

**CITY OF ELKO**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**SPECIAL WORKSHOP MINUTES**  
**6:00 P.M., P.D.S.T., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2010**  
**ELKO CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS,**  
**1751 COLLEGE AVENUE, ELKO, NEVADA**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jeff Thompson.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Jeff Thompson, Rich Perry, John Anderson, Doug Owen,  
Alene Sutherland

Absent/Excused: Reece Keener, Brent Elmore

City Staff: Curtis Calder, City Manager  
Delmo Andreozzi, Assistant City Manager  
Ed Wynes, City Planner  
Scott Wilkinson, Development Manager  
Eric Howes, Parks and Recreation Director  
Jeremy Draper, Civil Engineer

Others Present: Laura Hanson, CRSA  
Donald Buaku, CRSA

**I. WORKSHOP**

Over the last few months, Salt Lake City based consultants, CRSA have been working with the public, City Staff, and the City Planning Commission to update our City of Elko Master Plan. Last month, CRSA presented an overview of the current draft, and distributed copies of the draft plan to the Planning Commission and City Council. This meeting will focus on proposed changes or revisions to the draft plan by the Planning Commission. A copy of the current Draft Plan is available for public review on the project website at [www.envisionelko.com](http://www.envisionelko.com). **DISCUSSION ITEM ONLY, NO ACTION REQUIRED.**

Ms. Hanson said I didn't plan a formal presentation. I was hoping that we could just sit down and go through the document a little bit. I know you've had a few challenging decisions come before you in the last little while about multi-family housing, so I thought this is a great opportunity to make sure the Master Plan says what the community wants it to say, so as you're moving forward into the future you have a real clear direction on what you want to do in those types of situations and make sure the map is accurate and says what you want it to say.

Chairman Thompson noted he did not have notes with him.

Mr. Wilkinson said I noticed you have the proposed Future Land Use plan up there. Earlier on Staff put together a map with some proposed commercial nodes and things like that. I notice those aren't on here. What are your plans with regard to that information?

Ms. Hanson said we started looking at that in a little bit more detail and we talked to Susie Becker our economic consultant on the project and she gave us a recommendation, we actually recalled this from a previous project, that the distance between neighborhood centers ought to be about three miles apart. They have about a one and a half mile radius each, so if you put them three miles apart there's not too much overlap between those. If you look at the map, we started looking at this and we had identified some of these key intersections initially on that Staff map. We have this mixed-use neighborhood district and if we put the nodes where you wanted, they are only a mile apart. If you look at three miles, this is based on buying power and how much capture area that type of center can include, we started feeling like there maybe wasn't enough distance to justify having them quite this close to one another. We have two mixed-use areas, and thought maybe since there are some areas that are somewhat undefined at this point, we have just sort of a general holding zone area, but we don't have specific subdivision proposals or a sense of what's going to happen in those areas, that maybe these might suffice for now since they're at about the right kind of spacing, they're serving different sides of the community and that as the community starts to expand outward we may add in another location.

Mr. Wilkinson said I agree going that direction. What this map doesn't show is Cattle Drive being extended to the Exit 298 area from Mountain City Highway. That was one of our comments, Cattle Drive being extended and that maybe some commercial would be out in the Cattle Drive area.

Ms. Hanson said ok we'll make sure to make that note.

Mr. Wilkinson said you are the professionals and the consultants to help guide us. I'm going to just throw out questions that I have. That map we gave you showed Cattle Drive and then some secondary roads, we thought maybe a commercial node out in that Section 18 area that's owned by BLM, just for your consideration, and then another on Errecart. Errecart's going to be a minor arterial and we've had some discussion amongst ourselves at the Planning Commission meetings actually, that doesn't it make sense that we would see commercial development along the Errecart corridor. I understand the spacing, but does the spacing work for the configuration or geometry of Elko, or do we need to just reflect Elko's specific circumstances? I don't know. Those are two things I had on the Land Use so far. I haven't had a chance to do a thorough review of the document yet.

Ms. Hanson said we'll take a good look at both of those. I've mentioned a couple times in our previous meetings that I'm a little hesitant to identify too many additional commercial areas outside of your downtown. You have a couple really large commercial areas already kind of along the freeway which I think when you look at the population of Elko and recognizing that you draw from the county in a much larger area, you have tons of commercially zoned property already and it's so easy for it to spread along these major arterials so you get these big long strips of commercial and the more diffused it is the less successful and active the spaces are. This doesn't mean that it's not appropriate along Errecart. We can definitely look at that and there may be places where it is, but our sort of philosophy has been to limit that to the extent possible to the areas that have already been zoned commercial because you have quite a lot of it and then

encourage new development in the core of the city. The neighborhood centers are a little bit different animal though because they have a different type of use, a different type of function. That's the place where you go get a gallon of milk at 7:00 pm and you realize, what are my kids going to eat for breakfast. You know those quick little trips, the daily needs and so those can be farther out without really impacting your downtown, but we'll take a look at those.

Mr. Wilkinson said maybe we need to have, and maybe it's in here, that type of discussion. That philosophy needs to be presented in the text of the document which justifies to a layman like myself why we don't have commercial identified along a major corridor like Errecart.

Ms. Hanson said it's a discussion point too really. That's kind of an assumption and a practice that we've brought to the table but this is your community and we want to know what you think is right for Elko as well. These are kind of our professional recommendations, but if you feel really strongly that you disagree with that philosophy for one reason or another let's talk about it.

Mr. Wilkinson said well the city's committed to the redevelopment of downtown. That's obvious. They've gone to great lengths to facilitate that, so what we have needs to support that, but then again maybe we just put in the text maybe a paragraph discussion on the available commercially zoned property and the reason why there wasn't more presented along some of the minor arterials and some discussion on best practices for Planners that typically these are three miles apart or whatever, but based on Elko's circumstances this might be more appropriate however, etc.

Ms. Hanson said sure that's helpful. We'll definitely do that.

Mr. Calder said I had one comment right at the very beginning and Mr. Andreozzi might have already talked to you about this, but this could probably be located in two locations, the very beginning of the document where we're talking about what a Master Plan is and then possibly at the beginning of the Land Use section. What we need to have in there is a discussion of the terminology with regard to general Master Plans versus specific Master Plans because that seems to come up every time we get into Land Use discussions. I remember when Dennis Crooks was here he would often times have to educate even Staff on that issue because a lot of people come from communities with specific Master Plans which are very different than a general plan that is flexible, so somewhere in the document we need to differentiate between the two.

Ms. Hanson said it's a little challenging the way your State Statute is written. A lot of communities will call this kind of document a comprehensive plan or a general plan, but the fact that your Statute calls it a Master Plan gets a little confused with very specific Master Plans of like a planned community for example or a downtown area, revitalization area. The nomenclature can be a little confusing.

Mr. Wilkinson said in your introduction you talk about the requirements under NRS which are population driven, so as Mr. Calder mentioned just expand on that so Elko's plan based on population is basically a general plan. It's not a specific Master Plan and it's a guideline so on and so forth. Maybe just expand right there in the introduction on that.

Mr. Andreozzi said while we're focusing on the Land Use map, we have the new category of medium density. I was just wondering if we could have a conversation about that and how that might factor into things.

