

CITY OF ELKO
PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL WORKSHOP MINUTES
6:00 P.M., P.D.S.T., TUESDAY, MAY 18, 2010
GREAT BAIN COLLEGE, E.I.T. BUILDING, ROOM 201,
1050 CHILTON CIRCLE, ELKO, NEVADA

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman Rich Perry.

ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Present: Rich Perry, Doug Owen, Reece Keener,
John Anderson, Jeff Thompson (arrived later),
Alene Sutherland (arrived later)

Planning Commission Absent/Excused: Brent Elmore

City Staff Present: Curtis Calder, City Manager
Delmo Andreozzi, Asst. City Manager
Ed Wynes, City Planner
Scott Wilkinson, Development Manager
Erik Howes, Parks & Recreation Director

Others Present: Jim Conner, City Councilman
Laura Hanson, CRSA
Donald Buaku, CRSA
Jim Neilson, CRSA

I. WORKSHOP

This workshop is being held to review a summary of public input gathered at the last workshop meeting and recommendations from CRSA, along with brainstorming ideas for a direction to go with the City of Elko Master Plan update. Topics include Master Plan organization, preliminary goals, objectives and implementation and action items, a project list and surveys. **DISCUSSION ITEM ONLY, NO ACTION REQUIRED.**

Ms. Hanson said thank you for meeting us on a different night than you normally do and a new location. We appreciate you being a little flexible and accommodating a few more members of the public and members of the different advisory committees and boards for the City. It's nice to have as many people here as we can.

CRSA's meeting agenda was reviewed.

Ms. Hanson mentioned we're proposing a little bit different structure for the Master Plan organization which we hope makes it a lot more functional for you. The homework is to be done between now and our next meeting. For the most illustrative image of Elko to a newcomer, that

could be a good thing or a bad thing. A fifth one that we might want to add on there is what do you think Elko could or should look like in the future, so model places. We'll look forward to seeing your photos. You can either bring them on a CD or email them to me. I think you all have my contact info by now but if not we'll put it on the board.

Mr. Buaku said a lot of comments came in and we tried to synthesize them based on five main different topics: arts and culture, transportation, land use, activity zones and then sensitive areas. We tried to print out all of the comments we had. We had some comments from the public workshop that we did. We also had some from the website that we set up as well as the Facebook page. We tried to look through all of them and see where they belong, which would best fit the maps that we're coming up with. When you look on your maps you see that some of the comments are specific, so you have the callouts coming out from a specific place. At the end or bottom of the sheet you see additional comments. This is where the comments are more general, for instance in arts and culture where there's a comment, keep Elko small, is not placed specific but we add it as additional comments. This summarizes a lot of what people have been saying from all our sources. We even have some that came in later than when we printed these which are not here yet. For arts and culture you'll notice that a lot of the comments were centered on the downtown area and then people either talk about specific buildings they want improved or they want to see gateways. For transportation some of the things that jumped out included working on Mountain City Highway, making it more pedestrian friendly, and having some form of intervention on 5th Street. I should have explained the colors early on. The green represents areas of no change where according to the community comments they didn't see that there was going to be a lot of change in those areas. The red represented areas where according to people's comments there had to be a lot of changes or interventions and then the yellow and blue sort of fall in between. When we came last month we sort of limited it to just areas that were at risk or areas which were doing well and then based on the comments we synthesized and broke it down into about four different categories. It's about the same for all the other categories. With the land use, some of the comments have led into the development of potential projects that the city can undertake. These are comments the city and other advisory boards and organizations can determine whether they are things that can really be potential projects or just aren't feasible in the near future. In activity zones people are talking about malls, plazas, parks and trails. The poll came from the Envision Elko website and this was updated on May 7th so comments have come in since.

Ms. Hanson said the question we asked was which issue do you think would be most pressing or most important to address as the City of Elko grows?

Mr. Buaku said this public comment exercise has been very useful. As we get to know how the public is thinking about issues for the community and as we go on later in the meeting you'll see how it's being placed in goals and objectives as well as projects for the Master Plan.

