



REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD

MEMBERS
Robert Larkin, Chair
Geno Martini, Vice Chair
David Aiazzi
Mike Carrigan
Robert A. Cashell
Dwight Dortch
Jim Galloway
Pierre Hascheff
Ron
Schmitt
Bonnie Weber
Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director

MINUTES

REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD

Regular Meeting

Thursday, February 8, 2007

The Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGGB) met in regular session in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Robert Larkin at 2:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and Regional Planning Governing Board Members in attendance were: Robert Larkin, Geno Martini, Dave Aiazzi, Robert Cashell, Dwight Dortch, and Ron Schmitt. Member Jim Galloway arrived at 2:05 p.m. Member Dave Humke for Bonnie Weber arrived at 2:12 p.m. Members absent: Mike Carrigan, Pierre Hascheff and Bonnie Weber.

Also present: Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA Interim Director; Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel; Phil Caterino, TMRPA; Lora Richards, TMRPA; Patricia Rogers, TMRPA; Joy Randall, TMRPA; and Paige Menicucci, TMRPA.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 8, 2007, RPGGB AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Member Aiazzi led the salute to the flag and the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

[Member Galloway arrived at 2:05 p.m.]

5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

- A. PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration and possible adoption of proposed amendments to the 2002 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, including revising the boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA) or the Future Service Areas (FSA) based on applications submitted by the following private property owners:

Lora Richards, Planning Analyst II, presented an overview of this item regarding the TMSA applications.

[Member Humke arrived at 2:12 p.m.]

[The public hearing was opened.]

Trent Averett requested a continuance for his application in order to come up with more material on a development plan for the property.

David Bjorkman stated that the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) and the Reno Planning Commission have recommended his property for inclusion in the TMSA. Mr. Bjorkman asked that the RPGB agree with the RPC and staff to move his application forward. Mr. Bjorkman stated that if his application was not approved, he would request a continuance, at Member Aiazzi's suggestion, in order to provide additional information.

Caroline Poissant, Washoe County Parks and Open Space, expressed concern regarding development in sensitive areas on the fringe of the urban wildlife interface during a time when Washoe County is updating its open space plan.

John Rhodes stated that he has requested a continuance and that his application be brought back to the RPGB at the April RPGB meeting.

Carl Adams stated that all the conditions that were applied to the TMSA in the plan amendments should also apply to these parcels. Any approval of parcels that are contiguous with Reno should be conditioned on the fact that they should comply with the hillside ordinance. Mr. Adams suggested exploring with the Forest Service the possibility of extending the forest property so that the top of Peavine would be forever conserved.

Baron Caronite requested that his client's application be approved so that the property be included in the Reno service area.

Stacey Huggins stated that she is representing Bob Marshall's request for FSA inclusion. The properties are contiguous and surrounded on three sides by properties that are within the existing Reno FSA boundary.

Bill VonPool stated that Washoe County is updating its Regional Open Space and Natural Resource Management Plan this year. A year from now that document could provide guidance as to which lands within the County should appropriately be made available for development and which should remain open for wildlife habitat and recreational uses. Mr. VonPool stated that further additions to the TMSA should not be made until that document is available.

Fred Turnier stated that he is in concurrence with the RPC recommendation to include the Sunny Hills Ranchos property in the TMSA. This property is surrounded by existing TMSA.

Gary Duhan stated that his clients property (Sage Communities) is south of Winnemucca Ranch, an existing TMSA area, and requested approval for inclusion in the TMSA.

Ginger Pierce stated that she is aware of the fact that there is no water to give these large pieces of property.

Susan Jutten stated that as a citizen she was at a disadvantage to learn about these properties because the documents were not posted on the website until yesterday. Ms. Jutten questioned why Reno wants to include the Dolan properties. There are eight islands of rural development and two satellites on the property and it is fifty percent constrained.

John Frankovich stated that he represents Suzanne Larsen's property. This property is bordered on two sides by existing TMSA. The third side is an existing improved arterial. Utilities are in close proximity and it is appropriate to be included in the TMSA.

Christy Kolosky stated that she is representing District Ranger Gary Shiff at the request of Member Galloway to provide Forest Service perspective regarding the south face of Peavine.

