

CITY OF ELKO
JOINT REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY ADVISORY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
5:30 P.M., P.D.S.T., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2009
FIRE STATION NO. 2, 725 RAILROAD STREET, ELKO, NEVADA

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chris Johnson for the RDA and Lori Lynch, Acting Chairperson for the RDAAC.

ROLL CALL

Redevelopment Agency Present: Chris Johnson, John Patrick Rice,
Jim Conner,

Redevelopment Agency Absent: Mayor Michael J. Franzoia, Jay Elquist

Redevelopment Agency
Advisory Council Present: Tony Buettner, Lina Blohm,
Lori Lynch, Morris Gallagher, Duane Jones,
Steve Bowers (ECSD ex-officio member)
Sonja Sibert (GBC ex-officio member)

Redevelopment Agency
Advisory Council Absent: Cathie Horn, (ECVA ex-officio member)
ELKO COUNTY ex-officio member,
ECEDA ex-officio member

City Staff Present: Curtis Calder, City Manager
Delmo Andreozzi, Assistant City Manager (arrived at 6:45 p.m.)
Scott Wilkinson, Development Manager
Kelly Watson, Planning Technician

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 19, 2009 – Joint RDA and RDAAC Meeting
(for approval of RDAAC only)

****Mrs. Blohm moved to approve the May 19, 2009, joint meeting minutes as submitted. Mr. Jones seconded the motion and the motion passed.**

August 13, 2009 – Joint RDA and RDAAC Meeting
(for approval of RDA only)

****Mr. Conner moved to approve the August 13, 2009, joint meeting minutes as submitted. Mr. Rice seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.**

I. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

This agenda item is to provide time for the general public to address the City of Elko Redevelopment Agency and the City of Elko Redevelopment Agency Advisory Council 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.

Mr. Calder said in reference to an e-mail sent out by Mrs. Blohm to all of the members I wanted to bring it to everyone's attention that whenever you e-mail a quorum you could be violating the open meeting law through a serial communication. Dave Stanton reviewed it and he said the safest method would be regarding the item that is mentioned in her e-mail that is in the agenda is in reference to the bylaw revisions as it pertains to moving it from monthly to quarterly. The information we didn't have is how many people either responded to the e-mail either through e-mail, telephone or some other method. If there were responses that constituted a quorum of either board it would be clearly a violation and we wouldn't want to talk about it but if nobody responded to it or clearly the response to it was less than a quorum we could proceed. It is ultimately your decision how you want to handle it. In the future I would avoid mass e-mails to the quorum of any respective board. The Advisory Committee is set up through those bylaws to follow NRS 241 which is the Open Meeting Law. The RDA is also a public body that has to follow the Open Meeting Law.

Ms. Lynch wanted clarification from Dave Stanton regarding the open meeting law and what constitutes a quorum at this point in time with only five active members because the bylaws were adopted for seven members. At this point it needs to be clear whether three is a quorum with five acting members.

Mr. Calder noted he already discussed that with Mr. Stanton and the quorum is still four members even though they are not active because that's how the bylaws were adopted. Going back to the Open Meeting Law he read a Supreme Court opinion that says a quorum of a public body using serial electronic communication to deliberate toward a decision or to make a decision on any matter over which the public body has supervision, control, jurisdiction, or advisory power violates the Open Meeting Law. That is not to say, in the absence of a quorum, members of a public body cannot privately discuss public issues or even lobby for votes. However, if a quorum is present or is gathered by serial electronic communications, the body must deliberate and actually vote on the matter in a public meeting. Based on this the questions to ask are who received the e-mail and did the e-mails constitute the deliberation on a matter that is going to result in a decision thus did anyone respond, etc. Mr. Stanton stated from what I know Mrs. Blohm's e-mail has come close to an Open Meeting Law violation and it might be prudent to table that matter listed on the agenda discussed in the e-mail to a later meeting. I don't know if that is necessary if everyone here says we didn't respond or have any conversations. If you e-mail everyone on the committee it opens up that opportunity for response and deliberation.