Ms. Hanson said there were a few comments that seemed to come up over and over again. Most people, you can see in this poll which is by no means scientific, said arts and culture and beautification were key issues, job creation and economic growth, and downtown revitalization. Things that really didn't make the list were increase in a variety of housing stock or more high-quality affordable housing. Those were less of a priority for the people who answered this survey. We're going to be sending out a survey in the next couple of weeks that asks people these same kinds of questions. It will go to every single household in Elko. There will be some

questions about the recreation center as well, and those will go to a little bit broader circulation: Spring Creek, Lamoille, and Ryndon, so we're extending a little bit beyond. These are all posted on the internet and I have a few more packets here. Basically people really like Elko the way that it is and don't want to lose the character and qualities it has as the community grows. Things they want are better transportation connections from the north to the south side of the City over the railroad tracks and the river, more places for teens to have fun and stay out of trouble, activities for kids, more retail and commercial opportunities, more economic development, and bicycle and jogging paths. You have a pretty active community as you know and people like to get out, exercise, have fun and have places for that kind of thing. There will be other opportunities, as you know tonight's an open meeting to the public so we have a lot of members from the community here. We'll have the survey which will be another formal input period. After we put together kind of a draft Master Plan we'll take it back out to the public at large at an open house and say you gave us your ideas, we synthesized them, here's what we came up with. Did we get it right? Do we need to change it? Let us know what we need to tweak. That will be kind of the next big public outreach push and that will come in late summer.

The Elko Master Plan Proposed Document and Outline were reviewed.

Ms. Hanson said rather than redoing the entire population and demographics chapter of the current Master Plan we'll attach kind of an errata sheet or an update sheet that will say here are the numbers and here are the figures that are out of date, and correct some key numbers without doing a complete overhaul. Land Use will incorporate elements from the RDA Plan as well as some other ideas that have come out of our public process. Arts and Culture is a new chapter. The document will be formatted in such a way that the black and white box on the top right hand corner will serve as a navigation tab. We'll set it up in a PDF format on the City's website. It's very interactive. You could click on Introduction and it will take you to the Introduction chapter. You can click on Atlas and it will take you to all of the maps that are part of the plan. We hope that you can easily navigate through the document by using the tabs. Each chapter will have goals and objectives. This is the guiding policy that the city will use as it's making planning decisions. The Implementation list was compiled by general public suggestions. We're hoping this becomes a tool you can use on a more regular basis. As projects are funded you can move them to a completed projects tab so you have a record to show all the things that have been accomplished since the update was adopted. Before we get into the specific goals and objectives, how do people feel about this different Plan structure? It has a lot of benefits. There was a question earlier about, are a lot of cities doing this kind of thing? We've done three plans like this. It is kind of a new concept. It meets NRS requirements so it's still within the statutory requirements of creating a Master Plan. It's a little bit different but we also think it's a whole lot more functional than what you have currently.

Mr. Neilson said it's laid out in a way you can use it very effectively. You can adapt and modify it quickly and I think it's a little easier for people to understand as they use it because it's based on a group of projects. That's why we're seeing a trend in this direction.

Ms. Hanson said you can also add in additional topical chapters, so if you decided you needed a section on Economic Development or even something as specific as dog parks, if there's anything you want to develop a specific plan for it becomes a chapter within this so you don't have twenty separate plans floating around in parallel, you have one document that contains all of your plans.

Commissioner Perry said if I compare and contrast it with our existing Master Plan, at the end of each one of these chapters there was one or two pages of implementation with a sentence or two on what we were going to do, what the City was going to do, how we were going to act and so forth. To have an actual page for each one of these with its thoughts I think flushes that out a little more because we sometimes as Planning Commission, speaking for myself, struggle with our Annual Work Program. Which ones of these things are we going to do? Maybe this will make it a little bit more usable in the context we can pick a few of these and take some baby steps and when they're done put them at the end and say ok this one is checked off. Now let's go to the next one, and help us focus.

Ms. Hanson said some of the implementation strategies in your existing Plan almost read more like objectives to me a little bit. They were kind of broad. You know, we make a goal to. Implementation action would be to coordinate with x, y and z to make sure that this happens, but less of a specific: we're going to write a new Zoning Ordinance or we're going to improve this intersection by doing whatever. Hopefully we can capture all of those different things within there and not lose anything that you have currently. Are we ok to move forward in this direction? Does that sound like it's not any major concerns?