Fred Turnier stated that he is with Scott Fritz, the developer of Wildcreek at Terrace, and clarified that a Sparks TMSA island would be created if the Silverwing proposal is approved tonight. The RPC included the island in their motion at the last RPC meeting.

Monica Frank stated that she is disturbed that the advisory board recommendations to deny have been overruled.

Russ Fromhurst expressed concern regarding tax increases to be able to service these areas.

Amy Louise Mazza expressed concern that the decision-makers only care about power and money.

[The public hearing was closed.]

Member Galloway stated that there was a formula used when negotiating the 2005 Settlement Agreement that showed that the County had more TMSA land than it needed already and that cities still had a shortfall. Member Galloway asked how the statement could be made that all jurisdictions have room to add to their TMSA when the County is already over its allotment. Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, responded that the original determination that the County was over its capacity was determined prior to the decision to roll-back portions of the TMSA. When that roll-back occurred that actually provided some additional capacity in the County's TMSA. The final determination allows the County a small margin of available capacity.

Member Galloway asked for confirmation that the RPGB is being asked by a number of private property owners to approve these applications and make amendments to the current adopted Regional Plan prior to the adoption of the Regional Plan update. Ms. Richards responded that is correct. The amendments today would be to the current adopted version of the 2002 Regional Plan. The TMSA was amended in July of 2006. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) has not proposed any changes to the TMSA. Boundary adjustments were not part of the Regional Plan update.

Member Galloway asked if there might be something in the new 2007 update to the Regional Plan in terms of goals and policies that could give additional criteria to evaluate these applications. Ms. Coombes responded that based on the current revisions to the Regional Plan, there are some minor adjustments to language that could impact how the TMSA would be sized but it may not apply to this particular set of amendments. It would apply more so, the way the current language is written, to

amendments that are proposed on behalf of a local government and not on behalf of a private property owner.

Member Martini asked if the RPC modified the Silverwing proposal to take care of the island that would be created. Ms. Richards responded the RPC made a motion to move all eleven applications forward as they were received by staff. There was no modification to the proposal by the RPC.

Member Martini asked applicant to comment. Mr. Turnier stated that it was their understanding that that piece was brought into the motion. Adrian Freund, Washoe County, stated that it is their position that the additional parcel would need to be included to eliminate the island. The RPC motion simply moved all of the proposals forward as they were drafted. Mr. Freund stated that the Sparks Council did take a look at that particular change of TMSA jurisdiction and supported that with the inclusion of the property to eliminate that island. Mr. Freund asked that as part of any motion that be included.

Member Schmitt asked for clarification on which applications were denied by local governments. Ms. Coombes responded that assuming the parcels in case number one and case number two are continued, the only property for consideration today where a local government did recommend denial is the Larsen property.

Chair Larkin asked Mr. Frankovich if his client (Larsen) had disclosed any intended future uses of the property. Mr. Frankovich responded no. There are no development plans on the property at this time. Chair Larkin stated that the property is in a 100-year flood plain. Mr. Frankovich responded that a portion of it is. The County just recently approved a special use permit to take care of it.

Chair Larkin asked Mr. Frankovich if his client is fully prepared to work with Washoe County 100 percent, if this is included, to stay within the character and nature of that particular area. Mr. Frankovich responded that is an obligation of any property owner.

Member Humke asked Regional Planning staff why the Dolan property received a low score. Ms. Richards responded that there are a number of concerns regarding the clear and logical boundary, there are a number of TMSA satellites and an island of unincorporated area in the proposal, and fifty percent of the property is constrained by steep slopes.

Member Humke asked about the rural development area being the third and lowest priority. Ms. Richards responded the RPGB gave staff direction last year that the direction of growth would be to the north and east in the FSA, if it was not in the current TMSA. By a process of elimination that leaves the rural development area as the lowest of the three priorities.

