



## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

117 South Main Street, Monticello, Utah 84535. Commission Chambers  
November 13, 2025 at 6:00 PM

---

### AUDIO TRANSCRIPT

Mack McDonald (0:03 - 0:06)

It's like, let's just, just get them.

Mack McDonald (0:33 - 0:36)

If it doesn't, I'm going to be mad. It doesn't.

Lloyd Wilson (0:36 - 0:46)

No. It does. The county commission pulled the draft off.

Pulled the draft off of that ordinance. That was the only changes they made?

Trent Schafer (0:46 - 0:49)

Mm-hmm. Instead of just getting rid of it entirely.

Lloyd Wilson (0:50 - 0:51)

It would have been easier just to erase it.

Melissa Riggs (0:55 - 0:57)

He's not going to take over the business?

Trent Schafer (0:57 - 1:03)

You guys, you don't have to sign up. I will call on him.

Lloyd Wilson (1:06 - 1:07)

Okay.

Trent Schafer (1:08 - 1:10)

We're not calling on him.

Shay Walker (1:16 - 1:16)

Okay.

Trent Schafer (1:23 - 1:24)

It's six o'clock.

Cody Nielson (1:26 - 1:30)

Man, that was a long time ago, wasn't it? See, that's why I didn't want to go to class.

Trent Schafer (1:32 - 1:35)

That's his wife checking to make sure he's really here.

Lloyd Wilson (1:35 - 1:36)

Yeah.

Mack McDonald (1:36 - 1:41)

All righty.

Trent Schafer (1:43 - 2:11)

Let's call the November 13th, 2025 San Juan County Utah Planning Commission meeting to order. Commission members in attendance, Cody Nielsen, Melissa Riggs, T.C. Garcia, Shea Walker, Lloyd Wilson is bid in.

Mack McDonald (2:11 - 2:12)

Anne is online.

Trent Schafer (2:12 - 2:19)

Okay. Anne Austin. I called her T.J. Oh.

[Speaker 15] (2:20 - 2:23)

Yeah. Sorry. Sorry.

Trent Schafer (2:23 - 3:13)

They did. Staff, County Administrator Mac McDonald, County Attorney Jens Nielsen. That guy clear in the back.

Cory Coleman. He's hiding back there. Just a little bit of information.

I know a lot of you served with Mel Nelson. He passed away on Friday. Oh, really?

Lloyd Wilson (3:14 - 3:14)

Yeah.

Trent Schafer (3:16 - 3:37)

So he was from here, but he was served on Board for a long time. Bad deal, but we will remember him. And he was firm in his belief, you know, he was an engineer, but when he...

Lloyd Wilson (3:31 - 3:37)

Me and him argued a lot.

Mack McDonald (3:42 - 3:43)

He liked his cats.

Trent Schafer (3:44 - 3:45)

Yes. Yes, he did.

Mack McDonald (3:46 - 3:48)

That's how he resigned.

Trent Schafer (3:48 - 3:59)

He sent a picture of his cat. The picture, yeah. Very good.

Okay. Would somebody like to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance? Sure.

Planning Commission (4:03 - 4:17)

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it

stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Trent Schafer (4:29 - 4:49)

Conflict of interest. I would like to think that we'd also have a conflict of working on two things. Well, one thing.

But anybody have a conflict? None?

[Speaker 18] (4:50 - 4:50)

No, sir.

Trent Schafer (4:50 - 5:00)

Okay. Approval of minutes. I did see some grammar.

Grandma. Melissa.

Melissa Riggs (5:01 - 5:04)

Oh, I'm not going into the grammar, but I'll go into the spelling.

Trent Schafer (5:04 - 5:04)

Okay.

Melissa Riggs (5:10 - 5:29)

So, on page three, the first graph under public comment. Melissa. It's just a little one.

It's like Mexican cat. Is Mexican cat still in there? No.

Okay. But we're not talking about banding.

Trent Schafer (5:30 - 5:32)

Oh, yeah, I saw that.

Mack McDonald (5:32 - 5:33)

So, on page three.

Melissa Riggs (5:34 - 5:39)

Page three, Marjorie. Marjorie talking, first paragraph. She's talking about banding.

Trent Schafer (5:40 - 5:49)

Okay. Band-aid. Yeah, it was close.

It was something else. Okay. And I didn't write it.

Mack McDonald (5:54 - 5:56)

Okay, we'll make that fix.

Trent Schafer (6:05 - 6:33)

You know, having only a three-hour meeting with Lloyd in charge, that's pretty dang good. I was going to say, was Anne and Melissa in charge? Okay, I can't.

I should have highlighted that, but I didn't. So, I'll entertain a motion.

Melissa Riggs (6:35 - 6:38)

I move that we approve the minutes as amended.

Shay Walker (6:40 - 6:41)

I'll second.

Trent Schafer (6:42 - 7:33)

Okay. Got a motion and a second to approve the minutes from October 9th, 2025 as amended.  
All those in favor say aye.

Aye. Any opposed? Thanks, Anne.

Okay. Public comment. We'll take in-house first.

You had to have signed up. You didn't. Yeah.

[Speaker 14] (7:33 - 7:34)

Are you ready?

Lloyd Wilson (7:35 - 7:36)

Is it go time?

Trent Schafer (7:37 - 7:45)

Yeah, so anything that's on the agenda or not on the agenda. State your name.

Conner Simmons (7:45 - 10:38)

My name's Connor Simmons. I own two properties in Spanish Valley and have followed the zoning process for about three years. I'm here because I care about the community's future.

I spend four to six weeks a year here with my family. It is our second home. I live in Cache County.

I drove down today for this meeting to share something I hope will be helpful. Recently, I talked to an older friend about what's happening here. He shared a story from when he was young.

Cache County, like many rural counties, had almost no economic opportunity at the time. His father opposed growth because he feared it would ruin the county. My friend was forced to move to Salt Lake so he could provide for his family.

Cache County moved forward with a thoughtful zoning and encouraged business in the right areas while still protecting agriculture. Today, Cache County has both a strong economy and has a good rural feel that people value. My friend was able to move back because jobs existed and the county planned for growth instead of delaying it.

Even though my friend's dad was angry about the pig farm being in his backyard, he did get to eat the bacon by having his children and grandchildren grow up near him. I believe Spanish Valley is in a similar moment. It's your golden goose, the Spanish Valley.

This process has been delayed for a long time, and the uncertainty is holding back responsible investments that could strengthen the entire county. We just need a clear, simple zoning framework, even one that will be refined over time. This would give business and family stability. You don't have to make it perfect on the first try. I always say imperfect action is way better than just dreaming about how to do it perfectly. The southeastern Utah parks generate roughly \$450 million annually for nearby communities.

Spanish Valley, specifically, is uniquely positioned to capture and manage some of that economic activity in a responsible way that benefits locals. Again, it's a golden goose. Don't miss out on it.

There are diverse viewpoints in this room, and they all matter, but we need business, affordable housing, and to maintain property rights. Growth always requires tradeoffs. Even building the highway that allowed me to get here in six hours required difficult decisions.

Farms and homes were lost, but those decisions ultimately formed the backbone of our state's economic strength. Good planning isn't about choosing who wins or loses. It's about creating a system where the entire community can thrive.

I urge you to quickly finalize a workable plan that supports locals, encourages responsible development and business use, and sets San Juan County up for success for decades to come. Our kids deserve a place where they can build a future. I would also love an update on the timeline for the new zoning to go live.

Trent Schafer (10:39 - 10:47)

Thanks. Thanks, Daniel. You had that down to three minutes.

I practiced all the way here.

Daniel Wright (10:49 - 11:36)

That's really good. My name's Daniel. I live in Spanish Valley.

I just wanted to speak in support of the rezone and kind of expediting it. I don't know where it's at. I'd also love to hear about that.

But I think if it can just sort of be pared down to really focus on affordability for homes and incentivizing some business, I think San Juan has an incredible opportunity to be kind of the value capital and the place to be and the place to come and affordably live. I just came to urge that along and speak in my support of you guys. Thank you all for your hard work.

Trent Schafer (11:37 - 11:44)

Thanks, Daniel. Any other public comment? What?

Lloyd Wilson (11:45 - 11:47)

Who me? I never say.

Trent Schafer (11:53 - 12:44)

Any online? Lixie Walker has a comment, I'm sure. Okay.

Moving on. Legislative items number two. Consideration and approval of a one-year extension to the conditional use permit number for U-Haul in Spanish Valley.

Matt McDonald.

Mack McDonald (12:45 - 14:23)

Okay. With the requirements of the conditional use permit, when you kind of give the findings and you add the additional conditions on here, it sometimes can be a challenge to meet all those conditions in a timely manner. There's a party here for the U-Haul moving and storage of Moab to be located there in Highway 191.

There's two at the time. They applied for two different locations. This one here is the 1118-50 South Highway 191 that they're asking for an extension.

Our ordinance allows for an extension up to one year after the initial year. And so that's what they're asking for. They had provided a letter just kind of explaining where they were at in the process to satisfy all those conditions.

There's a few that are remaining that really kind of looks like it's more on the county getting information. The engineering drainage plan is something that we're still waiting on, but we've got to get that. And then the health department and the business license requirement, those are pretty easy once we get everything done.

But we don't issue a building permit until they're ready to go. So that's kind of where they're at. The applicant is online.

Those are the three individuals that you've seen on Google. So if you have any questions for them, they are here. But all they are doing is asking for that extension to get those final items.

Melissa Riggs (14:24 - 14:38)

I have a question about why this is on the agenda. Because, I mean, we've had a lot of conditional use permits where we just say, you know, you can get another six months, you know, you can get all these extensions. And those people never come back to us.

Mack McDonald (14:39 - 14:45)

No. Because it's in our ordinance that the Planning Commission approves the extensions. I would love not to, but...

Trent Schafer (14:45 - 15:03)

We had actually talked about it in our new ordinance, allowing staff to do that. We just haven't covered that. Is this application no changes?

Mack McDonald (15:03 - 15:22)

No changes. And that's kind of a little confusing on the date. Sorry about that.

This was literally taken off of the previous staff report with the conditions updated. But no, nothing else on here has changed. They're still continuing forward as planned originally.

Ann Austin (15:27 - 15:29)

I have a clarifying question.

Trent Schafer (15:29 - 15:30)

Okay, Anne.

Ann Austin (15:33 - 15:47)

Can you explain the encroached upon zone or area on the map? I'm just wanting to understand what... who encroached.

What is that about?

Trent Schafer (15:47 - 15:48)

I think that was SITLA.

Mack McDonald (15:48 - 15:54)

An adjacent property owner. Kathy, I don't know if you or Brett want to answer that one.

Brett Kalosh (15:56 - 17:09)

Yeah, we can. And hi, my name is Brett Kalosh. I'm with Hillside Architecture.

We're kind of the architect of record on this project. I can speak quickly. You know, we got into the property.

And as we got into the property and started looking at where, you know, our understanding of where the property was and where the things were, we realized that the neighbor, who I believe originally owned this part of the property, had built the... I think as they were building, I think as they were phasing their build out, they ended up building some of the pavement, assuming that they were going to continue their building development to the plan east. So what we did...

I mean, we just kind of noticed that that land was encroached upon. That's something that we're kind of working on internally. That's more of a U-Haul is working with the neighbor to

remedy that.

But that shouldn't have any impact with the city or with that. I think what it might do is it may at one point or at some point in time, we'll either let bygones be bygones, or that's kind of the... It's U-Haul's directive to kind of figure out what they're going to do with that.

There may be some kind of re... you know, a lot line adjustment of some sort at some point in time, but that would be kind of separate from this CEP extension exercise.

Ann Austin (17:11 - 17:35)

Okay. Okay. And so, yet unrelated, but another encroachment was mentioned with UDOT.

So I was interested in the access. Will there be some access between the two parcels at all, or will they both have separate accesses?

Brett Kalosh (17:36 - 18:02)

And just to clarify, you're talking about both parcels from U-Haul, correct? Both U-Haul parcels? Yes.

Yeah, both U-Haul parcels are going to be...are separate. They're actually... There's actually quite a bit of land in between them.

I'm happy to share my screen if that helps, and I can kind of show you on a map what that looks like, of where those two parcels are. They would not be connected. So do I have the ability to share my screen?

Ann Austin (18:02 - 18:16)

That makes sense. I've got the maps. Okay.

The one behind the business park, or in that zone, will be accessed from the existing access to the business park?

Brett Kalosh (18:16 - 18:18)

Correct. Correct.

Ann Austin (18:19 - 18:26)

Okay. And there was some issue about SITLA.

Brett Kalosh (18:27 - 18:29)

There was, and I think we need to...  
Ann Austin (18:29 - 18:30)

Did that get resolved?

Brett Kalosh (18:31 - 18:47)

I don't believe it fully has been resolved. I know what I had heard previously was that was kind of the county who had been working towards that, and we hadn't gotten forward on that. Maybe a back question, or maybe he can kind of give an update to that part.

Ann Austin (18:50 - 19:00)

I'm just wondering if it's going to become a problem down the line at all, or if it's, like, right now, if it's been sorted out, you know, as we move forward.

Brett Kalosh (19:01 - 19:41)

Yeah, absolutely. Matt, do you have any update on the SITLA? I know that there's been a couple of changes in regards, just from a transparency standpoint, where, you know, Drex Johnson is the owner's rep who's on the phone call now.

Previous to that, there was a gentleman named Brad Lang, who's kind of taken more of a peripheral view on this. So he kind of originally was the one that actually was down in San Juan County for the original CUP and got that approved. During that hearing, there was talk of this SITLA, and it's kind of been something we've bounced back and forth with Christine Bushnell, I believe, of your team for a little while.

Mack McDonald (19:42 - 20:13)

We haven't gotten a full update, but there was quite a few things that had to go back and forth between the county and the SITLA group kind of that were organizing that. We'd be happy to follow up on that with your staff and get that righted or make sure that that's got full clarity, if that's beneficial. And this is Mac.

I'm flying blind on this SITLA issue, but I can talk to them just to see what they've got going on.

Trent Schafer (20:13 - 20:46)

So real quick, let me refresh you. So when this first came to us, Lee spoke up and said that there

was an issue because the road going into the Moab Business Park, the access point was SITLA's, and there was never permission given. My argument to that was you created three huge buildings for the Moab Business Park, and then seven other buildings, plus nightly rentals, a laundromat, a camp park, all the same, but now we're going to come back and say, no, you can't go across there?

Because of the approach.

Ann Austin (20:51 - 20:59)

So just for future development, too, besides you all, whoever else, it just seems like something that needs to be put to bed, you know?

