

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

The Humboldt County Regional Planning Commission Meeting was held on December 8, 2011 at 5:30PM in the County Meeting room of the Humboldt County Courthouse located at 50 West Fifth Street, Winnemucca, Nevada.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Ray Olsen
Vickie Rock
Stephen Nye

Pam Wickkiser
Theresa Mavity
Lewis Trout

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Giovette Cassinelli

STAFF PRESENT

Betty Lawrence
Jennifer Wright

LEGAL COUNSEL

Mike Macdonald

PUBLIC PRESENT

Kent Barrett
Linda Fetters
John Milton

Michael Michaelson
Buddy Quilici
Rudy Herndon

Tom Heskett
Tammie Quilici
Stephen West

I. OPENING

Pam called the meeting to order at 5:30PM.

Pam asked if there was anyone who wanted to make public comment. None was offered.

Pam asked if there were any concerns or corrections for the minutes of November 10, 2011. It was noted that the minutes had the wrong date. Lewis asked to change the wording for his disclosure on UH-11-07 to read, "that he shares mutual fund ownership in a company that owns shares in Barrick." A request was made to fix the date of the minutes to read November 10, 2011. Pam asked for a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Ray motioned to approve the minutes of November 10th as amended; second by Theresa. Motion carried unanimously with Pam and Stephen abstaining.

Pam asked if there were any requests for postponement of agenda items. Betty indicated there was one postponement, item "A" under public hearing (UH-11-08) until January 12, 2012.

II. CONSENT AGENDA/DISCUSSION & ACTION

Pam read the consent agenda process and the following agenda item:

- A. SN-11-11 A request and recommendation from the Regional Street Naming Committee to name the road to an existing ranch Julian Creek Road. The road is located on the property within Sections 15 and 16 T38N, R42E, M.D.B. & M; assessor's parcel numbers 007-121-01, 007-121-23, 007-541-02 & 007-541-01.

Pam asked if there was anyone in the public had any comments. Seeing none, she brought it back to the board. Pam asked for a motion, Ray motioned to approve the item; second by Vickie. Motion passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC HEARING/DISCUSSION & ACTION

Pam read the following agenda items:

- A. RH-11-02 A rezone application submitted by Robert & Tammie Quilici to change the zoning from RR-13 MH (Rural Ranchette-13, 000 sf minimum lot size with a Mobile Home Overlay) to R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) on property located at 4205 & 4205 ½ Center Street; assessor's parcel #'s 010-361-20 & 010-361-29.

Ray reminded the board that this had been tabled from the October 27, 2011 meeting. He then invited the applicant, Buddy Quilici, to come forward. Ray informed Mr. Quilici that the board was satisfied with the findings, but at the meeting there was public comment. Ray asked Mr. Quilici what his plan was for development. Mr. Quilici indicated that his development plan is for apartments. Ray asked single level or two story. Mr. Quilici stated that he's not sure right now. He would probably build two bedroom apartments, four to eight units, metal roof, stucco and built by a licensed contractor. Lewis asked about the surrounding land uses that currently exist. Mr. Quilici indicated that there are mobile home parks in the area. He feels that this project would assimilate well into the community. Lewis said there were concerns about service activity, vehicle restoration. Mr. Quilici stated that he races and works on his own vehicles in the shop. Lewis asked if the shop and trailer would remain on the property. Lewis then clarified that there would be apartments, the shop and the single wide. Mr. Quilici said the shop would remain and the trailer if it was allowed. The trailer could possibly be moved closer to the shop. Vickie asked about access to the smaller lot. Mr. Quilici indicated that there is an existing driveway that would provide access. Mr. Quilici indicated that he does own Sonoma Construction and there is some storage on the east side of the property. Lewis asked if this type of storage could be continued with the change of zoning designation. Betty indicated that she would have to check. There was discussion regarding what type of storage, safety for occupants of apartments; especially children. Mr. Quilici stated that any storage would be fenced. Ray asked if it would be obscure fencing. Mr. Quilici said the front part would be chain link with slats. Lewis asked about the back of the property. Mr. Quilici indicated that it's already fenced. Lewis asked for clarification that there would be no possible access into the area for storage. Mr. Quilici stated that there would be no access. Ray asked if there were any other questions from the board. Seeing none, he took it out to the public. Linda Fetter approached the board. Ms. Fetter's voiced concerned about machinery on the property; lights from the shop shine on her property; apartment buildings are not appropriate for the area and there is not a fence at this time on the property. Ray pointed out that there are other large shops/garages on properties in the area. Ms. Fetter's agreed that other property owners have shops in the area, but she feels that Mr. Quilici is running his business out of his shop. She referred to a statement that Mr. Quilici made that this project would increase the property values in the area, she disagrees. Stephen asked if