Ms. Hanson said do you want me to start with how we came up with the terms that we have? You're very much like a lot of other communities in your same sort of setting and environment where you have pretty low density as a community in a lot of places, but you also have some pockets of higher density. Just to run through the four different categories of residential that we have right now, we have residential rural density and the idea here is this would be half acre lots or larger. You'd have a little bit more open space. It's more of kind of a county zoning feel really and these are all well beyond the current city boundaries, so these are our future annexation areas with the intent that as you fill this area up this may change over time, but that's a good 20 – 50 years out. Right now this is really just kind of a holding zone. If you're going to have very large lots, that's really a county type of density. It's not really as appropriate within a city. Basically at higher densities your infrastructure costs and water uses are cheaper to maintain. A really low density for a community is a really expensive kind of density because it's that many more miles of water pipe. It's that many more miles of roads. It's that many more miles for your fire trucks to travel or your snow plows to plow, and so it ends up being a much more expensive type of development for a community to maintain. Really high density is also kind of expensive because sometimes if you get to really high concentrations of high density you have some issues with unsavory people. We don't want to get too much into that because I've rented in my life and I bet most of you probably rented when you were young and before you were able to buy a home of your own, so there are a lot of really good people that rent and need multi-family housing but if you get a huge concentration of it together sometimes you can have crime problems and so those are a little bit higher to maintain as well. From the research that we've done and other groups like Envision Utah have done, if you are familiar with that group, they've found that there's a sweet spot between about 8 units per acre and 12 units per acre, which at that point the cost of developing those areas and servicing and maintaining those areas goes way down, and so it starts to plateau a little bit, and so that's about the density that we aim towards as planners as the average because it's a density that cities can usually afford to maintain. Keeping that in mind, we looked at your existing Future Land Use Map and your Zoning Map and came up with a few modifications. I described the rural density which is really a county level density. What we've called residential low density would be densities between two and four units per acre. In most places that's a really low density. It feels pretty standard here in Elko because you're in a fairly new area. You haven't been around that long. You don't have that large of a population, so you've had a little bit more luxury and ability to spread out like most people have in the west. Medium density we've identified between five and eight units per acre, so that's where you get into that sweet spot of what's the most economical for the city to maintain. You can see low density is yellow. We don't have a whole lot of that but it's on areas of steeper slope, where you have topographical constraints a little bit farther out from the city. Medium density really makes up the majority of your future growth areas. It's about consistent with what you have in much of the city already. High density we've defined as nine to twenty units per acre. That exists only in a few areas. The places I thought we had identified, our colors may be off a little bit, were the area where you have a bunch of existing apartments. There's a little area along the rail corridor by the airport and then there was another little pocket. They're pretty limited specific places and I think they match where you already had zoned.

Mr. Wilkinson said we had a comment from one of our Councilmen at a prior meeting talking a little bit about high density and as a planner I would like your opinion on this, but he thought if you disburse high density throughout a community you lessen the probability of any crime problems and any other associated problems. I thought that sounded logical to me.

Ms. Hanson said it's true.

Mr. Wilkinson said should we show some high density residential along our minor arterial routes for future growth? Right now we have five or six conditional use permits for apartments. Nobody wants us in their backyards because not only do people rent while they save to afford a home, but a lot of people don't want to maintain and they go from ownership to renting, and they maybe don't want to move to the retirement trailer community so they move to an apartment or whatever. There are all kinds of people that rent. Should we show some high density residential along Jennings, Errecart, and Cattle Drive as loop roads?

Ms. Hanson said those would certainly be appropriate places. There's nothing that revitalizes a downtown more than bringing people downtown and people living downtown, so I think downtown's an appropriate place. I agree completely the more you concentrate something you create the equivalent of a housing project essentially. You have too many altogether and guess what you're going to have crime.

Commissioner Perry said you have southeast Reno.

Ms. Hanson said it's true. You really do. You end up with problems if you concentrate it. We've put into the document a lot of best practice language about life cycle housing and about creating opportunities for creating different housing choices within a neighborhood. You're all of a sudden an empty nester and going up the stairs might be a little bit harder these days and you really don't want to mow that big lawn any longer. Having a little bit smaller house, a duplex, four-plex, or even a small condo might sound great to you, but you don't want to leave the same neighborhood that you've always lived in. You have your friends there. You go to church there. You know people there and so it's really disruptive for people when they have to move out of their neighborhood into a different one just because their housing needs change. It's a philosophy that I believe in whole heartedly that we need to distribute housing choices and options throughout a city. It is challenging when you're talking about really high density housing projects and if they're very tall buildings and they're right by a single family neighborhood it's hard for people to swallow sometimes. A good discussion point here is your lessons learned over the last few weeks with these conditional use permits. Is there a threshold at which a little bit more density is tolerable? It's something that we can swallow, maybe four-plexes or a small condo complex of eight different units or something within a neighborhood. It's multi-family. It's higher density, but it's not the same as 20 units per acre and 6 stories high or whatever. I don't know exactly the proposals that you guys have seen recently but it's a little bit easier for people to swallow and maybe those kinds of projects we can direct towards the downtown where that kind of height is really appropriate and very desirable. It's kind of a discussion point. I'm not going to claim I know all the answers.

Mr. Wilkinson said that might be appropriate. We have a height restriction in our R zoning which allows for multi-family. It's 45' so you can get a three story building and then we have separation standards in our R zoning. I think we have pretty good code there, so just depending

on your acreage, orientation of buildings, windows, doors, etc. that really guides your density. I think we had one application that was 27 units per acre. That was with three story units and five to seven buildings in there, pretty good layout on the thing. There were 108 units, so it's not large. It was adjacent to a minor arterial. Staff felt as an intersection of minor arterial and collector that it was a pretty good location for that. I think our Code right now really governs your density that way. I just don't know that you could get much higher than that with our Code.

Commissioner Perry said I like the concept of low, medium and high, and the numbers make sense because medium if you take that and divide it by eight units per acre is about 5,000 square foot lots, so seven is 6,000 and that's in our Code the number that we use, so it's right in that range nicely. It is a major redefinition of what low density is though because in our previous map we called that low density. If we go forward and adopt this Land Use Map we have to then look at the Zoning Ordinance because that will mismatch. Just thinking about the last couple months we really almost have only two residential zoning districts that we're using. We're using R1 which is only one house and we're using R which has this thing with a conditional use permit where you can do anything within reason, but it can go above five. I think that's where if we adopt this we're going to have to go back and try to make the zoning districts match something like the Master Plan. There almost has to be like an R1 and an R, but maybe we tighten up R to say it's the equivalent of medium or something like that, right? Such that there's a limit on the number of units or something and then R something or other that I'm not sure we have in the Code, and if you look at that we don't have much of that anywhere. Maybe it's there already. I don't know but we have to make sure eventually they kind of match and that when we sit up here and say this is consistent with the Land Use component of the Master Plan because this is high density, it has kind of an equivalent zoning in there as opposed to maybe a conditional use permit to take an R to something higher, which I think are maybe some of the fixes we could look at.

Mr. Andreozzi said that was actually one of the discussions I was hoping we were going to have tonight because we have been through a lot of great opportunities and timing wise it's great that we can really think about it as we're updating this Master Plan. Staff's had conversations about where it's appropriate to see higher density dwellings. Certainly in our viewpoint in the downtown area you would expect to see maybe multi-story, less open space because in many ways it's already provided through public space. Whereas when you're getting away from the downtown area maybe there's more of a requirement to provide some of that density specific that you're talking about in the R zoning that's specifically controlled for three-plexes and four-plexes, and then our Code like Mr. Wilkinson was talking about restricts and governs the density of a particular place through the building separation, setbacks, height and the parking table. Especially as we go through a rezone application, knowing that if you have something that could be a single family all the way up to something that's as high density as the 5<sup>th</sup> and Copper let's say for example, 27 units per acre, and having this designation in here with this medium density, what that's telling me is that anytime we have a rezone the way the map shows now in those peripheral areas we're going to be saying a density of no greater than eight dwellings per acre.

Commissioner Perry said I understand that and I agree with you. What you're saying though is the map is going to be specific to zoning. Watching the last couple of months we have to fix that with respect to R because R in our actual zoning districts is four units per lot, right? That's what R is defined as, four units per lot as long as you can meet all those requirements, but there's a conditional use permit there that allows you to go endlessly above that, five or more. What I'm saying is I think we're going to have to go back, perhaps maybe the way to do it is with parking

restrictions and so forth like that in number of parking spots, but one way of fixing it is to say the conditional use permit is up to eight or whatever. You know, it has a cap not an endless because that's what allows a conditional use permit in R to go to what's a number, 500?