Member Aiazzi asked if there is a time frame or fee established for the process to apply again if the RPGB denies anything. Ms. Richards responded that staff is working with Legal Counsel on draft regulations on procedure. Norm Azevedo, Legal Counsel, stated that there is no prohibition against an applicant coming forward again in any time period at this juncture. Mr. Azevedo stated that the RPC requested that he draft regulations regarding this process. Mr. Azevedo stated that the RPGB has the authority to impose fees and that the RPC requested he pursue that possibility, subject to the RPGB's review. Once the regulations are effective, they would be applicable to any application at that point in time.

Member Galloway asked Peavine Pines and Dolan property representatives if they have considered or explored trading any land with the Forest Service for land that would be easier to develop and that would better fit the criteria. Mr. Caronite described the Dolan property.

Member Galloway asked Mr. Caronite why the whole 3000 acres were included in the application. Mr. Caronite responded that they wanted to take the opportunity to master plan the area to incorporate areas into open space and put them into a master planned community so that future development of single homes on 40 acre parcels through the mountain range did not occur.

Member Galloway asked Mr. Caronite if they explored exchanging any of the steep land with any federal entity in order to get more developable land. Mr. Caronite responded that they have not explored that.

Member Galloway asked Mr. Caronite if they have gone to the Storey County Commission and if it is true that the access to the land is through the Sierra Highlands and that the ability to access the land goes away if the parcels become smaller than 40 acres. Mr. Caronite responded that there is a topographic connection from Storey County and there is a jeep trail graded in through the drainage. With the area in the TMSA, there is also an opportunity to connect to the Sunny Hills property.

Member Galloway asked Mr. Caronite if they have gone to the Storey County Commission to address their concerns about the aquifer and the traffic impacts. Mr. Caronite responded that with the application before the RPGB today they have applied for a service boundary change. Mr. Caronite stated that they have not taken a project to Storey County. Member Galloway asked Mr. Caronite if they have gone before Storey County at all on this. Mr. Caronite responded no.

Member Humke asked Regional Planning staff why the Richardson property received a higher score than the Dolan property. Ms. Richards responded that primarily the scoring is different because of the nature of the properties. Ms. Richards reviewed some of the differences.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE ITEMS ONE, TWO, AND THREE TO THE APRIL 12 RPGB MEETING, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Member Galloway stated that as part of a settlement with Evans Creek, Washoe County agreed not to oppose its inclusion in the TMSA.

MEMBER GALLOWAY MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 06-004 FOR ITEM FOUR [EVANS CREEK LLC (TMSA 06-004)], BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 06-005 FOR ITEM FIVE [MARK RICHARDSON (TMSA 06-005)], BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY MEMBER CASHELL.

Member Galloway stated that this should have occurred after the adoption of the update and that he will not support the motion.

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH SEVEN (7) IN FAVOR AND ONE (1) OPPOSITION BY MEMBER GALLOWAY.

MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 06-006 FOR ITEM SIX [SAGE COMMUNITY GROUP, LLC (TMSA 06-006)], BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY MEMBER CASHELL.

Member Galloway stated that he will not support this motion for the same reason as the previous motion.

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH SEVEN (7) IN FAVOR AND ONE (1) OPPOSITION BY MEMBER GALLOWAY.

MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 06-007 FOR ITEM SEVEN [SUNNY HILLS RANCHOS LLC (TMSA 06-007)], BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY MEMBER CASHELL. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Member Galloway asked Chair Larkin if he is satisfied with the answers he received regarding his concerns about cooperation with the County if this area is included. Chair Larkin responded that he is satisfied and that he feels confident that this property can move forward to inclusion in the TMSA.

MEMBER GALLOWAY MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE RESOLUTION 06-008 FOR ITEM EIGHT [SUZANNE LARSEN (TMSA 06-008)], BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY CHAIR LARKIN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 06-009 FOR ITEM NINE [SILVERWING DEVELOPMENT (TMSA 06-009)], BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY MEMBER SCHMITT.

Ms. Coombes reminded the RPGB members of the testimony on the record indicating that both Washoe County and the City of Sparks recommend a modification of this application to include the property that creates an island in the City of Sparks sphere of influence (SOI).