it would help if there was obscure fencing around the property. Ms. Fetters said obscure fencing is not attractive. She indicated that there was a junk yard on the property before with a lot of weeds, but it's been cleaned up. Ms. Fetters indicated that she would like to maintain the rural atmosphere of the neighborhood. Theresa verified with Ms. Fetters that her concern is the possibility of a business being run from the shop and possible multi-family dwellings. Lewis verified with Ms. Fetter it is her view that this would change the character of the area which is mainly rural. Lewis asked if Steve West, City Manager/Engineer, may have a comment. Mr. West stated he had three concerns: is high density zoning appropriate, if there is a commercial operation is there a home occupation permit or is it grandfathered in; there is a legitimate concern regarding the area becoming a high density residential area. Mike Macdonald pointed out the issue before the board is the high density rezone, not a compliance issue with current zoning regulations. Stephen commented that he doesn't see a reason to object. There was discussion between Pam, Stephen and Ray. Lewis voiced concern that there would be significant change in land use. He stated that he has reservations about the proposal. Stephen said he feels there is no reason to object and would possibly require a fence around the property, this is good use of the land. Ms. Fetters pointed out that the reason people live in the area is because it's rural. Theresa asked Betty if any other comments were received from adjacent property owners. Betty indicated none had been received. Mr. West commented that once an R-3 zoning was approved there would be no limit to the number of apartments that could be built later. Lewis said that the change to the one parcel in the neighborhood would change the character and could have significant impact on uses in the area down the road in terms of traffic and density. He has reservations about doing that at this time. Ray asked Mr. Quilici to come back before the board. He asked Mr. Quilici what his response was to Ms. Fetters comments. Mr. Quilici indicated that he had spoken with neighbors in the area of his property and they voiced no concerns with this rezone. Ray asked if he had spoken with Ms. Fetter. Mr. Quilici indicated that he had not talked to her as he knew how she felt about it. Lewis clarified with staff that all adjacent property owners were notified per public hearing requirements and no comments were received. Ray asked if the board was ready to propose a motion or if there was more discussion. Lewis stated that if the application was to be approved a condition requiring fencing including security be part of the approval. Mike Macdonald told the board that this is not an appropriate condition at this time. This is a condition that would be appropriate for a site plan. Betty asked if a site plan could be a condition for this application. The county doesn't have a site plan requirement. In the past it has been at the discretion of staff. There was discussion regarding the purpose of a rezone and this application. There was discussion regarding placing a condition requiring a site plan on this application. Mike Macdonald reminded board that what they are voting on tonight is a recommendation to the County Commissioners for the rezone. Mike indicated that if the board wanted to add a recommendation for a site plan he could look into it further. He is leaning towards that this is outside the rezone application. Ray asked Mr. Quilici if he would be willing to authorize the application to be tabled once more to allow the legal department to look into this. Mr. Quilici agreed to have his application tabled to allow legal to review. Ray motioned to table this item for further study by the legal department; second by Lewis. Motion passed unanimously. Mike Macdonald asked that it be part of the record that Mr. and Mrs. Quilici agreed to a continuance of this matter.

Pam read the following agenda items:

- B. RH-10-08 A rezone application submitted by Desert Mountain Surveying on behalf of Robert D. Stitser to change the zoning from RR-1.25 AH (Rural Ranchette – 1.25 acre minimum lot size with an Airport Hazard Combining District Overlay) to RR-20 PD AH (Rural Ranchette – 20,000 sf minimum lot size with Planned Development and Airport Hazard Combining District overlays); to change the zoning from NC-R AH (Neighborhood Commercial with an Airport Hazard Combining District Overlay) to NC-R PD AH (Neighborhood Commercial with Planned Development and Airport Hazard Combining District Overlays); to change the zoning from M-1 TRZ AH (Industrial with an Airport Hazard Combining District overlay) to M-1 PD AH (Industrial with a Planned Development and Airport Hazard Combining District Overlays). These changes will affect four (4) parcels (approximately 50.51 acres) located on West Rose Creek Road between Pine Street and Sandhill Circle; assessor's parcel #'s 013-111-01, 013-111-02, 013-111-03 & 013-112-01.

