A special workshop meeting was scheduled for the Carson City Regional Planning Commission and the Growth Management Commission on Tuesday, October 1, 1996, at the Administrative Complex Conference Room, 2621 Northgate lane, Suite 59, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 6 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Alan Rogers and Commissioners Allan Christianson, Archie Pozzi, and Deborah Uhart

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager John Berkich, Sheriff Rod Banister, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Finance Director Mary Walker, Fire Chief Louis Buckley, Public Works Director Jay Aldean, Utilities Director Dorothy Timian-Palmer, Health Officer Daren Winkelman, Chief Deputy Sheriff Bill Callahan, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (S.P.C. 10/1/96 Tape 1-0001.5)

OTHERS PRESENT: BLM Representative David Loomis, Ron Kipp, Maxine Nietz, Dick Murray, Larry Walsh, Lee Pisiewski, Barry Smith, Steve Hartman, and Ken Dorr

A. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM - Chairperson Rogers convened the meeting at 6:04 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Commissioners Horton, Mally and Wipfli were absent.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None.

C. WORKSHOP - 1. DEFINE WHAT GROWTH IS; 2. CITY DEPARTMENTS AND GROWTH; 3. URBAN CONTAINMENT; 4. QUALITY OF LIFE; 5. GROWTH MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE/RESOLUTION; AND 6. SPECIAL GUEST TOPICS (1-0017.5) - Chairperson Rogers briefly reviewed the purpose of the workshop. The topics he had listed with each agenda heading had been taken from the previous meetings/discussions on Growth Management. This list could be expanded to include any other issues which are deemed appropriate. As the proposal will develop a long-term plan for the City, he emphasized that the process would be lengthy and time consuming. He did not feel that it was critical for everyone to attend each and every meeting. He hoped that, if an agenda is established, the participants would be able to pick and chose between the topics so that attendance could be maximized. It would not be absolutely critical for everyone to attend all the meetings, however, regular attendance was encouraged for continuity. It may be necessary to provide a brief synopsis at each meeting or, at the very least, at the final meeting.

(1-0124.5) Mr. Murray commended the Commissions on their willingness to open the process to the community. He did not believe that any other community had done this. He cautioned against taking too long to complete the process as he felt that the door was already opened and the work could be naught. Chairperson Rogers explained that he meant that there would have to be more than one meeting a month. This will necessitate scheduling meetings without consulting all of the participants. Meetings will no longer be scheduled when the majority of the participants can attend. The month-and-a-half delay between this meeting and the last had been due to this scheduling problem. Meeting dates will be discussed later.