Lloyd Wilson (21:00 - 21:00)

I agree.

Trent Schafer (21:00 - 21:15)

Well, and it will once the Loves goes in because their road goes right through there. That'll be their one in and one out over by the other U-Haul on Sunny Acres. Okay.

Ann Austin (21:16 - 21:29)

But maybe it's something that SITLA's interest will resolve when they move forward with another project.

Trent Schafer (21:32 - 21:34)

Yeah. Thanks, Sam.

Ann Austin (21:35 - 21:53)

And then that other parcel to the north adjacent to Sunny Acres, that has not changed either? I didn't see it in this packet, but your other parcel is still going to be indoor storage?

Brett Kalosh (21:54 - 22:13)

Correct. That's correct. Yeah, and we're at that, and that's the other storage facility, which is on the, if you're, you know, the Loves site, it's on the north and just a little bit.

It's the northern part, and it aligns with 191. So that's the same storage. We're just working to get final building permit plan check comments on that facility.

Ann Austin (22:16 - 22:23)

And still the access on that map looks like it'll be from Sunny Acres, not the highway. It is. Correct.

Brett Kalosh (22:23 - 22:26)

Correct. Correct. It accesses off of Sunny Acres.

Ann Austin (22:29 - 22:36)

Does that involve any kind of change to the highway to access Sunny Acres from the highway?

TC Garcia (22:38 - 22:39)

There's a letter.

Trent Schafer (22:45 - 22:48)

And did you see the letter from UDOT?

Ann Austin (22:49 - 23:39)

I did. They have no issues with the proposed changes to the U-Haul site. I'm not sure what the changes are.

But, yeah, it does say there'll be a need to be an encroachment permit. Yeah, I mean, for me, this is just informational. I'm not arguing the approval of the extension.

I'm just wanting to know if there is going to be better access onto Sunny Acres from the highway than what is there now.

Brett Kalosh (23:40 - 23:46)

I don't believe it's changing a whole lot. If you bear with me, I can pull it up, and I can show you.

Trent Schafer (23:46 - 24:07)

And if you'd like to see, bear with me just a second. Hey, Matt, there's a mix in here. So we're looking at the 11850 Highway 191.

Mack McDonald (24:08 - 24:08)

Yeah.

Trent Schafer (24:08 - 24:24)

But then when I look at this one, this permit 24024A is Sunny Acres and Highway 191. The impact fees were for the Sunny Acres one. The UDOT was for the Sunny Acres one.

Mack McDonald (24:31 - 24:34)

This was original to the packet.

Trent Schafer (24:35 - 24:38)

Okay. So are we doing both of them right now, though?

Mack McDonald (24:40 - 24:43)

On the extension is only the one portion.

Trent Schafer (24:44 - 24:46)

On the 11850?

Mack McDonald (24:46 - 24:47)

On the 11, yeah.

Trent Schafer (24:48 - 24:54)

For Sunny Acres. No, no, 11850, the one at the business part. Okay.

Just making sure. Just clarifying.

Ann Austin (24:55 - 24:59)

Wait, the extension is just for the business parcel?

Lloyd Wilson (25:00 - 25:00)

Mm-hmm.

Ann Austin (25:02 - 25:05)

And not the one at Sunny Acres? Because in the packet, I'm pretty sure.

Brett Kalosh (25:08 - 25:29)

Yeah, I'd like clarification on that, too. I was looking at the packet just prior to the meeting, and it

looks like the letter on the packet and the application number are for the northern site, if that helps, the site above Love's, while the image is for the southeastern parcel.

Mack McDonald (25:34 - 25:42)

Do you have another image that you can share? I think you have access to share it. I was going to ask you.

I can already see you.

Trent Schafer (25:43 - 26:01)

Yeah, because our conditional use permit number is 24024A, which is for the Sunny Acres and Highway 191, and then this conditional use for 11850 is 24024A also. So they got the same number on them.

Mack McDonald (26:01 - 26:06)

They came in together to planning originally. Right.

Brett Kalosh (26:11 - 26:17)

And, Matt, I apologize. I don't know if I have the ability to share my screen. I feel granted.

Mack McDonald (26:18 - 26:25)

Here, let me stop sharing and see if you can share it now. I can. Let's see.

Brett Kalosh (26:29 - 28:42)

Okay. Let me know if you can see my screen. We can.

Oh, thank you. Okay. So just to answer your first question on encroachment, and Kathy, can you back me up on this, this is the site plan for the northern property.

So just to orient everybody real quick, this is the north. I'll call this the northern property or site one. This is where we're doing the controlled indoor storage facility at this location.

The other site is this one that's down in this. I think you guys called it that business park. So this is where we'll have what we call the showroom is in this existing facilities.

That's already, I believe, currently in operation. That's come back online. And then the new box building, which will house their, you all see boxes, which are kind of their storage kind of on

demand, if you will, that gets kind of shipped and then stored.

So that's going to be down in this site. We'll call that site number two. So regarding Anne's original comment about encroachment on the highway here, I believe we were only required to do an encroachment because of this, just the improvements to the road here.

And the fact that we were kind of this little, this little patch here, then these two patches as we connected to utilities and as we tied in the road itself, as you can kind of see from our development, you know, this is the site plan, the development side of it. You know, we're really kind of limited. We've got a retention pond over here, but there really isn't anything to do with any improvements on the road itself or the access point to that road.

So just to finish that or wrap that up. As we jump to the extension letters, I think, you know, in an abundance of caution, Kathy and I have, we've prepared two extension letters. We've prepared an extension letter for what we call site one, which was that additional kind of extension to the conditional use permit 24024A.

That was the one that I believe is in your packet. And then in addition, we also emailed a second packet, a second extension, which was for the other site, which is the site two, which is the 24024B. So maybe that's the best place to restart, if that makes sense.

Trent Schafer (28:44 - 28:50)

So it's two. Yeah. So A and B of 24024.  
Yeah.

Melissa Riggs (28:52 - 29:21)

And then it's just a quick update as to where we are on the properties. This property, which is the site one property or 24, 24024A is the one that's on the site one. We have submitted this drawing package for permits.

We have gone through our first round of plan check comments.

Brett Kalosh (29:21 - 32:04)

We've returned those. That's got a second round. So we're just short of permit.

We're looking to get back in within the month, I would say, for that final round of plan check review, to get this building fully permitted, to get this project kind of moving and getting their wheels from there. We're going to take it out to bid. That'll probably be a month or so.

And then we'll be looking to get going on construction. I'd say probably realistically, it's kind of the beginning of the year. Drex can kind of firm that up if that's kind of out of line or kind of not true.

And then on site two, site two, we did, you know, we did working with U-Haul Corporate. We did kind of hit a bit of a stalemate as we were trying to look at how this potential encroachment was going to alter or adjust the sites and how to develop that site in a pragmatic way. We've since kind of taken a lateral approach where we've realized that the site grading and the site overall isn't really going to be affected.

What's going to be affected is the idea of where we, how the RV coverage storage would look like. You know, U-Haul has identified the whole lab area as an area that they want to build out and there's a lot of demand for their facilities and their storage use. So their hope is to get the U-Box building, which stores that, and does that kind of move almost laterally to get this building in.

And then to kind of, you know, this area down here is usually separated. You know, these are all covered storage facilities. These are permanent separately than this building anyways.

So the idea is let's get in there and let's get the site regraded. Let's get this building built. And then we can kind of, you know, figure out what those, you know, kind of do a reassessment of needs and build out that with, you know, with the, with the, taking into account this encroached area or this area that's been kind of developed.

And just to circle back now that I've got the screen on the encroached area, the encroached area is, you know, it's encroached as an interesting word. The property line, this is where the fence is. It's not where the actual property line is for the property.

The property line exists probably about here. Probably in the middle of that driveway is where the real property falls. And again, I think what was happening is as this group was building out these units, as you can kind of assume, it makes a lot more sense to build out that whole path for vehicular circulation than to just have half of it.

So that's why they built it. I think when they did their property lines, they may not have realized what was going on when they sold off this parcel of property. And that's kind of where we're trying to just kind of unpack the pieces and parts of that.

So just to circle back to give you all the pieces and parts as we have.

[Speaker 15] (32:14 - 32:18)

So with only one of them being in the packet, can we approve both? No, you can't. Okay.

Trent Schafer (32:21 - 32:30)

Looking to approve it to an extent, With only one in the packet, can we approve?

Jenns Nielson (32:31 - 32:44)

Well, I think the ordinance is automatic. So like Melissa said, they didn't used to even come. I don't know that it's really required to come for admission.

So I think you can approve both for that reason.

Lloyd Wilson (32:44 - 32:44)

Okay.

Trent Schafer (32:48 - 33:42)

I see no reason not. You want a motion? Yeah.

I motion to extend. The conditional use permits on the two locations for. New hall.

Which one being the corner of sunny acres and one ninety one and the other being eleven eight fifty seven highway one ninety one for additional year. Any discussion? I'll second.

Okay. Got a motion in a second to extend. The conditional use permit for these two properties.

For another year. Any further discussion? Hearing none.

All those in favor say aye. Aye.

Lloyd Wilson (33:43 - 33:43)

Aye.

Trent Schafer (33:44 - 33:47)

Any opposed? Motion carries.

Brett Kalosh (33:50 - 33:52)

Thank you very much. Thank you.

Melissa Riggs (33:53 - 34:00)

I have a question. What is the read. A.I. Meeting notes that's showing up on the screen?

Mack McDonald (34:01 - 34:02)

Where are you looking at?

Melissa Riggs (34:02 - 34:10)

Go back and show the screen of all the participants. What is the read. A.I. Meeting notes?

Mack McDonald (34:11 - 34:37)

So Google has the read. A.I. So it's capturing your transcription. That's what we're.

That's Mexican cat instead of Mexican hat. Okay. Okay.

So that's one of them. And then there was somebody else that had A.I. before. If you have like an A.I. transcriber program it automatically follows you to meetings. This one is the Google.

Melissa Riggs (34:37 - 34:40)

And this is something that we know is on.

Mack McDonald (34:40 - 35:13)

Yes. Okay. It's transcribing.

When I. I don't know if you're watching but when I hit record. So Google is also recording at the same time and it's also transcribing.

That's this little button up in the corner. So right here is the A.I. that's pulling everything that you're saying. Hopefully Mexican hat instead of Mexican cat.

And so is that emailed to everybody that's online? No. To me.

Just to you. Okay. Just helps us do the minutes.

Trent Schafer (35:15 - 35:16)

I didn't know that.

Mack McDonald (35:16 - 35:19)

Captures. And that's. Yeah.

Blending. Branding.

Melissa Riggs (35:20 - 35:23)

Okay. Type things. That's good to know.

Thank you.

Mack McDonald (35:23 - 35:27)

Good question though. We're being watched.

Melissa Riggs (35:27 - 35:31)

Well you know Zoom says do you give permission for this to be recorded.

Mack McDonald (35:32 - 35:49)

So we're recording. It's kind of three dimensional. You have the.

We have the tape recording that's going on. The digital recorder that's running. We've got this one as well.

And our PhilSafe is. It's being broadcast live on YouTube. So YouTube captures it as well.

Melissa Riggs (35:50 - 35:50)

Okay.

Mack McDonald (35:51 - 35:54)

Thank you.

Trent Schafer (35:54 - 35:55)

Good catch.

Mack McDonald (35:56 - 36:00)

Good question though. Who's the AI person? I don't know.

Trent Schafer (36:01 - 36:05)

Okay. Number three. General plan discussion and direction.

Mack McDonald (36:07 - 42:34)

Okay. So I appreciate Melissa's help in this. She had gone through and just kind of reordered items on here.

There's nothing really substantially changed that she had in there. It was just really a float. And so she went through and provided the documentation.

I sent that to you. You should have been included in that. All I did is place it back in the general plan column form.

So it matches with the rest. And then took her language, those modifications, and placed it in here. I did add the survey results from the citizens that kind of matched what we had in the past.

Now you just kind of have updated survey results from that survey. I provided the survey to you. So you all have that as well in your packets if there was any questions.

But this is kind of a summation of the results that they had from that survey. So I included it in that. Other than that, there's no other changes other than just the flow of that from the past.

There are, you know, there's some decisions that we need to make tonight. One of them was do we include the recreational support zoning language? Last time you talked about just taking that zone out altogether, keeping the zones that we have instead of making a new one.

So if that's the case, it's just we would either have to include recreational support language or just exclude it altogether. Which is why when I looked at kind of the code requirements for what needed to be in the general plan, it doesn't state that you have to specify all of the zones that are included on a land use plan, but just that general language, general location of what the overall vision for the county is. And I think when you look through the land use designations in here, it kind of captures that pretty well.

There was a question last time on the map. I provided the full, hopefully you were able to see in the packet, that full entire map on there. One of the things that we touched on last planning commission meeting was, you know, why on the map does it show this mixed use area?

When you read the language in the general plan about the mixed use area, then it kind of addresses why the public lands are in a mixed use. So they're not seeing it as a specific zone, but a use. And on the map it kind of covers those public lands as a multiple use area overall that includes public lands as well as agriculture, kind of the overall use of public lands that you see.

So that language is in the general plan itself. So I think the last things that are left on here is kind of twofold. We've got to push this out to the public, and that community group indicated that

they could help us do that.

And so after today's look and guidance from you, we can make changes and hold off another month and capture those changes and bring it back, or go right to scheduling a public hearing, utilize the community group to get it out further than what we advertised on, and try to get this for adoption here this year. And so, especially when we only have December's meeting left for planning commission, unless you want to have a special planning commission, it's kind of up to you. So that's part of the thoughts that I had on here.

Looking at the map itself, I entertained that idea, okay, well maybe we have a public lands designation on this blue until I read the language in the general plan on multiple use, and then to me it was like, okay, that makes sense of why all this is blue in here. The only differences that I look at, if we update the map on here, if you look at Spanish Valley, we still have commercial in Spanish Valley. They have this commercial district area in Grand County, but it doesn't really represent a commercial use in Spanish Valley.

Let me make this a little bit bigger so you can see it. So I thought, well, maybe it would be kind of good to pull that color a little bit down further on the commercial district, so it represents that a little bit more. La Salle has a commercial component to it, but not a lot, and so it still makes sense to kind of go that agricultural, that transition color here with residential.

These other ones outside of here, I really don't understand why they had these commercial use hot zones out here, but I wasn't here at the time, so I don't know. If we take some of those off where it doesn't make sense, kind of give an updated spin on this. Montezuma Creek kind of has more of a commercial district now with the dollar store, they get the grocery store going, kind of more of a commercial zone with the hospital and that.

