

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was scheduled for 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, February 25, 2009 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Mark Kimbrough
Vice Chairperson Craig Mullet
Connie Bisbee
John Peery
Steve Reynolds
Bill Vance
George Wendell

STAFF: Lee Plemel, Planning Division Director
Jennifer Pruitt, Principal Planner
Jeff Sharp, City Engineer
Melanie Bruketta, Chief Deputy District Attorney
Jano Barnhurst, Recording Secretary
Transcribed by: Jano Barnhurst and Kathleen King

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the commission's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record. These materials are available for review in the Clerk-Recorder's Office during regular business hours.

A. CALL TO ORDER, DETERMINATION OF QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (1-0035) - Chairperson Kimbrough called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Commissioner Bisbee led the pledge of allegiance.

B. COMMISSION ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - January 28, 2009 (1-0064) - Commissioner Vance moved to approve the January 28, 2009 minutes, as presented. The motion was seconded and carried 6-0-1, Commissioner Bisbee abstaining.

C. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA (1-0050) - None.

D. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0053) - None.

E. STAFF PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENTS (1-0070) - Mr. Plemel advised the citizens present that agenda materials were available in the back of the room.

F. DISCLOSURES (1-0082) - Commissioner Reynolds advised he would be recusing himself from discussion and action on items H-5(A) and (B) due to a business affiliation.

G. CONSENT AGENDA (1-0086) - None.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 2

H. PUBLIC HEARING MATTERS:

H-1. SUP-08-076 ACTION TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM GOLDEN GAMING, INC., TO EXTEND THE EXPIRATION DATE OF AN APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM SEPTEMBER 24, 2009 TO SEPTEMBER 24, 2012, WITHIN WHICH TIME A BUILDING PERMIT MUST BE OBTAINED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A HOTEL-CASINO LOCATED AT 1620 NORTH LOMPA LANE, APN 008-161-72, LOCATED ON THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE CARSON CITY FREEWAY AND HIGHWAY 50 EAST (1-0142) - Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Ms. Pruitt reviewed the staff report and the pertinent agenda materials, and noted staff's recommendation of approval to extend the special use permit to September 24, 2012.

(1-0178) Golden Gaming Director of Business Development Amy Sances introduced herself for the record. Vice Chairperson Mullet expressed a preference for a two-year extension. In response to a question, Ms. Sances advised that the construction schedule was developed prior to the current "economic environment." She discussed difficulties associated with obtaining financing, the need for the "market to stabilize a bit," and the preference for the freeway to be completed. She expressed the hope to "hit the ground running" and start earlier than September 2012. "We just wanted to be sure that we have enough time to really get a project like this done."

Mr. Plemel acknowledged that approval of the request simply extends the term of the special use permit in order to secure a building permit before September 24, 2012. He clarified that construction would not have to be completed by that date. Vice Chairperson Mullet reiterated a preference for a two-year extension, and a brief discussion followed. Chairperson Kimbrough called for public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. Commissioner Peery referred to concerns expressed at the original special use permit hearing. He expressed the opinion the community is "currently overbuilt ... for these times," and advised he would not support the extension. **Commissioner Wendell moved to approve an extension from the original date of special use permit expiration, September 24, 2009 to September 24, 2012, to allow the applicant additional time for the existing financial markets to stabilize. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-2.**

H-2. SUP-05-265(a) ACTION TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM STATE OF NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (PROPERTY OWNER: STATE OF NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION) TO DELETE SUP-05-265 CONDITION OF APPROVAL 18, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE APPROVAL OF A BILLBOARD, WHICH STATES THAT LANDSCAPING OF THE PARCEL FRONTAGE IS REQUIRED TO BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION APPROVAL, A LANDSCAPE PLANTER AT THE BASE OF THE SIGN IS REQUIRED, AND A LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION; AND TO CHANGE THE LOCATION OF THE BILLBOARD 90 FEET TO THE WEST, ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2400 HIGHWAY 50 EAST, APN 002-105-01 (1-0290) - Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Mr. Plemel reviewed the staff report and the agenda materials. He advised of having received no response to the public noticing process. He requested the commissioners to modify the recommended motion to indicate deletion of condition of approval 18. In response to a question, he advised that the proposed relocation of the billboard "doesn't affect any spacing ... of billboards." He speculated that the purpose for condition of approval 18 "was to try to get some improvements along there with some landscape ..." He expressed the opinion that the applicant has made the appropriate findings for deleting the condition of approval. In response to a further question, he clarified condition of approval 19 in that "billboards are only valid for five years."

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 3

Nevada Department of Transportation Deputy Attorney General Roger Miles introduced Ron Dietrich, also of NDOT, and referred to a displayed photograph and diagram of the subject area. Mr. Miles expressed the belief that, in consideration of the freeway construction, requiring landscape “would be a waste of the taxpayers’ money ...” Mr. Dietrich pointed out, on the displayed photograph, the area to have been landscaped, and advised that the “closest water service is nearly ... 175 feet away.” In response to a comment, he advised that a request to sell as surplus property is being processed. Mr. Miles acknowledged agreement with the conditions of approval in consideration of the deletion of condition of approval 18.

Chairperson Kimbrough opened this item to public comment and, when none was forthcoming, Mr. Dietrich thanked Ms. Pruitt and Assistant Planner Kathe Green for their assistance. Chairperson Kimbrough entertained additional discussion of the commissioners and, when none was forthcoming, a motion. **Commissioner Bisbee moved to approve an amendment to SUP-05-265, a special use permit addendum request from the State of Nevada Department of Transportation to relocate the billboard to a point approximately 90 feet west of the originally-approved location, and to delete condition 18, on property in the general commercial zoning district, located at the northeast corner of Highway 50 East and Russell Way, APN 008-161-29, subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Wendell seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.**

H-3. MISC-09-005 PRESENTATION AND ACTION TO PROVIDE COMMENTS TO THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT (“BLM”) FOR THE NEW COMSTOCK WIND ENERGY PROJECT PROPOSED FOR THE VIRGINIA RANGE NORTH OF CARSON CITY AND WITHIN WASHOE, STOREY, AND LYON COUNTIES (1-0468) - Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Mr. Plemel reviewed the staff report, and introduced BLM Carson City District Sierra Front Field Office Manager Linda Kelly, who provided an overview of the presentation format. Ms. Kelly introduced Ken Nelson and Dan Jacquet, also of the BLM Carson City Field Office.