Mr. Wilkinson said if you try to do that, depending on the size of the parcel, they'd just start parceling things out to get around that, so we should think about that a little bit, but I believe we have an R2 zoning. The one thing we have in our current Master Plan is it really correlates well with our current zones and that was a comment I had was that all of our new definitions should correlate with our current zones because I think we probably have pretty good zone districts. Maybe we need to work on the conditional use under the R or maybe we just change the R zone and say you can only go up to a certain amount under CUP and the rest has to be an R3 or something like that without having to really rework all those zone districts, but I think if we're going to adopt this that it should be somewhat consistent with what we have on the books unless we just feel as a group that those zone districts don't work, but I think if you look at them you'd find that they do. We're not using all of them. We have very little R3 zoned property. I don't believe we have any R2 which would be I think the medium.

Commissioner Perry said my sense of that is that's because we're using the conditional use permit of R to achieve the higher zoning and that's where some the friction is occurring.

Mr. Wynes said right now we have R2 which is basically two dwellings permitted outright on a 6,000 square foot lot. We've got an R3 Zoning District which says the intended purpose is to provide and preserve residential areas appropriate primarily for multi-family residential uses of higher density usually along or in close proximity to arterial roadway corridors and to preclude uses that would detract or be detrimental to the character or function of the high density residential environment. As a permitted use there are no residential. As a conditional use multi-family residential development containing five or more units located on a single lot or parcel. The basic lot size in the R3 is 12,000 square feet. When you start playing with the numbers we're not too far apart. The discussion with the R zoning outright is something that we're going to be taking a hard look at in the near future. There are two things we want to look at and both of these are critical: parking and the R. We had some very rough, crude discussions among Mr. Andreozzi and myself last week, and Mr. Wilkinson's going to be probably involved within the coming week or so about how this is going to play out and we're going to be bringing these back probably to Planning Commission as soon as we can get something formalized so that we can get that out of this arena of the CUP. There has to be a better way to do it. I think the way to do it is to use what we have in the books right now, the R2 and R3 Zoning Districts, they're made for it. We may want to add some zoning districts and do away with things but I think what Ms. Hanson and her people are doing is trying to give us a better picture of what we want to go to than what we've got today. I think the zoning is pretty close to what we need. All we need to do is tweak the base and make it all work.

Mr. Wilkinson said I think one important thing we need to do with our Land Use Plan that we're going to present and possibly adopt is we need to look at the near term. Where can high density go now? Then we need to look at the long term. We can show it somewhere along the minor arterial of Jennings, but in reality that Jennings loop is not going to be built for decades. If we start saying in our Master Plan here is where our high density residential is going to go, and then we're coming in with conditional use permits because we have accessibility to more reasonable locations that's going to present a conflict. We need to identify short term locations for high

density residential and show that on this map that are logical. I believe our current Master Plan stating that they should be located along minor arterials, minor arterials and collectors where they intersect are roads that can handle those traffic volumes and things like that. We should look at this plan and start identifying those areas. It's obvious, I think to everybody in this room that Elko is in need of multi-family housing and we don't have it. People can't find reasonable accommodations. I think our plan needs to reflect that. Whether people like that color at that location on the map or not is what we have to deal with as we go through the adoption process.

Ms. Hanson said hopefully before then.

Mr. Wilkinson said if we don't show it, it's just going to present ongoing problems for the Staff and Planning Commission as we move forward.

Ms. Hanson said ideally you should not be using conditional use permits as a regular tool. It should be in kind of a rare circumstance and if we can do things right here we ought to identify the appropriate places where that kind of development can go outright without having to go through that permitting process where you just say these are the places where we think it's appropriate. You can do it here. If you try and do it somewhere else you're going to have to go through a few extra hoops but that shouldn't be the regular practice.

Mr. Wilkinson said a fundamental issue we have is that the majority of our area is R district throughout the city. Areas that we have that are suitable, we almost can't get rid of that right now because it's already zoned that. Unless those land owners want to go through that rezone, it's kind of tough to get people to rezone property.

Ms. Hanson said it's true. However, it's not uncommon in fact it's advisable for a city to update their Zoning Codes after adoption of a new comprehensive plan. The Code should implement the Plan. The Plan shouldn't necessarily just implement what your Codes say. I can see and I think we'll probably work on developing a list of recommended zone changes and zone updates to help implement this Plan and that may be one area where you don't change the designation of people's property but you may change the way that zone is rewritten a little bit. Obviously they'd be notified of that but if you reduce the ability for these multi-family housing developments to go in in places where people just feel like that is just not appropriate and it bothers them for whatever reason, you create a different zoning designation or update, I don't know if it's a new one or you just start using R3 a little bit more, and those are the places where it is appropriate, that's one way to get around it and a lot of people do that.

Commissioner Perry said I had to follow up on what you said earlier about people parceling. R seems consistent with medium density to me. If we adjusted the zoning district to read something like no more than eight units per acre, I know right now it's four per lot but that doesn't mean we can't add one sentence that says no more than this per acre and then we're not changing anybody's zoning or anything we're just kind of saying this is the cap on that particular one.

Ms. Hanson said that kind of change would probably be pretty favorable, I'm guessing in the community too.

Commissioner Perry said my other comment is this map is very different from our original map because our original map had swaths purposely so that it didn't follow actual boundaries and it's

nice that this does follow actual boundaries but it makes it look a lot more rigid. If we are going to try to add in, and I think that's a good idea, areas where we should have some higher density potential, perhaps we should go through in some of these areas and swath it, not specific to the lot and look at it just like we see here. I'll give an example, like along the Mountain City Highway there where we have commercial right off of the highway, of putting some high density, a strip of it in back of all of that before it reaches this mid density. That might achieve what we want without the map looking so specific. We've been through a few of these and I'm worried that for us and future Planning Commissions that with this map people are going to come in and say my lot was this or this piece of ground was this, how can you now say it's going to be something else? There's good and bad to this layout here but perhaps to accomplish putting some higher density along areas where we see it is to just put it in in swaths not specific to lot lines and that way there's a little more flexibility for Mr. Wynes and the person that is the Planner 20 years from now and the people that sit in these seats 20 years from now.

Ms. Hanson said we can definitely do that if that's something everybody likes and wants to go for. In the areas that haven't been platted it's really easy.

Chairman Thompson said the thing is where it has been though you're going to run into some opposition.

Mr. Wilkinson said I'm just wondering here because typically we like to update our Land Use Map as zone changes occur, so where we've got property that's already zoned, can we have those distinct boundaries and then areas, well I don't know, I don't think you can have a combination. Forget that, bad idea.

Ms. Hanson said it gets really confusing for communities to have a Future Land Use Map and a Zoning Map. The way I typically describe it to communities is your Future Land Use Map really shouldn't change very often. It should be as it is. It should be your long term vision saying this is where we want to be in 20 years, and it doesn't change much. Your Zoning Map changes all the time and hopefully it changes to better match up to the Land Use Map. I know you always have to go back and make changes because things happen but as a general principle your Future Land Use Map ought to reflect what you want to see 20 years from now and really shouldn't change a lot. That may be a little different than how you have been using it in the past.

Mr. Wilkinson said I think you answered the question that we should have poorly defined borders for the Land Use. What we had before but updated is kind of what we'd want going forward based on what you just said. Do you agree with that or do you feel different?

Ms. Hanson said I think it works. The nice thing about having it on specific parcel lines is that there's no grey area. If somebody's parcel happens to be straddled by two different swaths then it looks a little bit like you're picking and choosing sometimes. Sometimes that's a really nice benefit. If you're a land owner it's less predictable. You don't know quite exactly what you can do on your property. You know what your zoning is but you don't know what the potential for future zoning is.

Chairman Thompson said we had that issue back up on the other side of Mountain City Highway when the Land Use Map showed it was different than the commercial boundary so there was a big argument about where it actually was.

Mr. Wynes said I for one am in favor of blobs because it gives you, at least from my perspective, the option of saying, in my case I get a good application for a zone change there's rationale I can say we can move the line a little ways over here and make this fit or we can move it this way and make it fit depending upon the situation.

Ms. Hanson said we can go back to that. Right now your Future Land Use plan was just drawn as just large polygons in Autocad. The way we've done it is we've actually coded parcels as you noticed in GIS so that you can always pull that up and add and subtract different layers pretty easily. It's easy enough to go back to blobs. That's not a hard thing to do at all.

