



REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

MEMBERS

Terry K .Herman, Chair
Florence 'Marge' Frandsen, Vice-Chair
Fred Lokken
Kendall Mattina
Marvin Moss
Jim Newberg
Steve Rogers
Oscar Sanders
Mark Sullivan
Dave Ziegler, Director

MINUTES

Regional Planning Commission (RPC) REGULAR MEETING WEDNESDAY, 6:30 P.M., February 11, 2004

The Regional Planning Commission met in regular session in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 E. Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Herman at 6:35 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll and the following Commissioners were present: Terry Herman, Marge Frandsen, Fred Lokken, Kendall Mattina, Marvin Moss, Jim Newberg, Steve Rogers, Oscar Sanders, and Mark Sullivan.

Also present were: Dave Ziegler, TMRPA Director; Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel; Randy Baxley, TMRPA; Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA; and Angela Fuss, TMRPA.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COMMISSIONER LOKKEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 11, 2004, AGENDA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MATTINA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 14, 2004, REGULAR MEETING

COMMISSIONER LOKKEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 14, 2004, MEETING MINUTES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FRANDSEN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

- A. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - Proposed amendment to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan, Sky Vista parcel "E" (TMRPA 03-051) - amending the boundary of the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan to exclude ± 3.45 acres currently within the joint plan area and to add ± 1.0 acres to the plan area, located on the eastern and western sides of Sky Vista Parkway south of Silver Lake Road.

Randy Baxley, Senior Regional Planner, stated that Regional Planning staff reviewed this requested amendment and identified no significant concerns. Regional Planning staff recommends a finding of conformance with the Regional Plan, contingent upon the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) adopting an amendment to Map 6 of the Regional Plan to reflect the proposed change to the boundary of the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan.

[The public hearing was opened.]

Karen Boldi, Summit Engineering, provided background on the property. Ms. Boldi stated that the purpose of this request is to provide further continuity within the Sky Vista community for maintenance and security purposes.

[The public hearing was closed.]

COMMISSIONER LOKKEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE RPC DETERMINE THAT THE SKY VISTA PARCEL "E" AMENDMENT TO THE RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN CONFORMS WITH THE GOALS AND POLICIES OF THE REGIONAL PLAN, BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, AND NOTING THE EXCEPTION THAT THE RPGB MUST ADOPT AN AMENDMENT TO MAP 6, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MOSS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- B. PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration and possible adoption of RPC Resolution 04-01, recommending adoption of proposed amendments to 2002 Regional Plan, including:

Dave Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning, suggested first hearing the staff presentations for the three proposed amendments and then come back to the resolution to take action.

- 1) Amendment to Map 6 to adjust the boundary of the Reno-Stead Corridor joint planning area for Sky Vista Parcel "E".

Mr. Baxley stated that Regional Planning staff identified no significant concerns with this proposed amendment and recommend approval of the amendment, and adoption of the relevant portion of RPC Resolution 04-01 recommending to the RPGB adoption of the proposed amendment to the Regional Plan.

- 2) Policy and map amendments related to resort service areas.

Rosanna Coombes, Long-Range and Community Relations Planner, stated that this proposed amendment was presented to the RPC at a workshop on January 28, 2004. Based on the workshop, the RPC directed staff to incorporate guidelines or criteria into the proposed new Policy 1.1.14 to provide direction on the scale of accessory development allowed at a resort destination and the amount

of employee housing allowed at a resort destination. Regional Planning staff incorporated these elements in the proposed Regional Plan amendments.

Ms. Coombes reviewed proposed amendments to Policy 1.1.6, Policy 1.1.14, the Glossary of Terms, and Map 2 of the Regional Plan.

Regional Planning staff recommends adoption of the proposed amendments to the Regional Plan regarding resort destinations.

- 3) Amendments to Maps 2 and 3 making technical corrections to the mapping of the Development Constraints Area (DCA).

Angela Fuss, Planning Analyst, reviewed the proposed corrections to the DCA map. The proposed amendments make technical corrections to the DCA map but do not change the actual policies within the Regional Plan. Based on this analysis, and the discussion from the workshop on January 28, 2004, Regional Planning staff recommends that the RPC approve the proposed amendments to the Regional Plan regarding the DCA maps.

[The public hearing was opened.]

Ms. Boldi concurred with Regional Planning staff and is in agreement with the proposed changes regarding Agenda Items 5.B.1. and 5.B.2.

