

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Special 3/28/96 Joint Meeting with the Bureau of Land Management
and the Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes - Page 1

A special joint meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee was held on Thursday, March 28, 1996, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 6 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Alan Rogers, and Commissioners Allan Christianson, Maxine Nietz, Archie Pozzi, and Deborah Uhart

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens, Deputy Utilities Director Jay Ahrens, Deputy District Attorney Mark Forsberg, Division Chief Steve Mihelic, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (S.P.C. 3/28/96 1-0028.5)

BLM REPRESENTATIVE: Dave Loomis

CONSULTANTS: Randy Walter and Karen Melby

A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Chairperson Rogers convened the meeting at 6:08 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Commissioner Uhart had not yet arrived and Commissioners Horton and Mally were absent. Chairperson Rogers lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0043.5) - Susan Newberry explained the Rotary Club's request that the plan include bike and pedestrian trails. Don Langson expressed his concern about having an office overlay on his commercial property. He voiced his objection to this designation. Chairperson Rogers indicated this item would be discussed later in the meeting. Additional public comments were solicited but none given and public comments were closed.

C. MASTER PLAN UPDATE (1-0081.5) - C-1. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT TEXT; C-2. REVIEW OF THE MASTER PLAN DRAFT LAND USE MAP; C-3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING COMPARISON OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS AND PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATIONS; AND, C-4. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING POPULATION PROJECTIONS BASED UPON EXISTING ZONING AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS BASED UPON PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATIONS - Mr. Sullivan suggested a procedure for this meeting and requested an opportunity later in the meeting to address Jim Bawden's and Jay Meierdierck's letters. He indicated there would be meetings on the Master Plan on April 10, April 25, and May 6. The Plan is scheduled for consideration/adoption at the May 29th meeting. Mr. Walter begin the presentation by explaining slides providing the history of Item C-1 and the land use designation comparisons for Item C-3. Ms. Melby explained slides providing the history of Item C-2 and the population comparisons for Item C-4. (Mr. Loomis arrived at 6:32 p.m. during the slides on Item C-2. Commissioner Uhart arrived at 6:43 p.m. during the slides on Item C4. A quorum was present as previously indicated.) Mr. Walter then briefly responded to Mr. Bawden and Mr. Meierdierck's letters. Mr. Sullivan explained a meeting had been planned to discuss Mr. Bawden's concerns related to Item 4 of his letter. The conclusion of this meeting will be presented to the Commission in April or May. He also explained that the notifications would continue to comply with State Statutes and City Code as recommended by Deputy District Attorney Forsberg. Staff was not recommending any change in this procedure. Copies of the revised population estimates--Tables IV-1 and IV-2--were distributed to the Commission and Clerk. This was the reality check requested in Mr. Meierdierck's letter. The land use designations were defined. He felt that the land use element met the environmental constraints found in the area.

(1-0706.5) Mr. Sullivan explained that the Carson River Master Plan had been approved by the Board of Supervisors as recommended. It will now be edited. It contains cross-references to the Commission's Master Plan as well as the Parks and Recreation Plan, Trails and Bikeways Sub-element, the Visual Preference Plan, the

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Special 3/28/96 Joint Meeting with the Bureau of Land Management
and the Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes - Page 2

Capital City Focus Plan, the Downtown Core Plan, the Streets and Highways Plan, and the Airport Master Plan.