Mr. Wynes said the one thing I want is the parcel noted. Keep that so that we can use that as reference from Staff's perspective. I don't want to loose that but I also want the map to be more blobish or more like Commissioner Perry was saying and not so explicit. Washoe County as an example uses one map as a zoning map and a land use map. If they don't match the only thing you can do is rezone to what the map says. You can't deviate.

Mr. Wilkinson said that's population driven though right?

Mr. Wynes said I don't know what it's driven by but boy it's a mess.

Ms. Hanson said I don't know how they came up with the philosophy of the two maps, zoning plus the land use map, it's very confusing and causes a lot of problems I think.

Commissioner Perry said some of these aren't going to change and some of them are good. What if we use a hybrid of the two because the three areas that we really need blobby stuff are commercial, high density and industrial? Most of these low density residential, I'm not sure that those are wrong. A lot of them exist already and that's what they are. The public and all isn't going to change but the ones that we struggle with maybe that we want blobby so that the whole map might not have to change is just those. Does that make sense?

Mr. Wynes said it might be fun just to take a look at and see how that would look but I think if you start to get the blob people are going to say is mine this or that. If it's all blob then you don't have any arguments. If it's this way and that way, why is this that way and why is that this way? You get that argument and discussion which takes away from the whole effect of the map.

Chairman Thompson said I think you're going to have that anyway.

Mr. Wynes said there are going to be people who are going to be complaining irrespective of what you get yes. If it's not what they had before they're going to contest it.

Mr. Andreozzi said is it possible to have a color that designates any one of three of these as an appropriate zone for that?

Mr. Wilkinson said your legend's going to get pretty large.

Ms. Hanson said it would get complicated and then you could end up with an industrial development in a place where you really don't want it or commercial.

Commissioner Perry said I look up Mountain City Highway and we have lots of general commercial, highway commercial and so forth, and then it goes directly into medium density residential, and I think there's a logic in that there be a buffer of high density somehow in there along that because I think that is actually in the written part of our Master Plan where it discusses that to put buffers in there, and we've always looked at that as transitional.

Ms. Hanson said a lot of it has been developed already but there is a small part where you could do that.

Commissioner Perry said there's a lot around Adobe Middle School that's commercial that there's nothing on that would be great for high density residential.

Chairman Thompson said it's going to be around commercial development but that would go good with high density.

Mr. Wilkinson said back to the discussion on the style of map, if we keep the defined boundaries that we have here, if I'm looking at this from Staff, I'm going to go right into that parcel and say that's not in conformance with the designated land use because of that distinct boundary, so I think if you have less distinct boundaries from Staff's perspective it would allow us to make a recommendation that we believe it's in conformance or general conformance with the Master Plan.

Ms. Hanson said I agree with that and I understand where you are coming from. This kind of goes back to what a Future Land Use Map is. It gives you flexibility but as an alternative to leaving in wiggle room, we could try and make this perfect. Knowing that we don't have a crystal ball and we can't foresee everything, but try and get it as close as we can, and then be sort of firm as a City and say this is the area we thought was appropriate for this. I know you're just beyond it, but we've identified this is the area and your area we've defined as something else. Even if it's a compatible type of development it's a call on how rigid you want to be. Do you want to have that flexibility to say it's exactly like this kind of development, they're right next to one another, do we want to allow that? That's how you end up with those big long strip commercial developments because somebody else comes in and says it's just like the project the last guy had, but all of a sudden you end up with this big long chain or a big concentration of high density which are the types of things I'd suggest you try and avoid. In some regards I think it makes sense to be a little bit more prescriptive with this, but make sure you've done it right, and it says exactly what you want and then have the political will to stand behind it and not make oodles of changes to it. It's totally a philosophical discussion and it's your plan so we want to make sure it works the way that you're comfortable working.

Mr. Wilkinson said listening to you, you would prefer it be prescriptive.

Ms. Hanson said I'd prefer it to be prescriptive. That's my recommendation but I completely understand Mr. Wynes' perspective as well though. It's your plan, like I said there are pros and cons of doing it both ways. You have more flexibility or it's a little bit more predictable and you say this is our Plan this is where we want to go and we're going to try not to deviate from it.

Chairman Thompson said you can have the swaths rather than the blobs.

Ms. Hanson said could you define the difference between swath and blob please?

Chairman Thompson said long and narrow, and oblong or round in nature. If you get too much of a blob it does create problems just like we had out there on Mountain City Highway where that was their whole argument. We had to go back and change the Land Use Map before we could ever rezone that. We had to go be prescriptive or exact.

Mr. Wilkinson said that's because we were treating our Land Use Map as a Zoning Map and we should have had the political will not to do that, but that's a whole other discussion. Maybe in the mean time as we try to figure out exactly what we want is we can just try to get the colors right where they need. Keep the defined boundaries that you have and then if we need to tweak that as we think about it and finalize our decision as a group of people we could do that pretty easy couldn't we?

Ms. Hanson said absolutely. The notes I have on changes to the map so far would be a higher density buffer area along Mountain City Highway, maybe consider some additional commercial along your minor arterials like Errecart and possibly look at the same arterials as places for high density, maybe they're a long ways off in the future like along Jennings. It's going to be a while before you develop there but we could still show it, keeping in mind that we're making a philosophical shift that this is going to be the plan for a long period of time and you don't update it all the time. The other changes were to consider a neighborhood center in Section 18 along Cattle Drive.

Mr. Wilkinson said we don't show Cattle Drive on this yet.

Commissioner Perry said add Cattle Drive so that it goes through.

Ms. Hanson said did I miss any other comments that we've talked about to the map so far? Maybe using swaths of color for high density, commercial and industrial; that's one of those decisions we haven't totally decided on yet it sounds like.

Mr. Wilkinson said I think what Staff should do here is just take a look at your definitions. We can take a look at our zoning and you can take a look at our zoning and see how all that compares and what changes might be required.

Ms. Hanson said I'll try to do a little comparison table that says here's the designation on the Future Land Use Map, here are the appropriate zones. It may be just a plain old R, it may an R with a Conditional Use Permit, and just kind of break that down and it'll identify you need a new zone here and stuff like that.

Mr. Wilkinson said our current Master Plan has a table that shows what zoning classifications are appropriate for the different density definitions, so you could look at that. That's probably a useful type table that maybe we should have in here also.

Ms. Hanson said I agree.

Mr. Andreozzi said I think it's a really good idea to have you provide us with some ideas and guidance regarding any tweaks to the Zoning Ordinance, especially in terms of density. The only other area I was going to point out is on Jennings, on the east side of the city by the freeway, there's that commercial area and then it transitions into that medium density, which I think is kind of a nifty model, Jennings being a minor arterial and right off of Jennings the current zoning is high density and then away from that as they go back into that residential area it is specific low density R1. To me that seems to be like a pretty decent model where you have your higher densities located right adjacent to the minor arterial and as you go inward you decrease that so that you don't necessarily have all the additional traffic that's associated with high density driving through the neighborhood.

Commissioner Perry said where are you talking about?

Mr. Andreozzi said I'm talking about where The Pointe is where Mr. Winer has done that. That first little part of his subdivision is R or high density and then it transitions into R1.

Commissioner Perry asked in actual zoning because on the map it doesn't?

Mr. Andreozzi said that's a really good model of how any one of these neighborhoods should be. Then integrity of the single family dwelling interior is very well protected, the higher intensity stuff is right along the arterial and it seems like a good model that we should try to employ.

Commissioner Perry said should it then reflect on this Land Use Map by density because what you just described is actual zoning but this map's not showing it.

Ms. Hanson said yes.

Mr. Andreozzi said correct.

Ms. Hanson said good change. I agree with that one.

Commissioner Perry said the area around the hospital, adjacent to that is a general commercial but shouldn't we have some high density residential over in that area, a swath of it somewhere in there? Doesn't that make sense in that neck of the woods? Errecart will be a major arterial route when it's completed.

Mr. Wilkinson said maybe where Errecart intersects with Pinion or 12<sup>th</sup> that we have running up there, maybe we should have some commercial and high density around that intersection there I think.

Mr. Wynes said one of those intersections probably should be done that way, again looking at a commercial/residential node rather than a strip along there.

Commissioner Perry said with some high density in there.