Chairperson Rogers then explained his reasons for feeling that additional information was needed before any changes are seriously considered. Under this process he suggested that outside professionals be contacted to discuss the impact issues, specifically, Item 6. Mr. Berkich had suggested that the Commission(s) consider the long-term viability of the community and its ability to be a sustainable community. Various professionals and topic issues were noted. Discussion ensued on the type of information desired and the correct individual to provide information concerning the City's tax revenue. Mr. Hartman suggested the discussion include a detailed description of the SCCRT and its allocation process. Ms. Walker agreed that she could provide this information and explained her reasons for feeling that the State could not adequately provide the information needed by the Commission(s). The State does forecast revenue treads, however, they are on a two year cycle which may not be realistic for all of the Counties/Cities. Local governments have better projections. Discussion ensued on the figures provided by the State demographer. Mr. Sullivan felt that the State demographer's recent projections were more realistic than the City had been able to establish. Mr. Berkich explained his personal contact with the State demographer on the process which supported Mr. Sullivan's contention. Discussion indicated the desire to have him make a presentation. Chairperson Rogers indicated that the speakers were not limited and supported having contrasting views. Ms. Nietz suggested the Chamber/Retail Association of Nevada be contacted to provide information concerning the impact which would be created by the Bypass. Chairperson Rogers explained his plan to have the Chamber indicate the topics for which it wished to provide speakers or to offer recommendations on speakers. He planned to commence contacting individuals/groups concerning the topics as soon as possible. Commissioner Uhart suggested high tech and hospital professionals be included. Chairperson Rogers felt that the high tech group was included in the manufacturing group. Under this topic he suggested four speakers be allocated one-half hour to explain their field rather than just one speaker. Mr. Murray recommended the business contacts be expanded beyond the Chamber of Commerce. Chairperson Rogers agreed and indicated businesses which are not a member of the Chamber would also be contacted. Mr. Hartman felt that State Government should be considered due to its impact on the City's growth. Discussion pointed out several issues which retailers consider when they locate in an area and the impacts such facilities have on the City and its resources, i.e., Super K's customer base requirement of 200,000 and the traffic volume this creates. Mr. Berkich felt that the State demographer could provide statistics on the daytime population. He then explained a Truckee Meadows study on quality of life and suggested the Regional Director of the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning staff give a presentation on this topic. Mr. Hartman urged the Commission(s) to consider the positive sides to growth, i.e., increased ad valorem rates, downtown revitalization, increased number of business and jobs, etc. Mr. Berkich pointed out the positive impacts created by having large retailers. This causes the City to have a sustained sales tax base which lowers the City's property tax. Commissioner Uhart recommended having as many of the meetings in the Sierra Room as possible so that the meetings could be televised. This would help educate the public and may eliminate some of the negative comments when the final project is presented for adoption. Chairperson Rogers explained the scheduling problems with the Sierra Room. He suggested that CAT-10 be contacted and hopefully they will arrange their schedule to accommodate the meetings. Discussion supported having a recap on the workshops at each regular Regional Planning Commission meeting. Chairperson Rogers explained the commitment made to the Board of Supervisors to have a recommendation ready for the next Growth Management allocation meeting, which would be March.

Mr. Murray suggested the retail leakage study be considered. Purportedly, a study indicates that when Walmart locates in an area, 25 percent of the retail businesses disappear. A new retail leakage study could determine the impacts created by Walmart and Super K. Comments indicated UNR had already conducted this study.

Clarification indicated that there will be guest speakers, discussion on the topics, and reconsideration of items 1 through 5 as deemed appropriate. UNR had been discussed in a number of areas. Ms. Nietz suggested WNCC also be contacted as it may have some of the information. The pros and cons of having a student write a thesis on the impacts were discussed. Mr. Hartman felt that the revisions should not be released before June 15. Chairperson Rogers felt that the students could be involved with surveys. This could lead into a thesis, however, the program could not be delayed for the student. His list of topics/guest speakers was expanded to include State Government representatives--including Capitol Complex plans; gaming; retail; NDOT--Bypass and its development plan; Truckee Meadows Regional Planning--quality of life; hospitals; senior care facilities; multi-family versus single family--which may be under the housing element; (1-0712.5) use of the Chamber as a source of speakers; population projection included water planners; and growth management techniques and ordinances experts.

(1-0685.5) Chairperson Rogers explained the program which is considering the housing element and is on a parallel track to the Growth Management element. He felt that the housing element would be considered in May or June. Discussion considered whether the Commission(s) needed this information prior to that time. Chairperson Rogers suggested this group make a presentation to the Commission(s) on the program and its revisions. The consultant selection process was explained.

(1-0737.5) Mr. Hartman indicated the list of topics and speakers would take a great deal of time to complete. He cautioned against making a lot of revision to the current ordinance as it works. He offered to provide a litany of ways to stop or manage growth including moratoriums. Chairperson Rogers requested he speak on what happens when the Growth Management Ordinance is challenged by the market. Mr. Hartman indicated that the