Mr. Jones asked if you need an answer from us.

Mr. Calder said when we get to item 3 you might want to discuss that before you make a decision. Mrs. Blohm indicated she thought only one person may have responded. Chapter 241 of the Open Meeting Law is one of the few statutes that is basically predominantly case law and opinions versus the actual statutory language.

Ms. Lynch noted for the joint meetings the Advisory Council is never asked if they would like to add items to the agenda. It states in the bylaws we are responsible for helping establish these joint agendas. We are never given that opportunity to include those items on this agenda so I am going to bring all of my questions that I would have like to see on the agenda because it is the only place that can be.

Because the process for the Master Plan is already moving at such a rapid pace and one of the things I would like to ask is within that budget is there a designated amount which has been approved for the budget for the Redevelopment section of the Master Plan and if so, how much is it. How much detail is it going to be? Is it included at all?

Mr. Wilkinson said I believe there's \$100,000 from the Planning Department for Streets and Highways and the Land Use components of the Master Plan. The RDA would be addressed under the Land Use component of the Master Plan. We will work with a consultant to determine an appropriate level of detail that the RDA is addressed. Your Redevelopment Plan is the bulk of the detail and that's the plan you would revise as you work through the redevelopment process rather than the Master Plan. The RDA has the authority to revise the Redevelopment Plan. By state law we can only revise our Master Plan four times a year.

Ms. Lynch asked is \$100,000 the amount for the whole contract?

Mr. Wilkinson said no it's \$160,000; \$50,000 for Parks and Rec. and \$10,000 for Arts and Culture.

Ms. Lynch asked if this is creating within the Master Plan the redevelopment section that needs to be created referencing our master plan.

Mr. Wilkinson said it will and the extent and depth of that reference will be a process where the consultant is involved, the Planning Commission and public comment. Remember the Master Plan is more of an infrastructure type document. We're not going to rework your plan in the Master Plan. You have an adopted Redevelopment Plan.

Ms. Lynch said but what our master plan doesn't include are design concepts, structural concepts and zones. Ours is a bare plan and needs to be completely redone into a master plan. It is adopted but it is not a master plan because it doesn't include any of those details.

Mr. Wilkinson said the RDA should come up with the money to address those issues in the RDA Plan.

Ms. Lynch said that is my second question at this point if the RDA decides because mine being only one opinion the RDA can't move forward without that Master Plan. If taking some of that money that is available and having the resource at our hands now and being able to incorporate that into a working document and not a bare document. When the City's Master Plan is done it is addressing something that is complete and not bare. References really need to be from a detail perspective not from a blank page.

Mr. Wilkinson said that is probably why Carson City is very limited in that reference so as this evolves you don't have conflict with the Master Plan so you have to go back and constantly amend and revise the Master Plan and take it back through the whole process each and every time. You have more flexibility.

Mr. Calder said the SOQ calls for the consultant to come up with a plan to integrate the existing RDA Plan into the Master Plan because right now the Master Plan doesn't even envision redevelopment. Our Master Plan is not a specific plan it is a general plan. All of the components are pretty broad and allows for a lot of flexibility. We need to have the consultant's expertise to design the Master Plan so as this thing evolves it does fit and the Master Plan does need to be out in front of the Redevelopment Plan so we don't do something with the Redevelopment Plan that contradicts what is going on in the Master Plan.

Ms. Lynch said that is my biggest concern that it either be so little that it does really no good or without the design how do you do land uses and street design without having something that's been designed yet.

Mr. Wilkinson said at this point in time all they can use is what you do have.

Ms. Lynch said that is what is scaring me. We don't have anything in there yet specific to those questions.

Mr. Wilkinson said there is a lot of work that went into this over a lot of years that you have worked on.

Ms. Lynch said but not specific to what we have been working on all of these years.