So that's just kind of ideas for the map, but everything else, I couldn't find a reason to change. What is this one?

Cody Nielson (42:35 - 42:36)

This is Hyde, right?

Mack McDonald (42:37 - 42:44)

Yes. So that one's Hyde. What is this?

I don't know if that, to me... I mean, is that like under... Under Kansas?

Trent Schafer (42:44 - 42:46)

No, that's way too far out.

Mack McDonald (42:46 - 42:49)

This is before right next to Rodeo.

TC Garcia (42:49 - 42:52)

I don't know, I'm just curious what that one was.

[Speaker 14] (42:52 - 42:53)

Me too. Needles.

TC Garcia (42:53 - 42:55)

That might be the park.

Trent Schafer (42:55 - 42:56)

That might be Needles.

TC Garcia (42:56 - 43:03)

Isn't that the visitor center? Maybe. Yeah.

These two down here.

[Speaker 15] (43:03 - 43:03)

I can't think of what they are.

Trent Schafer (43:04 - 43:13)

We'll pass nothing right there going to Forty Canyon. That's the turnoff to head down the halls.

Mack McDonald (43:14 - 43:18)

We're finding going this way, halls that are over here.

Cody Nielson (43:18 - 43:25)

That's the park building, whatever they built. You know, Cedar Mesa. I should have just told you.

I mean, what is that sculpture?

TC Garcia (43:25 - 43:28)

So what is it that we're trying to communicate with this map?

Mack McDonald (43:31 - 44:41)

So, it's on here. Let me pull it. A shaded guide for the county.

Yeah, it doesn't make sense. The plan includes the incorporated territory. We've got that. Check that piece. At a minimum, the proposed general plan with the accompanying maps, charts, and descriptive and explanatory matter shall include the Planning Commission's recommendation, one of you, Solomon. Just quickly trying to read here.

Supposed to have projections for population density, which this kind of focuses on. Building intensity recommended for the various land use categories and coordinated to integrate the land use element with water preservation. We've got that.

Other than that, I don't see any other reason for the map is being able to show where you're pushing development and in what uses.

Trent Schafer (44:45 - 44:49)

That answered your question, T.C. Yeah.

TC Garcia (44:51 - 45:16)

Would it be worthwhile? Because to me this adds quite a bit of ambiguity. Maybe it would be worthwhile putting in the map we created that actually has our zones or our land uses from the proposed ordinance that then would match up with our land use table.

I don't know.

Mack McDonald (45:16 - 46:36)

If it's visionary, the only thing I worry about that is if you change the zone, you're changing general plan as well. Yeah. And so where this is, to me I looked at this as more visionary, higher up, and when it talks about these transitional areas, you have the heat map representing that transition areas where the general plan wants us to focus more of the development around the infrastructure.

These areas here really have the infrastructure, Eastland, Monticello, Mexican Hat. So that's

where visionary-wise with the general plan aspect, we're focusing and pushing that vision. If you threw in the zones here, I worry then it gets to where now your general plan map has to be a little bit more detailed, granular, so that you can zoom.

You take Spanish Valley. You've got highway commercial, Spanish Valley, residential. You have the flex zones in there.

Then that becomes distorted on a general plan map. You could. It's up to you guys how you want to play it.

Where it's supposed to be visionary, to me I like the high level to it. It's up to you guys. I'll do whatever.

TC Garcia (46:38 - 46:40)

No, thanks for the explanation.

Trent Schafer (46:42 - 46:59)

It wouldn't be a conflict if we kept just these zones and then my land use wind up with a recreational support. That was the question.

Mack McDonald (47:00 - 49:15)

That is correct. When I read through here, that land use element, you want to account for the effect of land use categories and land uses on water demand. We've captured that in just the statement that we want to cluster, push more of your development towards infrastructure areas, the cities with the transitional areas.

We're covered there. You have the planning commission's judgment there related to planning of the unincorporated territory as the county as a whole, but nothing in here tells me in the Utah code that it has to be specific. It wants that you designate the long-term goals, which the goals are in here, and the proposed extent, general distribution, and location of land for housing for residents of varying income levels, business, industry, agricultural, recreation, education, public buildings and grounds, open space and other categories of public and private uses of land as they appropriate.

But it doesn't tell you you've got to list your specific zones. It wants you to include a statement of the projections for and standards of population density and building intensity recommended. That's why I think when you're looking at these dots along here and they've got those varying colors coming through here, those on the heat map just signify that those are a little bit more

intense areas and they want more of a focus towards those.

And so that residential, you see that broader, you see the commercial in there, you see that transitional area in there to focus that attention and drive that. So I think we're covered there. Other than that, there's nothing in Utah code that requires specific zones to be listed.

Ann Austin (49:18 - 49:56)

Can you compare this map to the proposed map, the one that is more high level or not? There's more specific, I should say. We didn't have a lot of industrial zones like we do on this map.

So I think this map is really misleading in lots of different ways. And the fact that none of us are really sure what some of them indicate, I feel like we need to solve that problem on this.

Mack McDonald (49:56 - 50:59)

Let's go to the language. So in here for industrial, this designation is for the manufacturing, assembly, storage, shipping of raw materials and other activities that support the economic basis. Uses should be subject to approval and have no vested rights to develop in an industrial manner.

Industrial uses should be regulated in a manner that adequately mitigates any negative externalities caused by the use. Industrial uses can be located in places that do not conflict with public lands and recreational opportunities. Industrial uses should be located near existing utilities or pay the way to extend needed services.

So for me, when you look at the map, is that an indication of those areas where you have mineral extraction in the county? I think that's what that is more tailored to.

Melissa Riggs (51:01 - 51:33)

Well, you know, I'm going to follow up on what TC said. I think we need to take a look at the zoning maps that we're proposing and then go from there rather than use those as a starting point, even though I understand your concern that if we change the zone, we have to change the general plan. But just to give us an idea of what we're putting different places, just compare the two.

Because if this doesn't look at all like what we're...

Mack McDonald (51:34 - 51:35)

The zoning map?

Melissa Riggs (51:35 - 51:39)

The zoning map, I think we're in trouble again.

TC Garcia (51:39 - 51:45)

We take a lot of criticism for not following the land use plan.

Melissa Riggs (51:45 - 51:52)

I think it'd be a really good idea to just sort of plot it out in the general plan.

Mack McDonald (51:53 - 52:13)

So when it was developed, this was the zoning map that was used. And so even the general plan map in 2018 didn't match the 2011. I mean, the 2011 was...

Melissa Riggs (52:13 - 52:16)

I get that. But that doesn't mean just because it wasn't done right the first time.

Mack McDonald (52:16 - 52:34)

Oh, no. Well, it just grew up. And so then you take Spanish Valley, and that's my only concern in Spanish Valley, then it gets a little bit more granular in nature.

Ann Austin (52:35 - 54:11)

Well, I sort of... If you break this map up into, like, you know, three zones or voting districts or something where you're looking at the county in more bite size rather than the entire thing, because this map was so vague and incorrect, that's why Kristen and whoever got together with the... What is that software, that mapping software?

And they were able to create what is now the proposed map. Why can't we integrate that into our general plan? I know you're talking about the language of the zones, but it would be at least a little more indicative of what we're looking at as far as existing use.

Like this map, those are just little spray-painted things that... I guess that's the question is, is anybody going to say, well, the general plan map has this purple, and they think they're in the purple. You know what I'm saying?

Is anybody really going to argue the details of this map? Is it worth changing, or is it worth just saying, well, this is about what we've got?

Cody Nielson (54:14 - 56:28)

Don't we want to stay very general? Let's take here... Since Trent's here, he can yell at me.

We'll use Trent. You look at the area between northeast of Monticello. When you look at the heat map, it just shows Monticello, but there is a lot of potential for industrial use in this green area there, from a solar farm to some oil and gas.

Anyways, there's lots there. Do we need to color that now? I mean, going forward?

I don't think so. I mean, just because it's green, are we maintaining all that green forever? I mean, according to their study, we need more agriculture, but I hate to tell you, there's no water out there.

It's not a bad place for some of those industrial uses and the economic growth and financial support it brings to the county. So, I just don't... I mean, so if we don't color an area...

I guess that's my problem with the whole ordinance going forward, is if I have one regret and I'd like to go back, is we're trying to mention everything that we might want to have happen someday. This is allowed, this is allowed, this is allowed, this is allowed. And if it's not mentioned, then it's not allowed.

And I feel like if I have a regret and I'd like to go back, I'd like to change that and do the opposite. We should allow more. We should have more freedom.

We don't need to restrict the growth in the future because you don't know what will come. I heard a person today like, going forward with everything in the world, you're going to need all of the above solutions. Nuclear, coal, gas, solar, wind.

And so that's kind of how I look at this. We need as many options moving forward and not constrain the landowners and people as much. That's just my soapbox.

We can do whatever anybody else wants to tell me to do. My gibberish is getting very low.

Shay Walker (56:30 - 57:04)

I think looking at this as a general map and the format is fine, but there are some things that I... Look at our last meeting. We approved a thing at Wilson Arch, and that's straight purple.

And it doesn't meet what we approved at our last meeting. Anywhere in the Wilson Arch or on the other side of the hill with the mob under canvas, none of that meets this industrial thing. So

there's nothing...

It's like if I look at this general map... Oh, I'm looking at the wrong roads here. Sorry.

Lloyd Wilson (57:04 - 57:06)

It's not straight purple. It's not agriculture.

Trent Schafer (57:11 - 57:20)

I think for what it is, just for the general plan, without... I mean, because if you were to zoom in on it, what is it? You don't know.

Lloyd Wilson (57:21 - 57:21)

Right.

Trent Schafer (57:22 - 57:49)

So that's why we have our zoning map. This is a general plan. I mean, more or less, it's quite slight, other than a couple of hoops of paint on it.

Right. And everything has changed as we went along anyway. Yeah.

Do we really want to attack another map too? No. I mean, do we want another one to work on?

Cody Nielson (57:50 - 58:10)

Let's move on to things that these people in the room want us to do. That's my opinion, but... Yeah.

But I could be here all night. It's up to you guys.

Mack McDonald (58:11 - 58:11)

So let's...

Ann Austin (58:13 - 58:25)

Well, maybe there just needs to be a footnote that says that, you know, actual size is not... It doesn't actually represent...

Shay Walker (58:26 - 58:29)

For more specific zoning. Right.

Ann Austin (58:30 - 58:52)

I mean, I don't know why we even have this map, if this is the level of detail that we're giving. I mean, I just see all that purple, and there's not hardly that much on our proposed map for industrial. So...

Trent Schafer (58:54 - 59:01)

And maybe we need to readdress that proposed map, because all that Lisbon Valley...

[Speaker 13] (59:01 - 59:04)

...industrial on our map, on our proposed map.

Trent Schafer (59:04 - 59:12)

Yeah. All that in Lisbon Valley is going to be mining and industrial.

Mack McDonald (59:12 - 59:13)

Eastland and...

TC Garcia (59:13 - 59:20)

Zoom in on that, would you, Mac? Which one? On our proposed map to Lisbon Valley.

So we did have a couple parcels of industrial.

Mack McDonald (59:20 - 59:21)

This one here?

TC Garcia (59:21 - 59:24)

Yep. Where do you want me to go? Lisbon Valley.

Cody Nielson (59:26 - 59:31)

I mean, we did talk about doing a lot more industrial, and that didn't really...

TC Garcia (59:32 - 59:56)

I mean, because even right now we're seeking... I don't know. I think we got the copper mine covered, right?

You're right there. Yeah. That right there?

Yeah, and that's fine enough. We've got the copper mine covered, but we're starting to dig another mine northwest of it, and I'm pretty sure that's not industrial either. Yeah.

[Speaker 13] (59:59 - 1:00:01)

Maybe that's considered multiple use.

TC Garcia (1:00:02 - 1:00:02)

Yeah.

Cody Nielson (1:00:03 - 1:00:06)

Well, if it's state and federal land, why does it matter?

TC Garcia (1:00:13 - 1:00:18)

Sorry to get us off topic. And that's fine. I like it.

I agree with you.

[Speaker 18] (1:00:20 - 1:00:27)

I'd like to change all the greens to yellows and the blues to reds. No, I'm just... Okay.

Let's not.

Shay Walker (1:00:27 - 1:00:27)

Let's not.

Trent Schafer (1:00:28 - 1:00:38)

I think it's good guidelines for us. Bring some crayons. Well, that's the main thing, is it is a general.

It is specific. By no means is general.

Cody Nielson (1:00:39 - 1:00:52)

But it does show, like, we want around the cities, these towns, like where infrastructure is, we want those uses to be there.

Melissa Riggs (1:00:53 - 1:00:58)

But we also need to be able to say what the different places are, though.

Cody Nielson (1:00:58 - 1:01:00)

Yeah, but, I mean, like, you know, that's height.

Melissa Riggs (1:01:00 - 1:01:00)

Well, that's height.

Cody Nielson (1:01:00 - 1:01:11)

I can get height, but, you know. I mean, and if that's a park service entry building, then I guess they have a vending machine that needs that much paint. I don't know.

Mack McDonald (1:01:11 - 1:01:14)

I can follow up with those and put labels on them.

Trent Schafer (1:01:18 - 1:01:29)

So, Matt, let's say we move forward with this map. What aspects of the general plan are we still waiting for?

Mack McDonald (1:01:31 - 1:01:34)

Just any changes you all want to make.

Trent Schafer (1:01:35 - 1:01:36)

But not the water.

Mack McDonald (1:01:37 - 1:01:39)

So, that's a different element.

Trent Schafer (1:01:39 - 1:01:42)

Okay. So, this is just the land use?

Mack McDonald (1:01:42 - 1:02:26)

This is just land use. Yeah. So, we put the land use on fire, but we do have to have the water element that we're continuing to work on.

That one's a bigger conversation and much more analysis that we're working on. So, we touched on it in the land use, because you're supposed to. And so, we just kind of have that note on there.

But the land use element is a different section that you have to look at once we get the analysis done. But it's included language, too, pointing to the fact that land use and water are tied together, going back to what Cody mentioned.

Cody Nielson (1:02:28 - 1:02:42)

I'd like to go on to the, do we want to do the residential, or not residential, the recreational support? What are people's feelings there?

Mack McDonald (1:02:45 - 1:03:49)

So, in the mixed use language, multiple use, it talks about recreation in here. So, it's in the multiple use, the recreation part of it. When we looked at the zoning future, when you look at recreational support on here, it's kind of that, I hate to use it, but that residential or that commercial flex, where you're flexing from one thing to go to another.