Commissioner Perry said I'm seeing a lot of nods, not seeing a lot of head shaking so yes.

Ms. Hanson said there was a comment earlier about if we have this long list of implementation projects does it create an expectation within the community to implement some of these things that the City's going to take some of these on effective immediately? We need to have a real big disclaimer right at the very beginning I think that says funds are limited. We can only do so much and a lot of these things may take Stakeholders. We may need a lot of coordination with other people. Implementing this project can't all rest on the City, and I see our Councilman here is saying yeah there's no way we can do all of this ourselves so we need to make sure we have that at the beginning so there's no expectations that can't be accommodated. What we have here is a list of preliminary goals and objectives. Your existing Plan right now has a single goal for each topic and a long series of objectives. We stuck with a single goal and tried to maintain the same spirit and type of information in the objectives but combine a few, make them a little bit broader and then hope the specifics will come in down here under best practices where we say what does it really mean. How are we really going to address this? Just keep these as kind of broad objectives. In the electronic document when we're done if you clicked on one of these objectives it would be a hyper-link that would take you down to its discussion and the best practices. They'll seem a little bit broad. They'll seem like they're not really digging into the meat of what we need to do quite yet and that's sort of intentional, but if we're way too broad tell us that and we can adjust it as well. I'm hoping we can make this a working meeting where we all shout out different suggestions. We'll go back and rework all of these based on your input.

Mr. Wilkinson said how does that compare to what's in our Master Plan now? Have you looked at the objectives that we currently have versus that ones that are here and try to use those.

Ms. Hanson said some of them were a little bit more specific than we wanted to get here. Some of them we felt would fall more under projects or under best practices. We tried to maintain the same spirit and same topics for the most part. If we missed an important one, that's why we're here today.

Mr. Wilkinson said probably one of the bigger issues we have is a large area of the downtown area is improperly zoned General Industrial. Maybe that's an example we can talk specifically to on how this works because that really needs to be addressed. We need to rezone blocks and blocks.

Ms. Hanson said the actual rezoning itself could become a project. The goal here that I think that fits under is Objective 1.2. There are lots of ways to roll all that in and we don't want to start over from scratch. We'll reorganize it but we hope to maintain all of the same ideas within it. That's a good one. I've made a note of it to make sure we get that in there.

A member of the public mentioned hyperlinks could be placed on the objectives themselves to help find the specific steps to achieve those objectives.

Commissioner Perry said the verbiage in Objective 1.1 in Land Use, there's actually in the old Master Plan in the Housing Component: the City will ensure an adequate diversity of residentially zoned properties to accommodate a mixture and variety of housing types.

Ms. Hanson said we can keep the exact same wording but it basically says the same thing here.

Mr. Wilkinson said I'd like to explore the use of the word provide. The city needs to provide opportunities for that to occur, but the city doesn't provide the housing.

A member of the public mentioned using enable.

Someone else mentioned using encourage.

Mr. Wilkinson said we should review NRS against that language and just make sure it's consistent.

Ms. Hanson said ok we'll do that. In Objective 1.2 we put the word commercial there because there's a civic heart of the city that's in a different location kind of here by the campus, City Park and City Hall, but it may be more than just the commercial heart. It could be the cultural heart or we could just take it out and say the heart of the community. It seemed to me that served a little bit different role than some other parts of the city.

A member of the public said my concern is that saying commercial. The downtown is commercial but I do think there is a lot of cultural; the Western Folklife Center for example.

Lina Blohm, RDAAC said I definitely agree with that. We are trying to promote cultural. We're rather limited but we are really working hard. We'd really like to see some kind of reference to cultural there.

Ms. Hanson said do you want to add cultural or do you want to strike commercial?

There was further discussion on the subject.

Ms. Hanson said for now I will add commercial and cultural heart and we can revisit it again. Nothing we decide today is set in stone. The trend right now is away from large swaths of residential, large swaths of commercial, large areas of industrial and kind of mixing them together a little bit. Industrial is tough to mix in with other uses. Objective 1.3 isn't saying throughout the entire city but only in major centers along the key arterials, kind of those key community gathering places.

