



**CITY OF SPARKS, NV  
COMMUNITY  
SERVICES  
DEPARTMENT**

**To:** Mayor and City Council  
**From:** Marilie Smith, Administrative Secretary  
**Subject:** Report of Sparks Planning Commission Action  
**Date:** August 20, 2020

**RE:** **PCN19-0040** – 7. PCN19-0040 – Consideration of and possible action on requests for a site generally located at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway, Sparks, Nevada, to:

- DA20-0001 - Amend the Development Agreement between City of Sparks, QK, LLC, and 5 Ridges Development Company, Inc., to add 34.71 acres to a site approximately 386.87 acres in size, thereby increasing the size of the site to 421.58 acres (For Possible Action);
- ANX20-0002 – Annex into the City of Sparks a site 34.71 acres in size. Upon annexation the parcel shall convert from a Washoe County zoning designation of GR (General Rural) to a City of Sparks zoning designation of A-40 (Agriculture) (For Possible Action);
- MPA20-0003 – Amend the Comprehensive Plan land use designation from approximately 34.71 acres of Rural (Washoe County Designation) to approximately 10.00 acres of Intermediate Density Residential (IDR) and 24.71 acres of Open Space (OS) (For Possible Action);
- RZ20-0002 – Rezone approximately 34.71 acres from A-40 (Agriculture) to approximately 10.00 acres SF-6 (Single-Family Residential, 6,000 sq. ft lots) and 24.71 acres A-5 (Agriculture) (For Possible Action); and
- Sponsor an amendment to the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan for a site 34.71 acres in size to change the Regional Land Designation from RA (Rural Area) to Tier 2 Land and amend the boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service Area and the City of Sparks Sphere of Influence to include the site. (For Possible Action)

Please see the attached excerpt from the July 2, 2020 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1           COMMISSIONER PETERSEN:  Aye.

2           MS. MARTINEZ:  Commissioner Blaco?

3           COMMISSIONER BLACO:  Aye.

4           MS. MARTINEZ:  Commissioner Carey?

5           COMMISSIONER CAREY:  Aye.

6           MS. MARTINEZ:  Commissioner Pritsos?

7           COMMISSIONER PRITSOS:  Aye.

8           MS. MARTINEZ:  Commissioner Rawson?

9           COMMISSIONER RAWSON:  Aye.

10          MS. MARTINEZ:  Commissioner VanderWell?

11          COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL:  Aye.

12          CHAIRMAN READ:  Thank you.  Motion passes

13  unanimously.  Thank you, Sienna, for your presentation.

14  I guess, we'll hear from you soon.

15          All right.  Next, we have up PCN19-0040,

16  consideration of and possible action on five requests

17  for the same site at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway.

18          The first request is DA20-0001, which is to

19  amend the development agreement between the City of

20  Sparks, QK, LLC, and 5 Ridges Development Company to

21  increase the site.

22          Next is ANX20-0002, which is an annexation of a

23  site from a Washoe County General Rural zoning to a City

24  of Sparks Agricultural zoning.

1           And then we have MPA20-0003, which is an  
2 amendment to the Comprehensive Plan land use designation  
3 of Rural to Intermediate Density Residential and some  
4 Open Space.

5           And next is RZ20-0002, which is a rezone  
6 request from Agriculture to Single-Family Residential  
7 and some Agriculture.

8           And, finally, a request to sponsor an amendment  
9 to the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan.

10           MS. REID: So, again, thank you, Madam Chair  
11 and members of the Commission. Sienna Reid with the  
12 Planning Division presenting the second agenda item that  
13 is associated with the Five Ridges project site tonight.

14           Can everybody see the slides before them, or at  
15 least the slide before them currently?

16           CHAIRMAN READ: Yes, we can see and hear you  
17 very well.

18           MS. REID: Perfect. Okay. So, as noted by the  
19 Chair, there are five requests associated with this  
20 particular agenda item. And the first of these,  
21 Amendment Number 2 to the development agreement for the  
22 Five Ridges project site applies to a larger site area  
23 than the annexation Comprehensive Plan land use  
24 amendment, rezoning and Regional Plan amendment

1 sponsorship requests, which are primarily associated  
2 with the property that's proposed to be added to the  
3 Five Ridges project site.

4           So to give you a visual here, the area bound in  
5 red on this slide shows the Five Ridges project site as  
6 proposed for expansion. The parcel that would be added  
7 is shown in black hatching, and it totals 34.71 acres in  
8 size. If this property is added to Five Ridges project  
9 site, that site would ultimately increase to a total of  
10 421.58 acres.

11           The annexation, Comprehensive Plan land use  
12 amendment, rezoning and Regional Plan amendment  
13 sponsorship requests apply only to the property that is  
14 shown in black hatching, and that is currently under  
15 Washoe County jurisdiction.

16           With regards to background for the Five Ridges  
17 project site, much this information was covered with the  
18 previous agenda item. So I'll be brief and note that  
19 the initial entitlements associated with the Quarry, as  
20 the project was known at that time, were approved in  
21 July of 2018. Amendment Number 1 to the Development  
22 Agreement was later processed and approved in February  
23 of 2020.

24           And then, most recently, you'll remember that

1 tentative map and conditional use permit requests for  
2 portions of the Five Ridges project site were considered  
3 by the Commission this April.

4 And collectively, the five requests before you  
5 tonight, they propose to expand the Five Ridges project  
6 site and support single-family development on a portion  
7 of that expansion area.

8 Fair warning. Due to the fact that there are  
9 five requests associated with this item, this  
10 presentation is a bit lengthy. After giving the  
11 Commission an overview of the requests, we'll move on to  
12 the findings analysis. But that findings analysis is  
13 certainly a little bit beefy. We've done our best to  
14 consolidate where possible, and we'll try to move  
15 through the findings as expeditiously as possible. But  
16 there are definitely quite a few to go through.