John Milton approached the board. Mr. Milton stated that when he originally contacted the planning department regarding a planned development application he was informed that there was no application for planned development. Staff indicated that the rezone application is what would be used. Mr. Milton referred to NRS 278A which requires the county to have a planned development application if an ordinance is in place. Mr. Milton explained that a planned development is not a rezone. It's a change of the master plan and the zoning will not change. If approved it would create a planned development not in compliance with the current zoning. He explained the process of obtaining approval for the planned development and what would follow after approval. Mr. Milton stressed that the application is not for a rezone, but for a planned development. Mr. Milton indicated that the planned development anticipates there will be conflict with the existing zoning. He then referred to Humboldt County Code 17.48.040, subdivisions. He eventually will ask for approval of a subdivision. Mr. Milton referred to NRS 278A.110, site 2 regarding intensity and density of land use. He stated that the NRS chapter regarding planned development requires a common space which our ordinance does not refer to. He pointed out on the tentative plan that there is a common space. Mr. Milton then explained there is a definition of common space in NRS 278A. Mr. Milton then referred to Humboldt County Code 17.48.050, zoning map designations. Ray asked if there would be a water and sewer system for this development. Mr. Milton started to respond and Lewis asked to go back to the previous conversation. Lewis pointed out that in the application one of the questions is, will the proposed plan conflict with the adopted general plan for the area? The answer is no and the comment is approval of planned development district is considered an amendment to the general plan. There was discussion between Lewis and Mr. Milton with references made to Humboldt County

Code 17.70 and NRS 278A. John asked why we'd have the planned unit development ordinance if he can't do anything other than what the zoning says. Discussion followed between Lewis, Mr. Milton and Mike Macdonald regarding the density, zoning and the master plan. Mike pointed out that density is often times driven by the availability of sewer, water or other types of utilities or services. John indicated that's one of the things we looked at. There was more discussion referencing NRS 278A. Mr. Milton pointed out that if the property was developed as it is today, there would be individual septic tanks, no paved roads and no common area would be required. The idea of this application is to develop the property as smaller lots which are easier to sell on paved roads. People would be less likely to accumulate items on the smaller lots. It will cost more, were going to put in a sewer treatment plant. So the trade off is we get more lots, we spend more money, we put in all the amenities and we have a small development that would be a benefit to the county. The only way to do it was with the planned development which is being proposed. If this application is approved, there is a long list of things we have to do. We'd have to do topographic mapping, traffic study for NDOT, preliminary sewage plan to NDEP, transfer the water rights and then prepare and submit to the Regional Planning Commission and County Commissioners a tentative map and precise plan. There is a time limit on filing your preliminary and precise plan. If these items are not filed within the time allowed the zoning designation of PD goes away and you're back to where you were at the beginning. Lewis asked if the property were to be developed as it is today, would the same requirements not apply? Mr. Milton stated no because consecutive parcel maps can be filed which would require the traffic study and relinquishment of the water rights. He would probably do a basic topographic map, but it wouldn't be something sent to a government agency. Ray asked what type of sewer system and processing plant is planned. There was discussion regarding what type of system has been looked into. Ray asked what it would do to the aquifer. There was further discussion regarding the type of sewer system. Lewis commended Mr. Milton for the information provided and the supporting material for his project. John stated that he, Mr. Stitser and a third party see a need in the future for smaller lots to be developed. Mr. Milton indicated with the precise plan there would probably be a home owners association and restrictive covenants. Ray asked if there would be any stick properties or strictly mobile homes. John indicated it would not be mobile homes, at the minimum it would be manufactured housing. Ray asked about the airport hazard thing, noise pollution regarding the increase in population. He indicated in the future there would be more commercial air traffic in the area. Mr. Milton referred to the study he and Mr. Stitser provided regarding housing in the area of the Reno airport. Mr. Milton stated that under the present AH zoning the only restriction is height, there could be a possibility of an aviation height easement placed on the property. Stephen commented the nature of airport use suggests that anything that can be done to prevent housing and introduce industrial/commercial use is a greater benefit to us. He indicated that for the future of the county and the airport area we need to strongly think industrial/commercial not housing. This does not follow where we need to be headed. Lewis asked if Mr. West, as airport manager, could come to the table. Mr. West approached the board and stated he is here to pass along information for the airport board on this type of proposal to create a higher density residential area this close to our primary runway. He described the airport setup referring to the runways, types of aircraft and the airport master plan. Mr. West acknowledged Mr. Milton's argument about maybe this is not a rezone. He indicated that