Ms. Hanson said I think more high density than commercial because you have a huge commercial area.

Commissioner Perry said trends in most big cities have higher density close to hospitals because as people age they want to be close. It's a shorter ride.

Mr. Wynes said we do realize that the only way we're going to pay for Errecart is by having enough density and development there. We're going to need commercial and high density in there to get the return on that to be able to make that road work, but maybe not all the way along it, maybe we need just one node or something there.

Ms. Hanson said I agree that's a good change.

Commissioner Perry said the other area I was wondering how we've addressed because we've seen it in the Planning Commission a number of times and I hear it from individuals who own homes there who are frustrated, is the River Street area and those areas along the river which this shows as purple I guess, MU-downtown. The issue is zoning through most of that area is industrial and yet there are blocks of single family homes and people can't sell them or do anything with them. They have to get a conditional use permit every time they want to do something to the garage and I have felt for a long time that we're forcing what were Elko's nicest neighborhoods 100 years ago into continued disrepair. I had someone I know who owns a house down there recently in the last week tell me I had my house sold and nobody can get financing because it's industrially zoned.

Mr. Wynes said I think that's one of the reasons, we've discussed this early on, and I think that's what the mixed use is for. Those are the kinds of areas we can go in and mass rezone those to mixed use. We can have then grocery stores on a corner with houses covering the rest of the block or maybe a small garage and the rest of the block residential.

Commissioner Perry said so this is a change? That's not what it was before in our old map.

Mr. Wynes said no it's going to be different. This is one of the areas we really wanted to key into because we realized that problem exists. In the real world or in my fantasy world we'd take all of those special little entities that are down in that area and throw them out and rezone the whole thing and not even worry about that special restricted commercial zoning district down there.

Ms. Hanson said on page 43 we'll clarify it just a little bit.

Commissioner Perry said I think mixed use is consistent with that.

Ms. Hanson said we'll clarify what mixed use means.

Commissioner Perry said didn't we have something in here about live/work units?

Ms. Hanson said that's exactly what it is.

Mr. Wilkinson said I believe that's been one of our projects for quite some time is to go down and get all that area rezoned, all that residential get it rezoned to residential so that we don't have those types of issues.

Commissioner Perry said this one certainly enables it then, so that was really my question and it looks like it's been addressed.

Mr. Andreozzi said this one is in concert with the Zone Map, there's one more little piece of what we have zoned R3 up 5<sup>th</sup> Street, east of Copper.

Commissioner Perry said yes, you want to have the map represent what we did already.

Mr. Draper said back up to The Pointe, you have the medium density as you come in and transition to a low density because those lots are bigger so it's more appropriate for that area instead of changing it to high density because it doesn't fit the definition.

Commissioner Perry said in the Land Use component we have a short section talking about the river and floodplain and trying to avoid too much high density building on the flood plain because it just pushes problems elsewhere. On this Land Use Map have we addressed that?

Ms. Hanson said we need to go back and just double check, overlay them with one another to make sure.

Commissioner Perry said I understand here where it's been straightened because that's been engineered but on both sides of that.

Ms. Hanson said we should show the river on this map so we know exactly where it is and also maybe have a separate map that overlays the floodplain right on top of this just to make sure we're not. Thank you, that's a good suggestion.

Commissioner Perry said from a planning perspective it's hard to hold tight to something if somebody wants to build something on a floodplain unless it's in this map somewhere and has been talked about as a public safety issue.

Ms. Hanson said we've done that exercise but I need to go back just to confirm for myself and we'll produce that map so you guys can see that as well.

Commissioner Perry said is there a park in the northwest neighborhood?

Ms. Hanson said we were talking earlier about how the Future Land Use Map affects the need for future parks and we've been a little shy about showing new parks in a lot of cases on Future Land Use Maps because if you tie it to a particular parcel, this is where the blobs or the swaths come in handy, then somebody can say you've taken my property, essentially, so we don't want to do that, but as new development comes in you can work with a developer to set aside property for a park. It may be in one corner or another but we'll know general areas of where it might be. There is a map in the document that has some orange shapes on it that's called a Future Park Map which identifies the parks that I think are current projects that are pretty well established at this point. There may be some new areas where we need to create opportunities for more, and we may on the Future Land Use Map just get a little asterisk or some sort of symbol just to indicate as development occurs in this area you should think about a park, but without pinpointing it to a particular parcel.

Commissioner Perry said did we put it in the description or the needs for that neighborhood in the verbal part of the Land Use?

Ms. Hanson said I know it's been mentioned in the Land Use section and I think it's in the Park section as well. I'm not as familiar with that section since we didn't write it. We're talking about the northwest neighborhood?

Commissioner Perry said yes.

Ms. Hanson said we have Eight Mile Creek but we may need something more over in this area.

Commissioner Perry said yes, that's northwest. Eight Mile Creek is in the northcentral, from Mountain City Highway down to I-80, in that neck of the woods.

Ms. Hanson said we'll make sure that's in the discussion and then I think it's a good idea to add a little symbol to the Future Land Use Map. I like that.

Mr. Draper said for Angel Park you show that also has buildings, that's the new Dollar Store area so you may just want to quantify that shape.

Ms. Hanson said it needs to come back just a little bit?

Mr. Draper said yes, bring it back off Mountain City Highway a little bit.

Mr. Calder said I have a comment related to this Land Use but it's tied to a different component and I don't know if I want to jump into that right now but with the Parks, Recreation and Open Space component as I read through it, my general perception is that the goals and objective section is really good but then we get into this intense technical minutia that I don't know serves any purpose in this particular document. I think it's good data but I don't know if it belongs in this document. What's not addressed in there, and there is one small section that says you're waiting for City input, is with regard to cemeteries and what I've always kind of expected out of this new Master Plan is it would identify potential sites for cemetery expansion at some point in the future, where those would go, what types of roads would serve those areas, and in addition to that, potential ball field expansion. There are a ton of comments in the back about we need more ball fields, we're talking about the Rec Center feasibility study that's talking about possibly displacing fields we already have, so I would hope that as we get closer to a final document in this Open Space component it will tie into this Land Use component and we'll have some specific areas, doesn't have to be exact, but some areas where cemeteries, ball field complexes, those sorts of things could be located that are realistic that aren't out in the hinterlands where we can't get utilities to them but areas that can be accessed within a reasonable amount of time.

Ms. Hanson said we do have some information about projected needs for new acreage and new numbers of fields, but you're right I don't think we've gotten to specific locations of where those might be and that's a good comment.

Mr. Wilkinson said we have a PQP designation right? Did you want another Land Use Designation or is PQP adequate?

Ms. Hanson said we have a green open space.

Mr. Calder said I think for Land Use it's fine, but I think when you get into the Open Space component there needs to be a discussion of where within the PQP we are looking and it may not even be land that's in the City right now. For example, it might be BLM property that isn't zoned at all and maybe it's land that we're looking to acquire ten years from now, but I think since this document has to serve us into the future we need to identify some potential locations for amenities like that because sooner or later the cemetery's going to be full and we should have probably already built ball fields ten years ago so we're really behind the curve.

Ms. Hanson said how would you feel about using a symbol or something on the map to indicate potential locations without identifying a specific parcel in those cases so you don't get into a takings kind of issue?

Mr. Calder said I think that's fine for property that's held by other people but I do know that the City has property and I think those should be considered for possible locations.

Ms. Hanson said we'll identify the City owned property.

Mr. Howes mentioned that's especially important for ball fields, athletic fields, and cemeteries; general park space problems are critical. Certain neighborhoods like the northwest section of the community aren't served by any of our current parks and the "blob" could be used for those but as far as athletic fields and cemeteries there's a more specifically done analysis earlier in the plan to indicate we need certain amenities.

Ms. Hanson said as far as the detail in this chapter I don't know if you'd feel comfortable moving some of that to an appendix or do you feel like it needs to stay within the body of the document. Do you have a strong feeling?

Mr. Howes said I like where it's at, but as long as it's somewhere in there it'll be ok.