Adrian Freund, Washoe County Community Development, stated that Washoe County currently has at least one applicant interested in developing tourist destination resorts that are over 100 miles distant from Reno. Because of their isolated location, they can not be characterized as sprawl and they will clearly require supporting residential and retail services. Resorts within 25 miles of the organized areas of Washoe County are far different in nature in terms of requiring support development than places like Mt. Rose. The proposed approach inadequately considers the different types and locations of resorts and their different support and service needs. The appropriate approach may be the development of a set of criteria and guidelines for such resorts that are related both to the type of resort use and the remoteness from the urban center. It may also be appropriate to address resorts that could be located within the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA). Those type of resorts may be region shaping in terms of form and pattern of development. Mr. Freund expressed concern about the process being overly cumbersome for local governments, given staff constraints and workloads. In case the RPC chooses to adopt this amendment, Mr. Freund would like to see the County's proposed wording changes included. If the amendment is adopted as currently worded, the County will likely come forward with Regional Plan amendments to address the County's concerns.

[The public hearing was closed.]

Chair Herman asked Ms. Coombes if Regional Planning staff considered any of Mr. Freund's issues. Ms. Coombes responded that if a resort destination is located some distance from the urban center, and it is determined that it will require the creation of an urban center to support it, there is a mechanism in the Regional Plan to deal with that already. An amendment to the Regional Plan would be required to create an additional Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA).

Commissioner Lokken raised a point of order in the sense that the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 278 defines Regional Planning scope and it does not include Gerlach. Commissioner Lokken stated that Mr. Freund's point of view is not germane to the discussion tonight, unless it is raised specific to the jurisdictional boundaries of regional planning.

Commissioner Sullivan felt that some points in Mr. Freund's correspondence should be addressed. Commissioner Sullivan asked what areas the Regional Plan covers. Ms. Coombes responded that the statute indicates that the jurisdiction of the Regional Plan is all of Washoe County, less Incline Village and tribal lands.

Commissioner Sullivan clarified that the Regional Plan would apply to Gerlach. What we are talking about is having the opportunity to look at some of these resorts by right rather than by permission. Some of the things Mr. Freund has mapped out would provide that opportunity. Rather than someone having to come through a process, we could define the criteria under which they would be allowed to be developed in those areas where they are not relying on the services of the Truckee Meadows.

Commissioner Frandsen asked why the systems for planning destination resorts in other areas would not work here. Ms. Coombes responded that the approach other areas are taking is to create a planning hole. Given the history in this region, the concerns for planning holes always seems to be a source of conflict between entities.

Commissioner Moss stated that Mesquite is now a huge destination resort and asked if this region could have accommodated something like that. Ms. Coombes stated that there is nothing that would preclude a small resort destination out in the middle of the desert. There is always the opportunity to come in for a Regional Plan amendment if needed.

Commissioner Moss asked Mr. Freund if he feels the amendment process is viable. Mr. Freund agreed with Regional Planning staff that there are other service areas that could be designated within the Regional Plan. Mr. Freund stated that we deal with multi-county economic dynamics. The dynamics of economic development far removed from Reno and Sparks are extremely different than they are closer to the Truckee Meadows. Those unanticipated developments that will occur in Washoe County need to be considered.

Commissioner Moss stated that Mr. Freund is talking about economic development areas and resort development areas. This issue deals with resort development areas. Mr. Freund stated that economic development opportunities would be an attractor for other support services.

Commissioner Moss asked Ms. Coombes if Reno and Sparks have been able to respond to Mr. Freund's proposed changes. Ms. Coombes stated that she spoke with Margaret Powell, City of Sparks, today. Ms. Powell supported what is being proposed in the staff report. Ms. Coombes spoke with John Hester, City of Reno, last week. Mr. Hester stated that he would contact Ms. Coombes before the RPC meeting if he had any concerns. Ms. Coombes has not heard any comments since then from Mr. Hester.

Commissioner Frandsen stated that this subject deserves more discussion between the entities and the Regional Planning Agency (RPA). Some of the suggested changes in wording made by Mr. Freund are deserving of change.

Commissioner Lokken stated that Regional Planning staff has done an excellent job. Commissioner Lokken commented that if economics is the engine, why is there any zoning on the ground at all. The issue of right versus permission was framed very well by Commissioner Sullivan. A regional plan that brings consistency and balance and allows us to look at something is a good thing, not an obstruction to economic development. This is a good default standard with proposed clarified default language on resorts. If there are other ideas, they can come forward through a proper review process. If it is by right, it would only go through Washoe County.

Commissioner Sullivan stated that there is no benefit to regional planning when developing a resort in Gerlach. The comments Mr. Freund made do warrant taking another look to see how they can be incorporated into the document.