Commissioner Perry said looking at our existing Land Use Map and knowing the Ordinances that we have for zoning, is mixed use a separate and distinct zoning entity?

Ms. Hanson said a lot of places are adopting new mixed use zones and rezoning areas. For example, the downtown would be a perfect place to make it a mixed use area. You have retail on the ground level or a restaurant or something, apartments above or professional offices above. A lot of places are adopting new mixed use zones but you can also do it in other ways just by modifying the existing Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Wilkinson said I think our Commercial Zone already allows that.

Ms. Hanson said exactly. I was going to say it may very well do that.

Commissioner Perry said maybe we should consider that as an action somewhere along here. Not an objective but looking at our Zoning Classifications as a project and trying to define that out better because right now we have this map that shows all this red down through here and when you see all that red that says commercial you don't think of somebody living upstairs in a commercial building necessarily.

Ms. Hanson said a lot of communities are finding they need to really specify. Sometimes they have a mixed use zone and people say we have a restaurant and a retail store. Yeah that's a mix of different kinds of uses but it's not the same as residential near commercial uses. The idea behind this is to create places where people don't need to drive quite as much so if you need to go take care of your daily needs you can actually walk there instead of having to get in a car and drive. You could walk to your office perhaps. Walk to get a gallon of milk.

Mr. Andreozzi said in the downtown area where we do have some of the General Industrial, maybe a mixed use in that area makes some sense so that if people want to have a home or a commercial activity or other retail activity you can. With that Industrial that's really a hard one to address in there. We really don't have a whole lot of industrial activity it's just a remnant from when the railroad ran through here.

Ms. Hanson said that's a great spot for it to allow the area to transition a little bit.

Ms. Blohm mentioned some of the mixed uses today are not compatible.

Commissioner Perry brought up the example of the new state offices located in residential zoning and said a classification of mixed use in certain well thought out nodes might promote that better in the Master Plan.

Ms. Hanson said good design and buffers have a lot to do with how well land uses work well next to one another. We'll get into all of this in more detail, kind of the philosophical things behind some of these as we go along through the process.

Someone mentioned adding an "s" to the word pattern in objective 1.3 because the type of mixed use may be different in different areas of the corridor.

Ms. Blohm asked when urban sprawl would be addressed.

Ms. Hanson said there are a lot of growth management tools out there and I think Objective 1.7 does some of that. Objective 1.3 if we're talking about adaptability and longevity and overall sustainability could be part of that as well. We'll think about that one and figure out the best way to put it in because we can't stop private land owners from developing.

Commissioner Perry said there is a portion in the existing Master Plan that addresses annexations of enclaves and so forth within and outside the city, which might address some of that when you say sprawl because when I hear the word I think growing outside of the existing city boundaries.

Mr. Wilkinson said I think the real comment is that there is a lot of commercial development going out on Mountain City Highway. Depending on the size of commercial development, some areas downtown we don't have the space without buying up property and getting rid of buildings. People want bigger restaurants, stores, etc. Those aren't going to fit downtown.

Ms. Blohm said not necessarily because you find more and more of these box businesses looking at boutique stores because they realize they have to adapt to neighborhoods as opposed to being huge big box businesses. I read through here regarding communities. Do we want to encourage, incubate and nurture the core or do we just want to allow capitalistic development?

Mr. Andreozzi said aren't you seeing some changes out there where you have walkable communities and more centers that are close to commercial activities? On one hand Mountain City Highway, for the City, is kind of handy because we don't have to pay to maintain that. It's a State Route but at the same time we can't get to those places without driving there. Of course, I can't imagine shopping without needing a vehicle for bringing everything home.

Ms. Hanson said the idea is to have a variety, more choice. That's what we want to do. We want to provide lots of choices for your residents, make it convenient to do whatever it is that you want to do. Places like Home Depot or Wal-Mart, people like to shop at Wal-Mart. You need to provide lots of opportunities within your community for lots of different types of uses and I think we can balance all of that. That's the trick of long range community planning is a healthy balance.

Mr. Andreozzi said I think the other thing that helps control urban sprawl is the actual cost to develop that. We don't have any infrastructure out there. We're getting to the point where our water system, to really grow outside our borders, we have to build at a higher elevation. We're seeing a lot more infill projects because it's a lot less expensive to do that.