(1-0731.5) Commissioner Nietz then questioned Land Use Goal 1 in Chapter 2 as she felt there were conflicts between Policies 1.4, 1.7, and 1.8 and whether there would be a implementation strategy or specific policy mitigating these transition areas. Mr. Walter indicated he would check these. Mr. Walter then indicated that there are procedures in the document which protect environmentally sensitive areas. He also explained the change in map titles. They are now called supplements and not exhibits. These supplements are included in the draft plan. These maps will be referenced throughout the document for clarification. Commissioner Nietz voiced her objection to Policy 11.2. The City has already developed several parking areas and should not be designating areas for parking structures. Mr. Walter explained that this goal may have been in other City documents. Mr. Sullivan agreed to modify the policy to state parking areas as directed by the Commission. Commissioner Nietz noted the present policy to zone mid-block rather than the designated mid-street. Mr. Walter indicated this is a policy decision and agreed to support mid-block. He indicated that he would clarify Page 18. Commissioner Nietz elaborated on her concerns with this page which is an attempt to establish a mixed use neighborhood. Mr. Walter agreed to clarify/rewrite this section. Commissioner Nietz then questioned the medium density allowed under Supplement A, Review Criteria Process and Site Analysis, which she felt was the definition for high density residential. Discussion ensued on Implementation Strategy 7.3.1. regarding the response times for emergency services. Mr. Walter indicated that it would require adoption of the chart/map defining the level of services. Implementation Strategy 9.3.4, limits fences and walls on major roads, was taken from the present Highways and Streets element. Concerning Implementation Strategy 11.1.7, Commissioner Nietz reiterated her comments regarding parking structures due to her feeling that buildings should be restored/rehabed if at all possible. Page III-38 is an attempt to establish a guideline of one residence per acre for the suburban area. Mr. Walter agreed to place an upper limit on the high density residential level of the development chart if so requested. The level of service Table III-8 was established as a guideline. It is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate how the level of service can be met. Commissioner Nietz corrected the population estimate for not built projects as equalling 22,773 rather than the indicated 27,773.

Chairperson Rogers echoed Commissioner Nietz' concerns regarding the parking structures. Clarification indicated a Goal would be added to Page II-3 regarding noise. He then requested an implementation plan be included which would address Policy 8.4. (1-1020.5) Susan Newberry suggested this Policy be worded stronger than "encourage" and urged the Commission to include bikeways as part of the transportation element of Goal 9. Chairperson Rogers suggested "encouraged" be changed to developed. He felt that trails were an intricate part of both the Parks and Recreation and Transportation elements. Clarification by Ms. Newberry indicated Implementation Strategy 8.4.1 should be added to the Transportation Strategies. Chairperson Rogers also supported Commissioner Nietz' recommendation in Goal 11, Page II-6, to modify parking structure to parking area. He then suggested clustering be used not only for environmentally sensitive areas but also to provide open space in PUDs. Mr. Walter agreed and explained that the reason for listing it for environmentally sensitive areas is that it is another tool for meeting a specific goal. He agreed that it should be added to "all the other areas as well".

(1-1108.5) Public testimony was then solicited. Jay Meierdierck explained that his letter in the Commission's packet had been his written comments which were made during the Board of Supervisors' meeting on the request to augment the budget for additional meetings and his written comments submitted at the Commission's November 13 meeting. He then stressed his concern with the zoning friction areas and questioned the methodology and planning principals used to mitigate these friction areas. He felt that elementary schools and residential uses were more compatible than are elementary schools and industrial/commercial uses. He questioned the uses allowed in a neighborhood business zone and its design standards. These uses were indicated as creating a friction area for neighborhood residential areas. Although mixed uses are advocated in the plan, the tables indicate such mixed uses are non-compatible. He questioned why agricultural and single family have a conflict which conservation reserve and single family does not have. Table I-3A indicates community parks are in conflict with all of the residential uses but not the commercial uses. This is reversing the Parks and Recreation program advocating such uses. He supported Commissioner Nietz' comments regarding Policy 1-4 found on Page II-1. He encouraged the use of "prohibit" and "maximize public use" rather than discourage in Goal 6 on Page II-3. He questioned the desire to provide City services to all areas particularly those which are "distant or rural" as related to Policy 7.4 on Page II-4. He urged the Commission to adopt a policy similar to Boulder, Colorado, who had established a service