And so, you're kind of backed up against public lands, so those uses would support it. But part of that discussion that you guys had a couple planning commissions ago is like, well, let's remove recreational support altogether of our zoning ordinances, try to simplify the zones, and then, so that's kind of where it was shelled, was if we're taking out of the zoning, let's not include recreational support in general.

Melissa Riggs (1:03:52 - 1:03:54)

I'm fine with getting rid of it.

Mack McDonald (1:03:54 - 1:03:55)

Okay, thank you.

Cody Nielson (1:03:56 - 1:04:11)

I have a comment, real quick, sorry. Who likes it? We usually have our Pat Creek people here.

Are they supportive or like it? I mean, I'm...

Shay Walker (1:04:11 - 1:04:14)

They wanted residential. Yes.

Cody Nielson (1:04:16 - 1:04:25)

Well, depending on who was here. I mean, it would seem like we got two totally mixed on that.

Mack McDonald (1:04:26 - 1:04:35)

But was that just in worry that we're adding another zone and we want this instead of that type of thing?

Cody Nielson (1:04:35 - 1:04:58)

Because, I mean, if you're just residential, I don't know if I necessarily love that. Because there are those, you know, like the little... Those areas are a long ways from other places, so there's that little support building.

It's the water, it's the propane tank being filled, it's the, you know...

Trent Schafer (1:04:58 - 1:04:59)

Which falls in the multi-use.

Cody Nielson (1:04:59 - 1:05:04)

Which is fine, but they don't like multi-use. A lot of them.

Ann Austin (1:05:04 - 1:06:05)

I thought multi-use was less... Well, looking at the way other counties are using it, well, you said more your conservation land, less residential zones. But Pat Creek, they want to be residential, my understanding is because recreational support allows for overnight accommodations, and they're like, you know, other folks in unincorporated Monticello or parts of the county who want to stay residential or art agriculture, so that they're not turning into a glamping campground, overnight rental kind of first community.

But recreational support in the other counties, they're using that for things like glamping, like...

Mack McDonald (1:06:05 - 1:06:06)

Cabins.

Ann Austin (1:06:06 - 1:07:16)

Yeah, cabins and not long-term residences, but identifying those places that can support camps

or malaba under canvas or whatever, those kind of places. But I don't think we need it, because even if you have that zone, I think the common practice is that it requires a conditional use anyway to do some of those uses in that zone, but I think they were just identifying where in their county that is kind of existing, like in the mountains. Was it in maybe Garfield County?

There's places that families go, like in the season to camp, and they have cabins, so they're not staying there year-round, but that would be a recreational support zone, for example. But not... I don't think we should turn residential areas into recreational support zones.

Cody Nielson (1:07:16 - 1:07:38)

No, I don't either. I just... None of those people here, I just... I mean, I don't care. I would like to have a do-anything-you-want zone, but I don't think we're going to get that through. But, I mean, it just seemed like when we had Pack Creek here, there was two different feelings, and I wasn't sure...

Trent Schafer (1:07:38 - 1:07:39)

There was.

Melissa Riggs (1:07:39 - 1:07:47)

Well, but I think it was because we were giving them that. They didn't come to us and ask for that. It was...

Cody Nielson (1:07:47 - 1:07:50)

When the map is made, they're going to want to be residential.

Melissa Riggs (1:07:50 - 1:07:56)

Yeah, I think it was because it was being pushed on them and they were being given the options.

Trent Schafer (1:07:57 - 1:07:58)

It's going to be half and half.

TC Garcia (1:07:58 - 1:08:11)

Well, because the ranch is all short-term rentals. Right. So if you make residential, you'll not have short-term rentals in it, then half of them are going to want to be something besides residential.

Cody Nielson (1:08:12 - 1:08:46)

And it should be something other than multi-use, because they're not going to like multi-use either. Because, to me, multi-use is the do-anything-you-want zone. I mean, not really.

That's tongue-in-cheek. But, you know, it's a lot of people like, well, I want to be ag. I want to be ag.

But multi-use works really well. I mean, you can run cattle in multi-use. You can have your farm in multi-use.

Your steel tax, greenbelt, that has nothing to do with this. But if you want to do bull hollow, that's fine as well, you know.

TC Garcia (1:08:47 - 1:08:58)

Okay, Mac, on your general plan verbiage, page 33 or 27, whatever, where it's talking about agriculture.

Mack McDonald (1:09:00 - 1:09:03)

Let's see, on the uses? Mm-hmm, yeah.

TC Garcia (1:09:06 - 1:09:31)

Land designations, there you go. Yep, right there. So, incidental uses to agriculture are allowed as well, such as living quarters, sheds, storage, etc.

I don't know that I like having just that list. Maybe we ought to make it a little bit more inclusive, maybe add some verbiage like, or anything else that supports agricultural production. You know what I mean?

Melissa Riggs (1:09:32 - 1:09:33)

Okay, yoga studios.

TC Garcia (1:09:34 - 1:09:47)

Yoga studios, right. If a dude's having trouble paying his bills, selling his wheat, and he wants to start a yoga studio in his barn, sure. Is that yoga or yogurt?

Yogurt.

Mack McDonald (1:09:49 - 1:09:51)

So add to that right there? Yeah.

Cody Nielson (1:09:52 - 1:09:58)

Is that hot yoga or just regular? Either. Whatever pays the bills, bro.

Mack McDonald (1:09:58 - 1:10:51)

20 bucks. Let me show you an example of that language. Real fast.

It's not King County, Garfield. Let me try to find it real fast. In Garfield, so this is their zoning.

It's like uses normally and necessarily related to agriculture are permitted, and uses adverse to the continuation of agriculture activity are not allowed. So if we took that first part of that, so something similar to that in that language. Yeah, kind of.

But not as a permitted, but just to complete that sentence instead of. Go ahead, Ann.

Ann Austin (1:10:52 - 1:10:58)

Well, I was just going to say that, would anybody argue that a yoga studio would be adverse to agriculture?

Melissa Riggs (1:10:58 - 1:10:59)

Yeah, I like that.

Ann Austin (1:11:00 - 1:11:20)

I mean, not that a market for yoga studios is not an ad, but there's a lot of things that you could say are not adverse to agriculture. What's adverse to agriculture is permanent buildings where the land can't be turned back into ag after it's been trimmed.

Mack McDonald (1:11:20 - 1:11:24)

Yoga with painting goats, I mean, or goats. That's a real thing.

Melissa Riggs (1:11:26 - 1:11:30)

I mean, I think you could use that entire phrase.

TC Garcia (1:11:31 - 1:11:40)

My point was, I believe we had a young man in here earlier that was running a farm but was also starting a business doing metal buildings, right?

Lloyd Wilson (1:11:40 - 1:11:41)

Yeah.

TC Garcia (1:11:41 - 1:11:50)

So technically making a metal building is not agriculture. However, he's using that business to keep his agriculture business going. Do you know what I mean?

Lloyd Wilson (1:11:51 - 1:11:51)

Yeah.

TC Garcia (1:11:51 - 1:12:05)

And so in my mind, if a guy, if an agricultural producer finds some other income stream that he can make work on his land, I don't think we should be restricting that. Yeah, a hobby farm type, whatever.

Cody Nielson (1:12:06 - 1:12:12)

Well, I always think it's interesting that gravel pits must and have to be zoned agriculture.

Mack McDonald (1:12:13 - 1:12:36)

They have to, you cannot rezone them. So they are what they were back when the Utah law changed. And so that's why you see some of them are still the highway commercial district in Spanish Valley.

That's because that's the gravel pit. Others were agriculture. And you have to keep them, you cannot rezone them.

Cody Nielson (1:12:37 - 1:12:53)

Yeah, but I'm always like, well, how does ag and gravel go together? Well, it does. I mean, if you've owned a farm like I own a farm, and have a gravel, have had, don't have currently, but it's a way to pay the bills, you know?

Mack McDonald (1:12:53 - 1:12:55)

Makes cows way more as you go to auction.

Cody Nielson (1:12:56 - 1:13:08)

I mean, yeah, you sell some gravel. I mean, it's all those things that come from the land, you know? Yeah, that's what my grandpa said.

But that's not adverse to agriculture. Carpets.

Mack McDonald (1:13:10 - 1:13:17)

And where this is a general, yeah, just kind of that. Well, they're all decent for agriculture here.

Trent Schafer (1:13:18 - 1:13:23)

Mac, we mentioned the survey.

Mack McDonald (1:13:24 - 1:13:24)

Yeah.

Trent Schafer (1:13:26 - 1:13:43)

And then a few questions are answered of the results of the survey. Is the survey results going to be attached to? No.

Not in the general? No.

Mack McDonald (1:13:43 - 1:13:46)

Okay. I just gave that to you so that you had more information.

Trent Schafer (1:13:46 - 1:13:49)

Yeah, because it just didn't seem to fit.

Mack McDonald (1:13:49 - 1:13:55)

No, it wasn't. And so, no, we had, it references them.

Trent Schafer (1:13:55 - 1:13:55)

Yeah.

Mack McDonald (1:13:56 - 1:14:38)

Even the point survey that we did for the housing study, it references that. It'll reference the, as the SITLA, that Spanish Valley Plan, references that. Those are all appendixes to the general plan.

When I got here and read the general plan, I did geeky county administration thing, and city managers do the same thing as you go through, and you read the general plan, and that's where I found the survey, the initial survey, as an appendix. And so, you just add those as information. Okay.

But it's not part of this section.

Trent Schafer (1:14:39 - 1:14:47)

Melissa, I want to thank you for spending a lot of your time on cleaning this up. You're welcome. Thank you.

Melissa Riggs (1:14:51 - 1:14:58)

So, how do you all feel about the Kane County language, putting that in here, about agriculture?

Mack McDonald (1:14:59 - 1:15:00)

The Garfield County?

Melissa Riggs (1:15:00 - 1:15:01)

Garfield County, whatever county.

Mack McDonald (1:15:01 - 1:15:02)

On the agriculture?

TC Garcia (1:15:02 - 1:15:05)

Yeah. I think I like it better than what we currently have.

Melissa Riggs (1:15:05 - 1:15:06)

I like it better than what we have.

Mack McDonald (1:15:06 - 1:15:07)

Okay.

Melissa Riggs (1:15:07 - 1:15:10)

And it gives us more wiggle room.

Mack McDonald (1:15:10 - 1:15:30)

Openness, yeah. It's not quite an all-purpose, everything-goes zone. But theoretically, you know, your agriculture is, let them be agriculture, and if it's a hobby farm, in theory.

I need to tell you, they're almost all hobby farms.

Cody Nielson (1:15:31 - 1:15:33)

Yes. Yep.

Melissa Riggs (1:15:36 - 1:15:39)

So, I have a problem with low-density residential.

Mack McDonald (1:15:42 - 1:15:43)

In agriculture?

Melissa Riggs (1:15:44 - 1:15:46)

No, as a category.

Mack McDonald (1:15:46 - 1:15:49)

I just read that a minute ago. Okay, where are you looking?

Melissa Riggs (1:15:49 - 1:15:59)

Yeah, so it sounds like everybody wants to switch the agriculture to what they say in Garfield. But I don't like how it says low-density residential. I mean, I'm...

Mack McDonald (1:16:01 - 1:16:03)

Point me to where you're reading that.

Melissa Riggs (1:16:03 - 1:16:06)

It was where you were. It's where you were.

Mack McDonald (1:16:06 - 1:16:07)

On the use?

Melissa Riggs (1:16:08 - 1:16:31)

Yeah, on the uses. Keep going up. It says low-density residential.

And that's not what we're doing with our residential. We've got residential where we've got multiple buildings on a lot.

Ann Austin (1:16:37 - 1:16:45)

But the ag land has a certain acre to be called by as ag. You have to be a certain size, right?

Melissa Riggs (1:16:45 - 1:16:53)

Yeah, but this isn't... But I'm not talking about ag. I'm talking about the residential as the category.

The land use designation.

TC Garcia (1:16:54 - 1:16:59)

Yeah, I feel like we're kind of missing the residential, residential all together.

Melissa Riggs (1:16:59 - 1:17:00)

Yeah, yeah.

TC Garcia (1:17:01 - 1:17:05)

So low-density residential is what we used to call our rural residential.

Melissa Riggs (1:17:05 - 1:17:07)

And then we need another residential.

TC Garcia (1:17:08 - 1:17:10)

Right, for like the Spanish Valley.

Mack McDonald (1:17:10 - 1:17:35)

Like Spanish Valley, higher density. Right. Agreed.

So do we take a... Because unincorporated areas with lack of infrastructure, you're typically promoting your larger lot sizes and lower density. You want your higher density development to focus in those areas that are already incorporated and not unincorporated.

Melissa Riggs (1:17:36 - 1:17:38)

Yeah, but we're also talking about affordable housing.

Mack McDonald (1:17:38 - 1:17:39)

Correct.

Melissa Riggs (1:17:39 - 1:17:41)

And we're talking about, I mean, we were having...

Mack McDonald (1:17:41 - 1:17:59)

In those transitional areas, yes. And so we could, you could take out that low-density, take that off of there, and just leave it as residential. But...

Ann Austin (1:18:00 - 1:18:04)

Well, we don't want to encourage high-density on ag land.

Mack McDonald (1:18:05 - 1:18:18)

But you can get that in your zoning. If you're zoning lot sizes, you know, right now for agriculture, the minimum lot size is an acre. And so...

Ann Austin (1:18:19 - 1:18:20)

Oh, it's only an acre.

Mack McDonald (1:18:20 - 1:20:45)

Yeah, so if you fixed it in your zoning, you're stuck at lot sizes in your zoning ordinance, not necessarily your general plan. This is overall, if you're allowing high-density in your general plan, then your zoning should also match that high-density throughout. And most of the counties that are rural are focused more on the lower density.

They just don't have the infrastructure. And so why would you want to encourage a high density without that infrastructure? When you looked at the land use, that PUD that we did there at Wilson Arch, we had a lengthy discussion about water availability and that density that is in that area.

You know, and that water element became critical for that. And so if you don't have the water infrastructure, and it'll demonstrate that in the conversation that I had with Eastlander, they're like, hey, we're about out of water, you know, and we can't develop more homes. And so if you take that and spread that throughout that county with that thought, if you're promoting a higher

density in the unincorporated areas, it's like we can't service them.

You don't have any... You're taxing more EMS, you're taxing more of your water, your sheriff, because your roads, you're pushing more of a density out. Whereas the general plan in its entirety, as I read through there, really focuses the higher density closer towards those incorporated areas.

Spanish Valley needs to become its town. And then it makes sense outside of Spanish Valley. It's like, yeah, we still continue to promote the agriculture and that larger lot size.