Mr. Wilkinson said you don't want so much detail in the Master Plan that every time you work through an issue as a group the Master Plan has to be amended because it can only be done four times a year.

Ms. Lynch said can we use this time to get that done at the same time so we don't have to go back. They both need to be done if there's money available if we can get it done at the same time instead of having to go back and change them later. The concern is that this is already moving so fast and it has already gone so far that it is something that needs to be done immediately but it is up to the RDA to make that decision if they are willing to spend that money on that. I would like to see that on the agenda at some point and maybe have further discussion as to what we have available and what that will achieve or accomplish on our side so the Master Plan when it is done is actually a working document for us. The second thing I have is if the RDA is going to allow the Advisory Council to come up with questions to ask the consultant based on what we have been working on. If so we need time to do that because we don't know where you are in the hiring process.

Mr. Wilkinson said we've received all the SOQs and they are under review. We're going to try ranking them by the end of the month or the first week of October. Working as a group of people try to choose 5-7 out of those submitted. You need to keep in mind when scoring these consultants that the update is for the Master Plan for the whole city and not just RDA.

Ms. Lynch said if we can come up with three critical questions that we feel to know whether that will help us or not.

Mr. Wilkinson said whoever you selected to be on that committee will present those along with everyone else's questions. All of the questions have to be the same for the interview process.

Mrs. Blohm asked if completion could be expected by July, 2010.

Mr. Calder said the money is budgeted to be expended in that fiscal year.

Mr. Wilkinson asked if the Advisory Council would be able to accomplish this in six or seven months.

Mr. Buettner said that is part of the idea of having these team building meetings so we can address these questions cohesively and recommend. We're not going to tell the RDA what to ask. We're going to make recommendations on what we'd like asked. The development of those questions ultimately will be up to the RDA we are just an advisory board. Inclusion of the RDA design into the Master Plan is a sequential part of the process. We are not working with a blank slate; we have existing confines for redevelopment. One of the questions that may come out of a workshop to present is at what point in

time is the consultant going to inform us the adopted RDA current design doesn't have the level of detail or the information they need to finish their job? Then look at how we get those specific elements taken care of so when they develop the Master Plan the vision we have can fit into it. If they are good at what they do, they are going to tell us how and when to act and what information they need to have to make it happen. The timelines that we have restricting us for the SOQ process. Trying to find out what those durations were so we could work backwards and establish how many days it would take for us to get our act together. One of the questions might be how do we integrate the RDA Plan into the Master Plan.

Ms. Lynch said my concern is our document is not a working document. Yes it is based on what we needed at the time. We have this opportunity and consultant at our hands now. It's going to be a lot less to do a change order to include the RDA Plan while he is here doing the work anyway than to pay for a whole process again later.

Mr. Wilkinson said I don't know if the RDA can piggyback their funds with the City funds.

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS, PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

1. Election of Officers. Pursuant to the adopted Bylaws of the City of Elko Redevelopment Agency Advisory Council a chairperson, vice-chairperson and secretary shall be elected from its members in July of each year. Due to the lack of a quorum in July and August, action on this item has been postponed until such time a quorum is present for a vote.

ACTION ITEM. FOR ACTION OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY ADVISORY COUNCIL ONLY.

- Chair
- Vice Chair
- Secretary

Ms. Lynch said this is not a joint action and shouldn't be taken at a joint meeting and recommended setting a separate Advisory Council agenda to take care of this business.

Mr. Johnson noted there were five members to get support from.

****Ms. Lynch moved to table the item and put it on an Advisory Council agenda. Mr. Gallagher seconded the motion and the motion failed with a vote of 3-2. Ms. Lynch, Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Buettner voted for tabling, and Mr. Jones and Ms. Blohm voted against tabling.**

The following discussion took place before the vote.

Mr. Buettner noted we need to get together and understand our strengths and weaknesses before we elect members. Before we start talking about elections, we should take the steps that are second and third on this list. We need to do what's best for the City of Elko and the RDA. I don't know all of you personally.