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Special 3/28/96 Joint Meeting with the Bureau of Land Management
and the Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes - Page 3

area boundary and refused to provide services beyond those boundaries. He requested the Parks and Recreation Commission be given an opportunity to provide input to its element. Mr. Sullivan indicated that the Technical Committee had included a representative from the Commission. Mr. Meierdierck continued to iterate his desire to have the full Commission consider the element prior to adoption. He then explained the Commission's difficulty finding a park area in the northeast section of the City. This is the same area where the consultant had difficulty finding a school site. If a school site is discovered, the Commission would like to have a park adjacent to it. He iterated the need for a park in this vicinity to support his request. He felt that "encourage" in Policy 8.4 should be stronger and supported inclusion of the bicycle in the transportation element with an appropriate expansion of goals. The Carson River Master Plan element should be referenced in other areas as well as Policy 8.3. Goal 9's title should be modified to "Transportation" rather than "Streets and Highways" and include non-motorized forms of transportation. The principals advocated in Policy 9.1 should be itemized. The terms in Implementation Strategy 1.7.4 on Page III-2 should be better defined as any profit generation would make a project economically viable. A building height should be established in the design guidelines for industrial or tourist commercial districts abutting residential sites. The Planning Commission's guidelines for signs were solicited. He suggested that it be considered for identification purposes rather than advertising. Implementation Strategy 2.4.7 conflicts with statement 2.4.7b. Mr. Sullivan felt there is a difference between alleyways and streets and that residences should not face the rear of another residential lot. (1-1400.5) Mr. Meierdierck continued with Page III-20, Strategy 5.2.1 by suggesting the list of facilities be expanded to include multi-family at the least or, preferably, all uses. Goal 6 should use a stronger word than "discourage". If the study recommended in Strategy 6.1.1 has been completed, the statement should reflect it. He suggested a wildlife, natural heritage, and waterways/streams added to the environmentally sensitive issues. He corrected the reference to Exhibit A on Page III-21 to be Supplement A. He questioned when the Land Use Plan defining existing natural resources and vistas would be included as well as the Open Space Sub-element referenced in Strategy 6.3.2. He felt that Exhibit III-2 indicated the By-Pass will be on a fault line as well as in a wetlands, Exhibit III-4. Supplement A should include wildlife and wildlife habitat. Site Analysis should include valley views and skylines or prohibit scars based upon aesthetics and a desire to prevent development of barren hillsides. The Hillside Ordinance should prohibit developments similar to that found just east of Highway 395 in Douglas County. He suggested the addition of an introductory sentence to the designations found at the bottom of Page III-24. "Steep" should be replaced with "slope" under Clustering on Page III-25. He recommended that "less than full credit" be given to developers for areas which are "not suitable for development" as the developer had knowingly purchased this unbuildable land at a reduced value and should receive less than half credit. Page III-25 should cover views from and to a parcel. Page III-26 concerning Lot, Yard and Parking Requirements in Steep Slope Areas should utilize clustering. Fences and walls need to be limited and/or "prohibited" rather than "incorporated" on the same page. Mr. Meierdierck then indicated that there are "many areas of the Plan which he liked". (Commissioner Pozzi stepped from the room at 7:40 p.m. A quorum was still present.) Mr. Meierdierck suggested "numbered zone" be defined on Page III-28. Construction in flood areas should be discouraged. The term "Unnumbered Zone" should be defined on Page III-29. Mr. Walter indicated all flood designations are in the FEMA Floodplain maps/requirements and are defined terms. Exhibits III-7 and 9 follow Page III-30. Strategy 8.3.1 should be expanded to include other areas. Strategy 8.2.2 references the Public Facilities Map, which Mr. Meierdierck wished to see and compare with the Parks and Recreation plans. He suggested Exhibit III-8 be made more legible. He supported the comments to modify III-31 to Transportation rather than Streets and Highways and include non-motorized means of transportation and that it include a section dealing with signage, specifically highway and advertising signage, which would impact the commercial areas. Definitions should be included explaining the various street/highway terms or referencing the Regional Transportation Plan. (Commissioner Pozzi returned at 7:45 p.m. A quorum was present as previously indicated.) Strategy 13.2.3 should be clarified to illustrate the areas of concern. Also, Page III-35 should provide for a rural lifestyle for "some" or "those who want" it. He questioned the travel time used for the high school as downtown Carson City could be reached in less than 75 minutes. Page III-41 indicates the Community College would be in the urban area whereas the Land Use Map indicates rural or suburban. He indicated he did not have a problem with the population methodology and expanded definitions but encouraged their being added to the text. The consultant's figures were similar to his maximum density.

