



# REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

**MEMBERS**  
Fred Lokken, Chair  
Jim Newberg, Vice Chair  
Todd Brabbin  
Florence 'Marge' Frandsen  
Kendall Mattina  
Marvin Moss  
Dennis Romeo  
Steve Rogers  
William Weber  
Dave Ziegler, Director

## MINUTES

### **Regional Planning Commission (RPC) REGULAR MEETING Wednesday, June 14, 2006, 6:30 p.m.**

The Regional Planning Commission met in regular session in the Truckee Meadows Community College, Vista Building, Reno, Nevada and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lokken at 6:31 p.m.

#### **1. ROLL CALL**

The clerk called the roll and the following Commissioners were present: Fred Lokken, Jim Newberg, Todd Brabbin, Florence "Marge" Frandsen, Kendall Mattina, Marvin Moss, Dennis Romeo, Steve Rogers, William Weber

Also present were: Dave Ziegler, TMRPA Director; Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel; Randy Baxley, TMRPA; Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA; Paige Menicucci, TMRPA; Patricia Rogers, TMRPA; Lora Richards, TMRPA

#### **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

COMMISSIONER ROGERS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JUNE 14, 2006 RPC AGENDA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MOSS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

#### **3. PUBLIC COMMENT\***

NONE

#### **4. CONSENT CALENDAR**

- A.** PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review, City of Sparks Master Plan Amendment, Stanford Crossing (CR06-015), changing the master plan land use designation from Industrial to Commercial Industrial on a ±3.8 acre site located at the southwest corner of East Greg Street and South McCarran Boulevard
- B.** PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review, City of Sparks Master Plan Amendment, Sierra Shadows (CR06-016), changing the master plan land use designation from 1 DU/10 AC to 4 DU/AC, on a ±4.2 acre site generally located east of Wingfield Springs Road, north of Wingfield Springs and southwest of Cimarron.

COMMISSIONER FRANDBEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JUNE 14, 2006 CONSENT CALENDAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROGERS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

**5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY**

- A.** PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review, Washoe County, Project of Regional Significance, Sierra Reflections (CR06-017): a project of a) more than 625 housing units; b) water demand in excess of 625 acre-feet/year; c) sewage generation of more than 187,500 gallons per day; d) traffic in excess of 6,250 average daily trips; and e) student population of more than 325 students. A total of 938 single family residential units is proposed on a ±760 acre site generally located west of US 395 and south of Pagni Lane in the Pleasant Valley area.

Randy Baxley reported there are 938 single family residence homes in the Sierra Reflections plan, and directed Commissioners to the written staff report on p. 29 of the board packet.

*[The public hearing was opened.]*

Louise Thomas stated the last time an amendment like this was proposed, Washoe County residents and homeowners were able to voice their opinions before the amendment was being considered. She stated this time she only received short notice on the proposed amendment. She stated freeway access and water shortages are a major concern.

Monica Frank stated over one dozen homeowners sent in e-mails in regard to their disagreement with the Sierra Reflections amendment. She read one of the e-mails on 5a and 5b, stating it has been a tumultuous year for many homeowners. Many changes have been put into place, but most homeowners have heard nothing on the proposed amendment since May. Water for 700 is the available amount, not 3000 homes as the amendment proposes. The current plan doesn't allow transfer between hydrological basins. Plans can be misinterpreted. She asked the Board to please support conservative controlled growth.

*[The public hearing was closed.]*

Commissioner Moss inquired if any comment will be made from the City of Reno to the homeowners speaking tonight.

Adrian Freund replied that at this time, no comment is required under the Cooperative agreements with the City of Reno and the RPC.

**COMMISSIONER MOSS MADE A MOTION TO FIND THE SIERRA REFLECTIONS PROJECT OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLAN, BASED ON THE FINDING LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MATTINA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.**

- B.** Consideration and possible direction to staff related to proposed amendments to the 2002 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, including amendments submitted jointly by Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County pursuant to the settlement agreement in the matter of Reno's annexation program (August 23, 2005):
1. Status report by Regional Planning staff on activities pursuant to Regional Planning Commission (RPC) direction of May 10, 2005

2. Comments (if any) from owners of parcels presently within the Truckee Meadows Service Areas that would be placed in the Rural Development Area by the proposed amendments. PURSUANT TO REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION (RPC) DIRECTION OF MAY 10, 2005.

Dave Zeigler gave a status report on the proposed amendments within the staff report located on p. 44 in the board packet. He stated the Board will receive a version of proposed changes in legislative style with strikeout and underline at the June 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Board requested at the last meeting that staff assist with the TMSA modification. To date the office has received more than 20 requests to modify the proposed amendments. Most have to do with adding property to the TMSA; very few have to do with removing property from it. Zeigler reported staff is meeting with local city planners to discuss the requests for TMSA modifications.

Mr. Zeigler directed the commissioners to their packets where a letter has been drafted for discussion under the most common request to expand the TMSA.

The discussion draft on p. 47 lists "The ideal TMSA expansion". The Regional Plan should be a positive vision of the changes in the region. Mr. Zeigler stated pages 48 and 49 have attempted to draft criteria on how any given proposal will become an ideal. Staff is trying to develop and propose a set of versatile criteria that could be used at any time. When a request comes in, staff would like Government officials to answer in writing, and present recommendations if they are in disagreement. The RPC would then consider the same proposal and submit its own with comments.