Commissioner Mattina stated that she likes what Regional Planning staff proposed. This region does provide medical services, road maintenance and other services in rural areas. Anything that is going on out there really does need to come before the RPC and Washoe County for review.

Commissioner Moss stated that something developing in Gerlach of significant size does have regional impact. Our responsibility is to the region except for Incline and the Indian lands. Commissioner Moss stated that he supports the document as currently written.

Commissioner Newberg stated that he supports the document as currently written.

Chair Herman stated that he looks forward to input from Mr. Freund regarding proposed wording for an amendment for issues related to support services in remote areas. What we have on the table tonight is good planning. Changes can be made through the amendment process if needed.

COMMISSIONER LOKKEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE RPC APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO MAP 6 OF THE REGIONAL PLAN ADOPTING THE RELEVANT PORTION OF RPC RESOLUTION 04-01, AND RECOMMEND TO THE RPGB ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE 2002 REGIONAL PLAN FOR SKY VISTA PARCEL "E", SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FRANDBSEN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

COMMISSIONER LOKKEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE RPC MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE RPGB TO ADOPT PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE REGIONAL PLAN REGARDING RESORT DESTINATIONS, AS DESCRIBED IN THE STAFF REPORT, BASED ON FINDINGS ONE AND TWO OF THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MATTINA.

Commissioner Sanders stated that he would support the motion as long as any future amendments brought by the County are considered in good faith by the members of this commission.

Commissioner Sullivan stated that he will not support the motion because we have the opportunity to make those corrections tonight.

Commissioner Frandsen stated that, based on the discussion by Commissioner Sullivan, she will not be supporting the motion.

Commissioner Rogers stated that he would also not be able to support the motion, based on discussion by Commissioner Sullivan.

Commissioner Lokken stated that if there was any harm or impediment that would be created by supporting this motion tonight, he would understand. County staff has indicated a capability to bring forward further amendments. We are already into the second year of this Regional Plan and we need to be addressing a number of these issues. This language helps us to do that.

Chair Herman stated that if Washoe County had brought specific language forth tonight, it could have been considered.

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH SIX (6) IN FAVOR AND THREE (3) OPPOSITIONS BY COMMISSIONERS FRANDBSEN, ROGERS AND SULLIVAN.

COMMISSIONER LOKKEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE RPC APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE REGIONAL PLAN REGARDING THE DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS AREA MAPS, AS DESCRIBED IN THE STAFF REPORT, BASED ON FINDINGS ONE AND TWO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NEWBERG. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the spelling of the word comprehensive in the first line of the Resolution will be corrected. A finding required by state law was inadvertently left out of the Resolution and will be added.

COMMISSIONER MOSS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 04-01 WITH THE CHANGES MENTIONED BY MR. ZIEGLER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER LOKKEN. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH SIX (6) IN FAVOR AND THREE (3) OPPOSITIONS BY COMMISSIONERS FRANDBSEN, ROGERS AND SULLIVAN.

- C. WORKSHOP - Discussion and possible direction to staff on proposed amendments and additions to the RRGB Regulations on Procedure on:
- 1) Annual reports;
 - 2) Conformance review of facility plans, and
 - 3) Appeals of decisions of the RPC and the Director of Regional Planning

Mr. Ziegler stated that Regional Planning staff feels that no changes are needed in the regulations in the areas of annual reports and appeals. Regional Planning staff suggests that there might be a benefit to making a change in the regulations in the conformance review of facility plans.

Mr. Ziegler stated that it may be appropriate for the RRGB's regulations to provide more definition on responsibilities for ensuring that required conformance reviews actually occur. At the present time, the RPA reviews the plans that are submitted for conformance review, but does not have a program for monitoring the development of facilities plans and making sure they are submitted to the RPC.

To help ensure that required conformance reviews take place on schedule and that the local governments and affected entities are aware of the statutory requirements, a brief regulation could be written that would direct the Director of Regional Planning to monitor the development and amendment of facilities plans by local governments and affected entities, report periodically to the RPC on the

results of that monitoring, and at the appropriate time, notify a local government or affected entity, in writing, that it must submit a facilities plan or amendment for conformance review pursuant to NRS 278.028 or 278.0282.

Commissioner Mattina asked if there would be a penalty for an entity that is notified that a plan needs to be submitted for conformance review and they choose not to submit it for some reason. Would there be any enforcement measure. Mr. Ziegler stated that his experience is that the remedy would be civil remedies.

Norm Azevedo, Legal Counsel, stated that in that situation a petition for a declaratory order or judgment would be sought in District Court. Also, there is the possibility for either a temporary restraining order (TRO) or a preliminary and permanent injunction. That could subject the particular affected entity to damages for any private parties who rely on the plan that was being implemented.