Hearing back from some of the public comments, I was like... And the survey points to that as well, as we still value agriculture here, and we would rather have the higher acreage than the higher density. But it's up to you.

Those are just the arguments and some thoughts.

Shay Walker (1:20:45 - 1:21:09)

I get the intent that we've already allowed so much with the Wilson Arch thing and all this less than one acre lot sizes that now what do we do? Do we feel like we should allow for that stuff because we've been allowing it, so it should be in our...

TC Garcia (1:21:09 - 1:21:19)

It is kind of a plan going forward, right? It's a future plan. Not a high density, but a higher density in Spanish Valley than the rest of the county.

Mack McDonald (1:21:20 - 1:21:27)

Even La Salle. I mean, La Salle, you're looking at some growth in La Salle. Yeah.

In this one acre, yeah.

TC Garcia (1:21:28 - 1:21:49)

I'd still call that low density, right? But anyway, I kind of feel the same way. We're missing a little paragraph in here about a residential-type land use designation.

But in our case, it's almost specifically Spanish Valley. Spanish Valley. So what do you want me to do?

Ann Austin (1:21:49 - 1:21:55)

Low density residential will exist in our larger ag lands anyway.  
Mack McDonald (1:21:57 - 1:21:57)

Yes.

Ann Austin (1:21:58 - 1:22:07)

So we don't actually need a district that's low density residential. We just need the regular residential.

TC Garcia (1:22:08 - 1:22:20)

Exactly. Yeah, I don't know. Honestly, I think, you know, just add in...

Leave low density how it is and add in a residential that has its own language.

Mack McDonald (1:22:21 - 1:22:32)

So add a paragraph on there? Just residential and say we promote residential, more growth.  
Yeah, right.

Melissa Riggs (1:22:34 - 1:22:35)

Affordable housing.

Mack McDonald (1:22:35 - 1:22:38)

Affordable housing tied into that. Sure.

Ann Austin (1:22:40 - 1:22:56)

I'm pretty sure that points survey specifically was advising the county not to have low density residential, to move away from that, that there was language in it, just saying that could be contradictory.

TC Garcia (1:22:59 - 1:23:05)

Okay. Was that the survey included in the packet?

Mack McDonald (1:23:06 - 1:23:07)

No.

Ann Austin (1:23:07 - 1:23:09)

No, the points one.

Mack McDonald (1:23:09 - 1:23:10)

Oh, the housing survey.

Ann Austin (1:23:11 - 1:23:12)

Yeah, the housing survey.

Mack McDonald (1:23:13 - 1:24:18)

It was dwelling on the future. And it just highlighted the fact that we've got to do something here to get more housing, workforce housing. Kind of it was focused on the workforce housing side of it is we're losing population.

And, you know, if you try to move here and you have to pay, you know, \$400,000, \$500,000 for a home, then a lot of people aren't going to move here. So we've got to fix that. Or the trajectory that they showed is we are going to continue to lose population throughout time.

So we can add a paragraph on there, just normal residential. The county encourages residential growth throughout the county. And then you would tackle it within your zoning on your lot sizes.

Does that make sense? Makes sense.

Melissa Riggs (1:24:18 - 1:24:22)

So get rid of the word low density and just call it residential.

Mack McDonald (1:24:22 - 1:24:25)

Somebody mentioned they like the low. I mentioned that.

Melissa Riggs (1:24:25 - 1:24:31)

Okay, but you mentioned the second category. So either have two categories or get rid of the word low density.

Mack McDonald (1:24:31 - 1:24:40)

And then a general residential. And that will cover you, what we're seeing in La Salle, what we're seeing in Spanxville. Rural residential, whatever you want to call it.

Melissa Riggs (1:24:40 - 1:24:45)

Yeah, maybe rural residential and residential. That makes the most sense.

Ann Austin (1:24:47 - 1:24:51)

But rural residential should be more than one acre, right?

Trent Schafer (1:24:52 - 1:24:53)

No.

Ann Austin (1:24:59 - 1:25:04)

That's what I think we get. It's basically the same thing.

TC Garcia (1:25:04 - 1:25:10)

No, because you've got lots in Spanish Valley under an acre. Yeah, they're quarters. Yeah.

[Speaker 17] (1:25:11 - 1:25:14)

And that's not rural residential.

TC Garcia (1:25:14 - 1:25:19)

You're right, that's normal residential. That's why we're making two categories. Yeah, two categories, yeah.

Mack McDonald (1:25:21 - 1:25:23)

So just call it residential?

TC Garcia (1:25:24 - 1:25:29)

Yep. The higher density one residential and the lower density one rural.

Mack McDonald (1:25:29 - 1:25:56)

High density, that's an indication that you're pushing for your quarter acre infill. Okay, so we'll add a residential paragraph. You're okay with that one?

We'll take out recreation on there. Fix some of the coloring on the map. Anything else with the goals?

Melissa Riggs (1:25:59 - 1:26:24)

So somewhere in all of that, the area we're in right now, going back on up, I don't think it talks about sitla land in there at all. And I think there needs to be a reference to sitla land. Because it's not public lands, it's not tribal lands, it's sitla lands.

It's under land use designations.

Mack McDonald (1:26:24 - 1:26:32)

The Spanish Valley Area Plan is the sitla component to this.

Melissa Riggs (1:26:33 - 1:26:44)

But there's all sorts of other little pockets of sitla. And there's going to be even more north of Bluff now. That's unincorporated.

Mack McDonald (1:26:48 - 1:27:00)

Incorporates the approved state institutional trust land administration community structure plan. That's Spanish Valley. And so it touches on that sitla piece.

Melissa Riggs (1:27:00 - 1:27:03)

Yeah, but there's sitla throughout.

Mack McDonald (1:27:03 - 1:27:04)

Yes.

Melissa Riggs (1:27:04 - 1:27:08)

So I think we need to acknowledge there's sitla throughout.

Mack McDonald (1:27:09 - 1:27:09)

Okay.

Melissa Riggs (1:27:11 - 1:27:13)

You could make it its own category.

Ann Austin (1:27:16 - 1:27:29)

Very first paragraph has some language about the county under jurisdiction of either a federal

agency or the Navajo Nation. Why don't you just put in state or federal?

Trent Schafer (1:27:32 - 1:27:34)

Add sitla there.

Melissa Riggs (1:27:35 - 1:27:45)

Well, is it under the jurisdiction? It's not under the... Is it under the jurisdiction of sitla?

No, I don't think that's...

Ann Austin (1:27:45 - 1:27:52)

Well, in ownership of either a federal agency or the Navajo Nation, maybe that's where you stick sitla's name in there.

Mack McDonald (1:27:54 - 1:27:59)

A state, comma, federal agency or the Navajo Nation.

Melissa Riggs (1:27:59 - 1:28:07)

But further down, it has tribal lands and it has public lands, right? Those are actually pulled out.

Mack McDonald (1:28:08 - 1:28:09)

And sitla comes under the public.

Melissa Riggs (1:28:09 - 1:28:17)

And then sitla comes up. Yeah, it just needs to be mentioned.

Mack McDonald (1:28:17 - 1:28:21)

Okay. So just mention it here on the ownership side?

Melissa Riggs (1:28:21 - 1:28:36)

I wouldn't put it there. I'd put it in the public land section because it says jurisdiction and ownership because that's true for federal and Navajo Nation land. But sitla is just ownership.

Lloyd Wilson (1:28:37 - 1:28:37)

Okay.

Melissa Riggs (1:28:38 - 1:29:04)

So where do you put that? That section we were just in. In the public land section?

No. We were talking about the different designations like residential and agricultural. There are also public lands and tribal lands in there.

That's where I think there needs to be some reference to it. I see.

Trent Schafer (1:29:04 - 1:29:10)

And, Mac, we probably ought to change the name because it's no longer...

Melissa Riggs (1:29:10 - 1:29:11)

It's no longer sitla.

Trent Schafer (1:29:11 - 1:29:11)

Yeah.

[Speaker 15] (1:29:14 - 1:29:15)

What is it?

Trent Schafer (1:29:16 - 1:29:19)

It's State Trust Administration.

Melissa Riggs (1:29:20 - 1:29:24)

Oh, is that? S-T-A. I thought it was Trust Lands Administration.

Mack McDonald (1:29:25 - 1:29:26)

I can look and see.

Trent Schafer (1:29:26 - 1:29:28)

It says S-T-A.

Melissa Riggs (1:29:29 - 1:29:30)

Oh, okay.

Mack McDonald (1:29:35 - 1:29:41)

S-T-A. It's sta? Yeah.

So it's sta lands. Sta lands. Sta lands.

Okay.

Trent Schafer (1:29:41 - 1:29:43)

Double-checked. Yeah.

Mack McDonald (1:29:58 - 1:32:06)

Anything else? How about goals on here? Were you okay with the goals that were on here?

Are those still useful goals? When I read through here, I couldn't think of any changes that would be in conflict with what we're heading. We did add working with that Inland Port, and you'd seen that in the red lines document that was provided a long ago.

Does the county have a trails master plan? I was wondering about that. So the state has been working on an overall statewide trails plan.

They just released that a couple weeks ago. Statewide? So we do have that, and then you're starting to see more efforts throughout the county.

To the north, in Spanish Valley, you have the trail there that we partnered with Grand County to develop. And then Bluff, around the Bluff area, wanting to go into Montezuma Creek. There's a proposed trail there.

When we met with UDOT a couple years ago, UDOT has really been on an effort to connect trails throughout the state, so you can go top to bottom. Part of that continuing that thought is how do we get trail connected from Grand County down through San Juan County, going all the way through? Is it using the mountain trail networks that we have and connecting to those?

And so there's been work efforts on that trail. The county specifically doesn't have a trail master plan. It was really just that work effort with UDOT.

What's the one you partnered up with Grand?

Trent Schafer (1:32:07 - 1:32:10)

Which one? The one you partnered with Grand on?

Mack McDonald (1:32:10 - 1:32:10)

Mud Springs.

Trent Schafer (1:32:11 - 1:32:12)

Mud Springs.

Mack McDonald (1:32:12 - 1:32:38)

Yeah, that's that new trail that they've completed or completing the first phase now. That Mud Springs trail. The county originally had applied for funding for that.

It's in partnership with SITLA, BLM, and Grand County. And that's down by the rifle range? Shooting range?

Trent Schafer (1:32:38 - 1:32:39)

That's the one right at the bottom.

Mack McDonald (1:32:39 - 1:32:42)

Right at the bottom of the hill that people are complaining.

Trent Schafer (1:32:42 - 1:32:43)

It's the worst place to turn off.

Mack McDonald (1:32:44 - 1:33:53)

And we're working on that one as well. If you have a couple million dollars to do a pull out there, we're looking for money for that. And that's a high school enduro track, but not bike racing enduro track, where they're anticipating having more races there, and hopefully a championship being hosted there within the next couple years.

Mud Springs? Who made it Mud Springs? I think it was the Arias name before.

But yeah, they're finalizing that first phase of the development. There's a couple more phases that are planned for that. They tell me it's going to be awesome.

A lot of people are coming here to San Juan County that participate in those races. The original plan was hopefully we can get the high schools to have a mountain bike team as well and start utilizing some of the trails around here in the future.

Shay Walker (1:33:55 - 1:33:58)

State mountain bike is like thousands of people. It's Camper City.

Mack McDonald (1:33:58 - 1:34:13)

Yes. So their participation on it obviously was the land as well as kind of a parking lot out there so that when people do come, they kind of have a little bit more infrastructure there.

Trent Schafer (1:34:15 - 1:34:25)

There's like a... I always used to say it was Ken's Lake right at the bottom of Blue Hill. Right.

[Speaker 16] (1:34:25 - 1:34:25)

The pond.

Trent Schafer (1:34:26 - 1:34:39)

There's a city up there. Oh, absolutely. They hide right behind the old shooting range.

Right below the old highway. That's where we did the VFW through there. Yep. Holy cow.

Mack McDonald (1:34:40 - 1:34:41)

A lot of people camp there?

Trent Schafer (1:34:41 - 1:34:42)

Well, they pack them in there too.

Mack McDonald (1:34:42 - 1:34:46)

It's had a homeless population there in the summertime.

Trent Schafer (1:34:46 - 1:34:51)

And I'm sure those campers are never two weeks or more.

Mack McDonald (1:34:51 - 1:34:54)

We just get a lot of long-stayers there. Yeah.

Trent Schafer (1:34:54 - 1:35:04)

And I wouldn't necessarily call them homeless. They'll stay at work for a couple months in the

lab and they just... Vanders.

Shay Walker (1:35:04 - 1:35:04)

Vanders.

Trent Schafer (1:35:05 - 1:35:06)

Yeah. Yeah.

Mack McDonald (1:35:13 - 1:35:15)

Anything else that we need to add?

Mack McDonald (1:35:17 - 1:35:28)

Cody's already circling. He's already coming at us. I got a motion to adjourn.

He's like, let's go. So I'll make those changes. Go ahead, Anne.

Mack McDonald (1:35:28 - 1:35:28)

Sorry.

Ann Austin (1:35:29 - 1:36:23)

I'm sorry. I feel like I have to bring this up. This is kind of giving the language at the bottom here of our goals.

I'm sending mixed messages when I read it, coming from the Spanish Valley perspective, that we're supporting creation of area plans, such as the Spanish Valley plan, when pressure begins to mount. And then the sentence above that is only approving zone changes and development applications that conform to the future land use map of this plan. So if we end up getting rid of the...

If we end up rezoning Spanish Valley out of this whole countywide ordinance and it doesn't match the Spanish Valley plan, we might run into a problem there. Is anybody else following that logic?

Cody Nielson (1:36:24 - 1:36:25)

Yeah, get rid of that paragraph.

Mack McDonald (1:36:25 - 1:36:51)

So take out that paragraph altogether. Because the future land use map in this general plan was a high level. And we had a discussion on that tonight of, you know, do we get specific or do we keep it high level?

And my read from that was we're keeping it high level and not being specific. And so if we're not being specific, if we take that language out, then there's not a conflict.

Melissa Riggs (1:36:51 - 1:36:55)

So we're talking about taking out the top paragraph or the second?

Mack McDonald (1:36:55 - 1:36:57)

This one here.

Melissa Riggs (1:36:57 - 1:36:57)

That one.

Mack McDonald (1:36:57 - 1:37:05)

Only approves zoning changes and development applications that conform. I thought she was talking the next one down. So she touched on these two conflicts.