Additional public comments were solicited. (1-1710.5) Russell Best questioned whether any property owner who would be "down zoned" or is in a frictionally zoned area would be compensated. Chairperson Rogers explained an earlier meeting where property owners were able to explain any problems which would be created by the land use

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Special 3/28/96 Joint Meeting with the Bureau of Land Management
and the Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes - Page 4

changes. These areas were later discussed and solutions found. Any additional problems should be pointed out to staff. If staff determines there is a significant disparity, the area could be agendaized for a future meeting. Mr. Best then explained the difficulties encountered when the property is being developed if the project does not comply with the zoning/land use. He felt that the Commission needed to have a "war chest" to address such conflicts. Mr. Sullivan responded by explaining the Master Plan does not address the zoning districts. The Master Plan designates land use ranges. Amendment procedures are included within the Plan. Factors used to establish the land use ranges as well as for justification of the amendments were outlined. Mr. Walter explained that the initial Land Use Map had utilized a point in time for the data base gathering. Any uses approved by the Commission but not yet constructed had been considered as one category. They would be included in the Plan. Developed property is another category which is included. This process began over a year ago and there are uses which have been processed and need to be included. The data base will allow this modification.

(1-1805.5) Don Langson requested his property on Hot Springs maintain its previous land use designation and not be considered as Tourist Commercial with an office overlay. He objected to the request that staff have an opportunity to look at it. He then questioned Table III-1 which indicates that residential uses are in conflict with Tourist Commercial zoning. These residential uses are purportedly primary permitted uses on that property. He questioned how the staff would resolve these conflicts which staff had created. Mr. Sullivan indicated it would be addressed through the designs shown in the Plan. Mr. Langson then expressed his feeling that the design which he and Mr. Sullivan had worked on had provided an additional buffer than that required and his plan was still denied. Mr. Sullivan indicated that this was one of many reasons for the denial. Mr. Langson continued to expound on his feeling that he had not created the conflict. He felt that his zoning had been amended without proper noticing. The City had purportedly caused him to have to request a zone change as mobile home park was not an allowed use under the Tourist Commercial zoning. He is required to notify every one within 300 feet of the property when such a request is made. He felt that staff had arbitrarily undertaken on its own to notify many more individuals who were outside the 300 foot area. This had created a larger "mess" at the Planning Commission meeting. He demanded to know who had made this determination and who had authorized it. Mr. Sullivan indicated he would check into this matter. He is required to notify anyone within 300 feet of the property. Mr. Sullivan invited him to come to his office and discuss this matter. Chairperson Rogers explained that his issue was not on the Master Plan and encouraged him to meet with Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Langson felt that his "item would not be dealt with" and "would be put off".

(1-1948.5) Susan Newberry questioned how the population estimate could be made without a "high end" to the high density residential calculations. Mr. Walter explained that the number which had been used was the average used for Carson City of 14 dwelling units per acre. The high end had used 21 dwelling units per acre. Any development beyond 21 dwelling units per acre would require more than a three story unit. Criteria for development over three stories and the resulting cost would limit such projects. Ms. Newberry stressed the population issues found in Carson City to support her contention that the "high end" needed to be defined. Mr. Sullivan felt that maximum building height in the zone could restrict the buildings to three or four stories.

(1-1998.5) Additional public testimony was solicited but none given. Public testimony was then closed.

Mr. Sullivan read Jim Bawden's letter into the record indicating a follow-up letter listing his concerns would be presented and requesting an opportunity to discuss his concerns at a future meeting. Commissioner Nietz then suggested that staff and the consultants analyze the charts and the different permitted uses allowed for each of the zones. As several areas had been developed as a result of the permit uses, the charts should reflect the use rather than the zoning. Mr. Walter agreed that there had been problems in attempting to separate the different uses and several assumptions had been made to create the charts. Additional suggestions were solicited. Commissioner Nietz felt that the chart had been a good preliminary guideline, however, it was time to analyze it again. Mr. Walter explained the reasons they, as the consultants, had indicated a conflict between neighborhood parks and residential uses. If Carson City does not have these problems, it could be a compatible use. Commissioner Nietz explained that the converse is also true when schools abut commercial or industrial uses. This was the type of judgement calls the consultants had made which the Commission and staff needed to analyze. Commissioner Nietz supported Ms. Newberry's recommendation that the high density residential uses be topped at 21 units per acre.