Member Aiazzi asked what the rationale was for this to go out of the Sparks' TMSA into Washoe County's. Margaret Powell, City of Sparks, stated that they had several conversations with the developer on this property and the primary access to this property will be from the Sun Valley area. Ms. Powell stated that one of their primary concerns is that there will be very minimal access from the City of Sparks. Mr. Freund stated that the other factor that played into this is that the utility service will be through Sun Valley GID.

Member Dortch asked if this can be included without noticing it. Chair Larkin asked for confirmation from Mr. Azevedo that it has been noticed. Mr. Azevedo responded that this process has been noticed but as far as changing the proposed amendment to include the parcel that would compromise the island has not been noticed. Mr. Azevedo deferred to Ms. Coombes. Ms. Coombes stated that the property owner has not been directly noticed. It is not a standard operating procedure in the rules and regulations to notify property owners when doing TMSA amendments.

Chair Larkin asked Mr. Azevedo if it is a prohibited act or not. Mr. Azevedo responded that the notification that went out on this is consistent with State Law requirements. Mr. Azevedo requested a one-minute recess to confer with Ms. Coombes.

Chair Larkin called a recess at 2:45

[The meeting was called back to order at 2:55.]

Mr. Azevedo stated that the amendment as proposed does create an island. The RPGB has the option to approve it as proposed and the island portion can come back in a later application at a later date.

The RPGB also has the option to modify the proposed amendment. In the event the RPGB modifies the proposed amendment, it is required by law to go back to the RPC for further consideration. At that time in the RPC process, they can address notifying the property owner and following the notification required there.

Chair Larkin asked if it is correct that the RPGB will modify it and send it back. Mr. Azevedo responded that is appropriate.

MEMBER MARTINI MODIFIED THE MOTION TO INCLUDE MODIFICATION OF THIS ITEM TO INCLUDE THE ISLAND PROPERTY AND REFERRAL BACK TO THE RPC FOR NOTICING AND RECONSIDERATION, SECOND CONCURRED.

Member Galloway stated that this property was already in a TMSA. It is a change of jurisdiction but it does not create any more development potential than there already was. Ms. Coombes stated that is correct.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 06-010 FOR ITEM TEN [ROBERT MARSHALL (FSA 06-010)], BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY MEMBER AIAZZI.

Member Galloway asked if this was a matter of concern for the Indian Colony. Ms. Richards responded that she spoke today with Scott Nebesky who is a planner for the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony. Ms. Richards stated that Mr. Nebesky indicated that they would not be coming out against or for this application at this time.

Chair Larkin asked which drainage it is in. Ms. Coombes directed Chair Larkin to a map in the meeting packet and stated that this FSA amendment is aligned with the Reno FSA area which appears to be much further north than the current Reno Sparks Indian Colony Hungry Valley property. Ms. Coombes stated that her understanding was that the Indian Colony would be negotiating with Washoe County regarding future jurisdiction in Washoe County's portion of the FSA. This particular proposal is a notch out of the Reno FSA and it should not impact the discussions with the Indian Colony.

Member Galloway stated that based on the fact that the legal counsel recognized they had looked at it and they are not going to oppose it, he does not have a further problem.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

MEMBER HUMKE MADE A MOTION TO DENY RESOLUTION 06-011 FOR ITEM ELEVEN [DOLAN PROPERTIES LLC (TMSA 06-011)], SECONDED BY MEMBER GALLOWAY.

Member Galloway stated that this application contains far too much land that is constrained. The one part that would be buildable would be an island off by itself by Storey County. As it stands, because of drainage, water issues, and the concerns of Storey County that have not been addressed in a public meeting, if we approve this people will think we will approve anything.

Member Humke stated that this proposal received low scores in nearly all criteria. An approval of this proposal would create numerous islands of rural development area within Reno's portion of the TMSA. It also creates two Reno SOI TMSA satellites.

Member Aiazzi requested that this item be postponed for two months to see if some of the questions the public has can be answered.

Member Galloway stated that if the applicant wanted to come back with a modified application after working things out to get broader support, they can do that anyway without postponing it.

Member Schmitt asked about the difference in costs to the applicant between postponing and denying. Ms. Coombes responded that there is no application fee. Any costs would be those born by the applicant outside of government fees or charges.