17 So in terms of project overview, should all  
18 five of the requests be approved, this slide shows the  
19 resulting Five Ridges project that would be governed by  
20 Amendment Number 2 to the development agreement. The  
21 total project area would encompass 421.58 acres, which  
22 includes the 34.71-acre expansion parcel.

23 With regards to permitted uses, the residential  
24 unit number is not proposed to change. A minimum of

1 1,200 and a maximum of 1,800 residential units would  
2 remain permitted. The minimum amount of open space that  
3 must be reserved is 120 acres. And single-family,  
4 duplex, townhomes or multi-family development would be  
5 allowed in accordance with adopted zoning districts.  
6 Commercial uses would also be allowed based on adopted  
7 zoning. However, a limited number of commercial uses  
8 would be allowed based on proposed Comprehensive Plan  
9 land use designations and zoning districts that were  
10 proposed as part of the previous agenda item, and then  
11 also those in association with this agenda item.

12 And, ultimately, the applicant across the  
13 expanded site is seeking a mix of Intermediate Density  
14 Residential, or IDR, Multi-Family Residential 14, or  
15 MF14, and Open Space on the Five Ridges project site,  
16 with conforming zoning districts of SF6, MF2 and A-5.

17 This slide gives the Commission a visual in  
18 terms of existing and proposed Comprehensive Plan land  
19 use designations for the 34.71-acre parcel. Currently,  
20 the property in its entirety is designated Rural in  
21 Washoe County. The applicant is requesting City of  
22 Sparks Comprehensive Plan land use designations of  
23 Intermediate Density Residential, or IDR, for the  
24 eastern 10 acres of the site, and Open Space for the

1 western 24.71 acres.

2 For the zoning, the applicant is requesting to  
3 rezone the site, again on the eastern 10-acre portion of  
4 the site, to SF6, and on the western 24.71-acre portion  
5 to A-5.

6 Looking at the changes included in Amendment  
7 Number 2 to the development agreement, these are mostly  
8 due to the proposed expansion of the Five Ridges project  
9 site. However, there are some additional changes  
10 proposed for clarification and update purposes, as well  
11 as to address comments received by the Nevada Department  
12 of Transportation, or NDOT.

13 In addition to the increased project acres on  
14 this site, you can see changes that would impact  
15 Section 3.1 of the agreement for permitted uses and  
16 density. These would together remove references to  
17 specific zoning districts associated with permitted  
18 uses. And the intent there is really to simplify that  
19 portion of the agreement.

20 Gross density requirements are also proposed to  
21 be modified due to the expanded site area. And those  
22 gross density calculations, as updated, are based on a  
23 minimum of 1,200 and a maximum of 1,800 residential  
24 units. So, again, so requests here to alter the unit

1 parameters in any way.

2           And then, also, within permitted uses and  
3 density, the minimum amount of Open Space that must be  
4 reserved is increased by 20 acres to a total of 120  
5 acres.

6           Also, to address NDOT's comments regarding the  
7 timing of roadway improvements, Section 3.2 is modified  
8 to specify that improvements to the intersection of  
9 Highland Ranch Parkway and Pyramid Way shall occur  
10 concurrently with the widening of Highland Ranch  
11 Parkway. This was the intent of the language, but NDOT  
12 brought up a good clarifying request. And given that  
13 the agreement was open, we wanted to be able to address  
14 that request.

15           So with those improvements occurring  
16 concurrently, what that means is that both improvements  
17 would be triggered prior to the 650 first residential  
18 unit, the segment of Highland Ranch Parkway between the  
19 project entrance and Pyramid Way degrading to Level of  
20 Service D, or the intersection of Highland Ranch Parkway  
21 and Pyramid Way degrading to below Level of Service E.  
22 And that's whichever occurs first. So very similar to  
23 all of the language that you've seen before, just trying  
24 to bring forward additional clarity there.



1           In addition, the allowed disturbance area is  
2 updated based on a revised slope analysis. This results  
3 in a 26-acre increase to a total of 293 disturbed acres  
4 allowed.

5           And the agreement is further updated to reflect  
6 the current project status with regard to land use and  
7 agreement approvals. These include Washoe County's  
8 approval of an emergency access road and Council's  
9 approval of an agreement with the Sun Valley General  
10 Improvement District granting use of the City streets  
11 and roads for water transmission facilities.

12           And then, lastly, changes to the agreement  
13 include a variety of annexation property provisions.  
14 Some address definitions. Others address associated  
15 entitlement requests.

16           The conceptual land plan for Amendment Number 2  
17 to the agreement is shown on this slide. All  
18 anticipated development is residential, with townhomes  
19 identified in Village 1 at the project entrance, as well  
20 as within Village 5 in the center of the site.  
21 Single-family lots comprise the remaining development  
22 shown. And lots located in the expansion area, which is  
23 on the western portion of the site total approximately  
24 19 single-family lots.

1           While Amendment Number 2 would expand the Five  
2 Ridges project site, again, neither the permitted number  
3 of residential units or infrastructure and public  
4 service requirements necessary to serve those units are  
5 proposed to change.

6           In terms of information provided by the  
7 applicant, the indication is that changes to the  
8 agreement are sought to promote better design and  
9 circulation through the project site.

10           To facilitate inclusion of the 34.71-acre  
11 parcel that's proposed for annexation within the  
12 Five Ridges project site, the applicant is also  
13 requesting Council sponsor a Regional Plan amendment.

14           And so this map shows the relationship of the  
15 site, which you can see bound in red, that 34.71-acre  
16 parcel to the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan land  
17 designations as well as the Truckee Meadows Service  
18 Area, which is shown in the thicker black line.

19           As the site currently has a Rural Area regional  
20 land designation, what is being requested is a change to  
21 the Tier 2 land designation, as well as changes to  
22 include this particular area within the Truckee Meadows  
23 Service Area and also within the City of Sparks Sphere  
24 of Influence.

1           And so before City Council can take final  
2 action on the requests that are part of this agenda  
3 item, a Regional Plan amendment to redesignate the site  
4 from that Rural Area to Tier 2 land and amend the  
5 boundaries of the TMSA and City of Sparks SOI is needed.