if you're allowing a higher density residential area, in order for a property owner to do that it has the same impact as a rezone and that is why the airport board is so strongly concerned. He pointed out areas like Reno and how they have had tremendous costs associated with buying out residents in residential areas and modifying insulating residential area of the homes in those areas as a result of their increased aircraft traffic. Mr. West said he thinks it is wise to think long term and is this the right place for higher density residential. He agreed there is a tremendous need for housing in this community, but we, as the airport board, are encouraging you not to allow any type of high density residential developments in the areas approximate to our airport approach zones. Mr. West then indicated they have asked their consultants whether or not this particular property would be affected by noise. The consultants indicated that this property would not be affected by the noise based on their criteria. Mr. West went on to explain the criteria used for noise by the FAA. He reiterated the Airport Board's concern regarding this kind of development in this area. There was discussion between Mr. West, Stephen and Lewis regarding potential noise issues. Lewis asked Mr. West if the property were to be developed as it is currently zoned would that be something the Airport Board would find acceptable. Mr. West indicated that if the density was not increased the board would support it. Pam asked if there was anyone else who would like to make a comment. Kent Barrett approached the board. He stated his main concern is the aquifer and future water availability. Another concern with people in the area is the smaller lots which would increase the traffic in the area. Mr. Barrett said another concern is access to the inside and outside perimeter of the property in terms of fire protection. John Milton approached the board and explained Mr. Stitser's existing water rights and what would be relinquished to drill wells on this property. Ray asked Mr. Milton if a water system was planned. Mr. Milton stated that there was no discussion about a water system, but a sewer system. He told the board that Mr. Stitser owns 240 acre feet of irrigation water rights. A portion of this would be utilized to supply water to these homes. Pam asked if anyone else would like to make a comment. Tom Heskett approached the board. Mr. Heskett voiced the same concerns as Mr. Barrett. Pam asked if there were anymore comments from the public, seeing none she brought it back to the board. Lewis referred to page 4 of the staff report and the findings portion of the staff report. Wherein the zone change is not in compliance with the master plan or compatible with the current property uses in the area. He also pointed out the scope and purpose and uses permitted under the planned unit ordinance Chapter 17.48 of the Humboldt County code. He commented that he feels the board is being asked to prove something that is not in keeping with these goals, prevailing land uses in the area, not in keeping with the general plan. Lewis further commented that he feels conceptually we have an amendment to the general plan that changes density and at this point an inappropriate plan to approve. Stephen stated he does not see a need for a housing development in the airport area. Commercial, industrial, but extremely minimal on any housing to be built. Lewis verified that he and Stephen are in agreement that the existing density needs to be maintained. Lewis suggested a possible sixth condition to be included in the recommendation to the County Commissioners. This condition would be some form of disclosure by the seller acknowledgement by the buyer regarding possible noise issues in this area. There was discussion regarding this suggestion. Stephen motioned to deny this request, second by Ray. Motion carried unanimously.

Pam questioned whether each of these agenda items need to be read separately. It was indicated that each item is to be read separately. Pam read the following agenda item:

- D. **TH-11-02** A text amendment to Chapter 17.10 General Provisions of the Humboldt County Code to correct yard requirement designations to reflect yard requirement designations in Chapter 17.23.

Betty explained that it's being amended to meet what the zoning district requires this chart did not do that so that's what we're doing. Pam asked if there were any questions or corrections, discussions. Pam took it out to the public, brought it back to board. Ray motioned to approve amendment, second by Theresa. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- E. **TH-11-03** A text amendment to Chapter 17.12 Residential District Provisions of the Humboldt County Code to amend home occupations to reflect home based businesses; home occupation to reflect home based business; special use permit to reflect conditional use permit.