Commission(s) may not want to know this and reiterated his cautions against making major revisions to something which is working. Chairperson Rogers explained his reasons for feeling that the public needed to know that the ordinance is working and what happens when it is challenged. Mr. Hartman briefly responded that the present procedure would have to be followed and all of the requirements of 278B, the impact ordinance, would have to be met. This would include inventorying all of the City Departments, every infrastructure related item, every service related item, etc. Once you have quantified what you have, you must quantify where you are going and how you are going to get there. This is an expensive process to create a measurable standardization and proper defense mechanism. The need for this type of information was discussed. The problems associated with using statistical analysis to determine the actual population rate were noted. Unless the number of residents acquiring older homes is restricted, these figures will not hold true even if no new homes are constructed. Impact fees cannot be standardized enough to use the population figures either. Chairperson Rogers felt that growth could be standardized at five percent and building permits at three percent. This would provide truer population estimates. Comments noted that the building permits had not actually been at three percent. These demographic problems were debated. They create a public relations problem as the school population is growing faster than three percent. Mr. Hartman noted the school population projections indicate 56 percent of the homes in Carson City do not have any children or do not have any school aged children. He continued to iterate his reasons for feeling that the ordinance is working. Discussion ensued on the Board of Supervisors questions on whether the ordinance was working. Mr. Sullivan explained his Department's and the School District's formulas for figuring the population. The State Demographer has a different formula. All of these projections are guessimates. Chairperson Rogers felt that this puts the Commission(s) and Board at a disadvantage as the formulas are based on building permits.

Ms. Nietz explained the public concern about the impact growth has on the quality of life, transportation, schools, etc. She suggested the Commission(s) consider how each increment of growth creates impacts, how to make those impacts more positive to reduce the impression that the quality of life is deteriorating, and thresholds. Threshold examples were provided. Mr. Sullivan explained the balance he perceived between the retail customers/tourists and the local residents, i.e., increased sales tax and lower ad valorem rates. In 1983 the Board implemented the three percent growth rate. A comparison with Henderson, Nevada, indicates it has grown faster than three percent. The main difference between Henderson and Carson City is water. Discussion noted that Douglas County and Elko are having the same problems. Mr. Hartman compared Boulder City to Carson City. Both have little developable private land. Chairperson Rogers suggested that the issues are related to making the City a sustainable community and are based on a three percent growth rate. Clarification explained that the three percent permit allocation process is only restricted to residential development. Mr. Murray felt that the three percent ratio had not impacted the builders. Therefore, the program had not been challenged. He did not feel that their statements that the ordinance was working were correct. Chairperson Rogers felt that if the ordinance would not standup to a challenge, there would not be a growth ordinance. He wished to have an ordinance which would withstand a challenge and be supported by everyone. It may not be perfect but it would be sustainable. Mr. Hartman felt that the market should not be restricted under such conditions. The market is restricted through the use of the type of growth allowed and incentives. Special Planning Areas (SPA) provide this same type of growth. Mr. Hartman supported the SPA program, however, encouraged the Commission to lift the permit restrictions as developers cannot afford the infrastructure requirements on less than 50 permits. Chairperson Rogers felt that this is the flexibility provided in the program which staff considers. Mr. Pisiewski felt that a percentage would always be used in the equation. He did not foresee a problem with the formula unless the builders have a problem with the percentage. Efforts to reduce the percentage three years ago were cited to illustrate his comments. He felt that it would be necessary to reduce the percentage as the finite undeveloped land mass decreases. He encouraged the Commission(s) to begin reducing the rate to at least 2-1/2 percent, specifically, when compounding is added to the ratio. Chairperson Rogers responded by explaining that sustainable growth does not consider the land restrictions as finite. Redevelopment occurs in the older portions which provides for continued growth. These areas needed to be planned as well as the vacant lands. Special Planning Districts (SPD) had envisioned this approach as it allows development of small areas. Mr. Sullivan agreed to provide the tapes on this issue to the Commissioners. Commissioner Uhart stressed her desire to restrict the type of industry locating in the community. She encouraged raising the standards. Mr. Sullivan suggested this be a topic for another meeting. Reasons for undertaking this issue were stressed including the fact that there is only 40 percent of the industrial zoned land mass available for development. IMA also has tapes on this topic. Mr. Hartman stressed that growth management does not mean "no growth". It means management of growth, the type of growth wanted, and how to obtain that kind. This is a dynamic process which he had seen change during his residency. Commissioner Uhart also felt that it is part of the driving force behind the housing market. Chairperson Rogers supported Mr. Hartman's comments and emphasized that this would take a long time to complete. He felt that it may not be necessary to have a growth management ordinance if the supporting policies could provide the same result. This provides sustainable growth. Mr. Sullivan indicated this is the philosophical approach illustrated by Redevelopment's incentives. Mr. Hartman explained New Orleans' successful redevelopment program which had used this approach. Ms. Walker explained the seismic restrictions as another example.