6           Consistent with past practice, the Commission  
7 reviews these sponsorship requests and provides a  
8 recommendation to Council.

9           All right. So switching gears here and  
10 settling in, to a certain extent, here are the findings  
11 for each of the proposed requests. For brevity, the  
12 findings for the development agreement amendment,  
13 annexation, Comprehensive Plan land use and amendment,  
14 or Comprehensive Plan land use amendment, excuse me, and  
15 rezoning requests have been grouped by topic. These are  
16 the same topic groups that we used in the last  
17 presentation. So conformance and consistency,  
18 compatibility and public notice. The Regional Plan  
19 sponsorship is going to be held out of this topic  
20 grouping, because we do have new review criteria  
21 included as part of the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional  
22 Plan that need to be discussed.

23           So starting first with conformance and  
24 consistency of the requests, this is going to be with

1 either the Comprehensive Plan, state law or code. And  
2 other than the Regional Plan amendment sponsorship, all  
3 of the requests under consideration tonight must be  
4 consistent with the City of Sparks Comprehensive Plan.

5           So this slide focuses on the consistency of the  
6 development agreement with the City of Sparks  
7 Comprehensive Plan. As has been noted a couple of  
8 times, neither the permitted number of residential units  
9 or infrastructure and public service requirements to  
10 serve that development is proposed to change. To  
11 support the amendment to the agreement and the  
12 associated requests under consideration, the applicant  
13 did provide an updated trip generation letter, as well  
14 as sewer and water studies analyzing development of the  
15 Five Ridges project site with solely residential  
16 development. And those studies did not warrant changes  
17 to the agreement related to infrastructure and services.  
18 And the master developer remains responsible for roadway  
19 and intersection improvements, secondary access, sewer  
20 collection system improvements, water transmission  
21 facilities and improvements, as well as flood control  
22 and drainage improvements.

23           Noting that the agreement continues to specify  
24 how infrastructure and public services would be

1 adequately provided to support development, it is the  
2 opinion the City staff that the proposed changes in  
3 Amendment Number 2 promote the City's goal of providing  
4 adequate services concurrently with the impact of  
5 development while not adversely impacting the  
6 consistency of the agreement with the Comprehensive  
7 Plan. That's in support of policies MG5 and CF1.

8           Looking here at conformance and consistency as  
9 it relates to the annexation, the annexation request  
10 before you tonight must not only conform to the  
11 requirements of Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 268 per  
12 finding A1, but also the Comprehensive Plan with  
13 location of the annexation property in the City's Sphere  
14 of Influence and the seven-year annexation program  
15 pursuant to Finding A3.

16           Here, Chapter 260 allows for the City to annex  
17 properties that are identified in its annexation  
18 program, as well as properties that is aren't identified  
19 in its annexation program, provided that those types of  
20 annexations, which are often termed voluntary, are  
21 contiguous to City limits and annexation is requested by  
22 100 percent of the property owners. And those, those  
23 criteria are satisfied in this particular instance.

24           The property is not currently located in the

1 City's Sphere of Influence. And the City's annexation  
2 program actually expired in 2016. However, as  
3 discussed, a request to include the property in the  
4 City's Sphere of Influence would be considered through  
5 the Regional Plan amendment process if City Council  
6 sponsors the amendment.

7           Additionally, Finding A2 requires the  
8 annexation request to conform to 10 annexation findings  
9 in Sparks Municipal Code. So these will be covered on  
10 the next few slides, with the first of these, first four  
11 of these findings shown on this slide.

12           So as discussed, the property being considered  
13 for annexation is contiguous to City limits on its  
14 eastern property line side.

15           In terms of utilities, those would be extended  
16 through the existing Five Ridges project site consistent  
17 with the agreement, making the extension of City limits  
18 a logical extension.

19           And then annexation would not create an island,  
20 simply there because the property is already contiguous  
21 to the City's current corporate boundary.

22           And in regard to expansion to accommodate  
23 planned growth, the Five Ridges project site, which  
24 totals almost 387 acres currently, was annexed to the

1 City of Sparks in 2018 to accommodate future housing  
2 needs. And annexation of the 34.71-acre parcel would  
3 support modifications to the land plan that was  
4 previously shown in the presentation that result in  
5 improve circulation and promote development of the  
6 greater Five Ridges project site would be units  
7 anticipated in the development agreement.

8           The three annexation findings on this slide  
9 relate to utilities, community goals in the City's  
10 Comprehensive Plan and the cost-effective provision of  
11 service areas and capital facilities.

12           So in regards to water service, per the  
13 agreement, water service will be provided by the  
14 Sun Valley General Improvement District, or SVGID, and  
15 the developer is responsible for construction of water  
16 transmission infrastructure, as well as dedicating water  
17 rights to serve future development.

18           Sanitary sewer service is to be provided by the  
19 City of Sparks. It would ultimately be provided via the  
20 Northwest Sanitary Sewer Interceptor, which is currently  
21 located east of the project.

22           And, Chair, per the agreement the developer is  
23 responsible for all new on- and off-site sanitary sewer  
24 improvements.

1           Looking at community goals, annexation of the  
2 subject property and approval of the Comprehensive Plan  
3 land use amendment and rezoning requests associated with  
4 this agenda item would ultimately support modifications  
5 to the land plan that result in improved circulation and  
6 promote development of the greater Five Ridges project.

7           And supplemental materials provided by the  
8 applicant and as shown earlier in terms of the land plan  
9 show approximately 19 single-family residences will be  
10 constructed on the site proposed for annexation. This  
11 is a small number of homes. However, annexation of the  
12 site would still continue to support development of the  
13 Five Ridges project site consistent with the agreement.  
14 And that agreement does encourage a strong and diverse  
15 housing market in support of Goal H2 in the City's  
16 Comprehensive Plan.

17           With regards to service areas and capital  
18 facilities, fire service would be provided from Fire  
19 Station Number 4 or through automatic aid with Truckee  
20 Meadows Fire.