Ann Austin (1:37:05 - 1:38:37)

I'm just putting it out to consider because, you know, me, I think that Spanish Valley does need different treatment. And the fact that these goals say that is, like, well, why are we looking at Spanish Valley as under this umbrella of the countywide ordinance? I mean, if you take those things out, then you might as well take out mention of the Spanish Valley area plan up in the first paragraph.

You know, it just feels like one side of the county, you know, the mouth is saying we want everybody the same. And then on the other, you know, on this language, it's saying, no, we want to encourage this kind of foresight and planning for areas that are growing, so which is, because I think it's good that we have the Spanish Valley plan. But as we go through the zoning map, I think we want to make sure that any zone changes we make are compatible with the Spanish Valley plan.

Trent Schafer (1:38:38 - 1:38:51)

See, I think that third one right there is supporting the creations of area plans. That one's, I mean, that's pretty general. It's just using Spanish Valley as an example where the one above it would be the one you would remove, right?

Shay Walker (1:38:52 - 1:39:04)

It does read like you're specifying a different plan. Instead of, like, yeah, you're highlighting it as its own plan and not as a San Juan incorporate in the future.

Ann Austin (1:39:06 - 1:39:44)

Well, if nobody has a problem with it, then I guess just leave it. But it's, you know, this land use map or this plan that we're, the general plan is the same idea as Spanish Valley general plan. We're not talking, I'm not talking about the ordinance.

But that whole book in the county paid to have done of the Spanish Valley general plan, I think it was, or area plan, the Spanish Valley area plan.

Cody Nielson (1:39:44 - 1:40:00)

Yeah. I don't know about that, but to me, if you get rid of that, it keeps this high, like you were saying, this high over, you know, less specific and still encourages the area plans.

Mack McDonald (1:40:01 - 1:40:01)

Yeah.

[Speaker 15] (1:40:02 - 1:40:05)

Because there's already a plan that exists for the Spanish Valley.

Mack McDonald (1:40:05 - 1:41:01)

I like that Spanish Valley area plan. That participation was said there. It's such a huge chunk of the property, and it kind of shows their cards of what they intend to have developed in the area, which helps us develop the plan map for the rest of the Spanish Valley.

So you take and you apply that to Wilson Arch. You know, as we looked at that plot map and that kind of gave us an indication of what that community originally intended as far as uses in that area, that we use that as a guiding point to that PUD that was approved. You take these areas of La Salle, you know, or Eastland, some of these places that have that community cluster, it kind of helps overall, that makeup.

Cody Nielson (1:41:01 - 1:41:43)

I think we can do both things. Anne asked if we, you know, they are in conflict with one another, and I guess they kind of are, but in the same hand, we can do both. You know, we can always keep in mind that, you know, Spanish Valley has its own goals in mind, you know, but we want to treat everybody in the county the same.

Same ordinances, same overall arching plan, but realizing that someday Spanish Valley will, if Bluff can incorporate, anybody can, so Spanish Valley should be able to someday.

Melissa Riggs (1:41:44 - 1:42:20)

What if it were to say something like, instead of getting rid of it, so it would be something like, considering the future land use map of this plan when, or reviewing the future land use map of this plan when considering zone changes and development applications. Instead of saying only approving. Just taking into account the future.

Yeah, consulting with, there you go.

Cody Nielson (1:42:20 - 1:42:21)

Softening the language.

Melissa Riggs (1:42:22 - 1:42:26)

Softening the language and get rid of only, which is black and white.

Lloyd Wilson (1:42:26 - 1:42:27)

Okay.

TC Garcia (1:42:31 - 1:42:34)

Good thing we got good lawyers. Good question.

[Speaker 14] (1:42:38 - 1:42:40)

Well, this is the best lawyer in the room.

Mack McDonald (1:42:44 - 1:42:48)

Any other changes on the goals?

Ann Austin (1:42:53 - 1:42:55)

I don't have anything else.

Mack McDonald (1:42:59 - 1:43:00)

Cody has a list.

Trent Schafer (1:43:02 - 1:43:07)

You know, he's about run out of his, that list.

[Speaker 14] (1:43:07 - 1:43:08)

He's like, hey.

Trent Schafer (1:43:10 - 1:43:11)

Okay.

Mack McDonald (1:43:11 - 1:43:37)

Okay, direction for me. What do we want to do? Do you want me to incorporate the changes?

I'm just thinking of timeline and meetings. Incorporate the changes and bring them back to next planning commission so you can see, because there's been quite a few things that you've changed on here. And then you would be into January, push it out to the public hearing?

Yeah. Okay.

Cody Nielson (1:43:37 - 1:43:42)

No, let's just do the changes and put it out to a public hearing. We don't need to wait until January. Let's go.

Mack McDonald (1:43:43 - 1:43:45)

Because you may have changes after you hear from the public as well.

Cody Nielson (1:43:45 - 1:43:50)

Every time we can discuss this, we can change it. So let's go. Let's move.

TC Garcia (1:43:50 - 1:43:50)

Okay.

Mack McDonald (1:43:50 - 1:44:07)

So are you all in agreement with that? I trust you, Matt. I'll make the changes, send it to you beforehand to make sure I've captured your thoughts correctly.

And so, Ann, are you okay with that? Melissa, we'll look at all the language.

Melissa Riggs (1:44:07 - 1:44:09)

I'll look at all the language.

Mack McDonald (1:44:09 - 1:44:21)

So then we would schedule a public hearing. So I'll push this out, have that community group help us get it out as far-reaching as we can. We'll schedule it for a public hearing all in December.

Okay.

Trent Schafer (1:44:23 - 1:44:25)

That's a lot to get done.

Melissa Riggs (1:44:25 - 1:44:27)

So you've got to get it to us quickly.

Mack McDonald (1:44:28 - 1:44:28)

Yeah.

Melissa Riggs (1:44:29 - 1:44:30)

Because you have to notice it.

Mack McDonald (1:44:30 - 1:44:31)

Don't throw that piece in there.

Melissa Riggs (1:44:32 - 1:44:33)

You've got to notice it.

Mack McDonald (1:44:33 - 1:44:35)

I am. Yes, we do.

Melissa Riggs (1:44:35 - 1:44:35)

Yeah.

Mack McDonald (1:44:36 - 1:44:38)

Absolutely. And it has to be a part of that.

Melissa Riggs (1:44:38 - 1:44:38)

Yeah.

Mack McDonald (1:44:42 - 1:44:48)

Tomorrow is December, I swear. It goes that fast.

Cody Nielson (1:44:48 - 1:44:57)

Okay, we'll make the changes. I like what's moving, because 226 is driving out. Yes, exactly.

These years fly by. Not fast enough, it's worse.

Trent Schafer (1:44:57 - 1:45:02)

Okay. Land use ordinance discussion direction.

Mack McDonald (1:45:02 - 1:54:10)

Okay. So last time you had requested that land use table, when I... So before, a couple commission meetings ago, you had...

Kristen had presented chapters one through six. Chapters one through six of the 2025 are all... It's really the legal process.

A lot of the paragraphs in that reference the state land use ordinance. Or code. So because of that, we would incorporate those first few chapters into this.

And then I, in thought, getting down to our ordinance. And you all have the ordinances now in your books, so you can refer to those. In the 2011, it just highlights our zones.

So let me see, I have it up here somewhere. That is not ours. Okay.

So in our zones, this is kind of how it presents itself. So you go through your multi-use, agricultural, rural, residential. And then what's permitted.

In the Spanish Valley ordinance... I don't have it up. In the Spanish Valley, it breaks it out into chapters.

Where Spanish Valley residential is its own chapter. So to me, with those thoughts, I'm like, okay, how am I... Am I supposed to expand the 2011 zone to include more in chapter form?

Like the Spanish Valley in chapter form? Then I started looking out to other counties. And that's kind of where I stumbled across how Garfield County is doing theirs.

They don't necessarily have it in the chapter, but they bulked it all together. So in agricultural, they have their uses. They have that language that I like.

If we're missing something, but it fits in agricultural and makes sense, then it's allowed. And then here's kind of the permitted uses on there with the conditional uses broken down. You go to Kane Counties.

Kane Counties is a little bit different. I wish everybody was the same, but they're not. When you get into Kane Counties, they had more PUDs on their uses, but still broke it down into this agricultural residential use.

Then you get into... There was another Emory County. Emory County, they go wild and crazy on theirs.

They look at a use and give it points. If that use fits, then you get higher points, and you're trying to reach 1,000 points. So they've got it based off of a formula.

And conditional uses on a tier. So they've got an L1 tier, L2 tier. L1 tier is basically on a conditional use coming in.

Staff can approve it if it's an L1 conditional use. L2 planning commission approves it. L3 commission has to approve it.

So they kind of broke out of this conditional use. When I was looking at our use table that I sent to you before we last left off, you have a lot of conditional uses in there. So I'm like, how do I mesh Spanish Valleys chapters into a simplistic 2011?

Do you want the Spanish Valleys to be that style, or do you want us to break 2011 out into chapter where A1 is... Everything is all inclusive in the A1, lot sizes, things like that. The PUD right now in the 2011 is still...

It's an overarching chapter itself, but it still highlights the underlying use. So you can do a PUD in all of our zones, A1, the mixed use or highway commercial. So I still like that process where you still have to meet the underlying.

So if it's Spanish Valley residential and you want to do a PUD, you still have to comply with that underlying zone in nature. So as my thoughts ran wild in how to mesh these two together, I came into conflict with paragraph form or chapters. I like the simplistic nature of it when you're administering the ordinance in the paragraph form, but when you apply it, it can sometimes get a little bit difficult if it's not circular in the language itself.

And by that, I mean when you try to apply that in the Spanish Valley for conditional use, it gets all crazy. When we apply the light ordinance portion of Spanish Valley, it gets all crazy because it's not all circular to all the zones. And so I think if we watch for that, we'll be fine.

But just trying to figure out in most of them, I've seen smaller use tables. I like the Garfield approach on the agriculture as if it fits. But then for me, I worry on the staff level.

Now that's really subject to the employee that we have in there. Say we hire a city planner and they don't understand agriculture. Do they really understand that yoga with goats is a real thing?

The less subjective it can be, the better. But yet, you don't want a long ordinance. When I looked at Wayne County, I looked at Emory County.

There are 195, 200 pages in their ordinances, small counties. But it's all inclusive of everything similar to the 2025 ordinance that we had. As you're trying to be all inclusive in an ordinance, it gets lengthy, less simplistic.

So just trying to figure out what is it. Hopefully, you were able to do some research on your own. Look at those other counties out there.

Come up with some ideas of how we pull these two together. When I go from the 20, and I've been flipping back and forth through the maps. When you look at the maps on the old 2011, so we're still utilizing this everywhere else other than Spanish Valley.

The map is pretty simple, but the zones are simple in it. One of the conflicts that I have is highway commercial. Highway commercial, you don't see it on here.

It's kind of hidden, unless you know that it's there. But we have that 1,000 foot on here. That's the grayed out area, the falls, the highway.

That's all that highway commercial district. When you get into the Spanish Valley, when they did the highway commercial on here, they had a different thought. Instead of just keeping that 1,000 foot buffer on each side of the road, they expanded it out to the river.

I remember Lloyd being in that discussion. Lloyd's like, well, that river changes. How are we

going to manage that?

The river changes with each flash flood that we have down through here. Do we go back to the 1,000 foot in here, or do I keep this zoning consistent here, but then further down you morph back into that 1,000 foot highway commercial along the highways? So that was kind of where I left, when I tried to mesh those all together, those were some of the conflicts I had.

So we're keeping highway commercial? That's in 2011.

Mack McDonald (1:54:10 - 1:54:11)

That's what we've got right now.

Mack McDonald (1:54:11 - 1:55:37)

Yes. In 25? So what, I don't think you were here.

I was hoping you'd watch our YouTube. Just for fun. Where we left off on the ordinance is ditch the 2025, other than that legal language that is required to update.

We would take the 2011, so we're going back to 2011, and try to mesh everything together. With the Spanish Valley 2019 meshed into 2011, and the legal language from 2025. Go back to simple, is kind of what the message was.

So I just need that guidance on the zoning. How do you want that to look? In Spanish Valley, we've got those different flex zones from kind of my understanding is get rid of the flex.

Go highway commercial. What do we do with this overlay? These are the overlays.

This map needs to be updated. We approved this in 2023. These are the overlays that have been approved.

We have the two others that are missing on here from Sheik Khan, when he had the overlays approved. So we're missing those pieces.

Cody Nielson (1:55:37 - 1:56:54)

I just don't know what you want me to do with that. That's great. Ben can tell me what to do there.

I'm just looking then that kind of changes the use table a little bit if we continue with the highway commercial. Like if that's say north of Blanding, south of Blanding. If that's 1,000 feet,

that's what we're going back to?

Is that what I'm... So I'm just looking just right off the... Just boom.

Butcher shops. We've got highway commercial. It's not permitted, right?

If you're keeping with this use table. So I'm just saying like it needs to be permitted. I mean like we need to go back through this use table then and fix some of these because I'll catch all kinds of, well, heck.

Because we've gone out of our way on a lot of things right there as far as like, how about taxidermy? I mean that was one we talked in 25. They're going to now be in highway commercial rather than multi-use.

So is that permitted? The butcher shop needs to be permitted because Richie Monson's there and he needs... Taxidermy is not an allowed use.

It needs to be then.

Melissa Riggs (1:56:54 - 1:57:00)

I think taxidermy is further up. It's under something else.

Cody Nielson (1:57:00 - 1:57:02)

It's under what one?

Melissa Riggs (1:57:03 - 1:57:04)

I don't remember.

Cody Nielson (1:57:04 - 1:57:10)

I guess my point is like we just really need to go back through this use table then if that's the simplicity plan then...

Trent Schafer (1:57:11 - 1:57:19)

Well, let me ask this. Do we need four pages of use tables?

Cody Nielson (1:57:24 - 1:57:42)

Well, and what kind of language are we going to do then? Before, I know like my comments earlier that, you know, we've had so many different attorneys come in here and give us different

opinions that if it is not mentioned in the use table going forward...

Mack McDonald (1:57:42 - 1:57:49)

Don Budsman was like, okay, if not, create a process that you can allow it. And so when you look at Garfield's...

Cody Nielson (1:57:49 - 1:57:51)

So that needs to be definitely...

Mack McDonald (1:57:52 - 1:57:53)

Yes, absolutely.

Cody Nielson (1:57:55 - 1:57:57)

Not just disallowed. Nope.

Mack McDonald (1:57:57 - 1:58:07)

Like, okay, the process to allow this... That was one of the things we touched on when you were here is making sure we had a process in there.

Cody Nielson (1:58:10 - 1:58:14)

Well, sorry, I guess I missed more than I thought I did. You guys actually did some good work.