Ms. Lynch said that is exactly my point for requesting a separate meeting where we can spend the time laying that all out there.

Mr. Buettner said the second part of that is we do need to get our group together. Does the RDA want to sit in and listen to us deliberate?

Mrs. Watson noted it will still be an open public meeting and the people that are here right now could still be there.

Ms. Lynch said but it is focused strictly on that item but it is so critical for us to move forward. I have never met you so without knowing what your credentials are and where you are coming from and why you are coming from there and would like time to discuss things without a joint meeting.

Mr. Wilkinson asked if there was action taken to have joint meetings.

Ms. Lynch said we have always had our own meeting. We have always had our own agenda and meetings that are just advisory.

Mrs. Watson noted there was action taken at a joint meeting to continue the joint meetings.

Ms. Lynch said we also have separate meetings where the Advisory Council elected our officers and we did a whole lot of discussion, came up with proposed agenda items. That is one of the things I wanted to bring up to the Advisory Council is that we meet with the joint Council every month that we as the Advisory Council meet a week before that of every month so that we can come up with agenda items for every joint meeting so we have input on what is on the agenda and know that what we are working on where that is not happening right now.

Mrs. Blohm said this item has been tabled for July and August meetings simply because we didn't have a quorum. Since the RDA has been formally put in place we have had joint meetings. Prior to that workshops and developing this downtown Redevelopment Plan we had our separate Advisory Council meeting. Since we have a quorum and we have some item to take care of that we should move forward and get the actions done and proceed.

Mr. Rice said speaking as a spectator to this group. I talked to Ms. Lynch about the makeup of the agenda and I communicated with Mr. Andreozzi and Mr. Wynes regarding the setting of the agenda. It was my feeling that it is the responsibility and the privilege of the chair to be able to set the agenda and Mr. Andreozzi had indicated he did not consult with Ms. Lynch who at that time was the chair regarding the makeup of the agenda. It was just simply on oversight. That is why as an observer it is not inappropriate at all to place this item on another agenda and come back with action at a different time. I can't see that our action calling for joint meetings would prohibit separate meetings of the RDA.

Ms. Lynch noted there was an e-mail sent asking that this item not be put on the joint agenda but be set on an agenda separately for the Advisory Council.

Mr. Buettner said my concern is the deadline for the SOQ and our cohesive approach at meeting that deadline. If we lose an opportunity to have input and provide them with the recommendation we are trying to give them on this key issue because we can't get it together, then there is no reason for us to even be here.

Ms. Lynch said we have a motion and a second on the table and we need to finish that off. We also have a quorum right here right now and we have to post the agenda in three days so we can get an agenda out tomorrow and still meet on Wednesday. We have a quorum that can commit to a time, place and where

how that doesn't prohibit us from getting those. We have a working board even if we don't do this tonight.

Mrs. Blohm said I'm not going to be available at all next week.

Ms. Lynch said I think it is critical that we are all there; all five of us need to be there to set it.

Mr. Buettner said several of these items are going to be pretty long getting to know each other and discuss how we'd best serve the RDA. I think all four of these are pushing it for one night.

Ms. Lynch said this is the only item directly related to just us.

Mr. Calder pointed out the Advisory Council takes action on item 3.

Mr. Buettner asked what the advantage to taking action on this item would be right now.

There was comment that there was a quorum present as an advantage.

****Mr. Buettner moved to table the item to another meeting at a later date. Ms. Lynch seconded the motion.**

The following discussion took place before the vote.

Ms. Lynch asked if the Advisory Council members would like to set a date now.

Mr. Gallagher said I would like the date where all five voting members can attend.

Ms. Lynch suggested Monday, September 21, 2009, at 6:00 p.m. in Fire Station No. 2.

There was discussion regarding whether *all* of the members would be able to attend and an operating quorum being available to discuss item.

Mrs. Watson wanted verification of whether or not a new Chairman had to be elected for proper procedure.