21           In addition, the agreement continues to serve  
22 as the applicant's petition to be included in Impact Fee  
23 Service Area Number 1. That update, as stated in the  
24 last agenda item, is currently underway. And if the



1 subject property is ultimately included in that service  
2 area, it would contribute to construction of a fire  
3 station to serve the area, regional storm drain, sewer,  
4 and parks improvements.

5           So provided that Amendment Number 2 to the  
6 agreement is approved, it is staff's view that the  
7 requested annexation complies with Policy CF1 that  
8 requires the provision of City services at acceptable  
9 service levels.

10           Moving on to the fiscal impact of the  
11 annexation, the fiscal impact analysis that was  
12 submitted was discussed a bit already under the previous  
13 agenda item. So I'll try and be brief and note that we  
14 have an assumption of 1,220 residential units, no  
15 commercial space, and an expanded site area and,  
16 ultimately, with the removal of that commercial space  
17 and the increase of roadway area that would be dedicated  
18 to the City, what is estimated as a positive fiscal  
19 impact of approximately \$700,000.

20           In regards to a Washoe County adopted community  
21 management plan, this particular area is located within  
22 the Sun Valley Area Plan, which is an element of the  
23 Washoe County Master Plan. The City has not received  
24 any comments from Washoe County on this topic or the

1 other requests, either.

2 In addition to other factors, here it's just  
3 appropriate to note that the applicant has requested  
4 that City Council sponsorship of a Regional Plan  
5 amendment to include the subject property within the  
6 City's Sphere of Influence. And so, ultimately, should  
7 the City Council sponsor that requested Regional Plan  
8 amendment, that would be heard by the Regional Planning  
9 Commission and the Regional Planning Governing Board  
10 prior to any City Council consideration of the  
11 annexation request before you tonight.

12 Moving on to another aspect of conformance and  
13 consistency, here relating to the Comprehensive Plan  
14 land use amendment and rezoning, Finding CP1 requires  
15 the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment conform to the  
16 Regional Plan land use and intensity designations. And  
17 as I just discussed on the previous slide, the applicant  
18 is seeking that Regional Plan amendment to redesignate  
19 the site from Rural Area to Tier 2 land and then, also,  
20 to amend the boundaries of the TMSA and City of Sparks  
21 Sphere of Influence.

22 As proposed, the Intermediate Density  
23 Residential, or IDR, Comprehensive Plan land use  
24 designation allows for a density range of six to less

1 than 10 dwelling units per acre, and it complies with  
2 the maximum density standard of 30 dwelling units for  
3 Tier 2 land set forth in the Regional Plan.

4 In addition, the proposed Open Space  
5 designation is also consistent with that Tier 2 land  
6 designation, because it provides for passive and active  
7 open space rather than suburban development.

8 And, lastly, here on this slide, portions of  
9 the site are also designated development constrained by  
10 the Regional Plan, and this is due to the presence of  
11 slopes of 30 percent or greater. This is a small area  
12 of the overall 34.71-acre site. And not only does the  
13 Comprehensive Plan encourage preservation of steep  
14 slopes, but, again, we have the Sparks Municipal Code  
15 that requires that two-to-one ratio of open space if  
16 there is a disturbance of slopes of 30 percent or  
17 greater. And, again, that is the Regional Plan.

18 Looking here at Finding CP2, the Comprehensive  
19 Plan amendment must implement the goals of the  
20 Comprehensive Plan.

21 And then Finding Z1 for the rezoning then  
22 requires that request be consistent with the  
23 Comprehensive Plan.

24 Application of the IDR and Open Space land uses

1 and then conforming SF6 and A-5 zoning districts would  
2 support single-family housing development on the site  
3 and support more broadly the development of the  
4 residential units consistent with the development  
5 agreement. Really they are promoting diverse housing  
6 through the City of Sparks.

7 As has been previously discussed, the  
8 development agreement specifies the timing and scope of  
9 improvements needed to provide City services at  
10 acceptable service levels. And with that agreement in  
11 place and the updated fiscal impact analysis that was  
12 provided, it is staff's view that the requests comply  
13 with policies MG5 and CF1 of the Sparks Comprehensive  
14 Plan, that address fiscal implications to provide public  
15 services, and the provision of City services at  
16 acceptable service levels.

17 And, lastly, here on this slide, in regards to  
18 natural features, there are steep slopes. As I've  
19 noted, in addition to the 30 percent, there are slopes  
20 that range between 15 and 30 present on the site as  
21 well. And here to manage development on those folks are  
22 our Comprehensive Plan policies, as well as our Code,  
23 that requires development in terms of disturbed area be  
24 reduced as slopes increase. And, again, we have further

1 the development agreement stating that there is a  
2 maximum disturbed area that can be cleared, graded or  
3 otherwise disturbed, and that is increased to 293 acres,  
4 as was previously discussed through Amendment Number 2  
5 to the agreement.

6 All right. Moving on to compatibility, which  
7 is a new topic in terms of the findings analysis, the  
8 findings on display each focus on compatibility with  
9 surrounding land uses, Finding CP3 for the Comprehensive  
10 Plan land use and Finding Z2 for the rezoning.

11 Here, federally or homeowners association owned  
12 vacant land is located to the north, south and west of  
13 the site. These vacant lands have a Rural Washoe County  
14 master plan land use designation. And as proposed, the  
15 Open Space comprehensive land use designation would be  
16 applied to that western 24.71 acres of the site. And  
17 that Open Space designation is compatible with the  
18 surrounding unincorporated lands that are designated  
19 Rural.

20 On the eastern portion of the site, the IDR  
21 Comprehensive Plan land use is proposed to encompass 10  
22 acres. And that's compatible with adjacent land to the  
23 east that is already designated IDR.