Mr. Calder said I guess my problem would be just as a reader of the document you get into the day classes and you're talking about the ooey goey class and the paint it fun class. I view this document as a lot broader than getting into the specifics of it. I don't really want to know that there are super snacks for the latch key program or for the daycare. I think the field analysis is probably relevant but I think drilling down that deep on some of these programs although detailed, again I don't know if it serves a good purpose because when you read the document front to back it seems out of place. It's ten times more detailed than our Land Use Plan or any of the other important aspects of the plan so it just seems to make it off balance and like I said the data's relevant and it's important data and I think it serves a purpose I just don't know if it ends up ultimately being in our Master Plan document.

Ms. Hanson said I'll talk with Susie Becker about that and if you're ok with maybe considering moving it into an appendix we'll take a look at what that might look like.

Mr. Howes said I think some of that information is pretty important for our future facilities.

Ms. Hanson said you don't want to see it move? It's a discussion point.

Mr. Howes said I like it in there but that's for our purposes maybe not for the Planning Commission.

Mr. Calder said I think the Planning Commission ultimately should weigh in on the level of detail they want in this particular document. For example, we're going to already have a recreational feasibility study which includes a lot of this information and it might duplicate a lot of stuff that's already in there, but ultimately the Planning Commission needs to kind of give us some guidance on what level of detail, how deep do you want us drilling down on this because if we're going to go this deep on this component then I think we need to go deeper on the others.

Commissioner Perry said the Master Plan is supposed to be a guiding document for decision making; generalized. The more specific it gets the more difficult it is, and the more prescriptive it gets I think also the more controversial it gets. I would rather not have too much detail there, but the detail exists that Parks needs. Obviously it's there and so is the recreation study but I would agree it's probably more than what we want in this document because it's not necessarily going to help guide us into future decision making.

Ms. Hanson said it's a little difficult to get to that level of detail for the Land Use chapter for example or Arts and Culture because they're a little bit more of a philosophical approach. It's a little bit more philosophy and less data driven. It's more about livability and what type of place do we want to have, what feel should it have, transportation I think he could get into a little bit more nitty gritty with traffic counts and things like that but it'll be a little difficult to bring Arts and Culture and Land Use to that level of detail, if that were the direction.

Mr. Wilkinson said just as a reminder, whether it stays in here or as an appendix to the document it was part of the scope of work that the consultant would go to that level of detail for our Parks Department so that's why it's made it into here like this, but whether it stays here or goes to an appendix we can sort out at a later date. You might want to think about what comes out and goes to an appendix if that decision's made.

Mr. Howes said I think the provision of Recreation services is different than the Land Use planning or Transportation planning because you're talking about quality of life issue rather than infrastructure and it may not be critical for the Planning Commission or City Council to determine what programs we offer, but it's useful for us to identify what we're offering, where our gaps in service are so that we can try and fill the gaps and serve our population and that's true for our maintenance operations as well.

Ms. Hanson said it needs to be a guiding document that assists all the different planning departments; City departments.

Chairman Thompson said if it was moved to an appendix it would still be there.

Mr. Andreozzi said in the Atlas section under the Existing Park Facilities, a couple of parks that are missing, and maybe you have these already so I apologize if I'm being redundant, are the Peace Park in that area north of I-80.

Ms. Hanson said somehow it's on the Future instead of the Existing.

Mr. Andreozzi said that's the same case with HARP as well. The future park facilities for the Peace Park do continue up that Eight Mile, so that portion would be correct and the HARP area exists from 12<sup>th</sup> Street not quite over to Errecart. There's a gap so the future part of HARP would be where the infrastructure's missing or where HARP's missing in that Errecart gap and then we also have an easement that's coming across to the east of 12<sup>th</sup> Street also.

Ms. Hanson said do you mind pointing that out? I think I follow you but I want to make sure.

Mr. Andreozzi said it was also even envisioned someday even possibly going a little farther.

Commissioner Perry said it does go under the bridge though. Don't we have an easement on that?

Mr. Howes said neither one of those areas is complete. According to the Humboldt Area River Plan none of that's complete other than the trail itself, so I'm not sure if it belongs on existing or future.

Chairman Thompson said it does exist.

Mr. Howes said only the trail. There's nothing finished in the park.

Ms. Hanson said what if we combine the trails map with these maps so that you can see the trail there but it may not be outlined as a park space. You'll just have the line for the trail.

Chairman Thompson said the park doesn't exist I guess.

Mr. Howes said there's no park around the trail but that's our most developed trail anywhere and the Peace Park is close enough to completion overall that that probably should be on the existing.

Mr. Andreozzi said there were a couple references to the green belt. It's actually the green belt express.

Commissioner Perry said the BLM section at exit 298, Section 18, is that the one we show here within the city limits? Cuing on something I think Mr. Wilkinson said earlier when we talked about a park over there, do we want to just leave it as a residential low density or do we want to color it up a little?

Mr. Wilkinson said we presented a map that showed Cattle Drive and then our current Master Plan Streets and Highways component shows some other roadways out there, and we'd presented a map to the consultants suggesting a commercial node out there based at one of the intersections with Cattle and I think they're going to go back and look at that and probably add some color to that section and then have a little asterisk that says northwest neighborhood park.

Commissioner Perry said what we put in there is not going to be objective to anybody because it's public land. I recall some years ago that Dennis Crooks had some plan that he laid out at that intersection that he had commercial and various other things. I don't know whether that still exists anywhere, but it went into that. Maybe it would drive a strategy with the public entity that

owns the land. It would enable it a little bit more if that ever came to be an opportunity that the City wanted to pursue.

Mr. Wilkinson said we've had maybe a 15 or 20 minute conversation with BLM about possibly looking at a land exchange with some other property that the City has up above Kittridge Canyon and of course the BLM reminded us and we're well aware of any land exchange with that agency takes decades or better but they were open to the possibility of exploring that.

Commissioner Perry mentioned unless it's put into a senator/congressional rider, then it happens quickly like it does in Las Vegas.

Mr. Wilkinson said we had that meeting on Friday where we talked about a certain strategy and that was presented to the City Manager and I don't think he's quite in favor of that, but we'll explore any types of ways that we can expedite that process would help us out.

Commissioner Perry said it's long term. You look at it and it's going to be, and we've already had it here once or twice, an inhibitor to expansion of the city and residential development out there. There was one thing that came in that just wouldn't access the way the roads were. We have a problematic area there and as I recall one of the few ways to solve that was to come in from another direction.

Mr. Wilkinson said with the annexation of the Knudsen property up there that allows for the potential development of the intersection of the State Route and Cattle Drive and then that starts opening that up. I've had people already question the possibilities of moving into that area, but there needs to be some utility infrastructure and we have a pretty detailed engineering plan that was completed by Shaw Engineering, I can't remember the date, for utility infrastructure into that area. We have quite a bit of information and at some point they determined that it was appropriate to annex that into the city so the goal is, I would guess to see that develop.

Ms. Hanson said it doesn't look like Cattle Drive is on the Transportation Map either so we need to add it on there.

Mr. Wilkinson said no we need to show that. I have a couple more on those but back to Land Use, and I think it's one fundamental change that we may have, are we going to look at the river as separating our neighborhoods or is it still going to be Silver Street? That was a question we started talking about. I don't think we've answered that.

Ms. Hanson said I think we changed it to the river in the discussion but it may have just been a note to myself to change it but I'm pretty sure we did. I recall that as well. We'll make sure it's in there. I'm pretty sure we updated it.

Mr. Wilkinson said one more I want to talk about is our vacant land.

Ms. Hanson said I need some help with that one.

Mr. Wilkinson said right and I talked with Ferron Konakis briefly about it but I haven't been able to get with him. One thing and I just don't know how much work it would involve but certainly we want to limit it to a certain size but we have an atlas that shows our vacant land inventory. I

was just wondering how easy it would be to put together and I think it would be fairly easy maybe an index that numbers the parcels so we can kind of correlate the atlas to that, but there are a lot of small parcels so I realize maybe we'd start like five acres or more or three acres or more and be able to show those numbered and then have an index page.