(1-0522) Great Basin Wind, LLC President Rich Hamilton introduced Executive Vice President Ed Duggan and Consultant Lou Bridges. Mr. Hamilton narrated a SlideShow presentation, copies of which were included in the agenda materials. In response to a question, he advised that the total distance of the project is approximately seven miles “end to end.” In conjunction with a displayed topographic map, he responded to additional questions regarding turbine spacing.

(1-0634) Mr. Plemel introduced BLM Energy Project Manager Jane Peterson, who narrated a PowerPoint presentation, copies of which were included in the agenda materials. In response to a question, she advised that the BLM will make the final decision with regard to approval of right-of-way. In response to a further question, she advised that the decision will be made by BLM management staff and that Ms. Kelly will be responsible for signing the final decision. In response to a further question, Ms. Peterson advised that Great Basin Wind, LLC has “done a lot of work” which “folds into the NEPA process.” BLM staff is “trying to find a balance between enlightening people with what they’ve done and confusing people ... compared with what [BLM] has to do with the NEPA process.” Commissioner Reynolds expressed appreciation for showing “things that are visually correct.” He expressed surprise that something which can have such a “distinct visual impact” wasn’t available for the public hearing. Ms. Peterson emphasized that the subject process is in the very early stages, and that visual simulations are not yet available. She advised that once a draft is available, the analysis and the visual simulations will be available with “plenty of time ... to comment at that point.” Commissioner Reynolds expressed appreciation for the clarification, and looked forward to the visual simulations being made available to the public. In response to a question regarding the impact of the transmission line, Ms. Peterson clarified that the transmission line will be located close to Carson City. “But that doesn’t limit you in any way to having any issues, concerns, or comments about

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 4

the entire project.” In response to a further question, Ms. Peterson advised that the building permit would be the purview of the county in which construction occurs. Vice Chairperson Mullet expressed concern over operational control of the project. Ms. Peterson advised that “part of that will be the responsibility of ... our right-of-way process if we get to a point where we approve this.” She noted clean-up and reclamation requirements would be part of the terms and conditions of the right-of-way approval.

Mr. Plemel provided additional clarification that, if a special use permit is required, local jurisdictions will be responsible for review and approval. “This is just a start ... to get through the EIS ...” “An actual project would still have to come back for local jurisdiction review and approval.” In response to a question, Ms. Peterson requested that public comments be submitted through the commission to the BLM. She and Chairperson Kimbrough discussed the method by which to receive public comment during and following this meeting.

Chairperson Kimbrough opened this item to public comment. (1-1028) Chet Alexander of Carson City inquired as to where the transmission line starts, stops, and what it traverses.

(1-1035) Merlyn Paine of Carson City approached. I have been a resident of Carson City for over 15 years and am also a historian, geographer, and environmental professional. My husband and I took the map that was presented at the December 10th meeting at the BLM office and went to the site to see any aspect of this project as we imagine it if we were in Virginia City. We headed down Highway 50, went through Silver City, Gold Hill and walked around Virginia City. His quantitative skills are better than mine so I said if you have a 300' or 400' column plus turbines to the northwest, can you see them from this spot, or this spot, or this spot? We went all the way up, walked around Virginia City, and drove down Six Mile Canyon. We couldn't see anything. They're not there yet, but looking from where they were at roadway and up little ridges, and looking toward the project which would have been to the northeast, we wouldn't have been able to see anything. If you're walking around Virginia City, you can't see anything. The other thing is, people like their 100 mile view. The project is in the other direction. That's just a point I wanted to bring up. I think it would be beneficial for everyone who has a concern to go out there and look at what they can see. Use your imagination and if you think it's going to be 300' tall, pretend it's 600' tall, and try to imagine that. I'm only addressing the visual aspects and some of the concerns I've heard. As a Carson City resident, I can't imagine being impacted at all. I've looked at where the transmission lines will be underground along existing roadways. That looks great to me because I'm very sensitive to having scarring on the landscape. This landscape does not heal. The angles of the roadways or any sort of disturbance has to be very carefully calculated in order to not leave a huge scar on the hillsides. I love this project; it's innovative, American, safe, local, using our resources, and I like wind turbines. I think they're hypnotic. I think they're beautiful.

(6:08:05) Marty Schwedhelm of Carson City approached and commented that he lives in Lakeview Estates. “My view to the east would encompass this ridge line. I don't think Carson City has a leg to stand on in putting conditions on this item as it's in Washoe and Storey Counties. Visually, we will have a ridge line of eggbeaters or helicopters or whatever you want to call them. There would be an issue for Carson City from parts of it. The noise aspect was not addressed. I haven't seen anything in the handout or presentation; however, I was a military pilot and know what helicopters sound like and really want to know more of what they propose for Virginia City to hear an army of helicopters coming over the ridge without seeing the turbines, even if they are behind or west of the ridge line. I understand that the structural requirements would have to meet county planning in Washoe County and there should be federal guidelines for alternative energy programs. I question whether anyone has resolved what we do with our 80+ mile an hour winds through Washoe Valley and knowing what's happened at Altamont, as previously alluded,

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 5

is they have to shut down the generators when winds are too high. I want these issues brought forth through the commission to the BLM to require further studies.”

(6:10:58) Bruce Kittess of Carson City approached. “As I understand it, this is a private project on public land. I would like to have an overview of how much public taxpayer subsidy is going into this project. This is the fiscal part and would like to know how much we’re paying to have this all happen. Altamont Pass was mentioned. 1981. We’ve been subsidizing wind for 28 years.”