Commissioner Mattina asked if it would be incumbent on the developers that had a proposal forward based on an existing plan that had not be reviewed for conformance to seek civil damages against the governmental entity. Mr. Azevedo responded that initiating the action could come from the RPGB. If a court found that a local government were in non-conformance, and that the government agency was operating outside the parameters of statutes and laws, and in violation of a temporary restraining order (TRO) or an injunction, it could subject that entity to damages.

Mr. Ziegler stated that if this regulation is adopted, it will provide some clarity and put a duty on the RPA to notify entities.

Commissioner Frandsen stated that if this played out in court action and somebody has to pay, the taxpayers are the ones that will be paying.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if there is a requirement in the Regional Plan that the RPC perform conformance reviews of facility plans. Mr. Ziegler responded that the statute says that a local government or affected entity may not put a master plan, facility plan, or other similar plan into effect until the RPC has made a finding of conformance.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if not putting this rule in place would give some kind of standing to be able to appeal the RPC decision based on the fact that the RPC did not approve the facility plan according to the statute. Mr. Azevedo stated that the RPC does not have a duty to go out and beat the bushes for all the plans that would be subject to conformance review. The RPGB was given regulatory authority to clarify these issues that have not been spoken to in statute. Mr. Azevedo suggested getting that clarification.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if the RPC has an exposure by not having this clarified. Mr. Azevedo recommended that the rules be clarified because the RPC is charged with the obligation for regional planning. Part of that obligation is to perform conformance reviews of certain plans.

Commissioner Sullivan recommended that we do clarify it and put something in writing and put that burden on the other entities.

Mr. Ziegler stated that he will re-agendize this after working on it with Mr. Azevedo and getting some of the affected entities involved informally.

Chair Herman stated that it seems logical that there should be some kind of check-off and tracking mechanism.

Commissioner Lokken stated that this does not go to the heart of the problem, which is the lack of coordination and the attitude we have seen from some of the agencies.

Mr. Ziegler stated that Regional Planning staff is having discussions about coordination among all the entities with the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the Regional Water Planning Commission (RWPC) staffs.

- D. Discussion and possible recommendation to adopt proposed amendments to the RPGB Regulations on Procedure on dispute resolution.

Ms. Coombes stated that the parties to the Settlement Agreement participated in a series of status hearings with Judge Hardesty where a number of items related to the Settlement Agreement were discussed. The issue of changes to the Regulations on Procedure related to dispute resolution were discussed. The Court considered all of the proposed changes at a hearing on December 19, 2003. Ms. Coombes reviewed the order entered by the Court on this issue.

The Court ordered that all Boards and Commissions that were parties to the Settlement Agreement shall consider the acceptance of the revised regulations at their next available meeting. The Court added that should any party vote to decline the revisions, the existing regulations shall govern. Ms. Coombes reported that all of the entities have reviewed and approved the revisions.

Chair Herman asked Mr. Azevedo if he had any reservations regarding the appeal process. Mr. Azevedo responded that he is comfortable with the proposed regulations.

COMMISSIONER MOSS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE RPGB REGULATIONS ON PROCEDURE CONTAINED IN THE STAFF REPORT AND TO RECOMMEND THE AMENDMENT TO THE RPGB, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROGERS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- E. Discussion and possible direction to staff on 2005 legislative strategy.

Ms. Coombes stated that there are items listed in the staff report that are being monitored by Regional Planning staff. There have been no major developments since the January 14, 2004, RPC meeting. Ms. Coombes reported that Regional Planning staff is continuing to research separate funding sources for the RPA, as requested by the RPGB.

Chair Herman asked if the suggestions for legislative action from the last RPC meeting will go to the RPGB at their next meeting. Mr. Ziegler responded that they will.

Commissioner Mattina asked why a separate funding source is needed.

[Commissioner Sullivan left at 8:20 p.m.]

Mr. Ziegler stated that there was a committee of the RPC known as the Committee on Outstanding Issues or the Garage Committee. That committee had raised the question as to whether an independent funding source would be preferable. The idea also came up through the strategic planning process at a

workshop in September 2002. It was suggested that the RPA serve more of an informational and analytical role within the region. In order to do that, the RPA should have an independent funding source.

[Commissioner Sullivan returned at 8:23 p.m.]

Commissioner Mattina asked if there was a feeling that an independent funding source would relieve any obligation to any specific governmental entity on specific issues. Mr. Ziegler responded that is his understanding.