Ms. Lynch said the Vice Chair is automatic in the bylaws.

Mr. Calder noted that was fine. My suggestion is if you are waiting for all five of you to be there you probably will wait for the next two or three months. If election of officers is that important where everyone needs to be here, I can only guarantee you are here right now in front of me. If it is that important you should probably take care of it. If it is not that important go ahead and table it and schedule another meeting where four of you can be there as a quorum. We are happy to schedule the meetings and I guess the only concern Staff would have is if we schedule a meeting we would hope that a quorum shows up so it is not a waste of everyone's time.

****Mr. Buettner moved to withdraw his motion to table the item until action on agenda item 3 takes place. Mr. Jones seconded the withdrawal of the motion.**

2. Economic Report. Report on status of Tax Increment Funding available. **REPORT ONLY. NO ACTION REQUIRED.**

Mr. Andreozzi noted there is about \$88,000 in the bank which is the full year worth of tax increment. There are two new structures built in the Redevelopment area so there should be some additional tax increment next year. There are several different enhancement projects in the area including façade, downtown corridor lighting, curb, gutter, and sidewalk and drainage improvements.

Ms. Lynch asked since that is in the Redevelopment Area, is that something that is taken to the Advisory Council for design.

Mr. Andreozzi said it is not our intention that that would be the case because everything that is in the Plan as adopted when projects are taking place we are administering those provisions. The only thing that comes back to the RDA is anything that's issued a Building Permit. Within our Plan that is the only thing that requires Agency review and approval.

Ms. Lynch noted that is why they need to get a Plan done.

Mr. Buettner noted there is an architectural review process.

Mr. Andreozzi noted Staff is administering the adopted Plan.

Mr. Rice noted he goes in and reviews each Building Permit but there aren't guidelines.

Mr. Buettner noted we can't stop development because there isn't a plan yet. We need to get a design professional on board.

Ms. Lynch said her question earlier was how much money was there to spend and now they know the answer so they should move forward with deciding how to use it.

Mr. Wilkinson noted that would be a good agenda item for the Advisory Council.

****Mr. Johnson moved discussion to item 4.**

3. Review, consideration and approval of an amendment to the City of Elko Redevelopment Agency Advisory Committee Bylaws to reduce the number of members from seven (7) to five (5) members, to change the occurrence of meetings from one regular meeting in each month to one meeting in each quarter and to change the quorum requirement from four (4) to three (3) members. **ACTION ITEM**

Ms. Lynch wanted discussion on the pros and cons of reducing the board.

Mrs. Blohm asked are we a varied enough group to contribute to the board or do we require two more members to bring that expertise?

Mr. Buettner asked if seven people need to be on the board to utilize the power of the public.

Ms. Lynch noted getting public input doesn't happen. The seven member board was established based on having somebody from every core of every aspect to have the expertise on there to make educated decisions. My personal opinion is that we have a really hard time getting people interested for the seven because we pretty much have been very ineffective. People see that and they hear that and I think once

we become more efficient that we would have that option of having more people interested in getting involved.

Mr. Buettner asked what brought about the interest in reducing the membership to 5 members.

Ms. Lynch said the lack of a quorum.

Mr. Buettner said regardless of the number you have if you can't meet a quorum you can't be effective.

Mrs. Watson noted you can change the membership back to seven if you get more involvement.

Mrs. Blohm noted there are ex-officio members who don't show up.

Mrs. Watson noted we did send out letters to ex-officio members and Ms. Sibert is here representing the college. Staff has made the attempt.

Ms. Lynch asked if the bylaws should be changed to reduce some of the ex-officio members and add them as official members instead.

Mr. Gallagher said he asked Mrs. Watson about advertising for interested parties and Mrs. Watson replied that the City advertised on three occasions and there was no interest. I think as Mr. Buettner has pointed out as we grow and we become more effective there is more interest.

Mr. Jones said I think we should drop to five and if we can expand then do so.