Lewis motioned to approve the amendment; second by Theresa. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- F. **TH-11-04** A text amendment to Chapter 17.20 AG District of the Humboldt County Code to add recreational vehicles as a permitted use with the re-lettering to reflect the addition of recreational vehicles; amend home occupations to reflect home based businesses.

Pam asked the board if they had questions, took it to the public. Theresa motioned to approve the amendment; second by Ray. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- G. **TH-11-05** A text amendment to Chapters 17.23 RR District; 17.24 R-1 District; 17.26 R-3 District and 17.50 MHP District of the Humboldt County Code to amend home occupations to reflect home based businesses.

Pam asked if the board had any questions, then took it to the public. Mike Macdonald commented on 17.23.040. Should be "based" instead of "base." Vicki motioned to approve amendment with the correction; second by Lewis. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- H. **TH-11-06** A text amendment to Chapter 17.28 NC-R District of the Humboldt County Code to amend the ordinance to delete bars from permitted uses and re-

letter to reflect the removal of bars; amend home occupations to reflect home based businesses.

Pam asked if the board had any questions, seeing none she then took it out to the public. Michael Michaelsen approached the table and indicated that this is the zoning on his property. He questioned the change in the ordinance after approximately fourteen years of it being as it is currently. Mike Macdonald explained allowed uses and conditional uses and how bars are listed in both. He also explained why this use would be better served under conditional as opposed to an outright permitted use. There was discussion as to the different entities where you could find a bar. Lewis asked for clarification as to what this amendment was accomplishing. Mike Macdonald voiced his opinion that with this proposed amendment if it was just a bar a conditional use permit would be required. If it's a bar within a restaurant it would be a permitted use. There was further discussion if there would need to be a description of what type of bar would be allowed and what type of bar would require a conditional use permit. Mike Macdonald pointed out that with the requirement of the use permit for a bar it gives the county greater ability to make sure the activity meets whatever conditions were placed on that permit. Ray motioned to approve the amendment; second by Stephen. Motion passed unanimously. Mr. Michaelsen indicated he wanted to appeal the decision. Betty and Mike Macdonald explained the process of approval. This decision is a recommendation to the County Commissioners who have final approval or denial. It was further explained that Mr. Michaelsen could make comments at that time before the County Commissioners. The notice of public hearing process was also explained.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- I. **TH-11-07** A text amendment to Chapter 17.30 GC District of the Humboldt County Code to add "or structures" to item H under conditional uses.

Betty noticed that there was a correction to the description; it should reflect 17.30 instead of 17.12. Pam asked if there were any questions. Lewis questioned which portion was being corrected. It was found that the amendment indicates 17.30.030 and it should be 17.30.040. Pam took the item out to the public, there were no comments. She then brought it back to the board. Vicki motioned to approve the amendment as amended; second by Lewis. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- J. **TH-11-08** A text amendment to Chapter 17.44 M-3 District of the Humboldt County Code to add recreational vehicles as a permitted use and re-letter to allow for the addition of recreational vehicles; to amend home occupations to reflect home based businesses.

Pam asked if there was any discussion from the board. Seeing none, she took it out to the public then brought it back to the board. Ray motioned to approve the amendment; second by Vickie. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- K. **TH-11-09** A text amendment to Chapter 17.48 PD District of the Humboldt County Code to amend general plan to reflect master plan.

Pam asked if there were any questions from the board. Pam then took it out to the public, seeing none she brought it back to the board. Theresa motioned to approve the amendment; second by Ray. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- L. **TH-11-10** A text amendment to Chapter 17.54 Manufactured Home Siting Criteria of the Humboldt County Code to change TR to MH.

Pam asked if there was any discussion or comments from the board. She then took it out to the public, seeing none brought it back to the board. Vickie motioned to approve the amendment; second by Ray. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- M. **TH-11-11** A text amendment to Chapter 17.56 S Outdoor Advertising District of the Humboldt County Code to change "C" to Commercial and "M" to Industrial; remove (C) and (M).