Ms. Hanson said it's all in GIS so theoretically you could do a query and just pull them all up because we've actually coated the parcels in GIS so you should be able to do that automatically, so that would be an easy thing to do. My only challenge with that is if you look at this map it has a lot of big holes in it because we just didn't have parcel data for a lot of it. A lot of places it just doesn't exist, even with the core of the City like the railroad corridor for example is definitely a vacant corridor but we didn't have it identified as a parcel and so I don't feel like this is a very accurate map right now. It gives us something to go by, which is better than nothing, but it needs a lot of updating and I'm not quite sure how to go about, because I don't want to necessarily try and redraw parcel lines without a survey because I don't know exactly where they are. It wouldn't be accurate anyways. What we could do is take this into a software program like Photoshop or something and then just sort of manually fill it in but it'll be a little subjective.

Mr. Wilkinson said maybe that's what we need to do. I noticed we're saying 80%, I sent over that one map and I tried to mark up for you guys on what I thought might be appropriate percentages to use.

Ms. Hanson said we referred to that.

Mr. Wilkinson said I don't know how that correlates with what you have here. I don't know if all of the certain FEMA flood areas have been pulled out. To me the acreage still seems high and this is probably a significant issue for the City.

Ms. Hanson said it's a really tough number to pin down.

Mr. Wilkinson said I think we want to spend some time on it to make sure we get it right. We have the total acreage and then we have 80% of it being developed. The U.P. property we talk about consolidating it into two large parcels which total together somewhere between 70 and 95. I would think we have an accurate acreage right, so we should be able to clean that up and state the actual acreage.

Ms. Hanson said we need to chat a little bit about that because last time it was a little uncertain. It's a tricky section. It's a really hard one to pin down because in some senses it's very subjective you know is it 60% or 80% developable. We don't have digital elevation, topography necessarily. We can do topo-lines which will help some but it's hard when we don't have parcel data for everything so we're sort of making these assumptions in my mind it's like I know how big a section is, I know how big a quarter section is, this looks like it's roughly  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a quarter. It's a little tricky, but I agree. I'm not quite comfortable with this section either. We need to work on it.

Mr. Wilkinson said that level of detail wasn't defined in your scope of work either, so I understand that. I just want to be pretty comfortable with what we have in here and how it's presented, so 80% may be a good number. I'll take another look at it maybe spend a little time with Mr. Konakis.

Ms. Hanson said I can give you a little backup of how we kind of got to what we have here and next time I'm out, we'll be back in November for the downtown project and maybe we can set aside a little time to just sit in front of a computer and pull up GIS and try and kind of sift through it together because I could use a little help with it, and I think if we put our minds together we could get a number that's closer.

Mr. Wilkinson said that might work a little better than trying to get ahold of Mr. Konakis and do it.

Ms. Hanson said he did send me a little information which we need to add in still obviously.

Mr. Wilkinson said so then the result of that would be a little bit of discussion that we'll have on our current water consumption. We'll get that information to you. Council hasn't taken any type of specific action with regard to that, so how it's presented here we have to be careful how we do that.

Ms. Hanson said I haven't heard much from the community yet on the site. I hoped to get a little more public input before now as well on the draft plan but hopefully at the open house tomorrow night we'll get some more input and we can put a piece of trace paper over the Land Use Map and say here are some of the changes that were discussed at this meeting and just give them a real good sense of what it is we're actually considering so we can get some input on it.

Mr. Wilkinson said where are we in completing the cross reference table for the new plan versus the old plan so that we could present all of that to the Planning Commission and ultimately to the City Council?

Ms. Hanson said we have completed all of the Land Use cross reference table, all of the Transportation, Art and Culture didn't exist before so we haven't bothered with that one, and we're waiting on Parks still. I think they're working on it. I'll double check on that, but we're pretty close though. I sent them a reminder about a week and a half ago, so hopefully they're working on it. We'll be back in touch with you with an update soon.

Commissioner Perry said there were a couple items that assemblyman Carpenter had at one of our meetings and one was the NDOT yard. I remember trying to write out a sentence or two to try to fit it in in a couple places and send it over. Did that get included? Did you guys talk about that?

Mr. Wilkinson said I think we have a project to acquire that right-of-way along the State ground out there. I think maybe just under that project or maybe it's a separate project, I don't know but the goal would be to facilitate the extension of Ruby Vista, get them to locate out there and then possibly there are two pieces of private ground out there that might be some good industrial business park property that maybe we can annex in.

Commissioner Perry said what are we showing the NDOT yard on Idaho Street as on this Land Use Map now?

Mr. Wilkinson said it should be a big blob of PQP. It includes City Hall, the Convention Center, the park and NDOT.

Mr. Andreozzi said it looks like PQP to me.

Commissioner Perry said should we show it as red?

Mr. Andreozzi said that's the preferred use.

Commissioner Perry said we're looking into the future here right? If we're going to add it and say some day we'd like to see this. Why not make it red and put some high density behind it somewhere?

Mr. Wilkinson said we should.

Mr. Andreozzi said how about mixed-use? The concept would be to support the relocation of the NDOT facility and come up with a better use for that. We even talked about that being an expanded civic use. There have been a lot of different discussions as an example a recreation center or whatever.

Ms. Hanson said and he did mention California Trails is another one we need to add in.

Mr. Wilkinson said one more question the Planning Commission needs to consider is we talked about the public comments from the online map being in this and the question that comes up is should it really be in here especially when we get some really negative comments that don't have anything to do with anything about Master Planning.

Ms. Hanson said you have the question of do you edit by taking out a few.

Mr. Wilkinson said I think we shouldn't be selective.

Ms. Hanson said either they're in or they're out.

Mr. Wilkinson said then again we might have a couple atlases that might come out.

Commissioner Perry said what do other cities do?

Chairman Thompson said if we take out the parks stuff we should definitely take those out.

Ms. Hanson said it's been done both ways. Some have insisted they want the public comments just as a record, but we've implemented all that into the rest of the document. It should have guided everything else in there, so theoretically the public comments have been addressed already. I don't see any harm in taking it out. I'd keep them in a file somewhere.

Mr. Wilkinson said the Planning Commission can read through those and make a determination after that. I would like to see our water and sewer and our W.R.F. capital improvement plans as an appendix to this plan. I think they're pretty important and I think if the 10 year capital

improvement plans aren't correlating with our Master Plan then I think we have a fundamental issue that needs to be addressed.

Commissioner Perry said you've mentioned the appendix a few times and it sounds like a lot of maybe what belongs in the appendix is the work that went into this right? Maybe these four maps are a part of the appendix. The appendix being the data and the backup to the Master Plan and not all the Master Plans that are printed and given to Planning Commissioners or that sit on peoples' desks have the appendix in them. Maybe there are only four to six full copies sitting somewhere that have all of that backup existing in them in case somebody needs to go back to reference it. Is that the purpose of the appendix or every time we print one of these are we going to print the appendix too?

Mr. Wilkinson said I would like to have it all in front of myself. I'm not sure how you guys feel about it. Talking about the first four atlases that are presented, I think we definitely need a record of everything that went on somewhere, but me as Staff going forward I'm going to look at the meat of the document and go with that. I think the 10 year capital improvement plans should be a part of our Master Plan. They're a 10 year master plan for those departments, so I think we should be looking at them in conjunction with that or maybe we just incorporate them by reference. Our Wellhead Protection Plan should be a part of our Master Plan. We should have land uses that are compatible with our two year or five year recharge zones. Under that program anytime we're rezoning we should take a look at our recharge zones to say is this an appropriate use. That document's an inch and a half thick, so maybe we just need to incorporate those plans by reference to remind ourselves to be looking at them when appropriate. I do think we need to have copies of those plans available to people if they need them.

Mr. Wynes said from staff perspective there should be at least two copies of this Master Plan that have as much of the background material as how this got to be developed as possible and we should be really keeping any of the things Mr. Wilkinson is saying as a part of it. The ones the public get would be simply the Plan, not the appendix, not the reference material or anything else. That's not what they're looking for, but there should be a couple sets, if it's not a single volume it will be multiple volumes, so that if somebody wants to get some information it's all in one source, which is basically going to be for staff's review and use.