24 And noting that the rezoning request from A-40

1 to A-5 for the western portion of the subject site is  
2 consistent with the proposed open space zoning pieces  
3 further consistent with vacant properties zoned Open  
4 Space by Washoe County. And similar to the Washoe  
5 County Open Space zoning district, it is important to  
6 note that the A-5 zone proposed allows for agricultural  
7 and recreation uses by right and requires discretionary  
8 review for a limited number of industrial and utility  
9 uses. So they are very similar.

10 In terms of the rezoning request from A-40 to  
11 SF6 on that eastern portion of the site, this is very  
12 much consistent with future single-family uses in the  
13 adjacent SF6 zone immediately east of the site.

14 In terms of findings regarding public noticing,  
15 public notice is required for the annexation,  
16 Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and rezoning  
17 requests with the Planning Commission and City Council  
18 meetings functioning as public hearings. Notice of the  
19 public hearing for the annexation and rezoning were  
20 provided at a minimum to all owners of property within  
21 750 feet of the subject properties. And, also, public  
22 notice was provided in the Reno Gazette-Journal.

23 For the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment,  
24 mailed notices for a neighborhood meeting were provided

1 to all property owners, again here at a minimum within  
2 750 feet of the subject site. That neighborhood meeting  
3 was conducted also on June 8th with the same number of  
4 attendees. As I mentioned in the last item, nine  
5 attendees noting concern regarding development of homes  
6 on the ridgelines in a manner that would be visible from  
7 properties located to the north of the Five Ridges  
8 project site, traffic impact, and impacts to groundwater  
9 due to municipal wells.

10 All right. So moving on to what I will say is  
11 the last kind of set of slides as it relates to  
12 findings, here we have actual review criteria that come  
13 from the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. And so  
14 given that there are three requests associated with the  
15 Regional Plan amendment, we have three sets of specific  
16 review criteria for each.

17 So on this slide, what you can see are the  
18 first three of six review criteria associated with the  
19 requested Tier 2 land designation.

20 The first here is proximity to Tier 2 land.  
21 The site is immediately adjacent to existing Tier 2  
22 land. We also have compliance with applicable density  
23 requirements. This has been discussed as it relates to  
24 compliance of the IDR land use with the Regional Plan

1 land designations. And as requested, should the Tier 2  
2 designation be approved, the IDR land use is certainly  
3 less dense from a residential density perspective than  
4 the maximum of 30 dwelling units per acre.

5 And then, in addition, or looking at enhanced  
6 potential for land use diversity and a mix of housing  
7 types, including the site in the Tier 2 land designation  
8 would support its addition to the Five Ridges project  
9 site. And provided that the associated development  
10 agreement amendment, annexation, Comprehensive Plan land  
11 use amendment and rezoning requests are approved, the  
12 agreement would allow for a mix of single-family,  
13 duplex, multi-family and townhome housing types,  
14 supporting overall housing type diversity.

15 Looking at infrastructure availability and  
16 connectivity to existing or planned multimodal  
17 transportation opportunities, the addition of the  
18 subject site to the Tier 2 land designation would  
19 further allow for the extension of infrastructure and  
20 public facilities that will be coming through the  
21 existing Five Ridges project site. And that would  
22 include sidewalks and multiuse paths that are required  
23 to be constructed by the developer.

24 In regards to other multimodal transportation



1 opportunities here, the Five Ridges project site is not  
2 identified in the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan from  
3 a transit service provision perspective. So the mean  
4 multimodal improvement would be sidewalks and multiuse  
5 paths.

6 As proposed, approximately 10 acres of the site  
7 would be designated IDR, and the remainder would be  
8 designated Open Space. Noting that that is a relatively  
9 small amount of acreage, substantive impacts to other  
10 priority lands, as designated in the Regional Plan, are  
11 not anticipated if the proposed Regional Plan amendment  
12 were to be approved.

13 Here, shifting to the second aspect of the  
14 Regional Plan amendment sponsorship, which is expansion  
15 of the Truckee Meadows Service Area, or TMSA, to include  
16 the almost 35-acre site, the first four review criteria  
17 that you can see on the slide were already discussed as  
18 part of the review criteria for Tier 2 land.

19 So really just regarding the last bullet, which  
20 focuses on regional need for additional land, uses or  
21 purposes, application materials indicate that the  
22 addition of the site to the TMSA will support better  
23 design and circulation for the Five Ridges project,  
24 which will facilitate development at the project and

1 assist in meeting regional housing needs.

2           And, lastly, here we have the review criteria  
3 for requests seeking to amend the City of Sparks Sphere  
4 of Influence that are shown on this slide. Changed  
5 conditions in the vicinity of the request include not  
6 only the proposed amendment to the agreement, but also  
7 associated entitlement requests for the current  
8 Five Ridges project site, which is adjacent to the  
9 annexation parcel.

10           And amending the boundary of the Sphere of  
11 Influence to include the site allows for the absorption  
12 of what would be an otherwise largely undevelopable  
13 parcel into the adjacent Five Ridges project site.

14           The residential units that are permitted in the  
15 agreement are anticipated to assist in meeting demand  
16 for additional housing in the region that is due to  
17 population growth. And as proposed, the proposed  
18 Regional Plan amendment request would support the  
19 development of these residential units.

20           In regards to conferring with Washoe County  
21 staff on the SOI boundary change, City of Sparks staff  
22 discussed all of the requests before the Commission  
23 tonight, as well as what the ultimate Regional Plan  
24 amendment process would be, with Washoe County staff.

1 And that was done verbally. And then, in addition, all  
2 of the requests were distributed for Washoe County for  
3 review and comment. And no comments have been received  
4 by City of Sparks staff.

5 In regards to this agenda item, I did not  
6 receive any calls or emails as of today.

7 And with that, I'll conclude this presentation.  
8 Staff is recommending approval of each of the five  
9 requests for consideration as part of this agenda item.

10 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Sienna. That was a  
11 very comprehensive presentation. I really got to hand  
12 it to you, you hung in there.

13 Do any of the Commissioners have questions for  
14 staff on this item?

15 All right. Moving on, do we have the applicant  
16 that would like to provide any additional information or  
17 comment?