(6:11:52) Dave Hampton of Carson City approached. “I think it’s about time we face a project that generates power in our own neighborhood. San Diego wanted to generate power north of Reno because they didn’t want the pollution and that’s the ultimate in hypocrisy, to put it in someone else’s backyard. If we use power the way we do, we should generate it as clean and as close to home as possible, so we feel the consequences of our powered generation. That’s nature working if you think it out. In time we pay the price, but why make others pay? My question is what is the impact on the after population. Altamont and Mohave have problems. These are larger generators and I don’t know if the tip speed is such that it could be a big problem or not but think it’s something that should be asked. I hope there will be more projects like this. People in Virginia City can get upset, as an historical district, but the automobiles in that town have nothing to do with the history of that town and it doesn’t seem to bother them. If they’re willing to accept that technology, then why not the power? We all choose our own hypocrisy.”

(6:13:43) Sara Anderson of Carson City approached. “I live in Lakeview and my concern is about the migratory patterns of the white pelicans on East Lake and knowing they’re going to be in that general area. I’m concerned that that’s looked at before this all takes place.”

(6:14:31) Robert Dickinson of Carson City approached. “Wind generators sound like a good thing. Sometimes we jump into this type of energy thinking energy is going to be cheap, free, and that’s the furthest thing from the truth. I’ve done a lot of traveling across the U.S. and in Texas; there are thousands along I-10. Southern California has a lot of them. I think they look hideous. Half of them don’t even work. Half of them are on, half are off. To prove a point, I think they’re very distractive. Try to visualize this table over here, look at the people without seeing me doing this (waving his arms). You can’t do it. Your eyes are drawn to it, just like an animal, just like a hawk. Your eyes are drawn to movement. I think they’re terrible. There are many other ways we can make cheap energy, nuclear being one of them, but nobody wants nuclear in their backyard. They think it’s dangerous. Yet, over 90 percent of France’s energy is nuclear. Japan, nuclear. Why are they so afraid of it here? There’s other alternatives. You may not see it from Virginia City. If you’re driving somewhere, you will see it and your eyes will be attracted to it. That’s why I’m against it. It might be cheap power, but I don’t see my electric bill going down. I don’t see my electric bill going down with NV Energy with the new thermal energy that they put in Reno. I don’t see it happening. I think it’s going to get more and more expensive. T. Boone Pickens backed out of it. He was all for it. Everybody was looking for it on TV but now he’s backed out of it. There must be a reason why.”

(6:16:56) Mary Fischer of Carson City approached. “One of my concerns is there will be lights since they’re going to be such high towers. I live in Lakeview, my view is of Washoe Lake and that whole ridge there. I may be able to ignore that but what type of lights are you going to have? Are they going to be strobe or red lights? I think that will make a great deal of difference as far as looking at the skyline at night. I think that the fiscal concerns really need to be looked out. In Denmark, which has had wind generation for years and years, their electricity is the highest in Europe because wind energy has to be used when it is produced. It’s not something that is stored or that makes other plants come on and go off. You

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 6

couldn't shut down a power plant when it's really windy because it costs so much to start it up again. This is something that really needs to be analyzed. Is this the best source of energy? My first thought is this is great. But I'm not really quite so sure anymore. In some ways, there are other things that would be much more profitable for the dollar and if we're going to have to subsidize it, and if this is the reason that they're going in is because of the large subsidies that are coming, it has to be analyzed on how long those would have to last or if it would go away and become economically feasible."

(6:19:18) Cahal Doherty of Carson City approached. "I can't believe we're having this conversation because I feel that we need to get out from under the Middle East but I don't want to get into that argument. I'm from the northeast part of Ireland and there was multiple discussions about what we're talking about here tonight. People were predicting this and that. I come from the most beautiful valley in the Irish countryside. They put up their windmills and it didn't affect tourism a bit. This lady talks about Denmark and them having the most expensive electricity, but what she doesn't know is that Denmark has the highest taxes in Europe and they tax the heck out of electricity and gasoline. You only hear part of it but these guys have got my backing here, I'll tell you that."

Chairperson Kimbrough called for further public comment and, when none was forthcoming, requested BLM representatives to return to the podium.

(6:20:59) Ms. Peterson requested Mr. Hamilton to address the question regarding the starting and ending points of the transmission line. Mr. Hamilton advised that the transmission line will start at the southwest portion of McClellan Peak, "runs straight south until it hits the power lines that are running just north of 50 here. It follows that existing power line right-of-way" to the existing Brunswick substation east of town. In response to concerns regarding noise, Ms. Peterson advised that BLM representatives are taking steps to ensure that the noise analysis "will meet the concerns that we've heard." She further advised that "birds are always an issue." She expressed appreciation for the concerns expressed regarding the white pelicans on east Washoe Lake, and advised the comments will be added to the record. She further advised that surveys are being conducted to determine migratory paths of birds and bats. With regard to "taxpayer involvement," she explained that when "rights-of-way applications come to the BLM, all costs associated with processing ... fall to the proponent." This includes surveys and environmental impact statements ("EIS"). Subsidies will be included in the socioeconomic analysis portion of the EIS.

Chairperson Kimbrough entertained a motion. **Commissioner Reynolds moved to direct staff to forward public comments, by minutes from this meeting, to the Bureau of Land Management. Vice Chairperson Mullet seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.** Chairperson Kimbrough recessed the meeting at 6:25 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m.

H-4. MISC-09-006 PRESENTATION AND ACTION TO PROVIDE COMMENTS TO THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT (BLM) REGARDING AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR CARSON INTERAGENCY FIRE FACILITY PROPOSED FOR THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF EDMONDS DRIVE AND KOONTZ LANE (6:34:40) - Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Mr. Plemel proposed addressing this item using the same format as item H-3. He introduced Fire Chief Stacey Giomi and Open Space / Property Manager Juan Guzman, oriented the commissioners to the location of the proposed facility, and reviewed the staff report. He introduced Ken Smahula, of the BLM, who narrated a SlideShow presentation of the proposed facility. Mr. Smahula explained the purpose and operation of a BLM hot shot crew, and advised that none of the equipment is ever summoned "code 3, ... blaring red lights and sirens." He requested written questions or comments to be sent to Keith Barker in the BLM Field Office. At Mr. Smahula's request, Mr. Barker identified himself.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 7

In response to a question, Mr. Smahula requested any citizen interested in submitting written questions or comments to do so before March 11th.