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Special 3/28/96 Joint Meeting with the Bureau of Land Management
and the Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes - Page 5

(1-2095.5) Discussion among Mr. Walter, Mr. Sullivan and Commissioner Uhart indicated the Airport had established an Airport Layout Plan. It contains areas which are significantly impacted by the Airport and designates areas which should be acquired. The Airport Master Plan includes a chart listing the different uses which would be allowed under flight paths. This allows a "low density" use such as a park, agricultural, etc. Commissioner Uhart indicated she would have opposed Mr. Langson's mobile home park due to her safety concerns related to the Airport. Mr. Sullivan agreed to cross reference the Airport Master Plan in Goal 12 on Page II-6. Mr. Walter indicated FAA established the criteria for the Airport to follow. Commissioner Uhart felt that the development rights also needed to be considered. She then questioned whether the quality of life issues were included in Policy 13.2 found on Page II-7. Mr. Walter indicated these items were identified in the Level of Service Charts as well as parks and schools, etc. Commissioner Uhart urged the addition of trails. Mr. Walter questioned the measurement which would be used to establish the adequacy level. Chairperson Rogers pointed out the adoption of the Parks trail plan which is to be included in the transportation segment. Staff and the consultants agreed to look into her suggestion. Commissioner Uhart felt that XIII-4 included this to a degree. Mr. Sullivan explained the density factors provided for the various park sizes. Criteria mandating a trail system has not been established. Ambulances, fire, police services have standards which can be measured. He suggested that a goal be established which would mandate a trail reach a majority of the people by a set deadline or be interconnected with bike trails. Chairperson Rogers indicated the need to have an obtainable objective and suggested a set number of feet per capita. This has not been created/required previously. Neither Ms. Newberry nor Mr. Kastens were aware of a standard for trails. Ms. Newberry indicated the normal procedure used to add a bike trail is to mandate it be added to any street overlaid within a community or, when a subdivision is being presented, sidewalks and a multi-use trail are required. She was willing to check and see if there is a standard in use elsewhere. Chairperson Rogers indicated the Plan under discussion used the language she had indicated to obtain trails. This plan had been suggested by both Ms. Newberry's office and the Nevada Department of Transportation. Ms. Newberry then explained that the map had been adopted, however, questioned whether there is a plan to go along with the map as it could not be found in the City. Commissioner Uhart then requested a building height restriction for areas where there is a buffer for designated plans with commercial adjacent to residential uses. Under Goal 2 on Page III-8, she recommended removal of Strategy 2.4.4 as it would eliminate any potential bicycle trails in areas where both sides of the road are utilized for parking. Mr. Walter felt that the intent had been to allow local streets to be used for off-street parking in multi-family districts but not minor arterials or collectors. This would be a discretionary issue based on the traffic patterns. Commissioner Uhart felt that this discretion should not be allowed. She suggested criteria which would include a traffic count. Mr. Walter agreed to include the traffic criteria. Commissioner Uhart then recommended a requirement be included in the AO Zone Requirements, Page III-28, placing a condition on the maps indicating flood zones, earthquakes, etc. Mr. Sullivan explained the Statutes mandating this noticing. Commissioner Uhart indicated that this is not always done and explained personal experiences which supported her contention. Clarification indicated she wished to propose an ordinance for noticing such conditions. Commissioner Uhart then requested Strategy 8.4.5 on Page III-31 be modified to: Continue to implement the Bikeways and Trails Transportation System and Plan.....open spaces, neighborhood and high density employment areas within the City to each other." Chairperson Rogers indicated this statement could remain under Parks and Recreation and should be added to Transportation also. Commissioner Uhart modified Page III-52, Strategy SPA-CR.4 to "Add a trail system" as Mr. Bernhard had indicated the trail would be provided. Commissioner Uhart expounded on her suggestion that the wetland area east of the proposed By-Pass be established as a passive recreation and open area, Page III-55. This would allow a trade-off in density. Discussion ensued on the recommended site and its proposed land use. Mr. Sullivan indicated there is a plan for a green belt border along the expressway. This area would serve as a park or for drainage. Mr. Walter also explained the requirement for the developer to provide documentation on the actual location of any wetlands. Commissioner Nietz supported the need for this map and study. Chairperson Rogers also noted the impact a By-Pass would create on the wetlands. The SPA designation merely marks the site for future development. The entire area will be developed at one time with a review by the Planning Commission. Mr. Sullivan agreed that the SPA would include a detailed analysis of the entire site and its constraints. This plan will be considered by the Commission. Mr. Walter indicated the benefits of having it designated "SPA".