Shay Walker (1:58:17 - 1:58:21)

So, Matt, the Spanish Valley...

Melissa Riggs (1:58:23 - 1:58:26)

It's for goods manufacturing. It's still not allowed.

Trent Schafer (1:58:27 - 1:59:56)

I do think we need to work on it a little bit because the way it is right now, we cannot go back to the 1,000 foot commercial in Spanish Valley. Because that's more or less the only place that is legally, right now, that is not the 1,000 foot commercial on any highway. So at this point, I think what we would do is just go in there and adjust some things to make it work with what it is.

And then, because I know Sitla on that, those parcels, they want to maintain what they had requested in that. Yeah, so if you... And keep coming down.

So all this area right here is what their request was. So when we get to the end of this Spanish Valley map, it goes right back to the 1,000. Let's let Sitla, because this is what Elise and all them worked with Landmark on to get their area done.

Let's leave them alone. And then we just have a minute little bit of privately owned in that area to work on. Because Sitla already planned their parking.

So let's leave all that alone. We'll take the 1,000 foot highway commercial right up to, adjacent to that Spanish Valley plan. And then do the minute changes that we need in the privately owned area.

Okay. Let's let it flow.

Lloyd Wilson (1:59:57 - 1:59:57)

Mm-hmm.

Ann Austin (1:59:59 - 2:00:25)

We talked about before having from Sunny Acres down to maybe Pat Creek Cutoff, or even Kenslake Road, or somewhere in that vicinity be multiple use on the east side of the highway. And that would potentially make everything that's existing conforming.

Trent Schafer (2:00:25 - 2:00:29)

Oh, you're talking adjacent to the highway? The east side of the highway?

Ann Austin (2:00:30 - 2:00:37)

Yeah, isn't that what you're talking about? Like for the privately owned parcels that are existing as highway.

Trent Schafer (2:00:37 - 2:01:18)

Yeah, I think your biggest problem is like Sunny Acres. We talked about that area between the creek crossing, which was approximately 1,000 foot at the time, out to the highway being like a multi-use. Yeah.

But maintaining our commercial in that larger triangle that comes down to the Moab Business Park. But then Merriam Court is going to have to be multi-use. Right.

Well, actually, and it can be multi-use all the way down to Old Airport Road.

Lloyd Wilson (2:01:18 - 2:01:19)

Yeah.

Trent Schafer (2:01:19 - 2:01:27)

Because we have an RV park two lots down, well, no, one there.

Ann Austin (2:01:27 - 2:02:16)

Because I remember the thinking was that highway commercial should be in large lots that haven't been already developed. So we can still have highway commercial in that truck stop zone. And then south of airport, maybe, wherever the other big lots are that haven't been developed.

But the ones that are already existing with businesses on them, if we multi-use them, they could come into conforming. I'd have to double-check that language. But I think multiple use would allow for everything that's existing and not make anybody non-conforming.

Trent Schafer (2:02:16 - 2:02:48)

Yeah, so I agree with you. It might still go up a little bit to Old Airport Road, so right there. From there up to the Moab Business Park, which is just above Merriam, make that multi-use.

And then Moab Business Park up to the back side of Sunny Acres Lodge, keeping it commercial. Because that is all commercial there. But it's not.

Shay Walker (2:02:48 - 2:03:11)

You have nightly rentals. These are nightly rentals. Those are nightly rentals over there. I mean, people live in the Moab Business Park. That's their residence. Those are illegal anyway.

I know, but like Ant's saying, does multi-purpose make that, or multi-use, make it conforming? Because it's there, and that's what it is right now.

Trent Schafer (2:03:15 - 2:03:24)

Because we would have to stop that at Old Airport Road, because after that, you start jumping into a bunch of La Grande stuff there. You do have a couple prices.

Cody Nielson (2:03:24 - 2:03:28)

Why can't it just all be multi-use other than our new truck stop zone?

Trent Schafer (2:03:29 - 2:03:38)

Well, I mean, it falls under the 2011 one anyway, so we wouldn't have to worry about it at this point.

Ann Austin (2:03:40 - 2:03:43)

Well, if they're already approved, it wouldn't matter, right?

Trent Schafer (2:03:43 - 2:03:44)

Right, that's what I'm saying.

Ann Austin (2:03:47 - 2:04:04)

So, I don't know, someday maybe, I mean, can you do a truck stop in a multi-use? I don't know. But the larger parcels that have not been built, it should be more highway commercial, especially going south.

Melissa Riggs (2:04:05 - 2:04:13)

Truck stop is conditional in multi-use.

Ann Austin (2:04:14 - 2:04:50)

Yeah, but I don't think it would impact anything. I mean, I don't know, I'm not a lawyer, but whatever. I think the goal really is to focus on the existing folks' uses of their land and trying to figure out how to make them conforming.

And multi-use, since those are a bunch of smaller parcels, seems reasonable, as opposed to the left side of the highway, that's undeveloped, large parcels, and that is highway flex, right?

Mack McDonald (2:04:54 - 2:04:55)

Highway flex?

[Speaker 17] (2:04:56 - 2:05:02)

The map I'm looking at is, they're all purple, which is highway flex.

Trent Schafer (2:05:02 - 2:05:03)

Yes, you're correct.

[Speaker 17] (2:05:04 - 2:05:04)

Okay.

Trent Schafer (2:05:06 - 2:05:40)

So, I mean, since this is the only place we really have to change any of the mapping in for the 2011 ordinance, why don't we just set this as a discussion action item at a meeting? Instead of it just narrowing it down to the people that live there, let's just make it part of one of our next meetings to simplify the map, incorporate that into the rest of San Juan. And then that way it falls in suit with the 2011 ordinance with the use table that we picked.

Mack McDonald (2:05:41 - 2:05:52)

Okay, so, and that would kind of, it'll help. You'll still have the control district highway, that's a gravel pit. Yep.

Still have agriculture. Spanish Valley residential.

Trent Schafer (2:05:53 - 2:05:56)

It'll just be residential, yep.

Ann Austin (2:05:57 - 2:07:11)

See, I think we have to rethink that as well. Um. Because we need to see a map also with the, you know, like Mack, you mentioned with the overlays, the residential flex, because I think we've got some to like Lydia Court would.

One of our maps, we were looking at changing that we were talking about community commercial along Spanish Valley Drive. Not that I'm sold on that either, but it's, if we're going with residential flex for Chicon Zone and then what you call it, Balanced Rock Resort, plus the other one, the Valley Estates. We might be losing, you know, we're going to be losing a lot of what is residential on this map, the old map.

Y'all are looking at the one that's from 2011.

Trent Schafer (2:07:11 - 2:07:15)

Right. Which is fine because it's already been approved.

Mack McDonald (2:07:15 - 2:07:17)

This one here? Is this the one you're looking at Ann?

Ann Austin (2:07:17 - 2:07:31)

Um, yeah, because I'm, you know, I'm not remote, so I'm not seeing what y'all are looking at on your big screen, because on the presentation, it's just the table. So I've got my own map pulled up.

Mack McDonald (2:07:32 - 2:07:33)

Okay, hold on.

Ann Austin (2:07:33 - 2:07:37)

And it's the one that's from the website that amended 2021.

Mack McDonald (2:07:40 - 2:07:44)

Sorry, I thought you were still seeing what we were showing.

Ann Austin (2:07:46 - 2:07:51)

No, that's, I'm kind of struggling. I'm sorry, guys. I'm trying to keep up with what y'all are talking about.

Mack McDonald (2:07:52 - 2:08:13)

So I was, we were looking at this one. So this shows the overlay districts that have been approved. And trying to figure out, kind of going along with your thoughts, where you have the ones that are missing is Sheik's.

[Speaker 13] (2:08:13 - 2:08:16)

Yeah, so where is this map? This isn't public yet?

Mack McDonald (2:08:17 - 2:08:19)

This one was, yes, it should be.

Trent Schafer (2:08:20 - 2:08:24)

And the one that you're looking for was never finalized.

Mack McDonald (2:08:25 - 2:08:27)

Overlay. Which one?

Trent Schafer (2:08:27 - 2:08:32)

The little cul-de-sac. It was never finalized. It never went through the final process.

Mack McDonald (2:08:33 - 2:08:36)

That was brought to me the other day. We're looking into that one.

Trent Schafer (2:08:36 - 2:08:37)

And they're built.

Mack McDonald (2:08:38 - 2:08:41)

That one's partially, mostly done.

Trent Schafer (2:08:42 - 2:09:15)

Yeah, but it was permitted as residential. And I asked Kristen and I asked the contractor how it was being done because I had to assess it. And they said, well, the overlays was never finished by Sheik.

So we are building them as residential homes when we sign the permit for them to get it. And I brought that to everybody's attention not too long ago. Because I knew this was going to snake in there.

And that was what I said from day one when this started.

Mack McDonald (2:09:15 - 2:09:40)

Okay. Corey brought that up to me yesterday. So, the overlay was approved.

Like you mentioned, it hasn't completed. This one was approved. We have the development agreement.

This is Sheik's other one that was approved. So we have a development agreement on this one, just not this one. Which is that final step.

[Speaker 13] (2:09:42 - 2:09:49)

And Matt, this map is not on our county website.

[Speaker 15] (2:09:49 - 2:09:52)

Okay. It shows the overlays.

[Speaker 13] (2:09:53 - 2:09:56)

Right. It doesn't have any of this updated stuff.

Mack McDonald (2:09:57 - 2:10:07)

And this was just, we had approved this as the overlay. I think this is the one that you're seeing.

Trent Schafer (2:10:08 - 2:10:14)

The one on the west side. That was approved in 2019. I don't think you're seeing it.

Ann Austin (2:10:15 - 2:10:25)

So I think it is really important that whatever has been approved is official, current map that it gets on the website.

Mack McDonald (2:10:25 - 2:10:30)

Absolutely. It used to be on there. Things have been moving around.

[Speaker 13] (2:10:31 - 2:10:42)

I... Is it on there, like, in the... Under the proposed ordinance?

Mack McDonald (2:10:43 - 2:10:50)

No, the proposed shows that GIS map.

[Speaker 13] (2:10:51 - 2:11:00)

Okay. So then maybe it is on the county website. There's just the use table.

Mack McDonald (2:11:05 - 2:11:09)

So this is the one that was 2019 approved.

TC Garcia (2:11:14 - 2:11:17)

Yeah, it's on there now. You found it?

[Speaker 13] (2:11:17 - 2:11:17)

Okay.

TC Garcia (2:11:18 - 2:11:25)

It's current Spanish Valley specific ordinance. And then there's a link for the map in there.

[Speaker 13] (2:11:27 - 2:11:32)

Yes, yeah, but when you open that map, is it the 2011 one?

TC Garcia (2:11:34 - 2:11:38)

No, current 2019 and it's the same one the map's showing right here.

[Speaker 13] (2:11:39 - 2:11:39)

Really?

TC Garcia (2:11:40 - 2:11:41)

Okay. I just pulled it up.

Lloyd Wilson (2:11:42 - 2:11:43)

I'm trying to find it.

Mack McDonald (2:11:48 - 2:11:51)

So we will bring a new map and...

[Speaker 13] (2:11:52 - 2:11:54)

Oh, so it is the old one.

Mack McDonald (2:11:56 - 2:11:59)

Yes, just with overlays added.

[Speaker 13] (2:12:00 - 2:12:06)

Wait. Oh, okay. I'm going to just call me crazy tonight.

Shay Walker (2:12:13 - 2:12:15)

That's the one right here.

[Speaker 15] (2:12:17 - 2:12:28)

Yeah, it does. It's not showing all the... Yeah, the overlays.

Yes, it's not showing them. That was the old original ones.

Trent Schafer (2:12:39 - 2:12:49)

So do we agree on that? Let's bring this minute amount back and let's just discuss it, make it an action item and move on. Okay.

Lloyd Wilson (2:12:50 - 2:12:51)

Okay.

Ann Austin (2:12:53 - 2:13:01)

And you're talking about changing the zoning map officially or proposed?

Trent Schafer (2:13:02 - 2:13:02)

Proposed.

Mack McDonald (2:13:03 - 2:13:07)

It's not official until we go through the process.

[Speaker 13] (2:13:08 - 2:13:13)

Okay, but an action item to change...

Trent Schafer (2:13:14 - 2:13:18)

Discussion. And then a public hearing.

Mack McDonald (2:13:19 - 2:13:20)

Yes.

Ann Austin (2:13:20 - 2:13:24)

Okay, are we changing any other things like Cody was saying in the landing?

Cody Nielson (2:13:27 - 2:13:40)

Mine would be to go through the use table for highway commercial and multi-use then and look

at those areas and make sure that same thing like Spanish Valley, that those people that are already...

[Speaker 14] (2:13:43 - 2:13:43)

Cody did this.

Cody Nielson (2:13:43 - 2:13:45)

Keep them conforming.

[Speaker 14] (2:13:45 - 2:13:48)

TC did this.

Trent Schafer (2:13:50 - 2:13:52)

TJ, Cody, somebody did it.

Melissa Riggs (2:13:52 - 2:13:55)

What am I looking at? TC.

TC Garcia (2:13:56 - 2:14:28)

TJ did it. TJ, TC. Hey, when Lloyd gives homework, I follow through on it.

He did too. So... 120 on there.

Is this the revised version? No, this is straight out of TC's little... Okay.  
So, last month, Lloyd said, go home, look at the use table right and figure out how you would change it or amend it. This is the first swag at that.

Trent Schafer (2:14:29 - 2:14:30)

And I think you did great.

TC Garcia (2:14:30 - 2:14:35)

So you can see, I dropped your precious multi-use that we've been talking about all tonight.

Trent Schafer (2:14:36 - 2:14:40)

Which is more or less the same thing as the rural residential. More or less.

TC Garcia (2:14:41 - 2:14:42)

Very similar.

Trent Schafer (2:14:43 - 2:14:46)

61 is the only one I've got a problem with. So this is...

TC Garcia (2:14:47 - 2:14:54)

Like I said, this is just straight off the cuff. Rewriting it from just as much myself as anybody else here.

[Speaker 14] (2:14:56 - 2:14:57)

Is swag combined in there in TC?

Trent Schafer (2:14:58 - 2:15:20)

We can add it. We should be able to... It should be conditionally used in the rural residential because, I mean, who doesn't want a golf course in their neighborhood?

Yeah, I'm cool with it. Did you do this while you were at work? No.

Actually, I think it looks great.

Melissa Riggs (2:15:21 - 2:15:28)

Okay, so if we do this though, the general plan, does it have multi-use in there? It has commercial in there.

