting
Page 11

attended the numerous master plan meetings, and of having conducted a number of tours of the timber salvage area. He further reported having assisted Washoe County with interviews for an environmental officer. He is continuing discussions with Development Services regarding purchase of a vehicle to use in fire situations. He advised of having attended the May 10th CRAC meeting. He will be attending the State Land Use Advisory Committee meeting on Thursday, May 19th.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS - Previously covered.

5. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (1-2522) - Member Fischer moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 p.m. Member Scott seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

The Minutes of the May 16, 2005 meeting of the Carson City Open Space Advisory Committee are so approved this 18th day of July, 2005.

STEPHEN D. HARTMAN, Chair