Commissioner Perry said that makes sense to me because as a Planning Commissioner I don't want the appendix. I bring this book to Planning Commission meetings and I don't want all the detail that I know Mr. Wilkinson and you need.

Mr. Wynes said for you to make a decision all you need to know is what the map says but for us to make a recommendation for the decision we need to be able to delve sometimes into the background and say why was that done. That's why there has to be at least one or two copies of the complete document available.

Commissioner Perry said that's what I was trying to understand is what is in the appendix because we were starting to throw those around a bit. These four maps from the public to me should be in the appendix because it backs up the stuff that went from here into the document in case someone comes in and says we never listened to their comment.

Mr. Wynes said yes and we can flip to that and show them here's your comment. We heard it.

Mr. Wilkinson said that was our intent but there are some comments that have absolutely nothing to do with a vision for the community moving forward. The question's come up whether that is relevant to this document and should remain as an appendix to the document.

Mr. Wynes said I feel it should remain as an appendix because the person who made the comment made it as a part of the process.

Commissioner Perry said right and what we're doing here is managing a process not an outcome.

Mr. Calder said in the grand scheme of things I look at this document as we get a brand new Planning Commissioner, he gets a document to read through. What's going to be the type of document he could read cover to cover, it makes sense to him and he can start to understand this is what the City's doing? What the Planning Department wants to keep in terms of backup material, I've done lots of studies and had lots of consultants do lots of work and I end up having great big expandable file folders full of all that backup sitting in my office in the file cabinet. That's perfectly fine. Those are public documents. I don't necessarily think all of that information belongs in the final product. That's where we have to decide how much we want to put in. Do we want to make this document six inches thick? We can or we can go to the other extreme and just make the document an inch thick. Somewhere we need to decide what's important to go in the appendix such as if I'm reading a book that I go and buy at the store, a historical book and I'm reading it and it refers me back to an appendix or some sort of an index I want to go back there and find a relevant backup source to that, that makes sense, but if it's going to lead me to a bunch of hearsay and a bunch of irrelevant comments I wouldn't want to read that. That's my position on it. I don't think we discard any of the comments. I think there needs to be a record of them but I don't know if it needs to end up in the final published document. That would go for everything. What level of detail are we going to publish in this thing? Do we need to be drilling down to the nth degree? For example like the Parks and Rec we're talking about rates and we publish rates of our swimming pool. Those rates are going to change. A year after this is published we'll have all new rates then you have that in your document that you can't necessarily pull out with some sort of an amendment so that becomes problematic too, things that are going to change from year to year.

Commissioner Perry said that's a good point and when we change it it's a major effort.

Mr. Calder said Mr. Wilkinson brought up a great point about the other capital improvement plans we have. Those are all valid plans and they need to probably be referenced I think, for example if we put the W.R.F. Plan and the airport master plan together they are bigger than the Master Plan, so at some point you have to reference documents like that and staff needs to kind of know what's going on in all these different plans, but unless they're going to have a direct impact on something the Planning Commission or the City Council has to decide on they probably shouldn't be included in the document because they're constantly changing too. They're not all on the same cycle.

Mr. Wilkinson asked Ms. Hanson if the city provided a list of all the other plans we have.

Ms. Hanson said we do have that, in fact I have a CD with most of those documents on it so I can just go through that and prepare a list for the appendix and say included by reference in this Master Plan.

Mr. Wilkinson said I don't want to do that because if we change those documents are we changing this?

Mr. Calder said no I don't think so. I think somewhere in the document you just need to maybe have a list, a page somewhere that talks about related documents.

Ms. Hanson said yeah, maybe it's not included by reference but just other related city planning document or background documents.

Mr. Calder said and where you might find those, for example the airport master plan – Elko Regional Airport Director possesses that, W.R.F. master plan possessed by the Utilities Director. I think those are all important and in a perfect world everybody would know all the plans inside and out and know how they all link together but I think this Master Plan has to be general enough where you can cover a lot of things, maybe the river's wide but not really that deep in areas.

Ms. Hanson said maybe you could burn a CD and just stick it inside the back cover or something that just has all of those documents on it since you went to the work to scan and collate them all together for us anyways, it might be nice for you to have a copy of it for reference if you wanted it.

Commissioner Perry said along those lines, having visited a couple other cities who just recently finished Master Plans, I went to the City Planning Department and asked for one and that's exactly how you get it, a CD. That is the Master Plan, it's on a CD, it's not books. Something we might think of as we finish this up that maybe if people come in and want a copy of the Master Plan to have some on CD or on the web. When I think about what you're saying and reading this first paragraph, the stakeholder groups that have interest in this Master Plan are the Planning Commission, the City Council, City staff and the public. Truly there are differences in how much or little detail each group wants. Probably those of us on the Planning Commission, I can't speak for everybody, we want the smaller document because I can tell you when I started four years ago took me a while to read through that one and it was a lot smaller. It took numerous meetings to go through. It's almost like you need a training session at the beginning so that you understand the evolution of the Master Plan because there's a lot there that all of a sudden people are thrown into this up here to make decisions on and catching up on that is not easy. Probably the City Council is the same. City staff has much more depth of detail here. Your river is deeper because you're making decisions but still it's a guiding document because it's decisions that you make. For the public also, when they look at it I guess it's just a balance there somewhere that's the logical balance of how much is in the appendix and how much is in the Master Plan.

Mr. Wynes said the Master Plan and the appendix can be incorporated into one document or it can be two separate documents that are totally independent of each other.

Commissioner Perry said when it goes for final approval with the City Council, is it going to be approval of the Master Plan and all the things that are in the appendix or just the Master Plan?

Mr. Wynes said I think the appendix could be modified over time as we find new documents that we can use and I would recommend that the Master Plan that is adopted is the basic document, not all of the appendices and everything else because we don't necessarily need to have to amend the appendix and if we get a new W.R.F. document we're not going to have to go to the Council and say we need to amend the Master Plan to incorporate this. That isn't a part of it.

Commissioner Perry said I was hoping that's what you were going to say, but I was concerned that when the day came there would be this Master Plan and then there would be five inches of stuff behind it.

Mr. Calder said the amendment process is very complex and onerous so you don't want to put yourself in a position where each time a different departmental plan gets amended you have to come back and go through the Master Plan. I think they need to be listed as other important planning documents that should be referenced from time to time. We already know that we're going to have an amendment about a year after this thing's approved because all the population census data is going to change. It might change pretty dramatically and it might have a rippling effect through some of the projections and things of that nature. That one alone we know there's really no way around it because we have to wait for the census data to come out but those are the types of changes you want to spend your time doing, amendments of the plan not the airport master plan change because the FAA wanted us to change one little thing in it and now we have to go back because we included it we have to amend this one too.

Mr. Wilkinson said right now if you look at the list that's in the appendix it's all public, and then it's survey responses and then it's the cross reference table. I don't know if we need the cross reference table in the appendix but we need it as we present to the Planning Commission and our City Council that it's just information for them, ok here's our old plan, here's what happened to the items that were in it. They're either included or they were dropped for whatever reason, they've been modified or whatever, so we need that just for informational purposes we probably don't need that in an appendix going forward because once this is adopted that one will be forgotten about. Then the question is should we have the first four items that are listed now in the appendix to the Mater Plan and are they relevant and I think Mr. Calder brought up a good point that what's in your appendix is if you are reading through the document and need to refer to more detail, so if we take for instance something out of the Parks and put it in the appendix because you're reading through that and you can reference that appendix for more detail, maybe that information's more suitable for the appendix rather than all the public comment information. That could just be an entirely different file, like Mr. Calder said you keep this file of how you got from point A to point B.

Mr. Calder said I don't know how important it is to know that half the people responding really want a Target and Olive Garden. I don't know how that applies to the Master Plan.

Ms. Hanson said that's a good idea, have an appendix and then a separate backup of our process.

Commissioner Perry asked if there were anymore pictures needed.

Ms. Hanson said our Parks section you'll notice is a little light on photos, but we have a ton of parks photos that we'll throw in there. We have a ton of new photos of the downtown area so we'll try to put a bunch of those in there, but anything you notice could use more illustration.

## **II. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

This agenda item is to provide time for the general public to address the City Council and 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