Chairperson Kimbrough provided direction with regard to public comment, and opened this item. (6:43:05) Richard Duke of Carson City approached. I have been a Carson City resident for 45 years. I wrote a letter to Mr. Barker with a copy to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors regarding this project. I find it interesting that in addition to the comments I made in the letter, the next morning I heard on KOLO news that the BLM is proposing a facility on Koontz and Edmonds of five acres and a newspaper article says five acres. In the good neighbor letter sent to me at home, it says 15 acres, and tonight I hear seven ½ acres. I don't know if this is misinformation or just confusion of information. It needs to be clarified to let us know how many acres of land is going to be a footprint on this property. I made a lot of objections in my letter as to why this project shouldn't go through and one of the biggest objections is because it's over a mile to the Carson City freeway entrance, or on ramp or off ramp when it's built unless they decide to put in a new off ramp that we're not aware of. It could be better placed near a main artery so that they can respond to these emergencies they have. I've been an excavator in Carson City for many years and have done a lot of projects along that slope that they're proposing. That particular land, about a foot underground is caliche and doesn't absorb water well. When you put a project like they're talking about on that land, the absorption rate just goes away. The retention or detention pond they talk about in the same letter they sent out may be adequate for normal rainfall or snowfall, but if we have a flood of '97 that happens ever again, there's going to be a tremendous problem where the detention pond overflows onto Edmonds or even worse onto the proposed freeway. Right now there's no provision made for drainage to the west of Edmonds and when you start putting a hard stand on the ground, there's going to be run off and drainage that's provided for.

(6:46:18) Dave Hampton of Carson City approached. "I have two questions involving this facility. The first is, if it's used for any training, will they be fighting Class B type oil fires and what does that mean for the local air quality. The second question is are you going to ask the university to help you manage this and, if so, please see me for some advice."

(6:46:56) Fran McClain of Carson City approached. "I've lived on Koontz Lane for 30 years. I have six questions. If they're not going to be high tailing it out of there, there will probably be no requirement for traffic signals up there at the corner of Koontz and Hillview and Edmonds. Another item is the overhead lights, they said they're going to be directed downward which is fine, I've seen how that works, but when you're downhill from that how is it still going to affect residents to the west? I see their operation is 9-6, but what kind of noise level will be conducted during that? This is still a residential neighborhood and we don't want to be listening to all kinds of whatever goes on in the training facility. They provide for screening for the people on the east and the west, with shrubs, bushes, and all that, what about people to the west? We're all homes down there too and we'll be seeing that and it'll be an eyesore just as sometimes that water tower we just look at. We know that's open land and we accept that we can ride horses and take our dogs up there and all that, but if it's going to be all screened in, that's one thing to protect the view of the buildings, but is it going to be closed off to all the residents because of that. Lastly, explosives - it says in the letter of a possible flammable storage building. What type of flammable material will be stored there and what will be the safeguards to the residents if something should happen? Somebody comes in there at night. What is going to be our safeguards in the neighborhood?"

Chairperson Kimbrough pointed out that the design elements are still in draft form. The proposed facility hasn't yet been submitted to any of the Carson City processes.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 8

(6:49:40) Tim Howard of Carson City approached. He has numerous questions for this proposed facility at Koontz and Edmonds and their marketing plan proposal. He has solutions that are common sense. He then read a statement which was incorporated into the record.

(6:53:55) Art Duvall of Carson City approached. "A number of things I'm interested in have already been covered. It appears that this is a project that people feel is necessary at some level because you're proposing it and is legal and supportable. Some questions have come up. I live within the map area of the site. Are there plans for other developments coming in? Is this a block breaking sort of thing and there will be an industrial thing and another industrial thing. These are semi-industrial buildings and I'm wondering how it impacts the living in area. There was a question that came up in some of the discussions we had offline prior to the meeting here. I know several hot shot people, they're good people, they're fun loving people, very lively folks. But there was a comment that sometimes in fire crews you get trustees and that sort of thing coming in to work also. Is that an impact on the community that would be adverse? We've covered noise issues and helicopter issues which are a normal part of some of these firefighting things locally. Hazmat storage is listed on the map so what are we talking about there? That could be a very interesting issue for the community. Will they be pulling large quantities of water from the big water tank there which we now drink? That gets to be interesting if we don't have it to drink. Will there be tent camps for overflow groups coming in if there's a big event in the local area here? Will that be where they are sited or are there other sites for that? Have other sites been considered? It was just mentioned here, we're talking about the possibility, the old prison may be a better developed facility with perhaps better road access and other items to be considered. Bottom line is how good of neighbors will they be for a neighborhood community and impact on property values and that sort of thing which in today's market is a very real issue for a great many people. People who are interested in this should get together if we could get copies of the sign-in sheets for the local area of people to share information." Mr. Plemel advised that copies of the public comment sign-in sheet could be obtained from the Clerk's Office.

(6:57:50) Bill Davies from Carson City approached. "I live on Conte right next to Sinbad. I need to cover some new territory. This is getting pretty heated. Everybody's talked about my concerns already. My biggest concern is I've lived in this area for 25 years. The last 35-40 years, the only thing you people have built on Conte, on the east side of Conte are houses. There's 300 houses on that side, I counted them today and below Conte, on the west side, on south Edmonds is another 2,000. My concern to BLM is where is the sensitivity by BLM coming into my neighborhood and all the thousands of people that live there and putting a facility that isn't compatible. Why are we even talking about this? I don't understand why this has gone this far. I live on Conte because I'm a biker, I jog, walk, I ride all those hills on the side of Prison Hill, all those trails. I look down over the valley and it's gorgeous. The last thing I want to look at is a 7 or 15 acre facility built by BLM that I have to look at when I'm out there to enjoy the nature of the environment. Use your senses. BLM owns the whole state of Nevada and I can't understand why is my neighborhood so appealing to BLM when I like it better than they do. I've been there for 25 years and all of a sudden they want to live by me. I have neighbors. I have friends. I don't need any more friends. I'm retired. Life is having quiet time and enjoying my friends, grandkids. I encourage someone from BLM to drop by my house. Send one of your staff members, you have a lot of staff. You have more staff here than people here. Come by my house and talk to me. Go someplace else with your project if you would, with all respect. I really enjoy my environment. All my neighbors, it doesn't belong. You don't put a 15-acre facility among houses and commingle the two. They're not compatible."