18 MS. MARTINEZ: Mike Railey is able to speak  
19 now.

20 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Good evening, everyone.  
21 Again, for the record, Mike Railey with Christy  
22 Corporation representing 5 Ridges Development Company.

23 Yeah, I don't think there's much I could add to  
24 Sienna's presentation. She did a great job, was very

1 thorough.

2           Once again, this is a kind of a cumbersome  
3 entitlement process for what really boils down to a  
4 fairly simple change and request. As you can see, the  
5 majority of the site, about two-thirds of it, will  
6 remain as permanent dedicated open space and really just  
7 allows for a little bit of better circulation and layout  
8 within the project itself.

9           The property is under common ownership with 5  
10 ridges. It has very limited access and availability of  
11 infrastructure should it remain outside of the project.  
12 But with Five Ridges, it's essentially all the  
13 infrastructure is being extended to the front door, so  
14 to speak.

15           So, I think, it's a logical request. And we're  
16 here to answer any questions that you might have.

17           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Mike.

18           Do any Commissioners have questions for the  
19 applicant?

20           Seeing none, let's open up for public comment.  
21 And I'm assuming that we will need public comment for  
22 each item separately.

23           MS. MCCORMICK: That's correct, Madam Chair.

24           CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you.

1           So we'll open up public comment for the  
2 development agreement first.

3           And, Casey, can you please repeat the call-in  
4 information?

5           MS. MARTINEZ: The telephone number for call-in  
6 participation is 1-669-900-6833, and the meeting ID  
7 number is 962 4203 7566. And you'll press star 9 to  
8 request to speak.

9           I do have one caller already wanting to speak.  
10 And their phone number begins with 376. You are now  
11 able to speak.

12           MR. DAN FLANNAGAN: Greetings, again, folks.  
13 Dan Flannagan here listening to the presentation.  
14 Sienna, very well done. However, I have some questions  
15 regarding your vote you're about to take to support or  
16 to present this in front of the Regional Plan.

17           And it's very interesting, because I can't sit  
18 and question any of you. I am talking to, basically, a  
19 screen with you in the background. We can't convey or  
20 have our questions answered. And it doesn't appear that  
21 you are addressing anything we're saying anyway.

22           So that being said, a couple items that you  
23 said was about the trip generation letter. This creates  
24 a substantial impact. And just a letter instead of a

1 reanalysis of the traffic impact is interesting and  
2 inappropriate. You don't reference Sparks Section  
3 20.04.011, which Karen Melby and I had worked very  
4 closely to amend. And that was basically retired when  
5 she retired.

6           The issue of mining water where you're taking  
7 from the SVGID water supply and then taking the sewer  
8 distribution through the City of Sparks is  
9 inappropriate.

10           The other item is an IDR designation all by  
11 itself is very interesting. The IDR designation seems  
12 to cover anything and everything that you don't want to  
13 designate as anything else, and has no development  
14 restrictions. I don't see anything in the codes where  
15 that, you simply put it in a designation that is  
16 comfortable that'll match your comprehensive area and  
17 amendment plans.

18           And I'd like to know who you contacted at  
19 Washoe County for comments on this proposed agenda item,  
20 because we'd like to contact them. So at least us, who  
21 is in Washoe County, have the ability to vote them out  
22 of office, unlike we can do in the City of Sparks.

23           And a fairly simple development, interesting  
24 comment that was made by the developer's representative,

1 fairly simple, that's fine, but you know as well as I do  
2 that none of you would allow the type of development  
3 push through on a major impact in this area if it was  
4 anywhere adjacent to where you lived.

5 And, obviously, you're not going to comment on  
6 my comments. So everybody have a good evening. Thank  
7 you very much.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, caller.

9 Do we have any additional public comment on  
10 this item?

11 MS. MARTINEZ: I do not see any additional  
12 requests to speak. Oh, I am sorry. One additional  
13 request came up. Caller beginning in 742, you are now  
14 able to speak.

15 MR. ROC COLE: Hi. Roc Cole here. I know  
16 you're tired of hearing this. And, quite frankly, I  
17 know that all the wheels have been greased. And this  
18 thing was approved a long time ago.

19 This is just like a kangaroo court for a little  
20 caring for us people out here that mean nothing to you.  
21 Of course, if you lived out here, it would be different.  
22 But I'm sure that you could care less.

23 Except for you, Scott, I will give you. At  
24 least you ask questions and present commentary. The

1 rest of you sit there like drones. When you ask for  
2 comment or questions, it's like crickets in the  
3 background. What's wrong with you people? You call  
4 yourself planners? Why don't you call yourself an  
5 approval committee, because that's what you are. All  
6 you do is approve. It's really a joke. I'm ashamed of  
7 all of you, again with one exception.

8           You know, in this world, there's such thing as  
9 karma. And you guys could care less about us. And so  
10 could the developer. Because it's all about money. All  
11 you care about is money. City of Sparks for their tax  
12 revenues and the developer for his money. At what point  
13 is enough? Shame on all of you. Shame on all of you.

14           I'm done.

15           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

16           Casey, any additional callers?

17           MS. MARTINEZ: I do not have any additional  
18 requests to speak at this time.

19           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

20           So with that, I will close the public comment  
21 for the development agreement and open public comment  
22 for the annexation petition.

23           Do we have any callers on the annexation  
24 petition?



1 MS. MARTINEZ: I do not see any requests to  
2 speak.

3 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. I will go ahead and  
4 close public comment on the annexation and open public  
5 comment for the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment  
6 request.

7 Do we have any callers?

8 MS. MARTINEZ: There are no requests to speak.

9 CHAIRMAN READ: All right. Thank you.

10 Let's close public comment on the Comprehensive  
11 Plan land use amendment and open public comment for the  
12 rezoning requests.

13 Do we have any public comment?

14 MS. MARTINEZ: No requests to speak.

15 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

16 So let's close the public comment for rezoning  
17 requests and open public comment for the Truckee Meadows  
18 Regional Plan amendment sponsorship request.