Ms. Hanson said I can tell we're going to run out of time. I may move us along a little faster. It's great discussion and we need to keep having it. As far as controlling sprawl and growth

management I think we can put in a new objective that says annexations need to be logical and orderly and make good planning sense, and kind of things like that to say we're going to think about expansion as we expand and not limit the rights of individual property owners but make sure we have a balance, make sure we're addressing and preserving our core. I'm going to go a little bit faster. If you see something that's really burning let me know. We can always come back if there's something you want to think about for a little while, give us a call. My email address is up here. Send us comments as we go through. The idea for Objective 1.5 is we don't want a lot of really ugly stuff at the edges of our community. We want to have a nice pretty first impression but we also want to create more jobs within our community and more opportunity for people to work here. The light industrial term came from the public. People pointed out places they think would be good for light industrial. I don't think we mean to limit it.

Councilman Conner said what they were talking about I see places like Fernley and Carson City where they have industrial businesses that are in nice buildings. When I was on the Planning Commission in the '90s we looked at all the places that were general commercial in the middle of our city. What control do you have to stop people from building that way? At that time there was no taste to change that zoning but I think we still need to look at that.

Mr. Andreozzi said I actually like the statement but instead of just limiting it to light industrial I think that's a good general statement for commercial development. One complaint that we get, we don't have any way to regulate what that exterior of the building would look like.

Ms. Hanson said Objective 1.6 parallels 1.2.

Mr. Wynes said why don't you put that next to 1.2 and renumber all the objectives. That way you have the both of the community hearts next to each other and you don't lose the context.

Councilman Conner said could we go back to 1.6 for a moment? Consider adding the word preserve after strengthen because I know there were a lot of comments about not including a club there.

Ms. Hanson said we are adding annexation, growth management, controlling sprawl.

Commissioner Perry said do cities often have a public safety component objective here somewhere that would relate to such things as floods and earthquakes with respect to land use?

Mr. Wynes said NRS says you can talk about those.

Ms. Hanson said you certainly can. Some communities have a separate chapter on natural and hazardous areas but we could certainly put it in here.

Mr. Andreozzi said would we be looking at some of the County area around us as far as land use and working with the County regarding densities around our border?

Ms. Hanson said we can put that in as coordination. As we're going through deciding which future land uses should go in certain places we'll make sure that we don't have a stark contrast from one boundary line to another because those only exist on maps. We could also say publicly owned so we're not affecting the federal lands or tribal lands that are around the city. The idea

here is we don't want to limit private development and we recognize a lot of the area around the city is private but we don't want to go out and damage important systems if we can avoid it.

There was discussion about the environments listed in Objective 1.7.

Commissioner Perry said the foothills part of it, as we move we are getting into higher topography. It's happening already. The component I'm concerned about is the waterways, wetlands and drainages because if indeed we do see significant additional development in the floodplain then we have to start looking at how to mitigate that and that becomes a much bigger issue that places like Reno and Sparks are having to deal with because they've had floods because there's no attenuation of water anymore.

Ms. Hanson said your earlier comment about earthquakes and floods makes me think what if we spin this in such a way that we say ensure new development. We don't want to put the residents or people at risk. Maybe we spin it in such a way that we're protecting health, safety and welfare and less of the natural systems.

A member of the public said that would be my understanding of the terminology of jeopardize is what are we putting in danger? Is it a residence, home, or foothill? Are we going to cut it all down or are we going to work with what the natural topography is because you can still build and work within the natural topography and not eliminate that foothill and you might not even know a house is up there.

Another member of the public said instead of do not jeopardize, you can put are mindful of?

Ms. Hanson said we'll try to pull all these different ideas together. I'm going to move to the transportation section. I'm not sure why we went from Objective 1.2 to 4.1. We might have things out of order a bit. You guys are probably a ways off on a pretty serious bus system but don't you have car pool here?

Councilman Conner mentioned we have the N.E.A.T. bus.

A member of the public said it's pretty limited. It's not public transit. It has a limited service area.