(7:00:15) Janet Riggs of Carson City approached. "I live in the area where the last two gentlemen have spoken. The problem I have with BLM is that they do own a lot of land and I can't help but feel that once they get a foot in, the door's going to get open wider. I appreciate that they try to make their places look

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 9

like nice hacienda looking places but it still looks like an industrial complex and isn't appropriate in this kind of community. Something I wish the BLM would consider is that in the past number of years we, as the retired community, have taken a lot of hits. We have been very careful to try to see to it that we were never going to have our children be responsible for us or any of that good stuff. Our retirement nest egg, and probably a lot in this room has had the same thing, has suddenly gone to about half. The value of the house is an important thing. Property values have to go down when you have a public facility of that type suddenly thrust in the middle of it. I wish BLM would consider it. There must be pieces, I know they have to trade, they can't just walk in and use a state facility. They have to make trades and so forth. South of Snyder which is a better access to being able to get to something that is a major firefighting type project, would be a much more easily reached area. Down towards the prison, there is all kinds of land that some of it must belong to BLM or they could trade."

(7:02:26) Molly Sinnott of Carson City approached. "I have lived in this area for about 30 years at two different sites. I will not see this from my house but I have quite an interest in the open space area above it. Since I saw this in the Planning Commission on the agenda, I've been doing homework for about two weeks. I got a bit of information, I'm not going to recite all of it, but I did meet with two BLM fellows two days ago and spent about an hour to an hour and a half gaining more information about this. There was no information given unless I asked a question. But I did end up with a lot of information. I want the public to know that picture of Palomino Valley that I was shown, must be the opposite side of the building because it did not look like that. The picture I saw of Doyle that I was shown did not look like that so that must be another side of a building. Another point I want to make is all of that open space area, all of Prison Hill, this entrance here where this is being proposed is the gateway to all of the Prison Hill area that's going to be all open space. This is not a greeting to a nice open space area and the other thing is the BLM, outside of this land spill from what I've gained from my information, is that there are 40 acres here, so we're talking about a small footprint right now, but we have the potential for a whole complex to be built there. If you take out 15 acres from this, and what is going to be built on the remaining 25 acres? Is this going to be a total industrial looking complex as your gateway to all of Prison Hill? The square feet of structures from what I was able to gain is 15,000 square feet and that's a little bigger than most homes in this area and again, just as two of the people have put it eloquently, it's not compatible. It might be a great idea, but it's not compatible to a residential area. A lot of these people are looking to protect this area because it's one of the few areas that is not built on. Currently, these fire rigs, all this staff, are already housed somewhere. These vehicles are parked somewhere. Up until now, it's worked fine except for the situation with the seasonal housing. I'm married to someone that worked with BLM but I've known numerous people through the years that have been on hot shot crews and they've all managed to find a place. But, on the other hand, there's an area at the BLM. [Ms. Sinnott circulated photographs among the commissioners, which were later incorporated into the record.] If you look, this is the west side of the parking area of this building. If you look at that, to the right you've got everything set up there to put in housing for your seasonals for the ones who are out of the area. You don't need to move the fire trucks from where they are now. They must do training at some point in time, so they obviously have a place where they do training. Everything that's being spoke of, they've already got these things. Maybe they're not as grandiose as a complex would be, but looking at this also, there has been so much money spent on Carson City staff concerning public input meetings for this whole area. Most of these people have gone to these public input meetings, there's even been workshops on this. I would bet that you could look through public comment and see the vested interest people have in this site, and that they're not saying, please build industrial looking buildings on this area. Please cover this with asphalt so that you can park your big rigs. It says from the website I pulled off, and I go along with the gentleman, these numbers change continually from five to seven, fifteen, on the website that I found this, up to 40 personnel. So on top of these vehicles, you've got 40 also that this would be able to house, 40 private vehicles coming in and out of there for when

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 10

they're there. I was asked if it would help if I called my insurance agent, if this would help with fire insurance for my home. It doesn't because these are not structure rigs. If they're a hot shot crew, they're not going to be around most of the time in this area to fight any fires if there is something. They'll have to be brought in if they're out of the area. I think the 40 acres was vital for the people in this audience and people at home watching to realize we're talking 15 acres right now, but we're talking 40 acres total. I did not receive a letter, I saw it on the agenda so looking at this and on their website it said about the landscaping and to the north and the south. What about as the one woman said looking to the east and then when you're up there enjoying the new open space, you're looking down on this industrial complex; the potential for an industrial complex. Talking about the sedimentation basin, water basin, and how this would aid the future Carson City freeway. Are we grasping for anything to get this through? Do they think the Department of Transportation has not considered runoff on the whole freeway in this area? In looking at this, I hope that the Carson City Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, if it ever goes anywhere with these, would not support this industrial complex and keep the gateway to Prison Hill open space so that it's just that, open space. (She distributed another photo handout to the commissioners which was incorporated into the record). As I was leaving the BLM on Morgan Mill Road, it's a very nice facility, it looks like a great setting because you have all the cottonwoods from the river. This area I've circled on the photo is the landscape maintenance as you drive out of their building. These trees, these stubs of trees, is that an example of the maintenance we're going to be looking at? This is a leased building so maybe that's contracted out but this is their headquarters here and this is what you're looking at. It didn't give me a great deal of comfort looking at that."

In response to an earlier comment, Mr. Plemel noted the difference between the subject and previous item in that "this is a BLM-constructed facility on BLM property." He expressed the understanding that, pursuant to federal law, Carson City does not have the same jurisdiction as with state agencies or private developers. He expressed the belief that this project will not be submitted to the Planning Commission for further review. He noted the importance of the commissioners' and citizens' comments at this meeting.