19 Do we have any public comment?

20 MS. MARTINEZ: I do have one request to speak.  
21 The phone number beginning in 742, you are now able to  
22 speak.

23 MR. ROC COLE: This is Roc again. And I'm sure  
24 you guys are just thinking, look, I hope this guy shuts

1 up so we can get to dinner.

2 But I would like to say one thing. We were  
3 told in the appeal process with the City Council that  
4 there was over 10 meetings and public notices sent out  
5 on the demise of our ridgeline. You know what, I want  
6 proof of that. And, I think, you owe us proof that this  
7 ridgeline was deemed not protected, or how, I don't know  
8 how you can take that away without giving us some proof.  
9 Shouldn't you have to uphold what is in place? With the  
10 swipe of a pen, it just goes away?

11 And in the neighborhood meeting of this, the  
12 developer stated that there was over a hundred acres of  
13 developable land that was not being developed. Why  
14 can't you take that hundred acres, take all the homes  
15 off the ridgeline, offset them down to where we don't  
16 have to look at them, and everybody else in this valley  
17 that you care nothing about because it's not your  
18 precious city, and put them in that hundred acres? It's  
19 a win-win-win. It's a win for the City of Sparks. You  
20 get your tax dollars. It's a win for the developer  
21 'cause he gets his homes, although he doesn't get the  
22 view lot. And it's a win for us, because we get  
23 something that was promised to us five times.

24 Please take that into consideration. I know

1 you will, Scott. I was at the Quarry meeting back when  
2 we could go to the meetings. Do you know you even  
3 had -- and I don't even know her name, but she was  
4 sitting on the left. Do you know, she didn't even know  
5 what a detention basin was? A detention basin. Isn't  
6 that a little embarrassing for a planning commission?

7 I rest my case.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, caller.

9 Casey, do we have any other callers?

10 MS. MARTINEZ: We have no additional requests  
11 to speak.

12 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

13 So I will close public comment for the Truckee  
14 Meadows Regional Plan amendment. And that ends our  
15 public comment. And we will bring it back to the  
16 Commission for discussion. Any additional questions  
17 from the Commissioners?

18 Seeing none, we have five motions. And,  
19 Alyson, for clarification, can you tell me which ones  
20 will require a supermajority?

21 BOARD MEMBER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair, before  
22 we start, I have some clarifications. From one of the  
23 speakers -- and I apologize. It was on the first, it  
24 was on our first agenda item. But they had spoken about

1 fire and a fire station and things like that. And I  
2 would just like to point out that on page 16 of this  
3 report, in the third paragraph, in the third bullet  
4 point, and I will read it. I apologize.

5 It states "equipping all dwelling units and  
6 commercial structures intended for or used for human  
7 occupancy with fire suppression systems."

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner  
9 VanderWell, for that clarification.

10 Anything else from the other Commissioners?

11 Okay. So go ahead, Alyson, on the motions.  
12 You were going to tell me which ones will require the  
13 supermajority.

14 MS. MCCORMICK: Thank you, Madam Chair. Only  
15 the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment, MPA20-0003,  
16 requires a supermajority. The other items are less than  
17 full majority.

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you for that  
19 clarification.

20 So we will have five motions. The first is the  
21 request for the development agreement. I'll take any  
22 motion.

23 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I'll go ahead and make a  
24 motion.

1 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

2 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I move to find Amendment  
3 Number 2 to the development agreement, DA18-0001,  
4 associated with PCN19-0040, consistent with the Sparks  
5 Comprehensive Plan and to forward a recommendation of  
6 approval to the Sparks City Council.

7 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

8 Do we have a second?

9 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Commissioner  
10 VanderWell. Second.

11 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

12 We have a motion by Commissioner Blaco and a  
13 second by Commissioner VanderWell. Any discussion?

14 Seeing none, can we please have a roll call  
15 vote?

16 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

18 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

19 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

20 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

21 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

22 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

23 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

24 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

1 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

2 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

3 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

4 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

5 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

6 MS. MARTINEZ: And Commissioner VanderWell?

7 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes  
9 unanimately.

10 Next is the request for the annexation  
11 petition. Can I get a motion?

12 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair --

13 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I'll try.

14 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: -- Commissioner  
15 VanderWell. I move to forward a recommendation of  
16 approval to the City Council for the annexation request,  
17 ANX20-0002, associated with PCN19-0040, based on  
18 Findings A1 through A4, and the facts supporting these  
19 findings as set forth in the staff report.

20 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. We have a motion by  
23 Commissioner VanderWell and a second by Commissioner  
24 Pritsos. Any discussion?

1           COMMISSIONER CAREY:  Madam Chair, a couple  
2 comments for the record, if I may.

3           CHAIRMAN READ:  Go ahead.

4           COMMISSIONER CAREY:  Thank you.

5           I concur with staff's recommendation on this  
6 annexation request.  And I believe that I can make the  
7 required findings.

8           I agree that this proposed annexation is a  
9 logical extension of the City limits.  And I think that  
10 it will help support Goal H2 and Policy CF1 of our  
11 Comprehensive Plan.

12          Thank you.

13          CHAIRMAN READ:  Thank you, Commissioner Carey.

14          Any other discussion?

15          Can we go ahead and do a roll call vote?

16          MS. MARTINEZ:  Commissioner Read?

17          CHAIRMAN READ:  Aye.

18          MS. MARTINEZ:  Commissioner Petersen?

19          COMMISSIONER PETERSEN:  Aye.

20          MS. MARTINEZ:  Commissioner Blaco?

21          COMMISSIONER BLACO:  Aye.

22          MS. MARTINEZ:  Commissioner Carey?

23          COMMISSIONER CAREY:  Aye.

24          MS. MARTINEZ:  Commissioner Pritsos?

1 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

2 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

3 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

4 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner VanderWell?

5 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Passes unanimously.

7 The next is the Comprehensive Plan land use

8 amendment request. Do I have a motion?

9 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Commissioner Blaco. I'll

10 make a motion.