Member Schmitt asked for confirmation that the difference is that with denial they start all over with a project and with postponing we can pick up the application and talk about where we are right now and staff can just continue going on the way it is right now with the application. Ms. Coombes responded that would be correct. If the RPGB chooses to make modifications to the application, it would still need to go back to the RPC and start the process again anyway.

Member Schmitt stated that he is much more inclined to postpone a decision rather than deny to allow the applicant and staff the time to sit down and talk about it.

Member Galloway stated that the people who need to be talked to and negotiated with are outside of the RPGB. Member Galloway stated that he would rather that they get that input and then re-frame their project.

Member Martini asked the applicant about his preference. Mr. Caronite responded that they would prefer to continue and try and work through the details.

Chair Larkin asked Member Humke if he would like to restate the motion.

MEMBER HUMKE WITHDREW THE MOTION TO DENY, SECOND CONCURRED.

Chair Larkin asked Ms. Coombes to lead a discussion regarding a time frame for continuing this item before a motion is made. Ms. Coombes clarified procedural items with regard to time frames.

Chair Larkin asked Mr. Azevedo about provisions in law where an applicant voluntarily agrees to a time frame. Mr. Azevedo responded that it is generally a thirty-day time period. Under Nevada Law, the RPGB is empowered with the authority to specify an alternative period of time from thirty to sixty days or shorter. If a meaningful review by the local government is warranted, the thirty-day time period can be increased.

Chair Larkin asked how much time the applicant would need to get this back. Mr. Caronite responded that April 12 would work.

Chair Larkin stated that there was testimony from two commissioners that have residents that are impacted that it may take a little bit longer than that. Mr. Caronite agreed and asked if the intention is to take it back through the Reno Planning Commission and Reno City Council or to bring it back to the RPGB.

Member Aiazzi stated that if it is brought back to the RPGB and changes are made to the current application, it would have to be sent back to the RPC. In that same period of time it could go back to the Reno City Council or not. Member Aiazzi stated that the RPGB can postpone it as long as necessary. The thirty-day time frame would be after sending it back to the RPC. If it is not done in time, it can be continued again.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO POSTPONE THE RESOLUTION 06-011 FOR ITEM ELEVEN [DOLAN PROPERTIES LLC (TMSA 06-011)] UNTIL APRIL 12, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH.

Member Humke stated that he will support the motion based on the assurance from Member Aiazzi that there will be further continuance for further analysis by all the appropriate agencies if it is not a good application in regional planning terms.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- B. Status report and possible direction to staff regarding the work of the population forecasting working group.

Ms. Richards stated that Regional Planning staff is seeking direction today from the RPGB with regard to two key issues related to population forecasting. One is the work of the regional population working group and the idea of a consensus-based consolidated work program for the region. The other is how the Regional Planning Agency (RPA) core business is conducted specifically concerning conformance reviews as they relate to population plans. The Regional Planning staff recommendation is to consider establishing a subcommittee of the RPGB to work with staff on the details.

Chair Larkin asked about who is not participating. Ms. Richards referred to the list of people that are participating. Ms. Richards stated that the concern is that there is not consensus among the local governments on what to do in terms of the regional population work program.

Member Aiazzi stated that every entity seems to be using its own way of forecasting population and suggested that this be discussed at the next joint meeting.

Chair Larkin expressed interest in having the three planning directors come to report to the RPGB on what it will take to get consensus on the population forecasting. Member Aiazzi suggested including the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the Washoe County School District.

Chair Larkin asked that the three planning directors, RTC and the School District report to the RPGB on what it is going to take to make the consensus forecast work.

Member Aiazzi stated that everyone could make the decision together at the joint meeting.

Ms. Richards stated that there is a recommendation to form a subcommittee. Chair Larkin stated that rather than trying to get a subcommittee together, Regional Planning staff can go to these five entities and ask them what is it going to take to make it work.

Ms. Richards asked if that report should be presented at the April RPGB meeting. Chair Larkin asked if a status report can be ready for the RPGB meeting at the end of March. Ms. Richards responded that would be fine.

[Member Humke left at 3:40 p.m.]

- C. Review and consideration of proposed RPGB Regulations on Procedure clarifying the roles of the Regional Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Governing Board.