(7:12:53) Paul Sinnott of Carson City approached. "I'm Molly's husband and I fought fires with BLM in Carson City and Alaska. I'm pretty familiar with the crews and how they act. I don't want to bash BLM. They're good people, they're hard working crews, they fought a lot of fires, they do a real good job, but that area is a commercial business. When they're working, it's 24 hours a day, even though they're saying they're going to be gone, you've got people moving in and out of there all the time when a fire's going, particularly in this area. What bothers me the most is BLM used to be on Long Street. I don't know how long ago that was, 10 years ago? They moved the whole thing to across from the cemetery. It's a great place; it's all dead people, they don't care what you're doing. But you're wanting to move into this neighborhood, and when they moved, why didn't they plan ahead? They knew this was coming. You look out into the future, you plan 20 to 50 years out in the distance when you do that. Why didn't they plan ahead for what was going to happen? If the crews were going to be increased, you're going to get more fire trucks, you should have compensated when that facility was planned and you relocated. The other thing with fires is a lot of time you need to pre-position people. These people are always out of town, they're always going somewhere. Where are they going to? Crews should be pre-positioned to where the majority of fires they go to so you're not paying travel and all the other things you've got to do when you're sending them to different places. Previously, when they chipped out there, which was a good thing, but I disagreed with it, as a fire break. We talked to John Singlaub and expressed our concern about off road vehicles being there. He said, 'We'll take care of it. We'll do it right. You won't be able to get over there or anything else,' and three weeks ago, there's three quads following the fence to go around trying to find their way out of there. I'm skeptical that everything is going to be taken care of. Last, but not least, even though this isn't in your jurisdiction, they can do or build whatever they want, you can still call the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 11

representative back in Congress, Dean Heller, all those other people. You can send your comments to them and they can send their comments to the Agriculture Department people that run BLM if you're not getting good input back from what you've expressed here and I would recommend sending comments back to those representatives."

(7:16:28) Tim Howard again approached and asked where are they going to get their water? The facilities to the south, Carson, they can get it right out of the river.

Chairperson Kimbrough closed public comment, and requested Mr. Smahula to return to the podium. (7:17:00) Mr. Smahula advised that BLM training at the facility will not include oil fires. "It'll be classroom training mostly inside the facility." Mr. Smahula further advised "there will be a noise level from 9:00 to 6:00. ... We are working there from 9:00 to 6:00. This is why we put it more toward Koontz and why we left the barrier there along Clearview and Valley View." Mr. Smahula pointed out the fence line "from the Valley View side" on a displayed map. He advised that the BLM owns 15 acres between Koontz Lane and Valley View Drive. He estimated the footprint of the facility at five to seven acres. He advised that "the rest of the land is going to stay the same. We have no intention of any future development on ... the south side of Koontz." Mr. Smahula advised of a "small amount of flammable storage," including "chain saw mix" and the like. He speculated "some of us have the same amount at our house." He advised that the hot shot crews are not comprised of inmates. "These are sons and daughters of people just like you working on fire crews, summer jobs, getting through college, things like that." Mr. Smahula described two different types of crew; type 1 is "an initial attack crew or ... hot line crew." Type 2 crews are sometimes comprised of inmates who are not "put in that type of situation." Mr. Smahula advised there will be no fuel or helipad facilities incorporated into the design. With regard to outside crews, he advised of usually contacting Chief Giomi to arrange housing in a City facility. He advised that maintenance of the proposed facility will be done by the BLM.

In response to a question, Mr. Smahula advised that the planning process for the subject facility has been ongoing for several years, and provided background information on selection of the proposed location. He acknowledged there were no alternatives associated with the environmental assessment for the subject location. He reminded the citizens of the contact information for submission of written questions and comments. In response to a further question, he advised that anticipated water demands for the facility will be pertinent to the inhabitants for the time being. He could make no guarantee that filling engines will not take place at the facility. He acknowledged that each engine holds approximately 280 gallons.

(7:26:05) In response to a question, Architect / Design Team Leader Jack Emrick welcomed comments regarding building design and color. He advised of the intent to use "earth tone colors to match the terrain." He clarified the overall acreage is 40 acres on both sides of Koontz Lane, and that "we would not build outside that footprint outlined by that fence ..." Concerns expressed over a 15,000-square-foot building are not accurate. The two crew quarters are comprised of 4,300 square feet each and accommodate ten bedrooms for the seasonal employees. The hot shot facility will be 7,500 square feet total.

In response to a question, Ms. Peterson discussed the NEPA process, noting the importance of identifying mitigation measures to address such things as lighting, design, and landscape. She advised that water and hazardous materials storage will be analyzed during the NEPA process, and that the public will have the opportunity to review the finalized environmental assessment. She noted the importance of receiving comments during this meeting. She responded to questions of clarification regarding the level of public involvement pertinent to the previous and subject items.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 12

Chairperson Kimbrough closed public comment, and called for additional questions or comments of the commissioners. Commissioner Vance referred Mr. Emrick to the written comments provided by Parks and Recreation Department staff which were included in the agenda materials. In response to a comment, Chairperson Kimbrough emphasized that the proposed project is still in the environmental assessment stage and that nothing has been finalized. He entertained a motion. **Commissioner Reynolds moved to direct staff to forward public comments, by minutes from this meeting, to the Bureau of Land Management. Commissioner Wendell seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.** Chairperson Kimbrough recessed the meeting and reconvened at 7:42 p.m. Commissioner Reynolds had stepped from the dais.