11 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

12 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Move to approve the

13 Comprehensive Plan land use amendment, MPA20-0003,

14 associated with PCN19-0040, based on Findings CP1

15 through CP4, and the facts supporting these findings as

16 set forth in the staff report.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Commissioner

19 VanderWell. Second.

20 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. We have a motion by

21 Commissioner Blaco and a second by Commissioner

22 VanderWell. Any discussion before we vote?

23 Commissioner Carey.

24 COMMISSIONER CAREY: I'm going to support the



1 proposed comprehensive land use change. I do have some  
2 reservations about adding additional residential land  
3 uses in this area. You know, I would prefer that there  
4 would be a better mix of land uses. I think, in my  
5 comments on the previous agenda item kind of outline  
6 why.

7           However, in this instance, I think that the  
8 requested IDR land use change is very minor. And it is  
9 consistent with generally what the planned land uses are  
10 in this development. Overall, I think that the proposed  
11 Open Space and IDR land use changes are very minor in  
12 nature and, therefore, consistent with the goals and  
13 policies of our plan and the land use for this area.

14           But, I think, overall, we need to do a much  
15 better job of integrating land uses and getting and  
16 locating services and employment near residential,  
17 particularly in the Spanish Springs Valley.

18           Thank you.

19           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner Carey.  
20 Any further discussion?

21           With that, can we please do a roll call vote?

22           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

23           CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

24           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

1 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.  
2 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?  
3 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.  
4 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?  
5 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.  
6 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?  
7 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.  
8 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?  
9 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.  
10 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner VanderWell?  
11 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.  
12 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. The motion passes  
13 unanimately.  
14 And the fourth motion is for the rezoning  
15 request.  
16 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I'll go ahead and make a  
17 motion.  
18 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.  
19 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I move to forward a  
20 recommendation of approval to the City Council for the  
21 rezoning request, RZ20-0002, associated with PCN19-0040,  
22 based on Findings Z1 through Z3, and the facts  
23 supporting these findings as set forth in the staff  
24 report.

1 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

2 Second?

3 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Commissioner  
4 VanderWell. Second.

5 CHAIRMAN READ: We have a motion by  
6 Commissioner Blaco and a second by Commissioner  
7 VanderWell. Any discussion before?

8 Commissioner Carey.

9 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I  
10 concur with staff's recommendation of approval and can  
11 make the required findings on this rezone request.

12 I just wanted to express my appreciation to our  
13 staff and the applicant for going for the A-5 zoning in  
14 this particular area. I agree that it's compatible with  
15 the zoning of our neighbors in Washoe County. I think,  
16 although I believe that the A-40 zoning on this property  
17 when it was annexed into the City would probably be  
18 sufficient for what the applicant wants to do, I  
19 appreciate that they are going for the rezone request to  
20 being for the A-5, which is more compatible with Washoe  
21 County.

22 And I would hope that our partners in the  
23 region, Washoe County, would show the same courtesy to  
24 the City when they are considering rezoning changes

1 there near the City. And I appreciate the accommodation  
2 of this. And I will be supporting the motion.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner Carey.  
5 Any other discussion before we vote?  
6 All right. Can we go ahead and get a roll call  
7 vote, please?

8 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?  
9 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

10 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?  
11 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

12 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?  
13 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

14 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?  
15 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

16 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?  
17 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

18 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?  
19 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

20 MS. MARTINEZ: And Commissioner VanderWell?  
21 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Passes unanimously.  
23 And the fifth and final motion is for the  
24 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan amendment sponsorship

1 request.

2 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair,  
3 Commissioner VanderWell. I'm prepared to make a motion.

4 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

5 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: I move to forward a  
6 recommendation of support to City Council to sponsor an  
7 amendment to the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan for  
8 a site 34.71 acres in size to change the regional land  
9 designation from Rural Area to Tier 2 land and amend the  
10 boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service Area and City  
11 of Sparks Sphere of Influence to include the site based  
12 on the facts as set forth in the staff report.

13 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

14 Do we have a second?

15 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Commissioner Petersen  
16 will second.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: All right. Thank you.

18 So we have a motion by Commissioner VanderWell  
19 and a second by Commissioner Petersen. Any discussion  
20 before we vote?

21 Yes, Commissioner Carey.

22 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.  
23 Just a couple quick comments for the record. And I will  
24 be supporting the motion.

1 I view these TMRPA amendments pretty consistent  
2 with our master plan and the new Regional Plan. I  
3 think, adding this property into the TMSA, the proposed  
4 tiering change and the addition to the Sphere of  
5 Influence are consistent with what we're trying to do in  
6 this area. I think, it's pretty minor. And it's very  
7 technical stuff, but I think it's a pretty minor, minor  
8 change in general. And I hope that the City Council  
9 will support this amendment to the plan.

10 I would just like to say, you know, it took  
11 three years, about three years to get the Regional Plan  
12 updated, and it's cool to see that we're finally able to  
13 work on it. Perhaps if the Regional Plan took three and  
14 a half years to get updated, this amendment probably  
15 could have been rolled into the update. And it is  
16 pretty consistent and minor in nature.

17 I just wanted to make that point. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner Carey.

19 Any other discussion before we vote?

20 Seeing none, can we please do a roll call vote?

21 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

22 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

23 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

24 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

1 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?  
2 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.  
3 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?  
4 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.  
5 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?  
6 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.  
7 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?  
8 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.  
9 MS. MARTINEZ: And Commissioner VanderWell?  
10 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.  
11 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes  
12 unanimously.  
13 Thanks, again, Sienna and staff. That was a  
14 huge presentation, and you guys did a very thorough job,  
15 and I thought you really good on presenting that much  
16 information.  
17 Next are general business items, which there  
18 are none.  
19 So let's go ahead and move on to open to  
20 general public comment limited to items that are not on  
21 the agenda.  
22 Casey, can you please repeat the call-in  
23 information?  
24 MS. MARTINEZ: The telephone number for call-in