Mr. Azevedo requested authority to send the draft regulations to the respective public lawyers who practice in this area for comment as well as their agencies. The RPC and the RPGB have separate and distinct functions provided by statute. The regulation specifically defines all the express statutory appeal and petition processes set forth in the applicable statute. The regulation also provides a process for persons to seek a review by the RPGB.

Chair Larkin stated that the draft looks like restatements of existing policies. Mr. Azevedo responded that Section A possibly is; Section B is a listing of all the direct appeals, and Section C begins to be something different than a restatement of the existing policies. Mr. Azevedo stated that it is an interpretation of a direct procedural process between the RPGB and the RPC.

Chair Larkin asked if the regulation addresses that the RPC must make a decision to avoid the situation last year where they did not make a decision. Mr. Azevedo responded that it preserves the discretion of the RPC. If they make a decision, they fail to make a decision, or they make some other type of determination, it is reviewable by the RPGB.

MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO GRANT PERMISSION TO MR. AZEVEDO TO SEND THE DRAFT REGULATIONS TO THE RESPECTIVE CITIES' ATTORNEYS OFFICES AS WELL AS THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND THE PLANNING DIRECTORS FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SEVEN (7) MEMBERS PRESENT.

6. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- A. Consideration and possible action on Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) for Interim Director.

Mr. Azevedo stated that this item is in response to an inquiry from the administrative staff at the RPA. The RPA employees who are non-directors receive a COLA that is administered by the City of Sparks in January and July. In January of this year, the accounting staff received an inquiry from the City of Sparks as to whether the Interim Director receives that type of adjustment. Mr. Azevedo stated that the Interim Director's contract is silent on this particular point. Mr. Azevedo reviewed options for the RPGB to consider.

[Member Cashell left at 3:50 p.m.]

Member Aiazzi asked for a reminder on the status of a Director search. Ms. Coombes reviewed the history on this issue. The RPGB would need to take some action to initiate whatever selection process the RPGB chooses to go through. Statute indicates that the RPGB would select a Director from three names provided by the RPC.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO TREAT THE INTERIM DIRECTOR LIKE A DIRECTOR AND DO THE COLA ADJUSTMENT, SECONDED BY CHAIR LARKIN.

Member Galloway asked if it needs to be specified how the COLA is computed. Joy Randall, Administrative Services Manager, stated that the RPGB adopted a budget that allowed for a two percent COLA to be effective the first pay period of January and July.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- B. Consideration and possible acceptance of FY 06-07 second quarterly budget and work program report.
- C. Consideration and possible direction to staff on proposed FY 07-08 budget and work program.

Chair Larkin asked for questions on these items.

Member Galloway stated that he would like Adrian Freund to make some comments.

Mr. Freund stated that he and his fellow Planning Directors met and would like to express some general thoughts and recommendations regarding some fairly significant increases that have occurred in the member contributions over the last couple of years. Mr. Freund stated that they are working partially or totally off of enterprise funds and are experiencing severe constraints. Mr. Freund stated that in terms of the general fund, there are some indicators that may lead us to the conclusion that we would like to be spare of general funds where possible. Mr. Freund stated that their only firm comment at this point is that since the Regional Plan update is complete and there were funds budgeted for the update process, they at least believe at this point that amount of funding should be considered being rolled-back out. Mr. Freund stated that he has had discussions with Ms. Coombes about training and educational opportunities and in that regard there are differing positions. Mr. Freund stated that they are generally supportive although in the case of the City of Reno, because of some of their budget constraints, they have expressed some concerns.

Chair Larkin asked if they have any specific dollar recommendations. Mr. Freund responded not at this point.