****Mr. Jones moved to drop the Advisory Council membership to 5 members. Mrs. Blohm seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.**

Before the second, Mr. Calder reminded the Advisory Council that the amendment would require a 2/3 vote which meant all five members would have to vote one way or another.

Before the vote, Ms. Lynch said just to let you know I'm not in favor of going to five yet. I think we need to give ourselves a chance.

The following discussion took place after the vote.

Mr. Calder said in accordance with the bylaws, at the next Redevelopment meeting since we no longer have a quorum we'll have the formal amendment of the bylaws.

Mr. Bowers said we also need to look at the terms for the members.

Mrs. Watson said we actually looked at that and the first terms have already been established so we didn't feel it was necessary to change those.

Ms. Lynch said I'd like to set up a time and place for the next meeting while all five of us are here.

Mr. Jones said I am going to be gone the next week.

Ms. Lynch asked if it is critical that all five members be present for the next meeting.

Mr. Buettner asked if the election of officers needs to happen before a team building workshop and discussion of protocol. What about Wednesday, September 30, 2009, at 6 p.m. at Fire Station No. 2?

Ms. Lynch asked does that give us enough time to come up with questions.

There was continued discussion regarding meeting dates and times for the next Redevelopment Agency Advisory Council.

Mr. Calder said just for clarification we're still scheduled for Monday, September 21, 2009, at 6 p.m. at Fire Station No. 2. Now we have a meeting on Wednesday, September 30, 2009, at 6 p.m. at Fire Station No. 2. If you do a meeting on September 16, 2009, we need to know because everything has to be posted tomorrow by 9 a.m.

Mrs. Watson said we need to have the agenda items set and everything.

Ms. Lynch said the election of the officers is September 30, 2009. September 16, 2009, is out.

There was further discussion regarding the meeting dates and times and content of the agenda for the next Redevelopment Agency Advisory Council.

Mr. Johnson noted just have a couple of dates and agenda items and work that out with Staff.

4. Review, consideration and approval for implementing a revised Option B corridor block design as outlined in the City of Elko's Redevelopment Plan. **ACTION ITEM**

Mr. Andreozzi explained the agenda action sheets and then presented the options in the packet noting Block options A and B are currently in the adopted Plan.

Mrs. Watson said the option C could be considered revised option B.

Mr. Wilkinson said it was put on the agenda as revised option B because there wasn't an option C in the Plan.

Mr. Johnson asked if option C was what Staff was recommending.

Mr. Andreozzi said yes because in order to do option A or B we would have to reduce the corridor or take sidewalk away to facilitate that width. Revised option B is a representation of what is at the corner of 5th and Railroad Streets. Right now a typical corridor has parking for about 150 vehicles and the options show about 80 spaces.

Mrs. Blohm asked if the parallel temporary parking status would stay the same along Railroad.

Mr. Andreozzi said yes.

Ms. Lynch asked if there was supposed to be a designated bike path.

Mr. Andreozzi said there is a bike plan but nothing adopted in the RDA Plan. There is also a design in the plan for a bus pick up and drop off area on 4th Street with a kiosk.

Mr. Buettner asked if there was a way to configure some of the corridor so it was appropriate for large trucks and trailers with the access and parking.

Ms. Lynch suggested doing one corridor specifically for that.

Mr. Andreozzi noted there currently is one corridor designed specifically for that between 6th and 7th Streets.

Mrs. Blohm asked if it would be good to soften those approaches now before this is adopted.

Mr. Andreozzi said we have to consider fire access as well this is more or less the layout.

Ms. Lynch asked if this is already adopted will any of the designing ever come back to the Advisory Council?

Mr. Andreozzi said things are happening and that's why it is so important for you to figure out the design guidelines.

Mr. Buettner said it would be nice to know how much time we have to gather suggestions.

Mr. Johnson noted it was good to hear from the Advisory Council and said if you feel there's not enough information to make a recommendation tonight then we can structure the meeting for that.