Councilman Conner said we actually put bus stops at different locations throughout the City at one point when they were starting to become more, but I think the funding went away. They were also located at a transportation hub near the hospital which sort of went away.

Ms. Hanson said you sort of have to hit a critical population mass to really make those viable. I don't think you're quite there yet but this Plan is looking out a long ways. It will help you in the future.

A member of the public said especially if we continue to sprawl.

Mr. Andreozzi brought up the two mile radius for school buses and mentioned there may be a need for school bus facilities in the right-of-way so the children can safely load and unload.

Ms. Hanson said I'm not sure where Objective 4.5 came from. I didn't hear that. Was that a public comment? Our transportation consultant came up with this. It may have been rolling in some of your existing goals and objectives and trying to connect them.

Mr. Andreozzi said we've talked about looking at some of the limitations we have with our current transportation network system. How does it function? What level of service do we have? Is there anything we can do to improve that, and in some of our areas we have exceedingly wide excess rights-of-way that we need to evaluate reducing.

Ms. Hanson said if we don't feel like it's captured in there we may put in another objective of maximize what you have.

Commissioner Perry said I don't know whether this is an objective or implementation but there was quite a bit of comment from the first meeting regarding the traffic issues, especially coming over the hill and how that is something that has to be solved in time before certain things in downtown redevelopment can be done, the Silver Street thing and all of that. When I came in here tonight I thought if somewhere in there we could articulate that we're going to make a plan that has a logical sequence to it.

Ms. Hanson said moving on to Parks, Recreation and Open Space, we can draw a radius and I think our survey will help us pin down what areas are lacking and which are fairly well served.

Discussion took place regarding the wording every resident as opposed to residents and identifying additional park spaces to be developed because they're not already parks.

Ms. Blohm said would it make sense to address new residential development subdivisions as needing more green space in this section?

There was discussion about making developers do landscaping, and the perks and consequences of doing such.

Ms. Hanson said usually there's a lot or area threshold above which you need to landscape. A lot of communities are adopting things like that. We'll bring examples of how other communities have addressed that.

Mr. Andreozzi said there's no question there needs to be some maneuvering and some thought that needs to go into that but if you don't have a mechanism there that's why we don't have pocket parks now because there hasn't been that force of law or regulation. It's definitely challenging. If that's something the community wants then you've got to set yourself up. It's extremely hard now to go into these developed neighborhoods and develop a park, if not impossible.

Councilman Conner said there have been some of our new developments that had softball fields and other fields in their plans and as money got spent on various things they never got built because it wasn't a guarantee.

Mr. Andreozzi said there are a couple neighborhoods that have absolutely no place for kids to play.

Ms. Hanson said with Arts and Culture we got input earlier today.

Commissioner Perry said sometimes you need to look at the existing Plan to see what it says to see if there are some things that worked and this was the strategy twenty years ago and if you think about it, it really did get carried out.

The current Master Plan's Parks, Recreation and Open Space, Objective 4 was read.

Commissioner Perry said indeed other than the few places that we have where there aren't any of those, and there are no parks, we're largely doing that and even as we speak a new park's going in, in a floodplain that the City has control over because you can't build on it, so it's not a cost to anybody as far as development goes and a lot of our parks have been built along these areas.

Ms. Hanson said do you see that as being a tool to identify additional spaces or do you see that needs to be elevated to its own objective?

Commissioner Perry said well it was an objective then. It doesn't fit all parks of the City. In fact the areas that don't have parks are areas that don't have any of these. This strategy looks like it worked. Maybe it should still be in here someplace and then a strategy of exception to address the areas where we really don't have any of those and we don't own any land.

Ms. Hanson said how about if we add an objective 2.6?

A member of the public said one of the things I heard at the last meeting was people wanted to be careful with Objective 2.2 and the recreational center that it not hurt an existing recreational area.

Ms. Blohm said or be in competition with it.

Ms. Hanson said I understand the meaning.

There was more discussion on the topic.

Ms. Hanson asked if everyone heard the change to say underserved instead of unmet.

Councilman Conner noted the athletic clubs didn't feel threatened by a recreation center because they serve different people.