Commissioner Lokken stated that the Garage Committee had looked at the process of funding the update, which had to be a special request to the funding entities. At least two of the entities were in budget crunch at that time and did not see a regional priority. The other issue is that we looked at other regional activities and realized that the notion of some autonomy and a dedicated funding source seem to be a natural progression. It would be a reliable funding source that would not be eliminated for political reasons. There has been at least one entity threatening to withhold money from the RPA because it did not agree with what the RPA was doing.

Commissioner Mattina asked if a governmental entity has the right to withdraw their support financially.

Chair Herman stated that the RPGB has to approve the budget and the RPGB consists of the three entities.

Commissioner Moss stated that there is no real logical reason for the 40/30/30 split. It is not based on population or wealth. It is more logical for the RPA to be established by taking a piece of the property tax.

6. DIRECTORS, MEMBERS, AND LEGAL COUNSEL INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Report on actions and agendas of the Regional Planning Governing Board.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the RPGB will meet tomorrow. Mr. Ziegler reviewed the agenda items that will be considered by the RPGB.

[Commissioner Rogers left at 8:27 p.m.]

B. Legal counsel's report - Status report and possible direction to staff on:

Mr. Azevedo requested that agenda item 6.B.3 be addressed out of order.

- 3) Request, if any, for judicial review of the final determination of the Regional Planning Commission and the RPGB certifying the City of Reno Annexation Program 2003-2009 as conforming with the Regional Plan.

Mr. Azevedo distributed copies of a letter from the District Attorney's office and a pleading from Washoe County received yesterday regarding this issue.

[Commissioner Rogers returned at 8:30 p.m.]

Mr. Azevedo recommended that this case be consolidated with the other proceedings going on before Judge Hardesty. Mr. Azevedo stated that Judge Hardesty has a strong familiarity with the issues that were raised during the settlement of the case referred to in the pleading.

Mr. Azevedo requested a motion from the RPC to allow him to file a motion to consolidate this new case with the existing case in Judge Hardesty's courtroom.

COMMISSIONER LOKKEN MADE A MOTION TO ENDORSE LEGAL COUNSEL'S RECOMMENDATION TO CONSOLIDATE THE CASES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROGERS.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if there was a reason that the letter from the District Attorney's office states that it is not critical that this case is in front of Judge Hardesty. Mr. Azevedo responded that when he last spoke to the attorneys, they all agreed to go back to Judge Hardesty on this issue.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- 1) Washoe County and Sun Valley GID appeal to the 2nd Judicial District Court of RRGB Decision 03-02 in Case DR03-001-RRGB: Washoe County and Sun Valley General Improvement District appeal of Regional Planning Commission Decision 03-03 in dispute resolution case DR03-006-RPC;
- 2) Hearings held on January 27, and February 3 and 4, 2004, in the 2nd Judicial District Court regarding the settlement agreement dated October 17, 2002; and

Mr. Azevedo reported on the status of the Bushey/Busi and Beckworth/McMullen mediations. Mr. Azevedo stated that the opening brief for the judicial review on case DR03-006-RPC is not due until the latter part of February. Once Mr. Azevedo receives the opening brief, he will provide copies to the RPC members. The RPC will have a chance to review Mr. Azevedo's responsive brief before it is submitted.

Commissioner Lokken stated that he is perplexed by the use of the District Attorney's office in lawsuits representing a portion of the population of Washoe County. Commissioner Lokken asked if there should be a requirement that the County retains its own legal advise and not use a District Attorney's office which is supposed to serve all of the County's population.

Commissioner Sullivan responded that it would be wasting more tax dollars.

7. REQUESTS FOR AND ACTION ON FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Commissioner Lokken asked Regional Planning staff to include the wording for possible motions in the staff reports.

Commissioner Sanders expressed concern that the information from agencies reviewing projects that come before the RPC and the RRGB is not getting to the local jurisdictions.

- A. Tentative RPC meeting schedule for March and April, 2004.

Mr. Ziegler reviewed tentative agenda items for the RPC's February and March meetings.

Commissioner Lokken asked if at least the Chair and Vice-Chair of the RPC will be involved in developing the performance criteria for the Director of Regional Planning. Commissioner Lokken feels that the RPC should also be involved in the annual evaluation process. Mr. Ziegler responded that he would raise that question with the RRGB tomorrow.

B. Discussion of the 2004 schedule of RPC actions.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the last four pages of the meeting packet are the 12-month calendar. The calendar has been updated and now runs through February 2005.

8. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Herman adjourned the meeting at 8:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

Reviewed by:

Approved by:

Dave Ziegler, Director

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

Terry K. Herman, Chair

Regional Planning Commission

**APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION IN SESSION ON _____,
2004.**