(1-1305.5) Ms. Walker then briefly explained the budget items she would like to discuss with the Commission(s). Her illustrations included the Sheriff's budget requests and his support for the Public Safety Complex, which is his number one priority. She pointed out that the budget is outside the Commissions' scope. She had not been aware of the service letters and the Sheriff's indication that he was underfunded. This had not been indicated in the budget documents. Commissioner Christianson pointed out that the public perception is that everything is underbudgetted as a result of the uncontrolled growth. Chairperson Rogers pointed out the new federal mandate on fire departments which could also impact the budget. Fire Chief Buckley responded by explaining how his small department is able to meet such mandates. His budget would be impacted by growth and specifically, urban sprawl. Fewer people are required to address a fire in a 20 story building than for urban sprawl. The same impact is created on the Sheriff's Department and for ambulance services. He, also, felt that when the land mass is fully developed, the buildings would start going upwards and that the elected officials react to the citizens' demands. Decisions made by the Board of Supervisors and the Commission(s) would determine the complexity of his Department and budget. Chairperson Rogers felt that this was the imput which had been used to justify the service areas. This may help him with this issue. Only time will tell. Mr. Hartman indicated that the public perception indicates that one and five acre subdivisions control growth and will, purportedly, solve growth problems. Reality indicates the opposite is true as it drives the service level through the "sky". Chairperson Rogers agreed that this is a public relations problem and expressed his hope that the workshops would be able to mitigate this situation. The message which needed to be relayed is how to manage this growth and not how growth is controlled.

Fire Chief Buckley then explained how commercial growth supports the residential growth. If commercial growth is halted, a "payback date" will occur at some time.

(1-1511.5) Chairperson Rogers then explained the need to address the public perception about cloistering residences and its ability to provide more open space. The public seems to feel that multi-family units are causing extensive growth. The public also does not appear to understand that cloistering creates more affordable housing.

Mr. Sullivan explained a letter which had been copied to the Commission from a lady who had counted the number of cars in the shopping centers and people in the stores. This had indicated to her that the City had exceed the three percent ratio. He felt that public relations should address the dynamics of growth and what it is. Comments indicated that the surrounding Counties use Carson City for their shopping hub. This should be continued otherwise the property taxes will have to be increased to provide the services demanded by the residents.

Fire Chief Buckley then explained the impact which the OSHA ruling may have on the City. This ruling requires public agencies to comply with the standards established for private industry. It will impact Fire Departments, law enforcement, and to a lessor degree Public Works. Another impact will eliminate the ability to have fire fighters on 24-hour shifts. They will be restricted to 8-hour shifts. These safety factors were briefly outlined.

Chairperson Rogers then thanked all for their participation. He explained his intent to schedule two or three topics per meeting. Any topic which is not appropriately covered could be reconsidered later. He felt that this process would require approximately five meetings which would be one-and-a-half hours long. The next two meetings were scheduled for October 22 and November 5. These dates were discussed and supported by a majority. The location will be determined by staff. Mr. Sullivan suggested CAT-10 be contacted to see if the meetings could be taped for airing at a future date. Other dates will be considered on November 5th.

No formal action was taken. The meeting was adjourned by mutual consent at 7:45 p.m.

The Minutes of the Special October 1, 1996, Regional Planning Commission and Growth Management Commission workshop

ARE SO APPROVED ON__December_4____, 1996.

_/s/______________________________________

Alan Rogers, Chairperson