Mack McDonald (2:15:28 - 2:15:30)

It has multi-use in there.

Trent Schafer (2:15:31 - 2:15:36)

So you're just going to change the name of that rural residential to multi-use? Sure. You're fine with that?

Cody Nielson (2:15:36 - 2:15:45)

Yeah. So short-term rentals, what are they under? In your...

What are they under?

TC Garcia (2:15:45 - 2:15:52)

So this is the exact same... 111. The uses are the exact same one we had on our proposed...

Trent Schafer (2:15:52 - 2:15:55)

Everything but residential.

Cody Nielson (2:15:56 - 2:16:02)

So they're not permitted in this new... Or this... I can't even read the yellow.

Residential.

Trent Schafer (2:16:03 - 2:16:03)

Sorry.

Cody Nielson (2:16:03 - 2:16:07)

Residential, I'm sorry. And rural residential, which is...

Trent Schafer (2:16:07 - 2:16:10)

Can you look those in the glasses? It glows. Yeah.

Mack McDonald (2:16:10 - 2:16:15)

So they're permitted in all uses other than your...

Trent Schafer (2:16:15 - 2:16:19)

Residential. Rural residential. No, just the magnifying glass.

TC Garcia (2:16:20 - 2:16:22)

The yellow one's hard to read, sorry. That says residential.

Mack McDonald (2:16:23 - 2:16:31)

Yep, residential. So they're permitted everywhere else. So they'd be in the mixed-use, agriculture, highway, commercial, industrial.

Trent Schafer (2:16:32 - 2:16:34)

And that's what the people wanted.

Mack McDonald (2:16:34 - 2:16:38)

And that kind of keeps the Spanish Valley residential sacred.

Trent Schafer (2:16:38 - 2:17:20)

Yep. So one other question. I know it's out of the other one too, but you had...

107, and then you go back to... 42? Yeah.

So... You've got permissible across the board, except for industrial. And then you've got conditional use...

In rural, conditional use in ag, permissible in highway, commercial... And then conditional in industrial.

Lloyd Wilson (2:17:20 - 2:17:20)

Yep.

Trent Schafer (2:17:21 - 2:17:34)

So the... Is that, or... Oh no, I'm sorry, 106.

So you've got permissible across the board, other than residential. Okay.

TC Garcia (2:17:34 - 2:17:35)

Yeah, for Huntington County.

Trent Schafer (2:17:35 - 2:17:52)

Yep. That was the one I was concerned about. So more or less, they're kind of the same thing, except for...

The residential. Because this one, you're requiring a half an acre.

TC Garcia (2:17:53 - 2:17:54)

Right.

Trent Schafer (2:17:54 - 2:17:56)

And the other one, I mean, more or less...

TC Garcia (2:17:58 - 2:18:16)

I think, so this is all a one-for-one from the proposed uses that are on our proposed table. And I believe we added 42, or maybe it was, I don't know. Because I think we got into this discussion about how a mobile home or a trailer park is different than...

Lloyd Wilson (2:18:16 - 2:18:17)

Right, exactly.

TC Garcia (2:18:17 - 2:18:20)

Some old boy parking his camper on his lot, right? Yeah.

Trent Schafer (2:18:25 - 2:18:28)

No, that was just questions, no argument with that at all.

Cody Nielson (2:18:29 - 2:18:31)

So a trailer park is which one?

Trent Schafer (2:18:31 - 2:18:32)

Manufactured home.

TC Garcia (2:18:32 - 2:18:34)

107 or something like that.

Cody Nielson (2:18:34 - 2:18:34)

Which one?

TC Garcia (2:18:37 - 2:18:37)

107.

Cody Nielson (2:18:43 - 2:18:46)

No, like a... Okay, not a trailer.

TC Garcia (2:18:46 - 2:18:51)

Like a mobile home park. Yeah. I don't think we had ever clearly said that.

Trent Schafer (2:18:52 - 2:18:56)

That's more or less what 107 is, RV and trailer park. Yeah.

Cody Nielson (2:18:58 - 2:19:16)

Okay, so single, wide, manufactured... What the hell? I mean, I don't know.

I hate these different... A single wide. What is a single wide?

A single wide village trailer house, trailer court. What number is that one?

Trent Schafer (2:19:17 - 2:19:17)

107.

Cody Nielson (2:19:17 - 2:19:27)

Sorry, I'm getting frustrated. I don't think it should be 107, but... Dude, I don't know.

But that's fine. I'm just wondering, is it permitted in highway commercial? Lloyd

Wilson (2:19:29 - 2:19:30)

Yeah.

Cody Nielson (2:19:30 - 2:19:41)

Yes. Okay. I see what you're saying.

So this means like we're going to change a bunch of the map and get rid of mobile homes? Is that what we're talking about?

TC Garcia (2:19:41 - 2:19:52)

Given what they use. I think we had a tough time with Kristen when she was developing it. We had agriculture, highway commercial, industrial, single wide.

Melissa Riggs (2:19:53 - 2:19:55)

Yeah, but let's not just rush.

Trent Schafer (2:19:56 - 2:20:04)

No, no. I'm just trying to wrap my mind around this. Yeah.

Because you can't do a modular in a trailer park anyway because they have to...

Cody Nielson (2:20:04 - 2:20:31)

I'm just looking for my own. Any household. Conflict of interest here, my own. Part of my... The land I own, I had wanted a multi-use. But then some of it I had ag, a little further away from everything.

But if we went with this and I had to choose between a residential and ag, I'd probably choose ag.

Trent Schafer (2:20:35 - 2:20:40)

Okay. As...

Mack McDonald (2:20:40 - 2:20:41)

Discussed.

Trent Schafer (2:20:42 - 2:20:44)

Let's go through TC's.

Mack McDonald (2:20:45 - 2:20:45)

Yep.

Trent Schafer (2:20:47 - 2:20:53)

It's much, much cleaner than what we've got. I like it.

Melissa Riggs (2:20:53 - 2:20:54)

It's simplified.

Trent Schafer (2:20:54 - 2:20:55)

Yeah.

Melissa Riggs (2:20:56 - 2:20:58)

So go through it at our next meeting?

Trent Schafer (2:20:58 - 2:20:59)

Have it ready.

Melissa Riggs (2:20:59 - 2:21:03)

Have it ready at the next meeting. So it needs to be on the agenda. Okay, TC.

Trent Schafer (2:21:04 - 2:21:12)

TC, you did all the work. Thank you, TC, TJ. If you can send an email copy to Matt.

Mack McDonald (2:21:12 - 2:21:37)

Yeah, we can add it. Then I'll work on that incorporation of Spanish Valley into 2011. Then work on some of those, that circular language.

Make sure it's all there. The Spanish Valley, it does touch on the dark sky initiative compared to your 2011. Do I incorporate some of that language over?

Trent Schafer (2:21:38 - 2:21:39)

Into the entire county?

Mack McDonald (2:21:39 - 2:21:41)

Into the rest of the county.

Trent Schafer (2:21:41 - 2:21:54)

Everybody will find your house. You're going to go back to that overreach. That's what you're going to get from everybody.

Mack McDonald (2:21:55 - 2:21:55)

Okay.

Trent Schafer (2:21:56 - 2:22:19)

I think, if anything, we've already got the water part in there, in our general plan. It's going to be... Yeah, we have to have that.

So, I mean, that was a big one that was in the overlay. For the Spanish Valley ordinance. But I think you're going to get so much kickback on that lighting.

Okay. Yeah.

Melissa Riggs (2:22:19 - 2:22:32)

I would argue the other side, though. Right. I mean, people come here because it's a special place.

And dark skies are drawing people to block.

Mack McDonald (2:22:32 - 2:22:38)

Building Code kind of pushes that anyways now, with the energy efficiency and that and so on.

Melissa Riggs (2:22:38 - 2:22:40)

We have a gathering this weekend.

Mack McDonald (2:22:40 - 2:22:44)

I don't know. The Spanish Valley is unenforceable.

Melissa Riggs (2:22:46 - 2:22:49)

You can see Las Vegas for hundreds of miles.

Trent Schafer (2:22:49 - 2:22:51)

I know. People coming to see it.

Melissa Riggs (2:22:54 - 2:22:59)

I would say put it on there and see what people say.

Trent Schafer (2:22:59 - 2:23:11)

Okay. I oppose. Okay.

And with TC's... Use table. See if we feel that anything should come across that didn't come across.

Mack McDonald (2:23:11 - 2:23:20)

Yeah. Well, and if we add the language and that process, if we're missing things, it has a process to write it on.

Lloyd Wilson (2:23:22 - 2:23:22)

Yeah.

Cody Nielson (2:23:24 - 2:23:41)

But just, I guess, I don't know why I'm saying this, because it's pretty obvious, but if we go with TC's, then we have to spend time looking at the map and making sure that multi-use, which is fine.

Trent Schafer (2:23:41 - 2:23:49)

It's five things. Residential, multi-use, highway, commercial, and industrial. Five things.

Simplify it.

Cody Nielson (2:23:50 - 2:24:01)

That's fine. I'm just saying, but I can tell you quite a few parcels that will be like, okay, which one am I picking? Yeah.

If I'm not multi-use, where am I going?

Trent Schafer (2:24:03 - 2:24:08)

Well, I mean, go back to the 2013 map.

Cody Nielson (2:24:08 - 2:24:17)

But if the use table is open enough, which I think it is, looking at it, then it's an easy choice to make.

Mack McDonald (2:24:18 - 2:24:20)

So you're this around blending up.

Trent Schafer (2:24:24 - 2:24:27)

So, I mean, what is the...

Cody Nielson (2:24:27 - 2:24:32)

Well, I just meant from the 25 map.

Trent Schafer (2:24:33 - 2:24:34)

Oh, yeah, we're not looking at that map.

Cody Nielson (2:24:34 - 2:24:38)

Or the 23 even. This is 13.

Trent Schafer (2:24:40 - 2:24:43)

What is that around blending? Yeah, what is that portion?

Mack McDonald (2:24:43 - 2:25:04)

So you have an enterprise zone, and those are no longer in San Juan County, and then you have the... I don't know, the... Kind of that transition area, where in this area around blending, we...

I don't know anything about transitioning.

Trent Schafer (2:25:05 - 2:25:10)

We ask blending what they want. Huh? We ask blending what they want.

Mack McDonald (2:25:11 - 2:25:12)

As far as zoning?

Trent Schafer (2:25:12 - 2:25:15)

Yeah, or is that in their annexation?

Mack McDonald (2:25:15 - 2:25:21)

This is the annexation, future annexation transition area.

Trent Schafer (2:25:23 - 2:25:36)

So, real quick question. So, in all areas of San Juan County, you have residential? RR.

Just, yeah, just residential.

Mack McDonald (2:25:36 - 2:25:37)

Yeah, just residential.

Trent Schafer (2:25:39 - 2:25:48)

And then you have agricultural. You have highway, commercial, and industrial. What else do you

have, as it stands right now?

Not including Spanish Valley.

Mack McDonald (2:25:48 - 2:25:49)

Your commercial districts.

Trent Schafer (2:25:49 - 2:25:50)

Mm-hmm.

Mack McDonald (2:25:51 - 2:25:58)

Those are in there. Multiple use. And then, so your highway commercial, your commercial districts that are broken out in three levels.

Trent Schafer (2:26:00 - 2:26:25)

So, we're not adding or taking away anything that's not already in San Juan County? Correct. So it should be a pretty easy adjustment.

We're not remapping the entire county. We're just going to put in this ordinance in place, and then the only thing we're remapping is that little section of Spanish Valley, applying this to the already existing mapping in San Juan County.

Cody Nielson (2:26:26 - 2:27:04)

No, I think it's like, maybe so, but I don't know. So, so what am I? I mean, let's use this map, which is garbage to me.

Okay, let's see if I can find my, where I am. I think I am, what is this little road? I mean, I couldn't tell you.

Yeah, I look at Google Maps and pull this map up. I have no idea what the hell I am. I look for this curve, this is a cemetery.

No, well, I live on Flower Mill Road, the end. So which one is Flower Mill Road? Is it that one?

Is this around the world?

Lloyd Wilson (2:27:04 - 2:27:05)

Yeah, I don't know.

Cody Nielson (2:27:05 - 2:27:09)

Is this the dairy lane? I couldn't tell you. Like, what's the blue here?

TC Garcia (2:27:11 - 2:27:13)

Blue is the controlled district industrial.

Trent Schafer (2:27:13 - 2:27:24)

Look, Cody, my idea on this is if we can get this through, then we start approaching changing the mapping on the county. Let's get the ordinance through.

Mack McDonald (2:27:25 - 2:27:35)

And this, yeah, we'll take this and push it into the GIS system. So you'll be able to narrow it down into, okay, what's...

Cody Nielson (2:27:35 - 2:27:46)

I am 100% fine with doing anything. So I'm with you, Lloyd. I just don't want to be, to stick anybody in a box they don't want to be in.

Lloyd Wilson (2:27:46 - 2:27:55)

That's the thing is they're already in the box they're in right now. And all we're doing is putting this on their bars.

Cody Nielson (2:27:55 - 2:27:56)

Sure, I'm just saying.

Trent Schafer (2:27:57 - 2:28:12)

And sticking with the 11 ordinance with the changes that we had to make due to state laws. And then after that's in place, then you start working through the rest of the area.

Cody Nielson (2:28:12 - 2:28:20)

I'm fine, I'm good with you. I'm just saying, to this day, I still, using this map, I have no idea what I am.

TC Garcia (2:28:20 - 2:28:45)

There's not a residential on this map. There's a rural residential, but not a residential. So if your

end goal is to be adding the Spanish Valley into our proposed ordinance, you probably need to make sure that we've got a residential in this map.

Trent Schafer (2:28:46 - 2:28:54)

Right, yeah. Because before it was all rural residential, which was creating forest lots.

Cody Nielson (2:28:57 - 2:29:01)

I would love to see us pass something and get something through.

Lloyd Wilson (2:29:01 - 2:29:05)

I don't want to delay it. One thing in 13 years, that's all I ask. No.

Mack McDonald (2:29:09 - 2:29:13)

Us too. But it has to be complete.

Trent Schafer (2:29:15 - 2:29:16)

Do we leave draft on it?

Mack McDonald (2:29:16 - 2:29:19)

Don't give us a draft. And don't approve a draft. Yeah.

Mack McDonald (2:29:22 - 2:29:25)

Have it be complete and circular.

Trent Schafer (2:29:26 - 2:29:30)

Yeah, TC's going to have draft on this. Yeah, totally.

Mack McDonald (2:29:30 - 2:29:32)