H-5(A) AB-09-022 ACTION TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGARDING AN ABANDONMENT OF PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY APPLICATION FROM VOLTAIRE GREEN HOMES, LLC (PROPERTY OWNER: BENJAMIN AND MAUREEN SALJESTAD), TO ABANDON A 600-FOOT-LONG, 60-FOOT-WIDE PORTION OF WEST WILLOW STREET WEST OF VOLTAIRE STREET, AND ALSO THE 30-FOOT-WIDE RIGHT-OF-WAY EXTENDING FROM THE WEST END OF WEST APPION WAY NORTH APPROXIMATELY 568 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4500 AND 4600 VOLTAIRE STREET, APNs 009-253-10 AND 009-255-01; and H-5(B) TSM-09-003 ACTION TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGARDING A TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION FROM VOLTAIRE GREEN HOMES, LLC (PROPERTY OWNER: BENJAMIN AND MAUREEN SALJESTAD) FOR AN 8-UNIT COMMON OPEN SPACE SUBDIVISION KNOWN AS CITY VIEW GREEN HOMES, LOCATED AT 4500 AND 4600 VOLTAIRE STREET, APNS 009-253-10 AND 009-255-01 (7:42:25) - Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Ms. Pruitt reviewed the staff report pertinent to the abandonment application, noting in particular the concurrence of Nevada Energy, Southwest Gas, AT&T Nevada, and Charter Communications, as included in the agenda materials. As indicated in the staff report, she noted that the right-of-way was created by federal land patents; the City never purchased it. She further noted the finding that the general public will not be materially damaged by the proposed abandonment. She narrated pertinent slides. She expressed the understanding that over 14 adjacent property owners attended a recent open house hosted by the applicant. Ms. Pruitt reviewed the staff report pertinent to the tentative subdivision map, noting in particular that the subdivision is proposed as “a green project.”

Glen Martel, representing Voltaire Green Homes, LLC, introduced Ben Saljestad, Ben Smith, and Designer Steve Hendricks. Mr. Martel expressed agreement with the conditions of approval for the abandonment and the proposed tentative map. He thanked City staff for their assistance over the past several months. He advised that 15 neighbors had attended the open house held Tuesday, February 17th, and thanked them for their participation. He narrated a SlideShow presentation of the proposed development, copies of which were included in the agenda materials. He distributed, to the commissioners and staff, copies of the brochures which were provided at the open house, and advised that the subject project will be the first certified by the Sierra Green Building Standards Program. He responded to questions of clarification regarding the “Energy Star” appliances and fixtures proposed to be used. With regard to the windows, he anticipates the homeowner’s manual will include information on required shading. He noted the garages are equipped with an exhaust fan. He responded to questions regarding the proposed stem wall design, the proposed driveway design, and the cupola. Ben Saljestad provided additional clarification regarding the green building design and the cupola.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 13

Chairperson Kimbrough opened this item to public comment. Bob Widmar pointed out, on a displayed map, his two acres adjacent to the south of the subject property. He expressed support for the proposed project, and concern over Appion Way in that “what it shows here on the map is a misnomer.” He advised that Appion Way “from Voltaire west is non-existent.” He advised of having graded the road way “in order to build our house,” and of having maintained it since 1974. He referred to the “massive hill” which will have to be cut into “60 to 100 feet ... at about a 60 percent grade, and take out the estimated 55,000 or 60,000 square feet of dirt.” He expressed no opposition, but an interest in ensuring that his property “have some retainers in it that it’s not going to wash down.” He advised of having cut four building pads in 1974, on one of which he constructed his residence. He discussed off-road and other unwanted access to the undeveloped lots, and advised of having installed a 1-inch steel cable “right at [his] house ... and that seemed to stop everybody.” He expressed concern that “once that’s opened again, ... there is some type of safety mechanism that won’t allow these people to come up and ruin that property ...” He requested consideration for “whatever grandfathering in is available ... because I don’t want to move back all the landscaping and the rock wall and everything we’ve had there for the last 35 years.” He responded to questions of clarification. (2-0001) In response to a question, Mr. Sharp provided background information with regard to the grade proposed for the new roadway, and discussed the decision to leave Appion Way at its existing grade. Mr. Widmar reiterated his concern over off-road vehicle and other access to his undeveloped property once the roadway is paved. Mr. Sharp advised of a proposed turn around at the end of the Appion Way extension, which will require “a bit of a retaining wall right at the end of the road.” Mr. Saljestad expressed a willingness to discuss the matter further with Mr. Widmar. In response to a question, Mr. Widmar summarized his concerns as pertinent to the proposed grade for Appion Way and to ensure “the hill doesn’t come down on us once they finish grading all that ...”

(8:17:35) Jean Bondiett, a resident of Voltaire Street “about a block to the north and facing west,” expressed concern over “the trash” in that the subcontractors were parking on Voltaire Street and “just throwing their trash out on the east side of Voltaire” after lunch. She advised of having informed Mr. Saljestad of the issue, and that he committed to have it picked up. “They did pick some of it up. They’ve also just bulldozed some dirt over some of it. There’s still quite a bit in the sagebrush.” Ms. Bondiett commented, “Littering the neighborhood is not a green building practice ...” She advised of having been “sandblasted today,” expressed concern over continued removal of sagebrush, and requested mitigation for the “dirt that’s left open.” She expressed additional concern over the steepness of the hillside, the amount of dirt to be displaced, and the amount of existing vegetation to be removed. She advised that more snow tends to fall in her neighborhood than in the center of town, and expressed concern over driveway access and parking issues once the development is complete. She expressed additional concern over snow removal processes, and requested that the development be required to connect to the City’s utilities system. She advised of earthquake fault lines in the area, and expressed concern. She expressed concern over continuing to have livestock on her property, and requested to be “grandfathered in.” She expressed opposition to being required to “defend her house” at some point in the future. She commended the developers for their openness and willingness to meet with the neighbors. In response to a previous question, Chairperson Kimbrough referred to the condition of approval requiring dust mitigation during construction. He further advised of the condition of approval requiring connection to City utilities. He commended the relationship between the developer and the neighbors.

(8:25:05) Paul Ford, representing the owners of the 5.64-acre “contiguous rectangular between Voltaire and Cochise Streets,” advised that an application to abandon West Willow Street is in the process of being prepared. He expressed support for the abandonment application, and described two development scenarios for the 5.64-acre parcel, one which would require fill and one for which retaining walls would be proposed. Depending upon the direction, “we would be impacted only if they push dirt on our land.” Mr. Ford

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 14

advised of having discussed the matter with Mr. Saljestad in the past, who advised of the intent to “use all their dirt.” Mr. Ford reiterated support for the project.