A member of the public said from my perspective the rec center seems like such a huge project in and of itself that I'm not convinced that it really belongs in this document as a stated objective. Perhaps that might be better off having that separate like as a project rather than as a stated objective for the Master Plan.

Ms. Hanson said any objection to moving it to a specific project? It would be a quick, easy success for you.

A member of the public said your goal is for all ages regardless of the time of year, you're talking about trails, you're talking about outside, you better talk about inside otherwise you've eliminated one of your objectives out of your goal.

There was additional discussion on wording and where to place it.

A member of the public said there is a piece of property that would be ideal for a recreational sports complex and it would be across the street from the Igloo and it would be in close association with the bowling alley. It's only a block from the park. You could even add more soccer fields. You could add lots of things.

Ms. Hanson said we'll add some key words here. We'll broaden it a little bit so we're not talking specifically about the rec center but we'll keep the focus on underserved recreational needs. We'll make sure it's regional and we don't want to compete with existing resources.

Mr. Andreozzi said with Objective 2.4 we do have outfalls along the Humboldt that we are required to maintain. When you say natural, it still acts as our storm water discharge too.

Commissioner Perry said we have a Land Use Map for the city. We have a Transportation Map for the city, but one of the things I've always wondered is we don't have a Parks and Recreation Map or overlay for the city that shows just where the existing parks are or just where the existing linear parks and connectivity is. With a map that showed those places, perhaps it would drive us to think more about connecting all these parks via sidewalks and bike paths, but without a map now it's kind of hard to think about how they connect without a car. Maybe an objective should be to do a Parks and Recreation Map.

Ms. Hanson said we actually have it on the list already, you'll be happy to know. The Elko Community Atlas section will all be maps. We may need to add some more. We'll rely on you heavily as we're preparing them.

There was discussion on Objective 2.5.

Ms. Hanson said so we can say coordinate planning with county, state, federal, and tribal lands to ensure access and the best use of open spaces, trail heads, access points and visual resources.

Commissioner Perry said it's always been my assumption that what we paid attention to was that which was shown on the Land Use Map. The Land Use Map goes outside the city boundaries into places that eventually the city saw could be annexed and we wanted to be thinking about infrastructure and so forth and were coordinating with the county on roads and various other things like that. It's almost like within the sphere of the Land Use Map. That extends several miles.

Mr. Wynes said there is no definition. It would depend on what would be a logical boundary for the city to envision in the next given time period. It could be in some places adjacent to the city limits and other places it could be out a couple miles. As we go out it moves out one mile.

Ms. Hanson said Arts and Culture I'm going to go over real quickly because we got some input from the Arts and Culture Advisory Committee earlier today. The word projects was added in the

goal before the word activities. We decided to rework a lot of these. We had to balance between beautification, arts and the cultural aspect. This is a guiding document that will guide all of the different advisory committees of the city but we didn't want to have different goals and objectives that conflict or compete with RDA's goals. Objective 3.1, we thought instead of redesign it would be beautify or enhance. The Arts and Culture Advisory Board would focus mostly on the details whereas the RDA would focus on the big picture of how do we revitalize this area. Objective 3.2 refers mostly to extending what's already been done that's working well and build upon that. This is referring to the vacated rail corridor. Maybe there's a need to create some green spaces within the core of the downtown.

There was discussion on using underutilized space instead of open space.

Ms. Hanson said the main comment for Objective 3.3 was that we weren't creating a program but we're supporting the creation of programs. Objective 3.4 was changed from saying establish to support the coordination of and also adding the RDA after City. Objective 3.5, we had a long discussion about the role of different advisory committees and who is doing what. Our goal is to create a broad vision that can help support everybody's actions and projects. We can leave the project brainstorming for next time and you can all send me your own ideas and we'll come back with a compiled list. Remember your homework assignment to take photos and send them to us.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

This agenda item is to provide time for the general public to address the Planning Commission regarding items of concern not specifically listed on the agenda. Action cannot be taken at this time, but a matter can be set on the agenda for a future meeting, as appropriate.

There were no comments made at this time.

NOTE: The Chairman or Vice Chairman reserves the right to change the order of the agenda and if the agenda is not completed, to recess the meeting and continue on another specified date and time.

III. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Jeff Thompson, Chairperson

Reece Keener, Secretary