Mrs. Blohm said we can take action that these design options be reviewed by the Advisory Council at a separate workshop in order to forward a recommendation to RDA.

Ms. Lynch asked what it takes to change the Plan.

Mr. Andreozzi said normally there's just a public hearing. Staff sees a fatal flaw with option A and B and ideally I'd like to see you adopt this revised option B and then refine it later.

Mr. Buettner pointed out the Advisory Council just gives recommendations and it's RDA's ultimate decision to take the recommendations or not.

Mr. Andreozzi said if something happens right now we're going to administer option A or B.

Mr. Calder said you have an opportunity to make improvements without utilizing RDA money. I wouldn't stand in the way of that happening because the project in front of Roy's is about \$80,000 of general fund money that will go somewhere else.

Mrs. Blohm said the extended curbs on 5th and Railroad happened without the advice of the Advisory Council. We felt a little slighted that pavers or something a little more aesthetically pleasing didn't happen there.

Mr. Calder said that was an issue of other folk's money before the RDA was even formed. This plan is what we have to follow.

Mr. Buettner noted it would be nice for Staff to give us some recommendations and let us know how long we have before development.

Jacques Errecart noted a professional should look at the corridor. The Master Plan hasn't been updated for a decade and to say it should be done in 6 months sounds a little pushy. I would hate to see revised option B adopted when it hasn't been analyzed.

Mr. Wilkinson said I agree with that and that's why we're trying to get your opinions but we shouldn't have to go back to you block by block. We need the plan for the entire corridor so that when we have the infrastructure going in we just have to implement the plan.

Mr. Gallagher said I would like to see tying in some sidewalk heating and lighting. These things are very inexpensive with pavers.

Ms. Lynch said we're working off of a blank document and I feel like we're being asked to make an uneducated decision based on the way it looks on a piece of paper. Give us 30 days to just work on the corridor because once we do it that's permanent.

Mr. Andreozzi said there is no money budgeted to redo any of the corridors today. The 45 days is the project to do the curb, gutter and sidewalk in front of Roy's.

Mrs. Watson wanted to know if the revised option B could be approved in part such as the sidewalk and the travel lanes but approve parking later.

Mr. Conner said things are going to change but I don't think it's going to change a whole lot and I think we have enough information to approve that.

Mr. Rice said we need to have a cohesive plan but we need to fix the infrastructure problem. I think we have a design plan here that is generally the direction we're going for downtown.

Mrs. Blohm asked if the motion can give the flexibility to work on the corridor concept in conjunction with approval of revised option B.

Mr. Buettner said my opinion is I like the configuration of revised option B with further consideration for larger vehicle access on future design.

Mr. Andreozzi said the Plan indicates this revision will have to be done by Resolution.

****Mr. Rice moved to direct Staff to bring back a Resolution that designates revised option B as the plan for the downtown corridor but let it be known that RDA wishes that further consideration of access points, size of parking lot for trucks and other amenities can be brought forward for consideration. Mr. Conner seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.**

The following discussion took place before the vote.

Mr. Buettner requested modifying the motion for clarity stating: accept revised option B for the purpose of developing infrastructure for the current project by Roy's.

Ms. Lynch noted you won't write a Resolution for one project. This is a reference for the entire corridor.

Mr. Wilkinson said you're right but if you have changes then bring back another agenda item.

Mr. Rice said the idea is to ultimately do a resolution for the entire corridor but we are trying to get this project done this season. We can come back with another Resolution at a later time that's going to encompass the entire corridor.

Mr. Wilkinson said the presented option is for the entire corridor and if you adopt it by resolution you would take option B in your plan and revise it. As you get into further detail then you would come back with them to change the Plan with the Resolution.

There was continued discussion regarding conditions of the actual project in front of Roy's.

****Mr. Johnson moved discussion back to item 3.**

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.

**Chris Johnson, Member
Redevelopment Agency**

**Lori Lynch, Vice Chairman
Redevelopment Agency Advisory Council**