Chairperson Kimbrough called for additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained additional questions, comments, or a motion of the commissioners. **Commissioner Peery moved to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve an abandonment of public right-of-way application, AB-09-002, for a 630-foot-long, 60-foot-wide portion of West Willow Street west of Voltaire Street, and also the 30-foot-wide right-of-way extending from the west end of West Appion Way north approximately 599 feet to the northwest corner of the subject property, being a 53,956-square-foot area, more or less, located northwest of the intersection of Appion Way and Voltaire Street, based on seven findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Wendell seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-1, Commissioner Reynolds abstaining.** Chairperson Kimbrough commended the project and the developers for their willingness to work with the neighbors.

Chairperson Kimbrough entertained a motion pertinent to the tentative subdivision map. **Commissioner Vance moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of a Tentative Subdivision Map known as City View Green Homes, TSM-09-003, to allow a common open space development of eight residential home lots, on property zoned single family one acre, located at 4500 and 4600 Voltaire Street, APNs 009-253-10 and 009-255-01, based on required findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Wendell seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-1, Commissioner Reynolds abstaining.**

H-6. MISC-09-004 DISCUSSION AND ACTION TO DIRECT STAFF REGARDING POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO THE CARSON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE TO LIMIT THE SIZE OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLES THAT MAY BE PARKED OR STORED IN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS, CLARIFYING DEFINITIONS FOR PICKUP TRUCKS AND COMMERCIAL VEHICLES, AND OTHER MATTERS RELATED THERETO (8:30:00) - Commissioner Reynolds returned to the dais. Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Mr. Plemel provided background information on the purpose of this item, and reviewed the staff report. He recognized Richard Schneider, who was present in the meeting room, and expressed appreciation for the research he had conducted and provided to the Planning Division. As outlined in the staff report, Mr. Plemel discussed the recommendation to better define commercial vehicles, pickup trucks, and vans.

In response to a question, Mr. Plemel discussed the past issue of recreational vehicles which now have distinct standards. He characterized the subject issue as “not as big,” but advised that the code enforcement division receives “fairly steady calls” regarding commercial vehicles parked on residential properties. Commissioner Peery discussed concerns that “tying the issue to property size” may “smack of discrimination.” Discussion followed, and Commissioner Wendell expressed the belief that the issue is significant. He described examples in various areas of town. He expressed the further belief that, for enforcement purposes and to maintain the community’s quality of life, there is no alternative but to address the subject matter very specifically. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel reviewed regulations pertinent to parking vehicles on the street. In response to a further question, he reviewed the exceptions to commercial vehicles parked in a residential area.

Chairperson Kimbrough opened this item to public comment. (2-0621) Bruce Kittess explained that Mr. Schneider would not be speaking at this meeting due to the requirement to testify at a hearing scheduled for February 26th. Mr. Kittess speculated as to the reason the Board of Supervisors had referred this matter

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 15

back to the Planning Commission. He expressed opposition to a dump truck, because of being designated as a pickup truck, being able to travel in and out of and park in a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Plemel referred to a displayed graphic, and discussed the various sizes of trucks which fit the current size definition in the ordinance.

(2-0675) Marty Schwedhelm, a resident of Lakeview Estates, expressed sympathy for the Planning Division staff and the commissioners in consideration of this matter and the perspective that “a lot of it is subjective.” He requested the commissioners to consider “the evidence specifically in code enforcement where a seemingly benign van might have ladders ... and signage,” and with the “preponderance of evidence” being considered a commercial vehicle. He couldn’t imagine a “chassis cab and below” being considered “anything other than a commercial vehicle.” He advised that he owns a “large pickup truck” which “falls within the definition, as manufactured, a Ford F350 crew cab, long bed, that is 21 feet 10 inches long.” He further advised that his vehicle fits “easily” into the Harrah’s and Circus Circus parking lots, “slides right under the 8-foot” maximum height barrier. He expressed the opinion that his vehicle “fits with [his] neighborhood.” In reference to the “preponderance of evidence,” he suggested considering use, signage, and accouterments” such as tool boxes, ladders, etc. He expressed concern over “getting into the subjective aspect” of the vehicle usage. He expressed support for keeping vehicles “used in a commercial enterprise away from residential parking at the off hours ...” He expressed the opinion that the current standards for a pickup “are vastly overblown,” and disagreement that any commercially manufactured pickup goes up to ten feet.

Chairperson Kimbrough called for additional public comment; however, none was forthcoming. He advised that he lives on a five-acre lot, and that “if I had these restrictions and I passed it, I’d have to move because there’s a lot of big vehicles out where I live and that’s why they picked five-acre lots.” He requested consideration for residential areas with five or more acres. He expressed difficulty with the subject item “because you can’t get your hands around it.”

Commissioner Wendell suggested that, in discussing commercial vehicles, pickups and vans should also be considered. He described an example, and discussed the importance of crafting enforceable ordinance language. He advised of having measured the height of his standard GMC pickup at 6 feet and his garage at 8 feet. He suggested restricting the height of a pickup truck or van to under eight feet, and imposing the parking restrictions on parcels of less than one acre. He expressed the belief that the “real key” is screening. Vice Chairperson Mullet suggested taking action to direct staff to prepare a draft ordinance. He related an example of a person who drops a trailer off downtown and drives his tractor to his residence.

Mr. Plemel advised that staff would present alternatives for further discussion. Vice Chairperson Mullet suggested that Commissioner Wendell submit his suggested language to Mr. Plemel for incorporation into the draft. Chairperson Kimbrough entertained a motion. **Vice Chairperson Mullet moved to direct staff to prepare a draft ordinance based on the planning commission’s discussion and comments. Commissioner Wendell seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-1.** Chairperson Kimbrough thanked the citizens for their attendance and participation.

H-7. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWING APPLICATIONS (9:05:20) - Chairperson Kimbrough continued this item to a future meeting. He requested the commissioners to review the materials which were distributed prior to the start of the meeting.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Meeting
Page 16

I. STAFF REPORTS

COMMISSIONER REPORTS / COMMENTS (9:06:20) - None.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION (9:06:30) - Mr. Plemel reviewed the director's report, copies of which were included in the commissioners' agenda materials, and responded to questions of clarification.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (2-0946) - Mr. Plemel reviewed the tentative agenda for the April commission meeting.

J. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (2-0962) - Commissioner Peery moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

The Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 25th day of March, 2009.

MARK KIMBROUGH, Chair