Ms. Coombes stated that a few developments have occurred since the budget proposal that was presented at the last RPGB meeting. At that meeting the RPGB directed staff to proceed with the proposal which included three BCPs. The day after the last RPGB meeting, the RPA received a letter from the Air Quality Division of the District Health Department indicating that their normal grant of about \$27,000 would no longer be available starting next year. Also, the RPA received a letter today from the City of Sparks stating that they will be increasing our accounting costs by \$46,000. Ms. Coombes stated that those two items have a fairly substantial impact on the budget and that it is difficult as the Director to make a recommendation that the BCPs be funded. Ms. Coombes stated that rolling out a contribution that was made previously by the three local governments would diminish the budget even more by possibly 10% or more. Ms. Coombes asked the RPGB to consider the implications of all of these factors on the budget. Regional Planning staff is more than happy to make whatever changes need to be made to make this comfortable for the local governments. Ms. Coombes stated that these changes will impact what staff can deliver as well. There may need to be some global contemplation of what the RPGB wants to do in light of all these things that have come forward.

Member Aiazzi referred to the letter from the District Health Department and asked if the Board voted on it. Andy Goodrich, Air Quality Management Division, responded that the Board did not vote on it. Mr. Goodrich stated that this item is a discretionary spending item under the Division's budget and that they did work with their Administrative Health Division in determining where they need to cut back. Because the grant was a discretionary item it was eliminated.

Member Aiazzi asked Mr. Goodrich if the Board gives them discretionary items. Mr. Goodrich responded that working with their Administrative Services Division, it allows the Division Directors to offer a budget. That budget has not been approved yet and will go forward next month to their District Board of Health.

Member Aiazzi stated that to cut back in regional planning is the wrong place to cut back. Member Aiazzi stated that we are trying to increase what regional planning does and to cut back is a mistake.

Chair Larkin stated that he will convey that to their representative on the Health Board. The Health Board will present their budget to the Board of County Commissioners in their budget hearings and Chair Larkin stated that he will take that charge there too.

Member Galloway suggesting giving direction now to ask the Health Department Board to consider retaining the grant. All of the local governments have been making an additional contribution in order to get the Regional Plan update which will not be needed next year. If we did not have these other blows to the income, the local governments would all be able to have a reduction. Since there is an additional charge from Sparks, staff should be asked to come back with another budget that reflects that we no longer need to support the Regional Plan update and also takes into account the potential reduced revenues on a contingency basis if the charge from Sparks stays and we don't have the grant from the Health Department and say here is a proposed share that the local governments would have to pitch in in order to maintain the baseline operation.

Mr. Goodrich stated that the fund that the monies come from for the grant is stagnant and projected to decrease. If the funding has to be sustained, then something else is going to be cut off the table.

Ms. Randall clarified that the Regional Plan update costs have not been included in the budget before the RPGB today.

Member Galloway stated that in that sense the local governments are already getting a reduction in the budget. Ms. Randall responded yes.

Member Galloway stated that since the local governments are getting some break maybe they can give just a little part of that back to cover additional administrative expenses or the loss of a grant if that should remain a problem.

Ms. Randall stated that the budget before the RPGB today does include the increase based on the loss of the grant but does not include any impact based on the increase in the Sparks financial accounting. Ms. Randall stated that she did have a discussion with the Budget Manager and that they had allocated costs across the board for different areas. There are some areas open to negotiation. Ms. Randall stated that the staff report includes possibilities for direction with regard to areas where the RPGB might want to see reductions.

MEMBER GALLOWAY MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE SECOND QUARTERLY BUDGET REPORT, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

7. REPORTS

A. Members' and Director's reports.

- 1) Status report on the 2007 update of the Regional Plan

Chair Larkin asked for questions on this item. There were no questions from the RPGB.

- 2) Status report and possible direction to staff on implementation of the legislative strategy including, but not limited to, RPGB legislative subcommittee meeting schedule and tracking of bill draft requests

Ms. Coombes stated that the Agency has been invited by Assembly Transportation to present the Safe Walking Routes to Schools in Washoe County to that particular committee on February 20. The legislative staffs of all of the participating MOU partners have been notified.

Chair Larkin asked for questions on this item. There were no questions from the RPGB.

B. Legal counsel's report:

Mr. Azevedo stated that there is no pending litigation at this point.

8. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- A. Consideration and possible action on calendar of agenda items.
- B. Members' and director's requests for agenda items.

None

9. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None

10. ADJOURNMENT

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 4:08 P.M., SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

Geno Martini, Chair
Regional Planning Governing Board

**APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD IN SESSION ON
_____, 2007**