Commissioner Christianson then noted the "heartburn" indicated from the City's noticing policy, however, the City is well within the NRS for our notification process. This does not, however, make the people happy. He acknowledged the cost and labor involved with such a process. He questioned how other cities/counties notify

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Special 3/28/96 Joint Meeting with the Bureau of Land Management
and the Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes - Page 6

their constituents and felt that, if there is another method between the two programs, it should be seriously considered. Such an approach may use a different type set to notify property owners as a class. Mr. Sullivan agreed to research this proposal. He explained that Nye County does not do any zoning and never notices anything. Discussion ensued on the pros and cons of noticing one individual class versus the current procedure and various ideas on how to change the current newspaper ad. Chairperson Rogers felt that, if warranted, the Commission should seek additional funding from the Board of Supervisors. Discussion included having CAT-26 post the agenda on its reader board. Mr. Walter indicated all of the Reno's agendas are listed on the public access television station's reader board.

(1-2715.5) As Chairperson to the Parks and Recreation Commission Mr. Meierdierck requested consideration of Page III-31 concerning Strategy 8.4.3. This Strategy is not listed in any other areas of the Plan. His Commission, as does the Planning Commission, makes every effort to notify and accommodate the public of any activities which are occurring. He urged the inclusion of this statement in all phases of the Plan or its elimination from this Section. Mr. Sullivan indicated this requirement should be placed in all of the Plan Elements.

(1-2755.5) Chairperson Rogers suggested Tables III-1 and III-1A have a "plastic overlay" which would illustrate the permitted uses and could be used to compare the conflicts with permitted uses. This could assist when considering conflict areas. Mr. Sullivan cautioned against this proposal due to his feeling it may be costly and extensive. He urged the Commission to maintain a generality as provided within a specific zone and its impacts. Examples illustrating his concerns were provided. Chairperson Rogers explained that the current tables create an erroneous perception as it does not reflect any "gray areas". Mr. Walter expressed the feeling that at a future meeting the consultants could highlight those areas which may be conflicts and the Commission could agree or disagree with same. This could clarify the charts. Chairperson Rogers also noted the variables which make decision harder. Although the Commission may understand this flexibility, the general public may not. The Plan is a general guideline and there are decisions which must be made on these types of issues. Ms. Melby suggested a paragraph be added explaining this flexibility. Chairperson Rogers used the lack of a conflict between schools and industrial/commercial zones as an illustration, specifically, as there could be a conflict between certain industrial uses and schools. Mr. Meierdierck suggested that Page I-5 include elaboration of the planning principals used to establish the chart. Chairperson Rogers agreed that this would be done. The consultants felt that the charts and maps in future copies would be clearer and clarify the designations even more.

Chairperson Rogers thanked all for attending. The comments, suggestions, and recommendation would be analyzed and incorporated if possible.

E. ADJOURNMENT (1-2927.5) - Commissioner Uhart moved to adjourn. Commissioner Nietz seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Chairperson Rogers adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's office. This tape is available for review and inspection during normal business hours.

The Minutes of the Special March 28, 1996, Carson City Regional Planning Commission, Bureau of Land Management, and Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON _____, 1996.

Alan Rogers, Chairperson