Stephen and Vickie pointed out spelling errors. 17.56.020 reflects except and it should be except; 17.56.040 reflects accept, this should be except. Pam asked if there were any other comments. She then took it out to the public, seeing none Pam brought it back to the board. Lewis motioned to approve the amendment with the two amendments; second by Theresa. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- N. **TH-11-12** A text amendment to Chapter 17.60 Off Street Parking & Loading Regulations of the Humboldt County Code to amend fifteen square feet to reflect 150 square feet.

Pam asked if there were any comments from the board. Lewis asked if there was a chart that goes with the ordinance. Betty explained it is a list of stuff and did not include the entire ordinance with the amendment. Pam then took it out to the public for comment, seeing none she brought it back to the board. Theresa motioned to approve the amendment; second by Ray. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- O. **TH-11-13** A text amendment to Chapter 17.68 Conditional Use Permits of the Humboldt County Code to remove county.

Pam asked if there were any comments from the board. Seeing none she took it out to the public. Pam then brought it back to the board. Ray motioned to approve the amendment; second by Stephen. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- P. **TH-11-14** A text amendment to Chapter 17.70 Amendment to Title of the Humboldt County Code to amend general plan to reflect master plan; to add 30 different property owners for public hearing notification.

Lewis asked about the checker board properties and notification. It was explained that NRS requires the notification of 30 different property owners in addition to the property owners within 300'. Pam asked if there were any other comments. Seeing none she took it out to the public. Seeing none Pam brought it back to the board. Ray motioned to approve the amendment; second by Stephen. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- Q. **TH-11-15** A text amendment to Chapter 16.04 General Provisions of the Humboldt County Code to amend general plan to reflect master plan.

Pam asked if there were any questions from the board. Seeing none she took it out to the public. Seeing none Pam brought it back to the board. Ray motioned to approve the amendment; second by Theresa. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

- R. **TH-11-16** A text amendment to Chapter 16.08 Definitions of the Humboldt County Code to amend general plan to reflect master plan.

Pam asked if there were any questions or comments from the board. Seeing none she took it out to the public. Seeing none Pam brought it back to the board. Ray motioned to approve the amendment; second by Theresa. Motion passed unanimously.

Pam read the following agenda item:

IV. COMMISSION/STAFF/LEGAL COMMENTS/COMMITTEE REPORTS-Discussion & Action

Pam asked if there were any items. Betty again welcomed Jennifer to the Planning Department. She also explained that Giovette was not at the meeting do some

surgery. Betty indicated a card would be available for anyone wishing to sign or she will sign and mail the card to Giovette. Betty also reminded the board about the open house in the Planning Department the following Thursday.

Vickie asked if there was to have been a change in the verbiage referring to the planning director in some of the ordinances. Betty reminded the board that it was decided a couple of meetings ago that the definition of "planning director" addresses the issue in question.

Stephen asked Mike Macdonald if he has had a chance to look at the road thing that has been discussed at past meetings. Mr. Macdonald indicated he has not come to any conclusions and is not in a position to make any recommendations to the board yet.

Pam read the following item:

V. CORRESPONDENCE/BUDGET/PERSONNEL-Discussion

Pam asked if there was anything for this item. Lewis asked how the budget was holding up in terms of notifications that are taking place. Betty indicated that there were still funds in the budget. Some of the items may have to wait until next year if the funds get short. She did indicate that the overtime has been commented on but this will slow down. There was discussion that this is due to the travel and additional meetings. Lewis verified that the next travel date will be January 26 to Golconda. Vickie asked if there would be any out meetings after Golconda. It was verified that Golconda is the last out of town meeting. All other meetings will be in Winnemucca. There was discussion as to time and day of the future meetings for the Master Plan review. Vickie asked if there would be multiple meetings for Winnemucca. Betty explained that there would be a meeting for Highway 95 from 6 Mile Road which would include Jungo Road; a meeting for Grass Valley/Rose Creek; a meeting for the City. Vickie asked if the notices would indicate what section the meeting was being held for. Betty stated there is an ad in the paper, notices are not sent. There was discussion as to how many meetings a month.

Pam asked if there was any further discussion.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTARY

Pam asked if there was any public comment.

Pam adjourned the meeting at 8:06 PM until 5:30 PM January 12, 2012.

Pam Wickkiser

Pam Wickkiser, Chairperson

UNOFFICIAL