Mr. Zeigler stated some people have discussed how the RPC would adopt or memorialize criteria mentioned at the top of p. 45. Perhaps amendments could be adopted by resolution, or another option could be just adopting amendments right into the Regional Plan. The latter is more complicated.

After reviewing the discussion draft, Mr. Zeigler asked for input and said if the Commission is comfortable with it, staff will continue to revise the discussion draft into an official one, and present it as soon as possible.

Commissioner Lokken stated in the 2002 Regional Plan Update a discussion ensued about predictability in amendments and proposals. He stated this predictability is needed.

Dave Ziegler replied the TAC will be addressing this area soon, as there have been discussions about confining the TMSA updates to every other year. There have only been three TMSA amendments since the 2002 update.

Commissioner Frandsen stated her approval of Cumulative Effects being included in the discussion draft. Many people were apprehensive about them because of past disagreements, but she inquired if all of the department heads have agreed it is an important issue to include in the planning process.

Zeigler replied the TAC did discuss cumulative impacts at length in their meeting, and are still

discussing its importance in the planning process.

*[The public hearing was opened.]*

Heather Singer stated at the May board meeting she heard Commissioner Mattina say she trusts developers to set their own restraints and boundaries. She stated developers do not know where to draw the line because their interests are selfish. Water is scarce, and many new homes will tap the resources already in jeopardy.

Sandra McGill with Rancho Haven Residents for Sensible Planning commented on a remark made that many of the same people are seen at the RPC meetings. She stated many voices could say the same thing, and most come as representatives for others. She said she speaks as one voice, for 36 people at Sensible Planning.

Lee Weston stated he has no objection to having the new Winnemucca Ranch included in the TMSA. He said he would like to see a consistent application for each person applying for inclusion in the TMSA, though. A list of applicable criteria should be used to determine each accepted

Sandra Hamilton mentioned she owns 40 acres at the end of Toll road. She received notification today that was sent on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, that she needed to prepare comments for the meeting. She understood the RPC and TMSA existed to benefit everyone in the public spectrum. She stated her disappointment that she is zoned for general rule, and can not subdivide or sell her land to make a profit. She mentioned she does not want a subdivision built to her fence line.

Monica Frank commented the Weston/Lowden amendment has many fallacies in its proposal, and the sensitive Washoe Valley Basin will be under jeopardy. She asked Commissioners to vote against destroying the last stretch of scenic beauty in Washoe Valley.

Louise Thomas stated her disapproval of the Weston/Lowden amendment, and stated 120 new homes in Washoe Valley will destroy its beauty and uniqueness.

Ann York stated she is happy to provide her verbal support of the Winnemucca Ranch inclusion in the TMSA.

John Hester stated his support for the item 5.b amendment. The categories for natural resource public services and facilities are good categories to use. They tie back to the Regional Plan. He stated on June 28<sup>th</sup> there will be draft criteria available in support of the amendment. Depending on the conclusion, the proposal will probably require researching additional information.

*[The public hearing was closed.]*

2. Comments (if any) from owners of parcels presently within the Truckee Meadows Service Areas that would be placed in the Rural Development Area by the proposed amendments

Dave Ziegler reviewed the staff report located on p. 51. He stated a unique set of circumstances in overall amendments were proposed in January by three local governments. Staff sent out around 100 notices and invited homeowners to make a comment tonight if they wanted. The proposed amendments would move fewer than 100 parcels from the TMSA to the RDA, in the following general locations:

- The northern end of the TMSA in the Cold Springs area;
- The Lemmon Valley area, south and east of Lemmon Drive;
- West of Sun Valley and north of Dandini Boulevard;
- The western edge of the TMSA, north of Arrowcreek;
- Pleasant Valley, south of Toll Road and east of US 395; and
- The southern end of the TMSA in the vicinity of Warm Springs.

In Washoe County land use designations, there are a variety of uses for these areas. Zeigler reported on p. 53 there is a copy of the letter sent to owners of the parcels being considered for rezoning to the RDA.

Mr. Zeigler added in answer to a question earlier, there will be a chance to comment on all issues until board makes a movement.

*[The public hearing was opened.]*

John Rhodes reported he resides in Steamboat Valley. The proposed settlement agreement would remove six lots (belonging to himself, his family and neighbor) from the TMSA. He stated the lots were in compliance with the 2002 Regional Plan. Each lot still meets the given criteria except for the ones as outline in the proposed settlement agreement. He mentioned the county is spending millions of dollars to do sewer easements and water resource testing. It is the reason why this settlement is being proposed. The lots in question are zoned high density rural areas for two acre zoning. The county says without sewer, they can't develop beyond five acres. If taken out of the TMSA, owners will not be able to develop the lots to their full potential. The property has potential. All other property will have to be created. Rhodes also mentioned that on the notices, most people don't know what they mean. He asked staff to clarify in the notices what is being spoken on and who is invited to the meeting.

John Domina stated he had the opportunity to speak a few months ago. He does not want to be removed from TMSA. After reading staff reports on three categories restructuring boundaries for the TMSA, his land is in the third category and he wishes to remain within the TMSA. He inquired why his property is being considered for removal and why inclusion of new development property takes priority over already existing property and the families residing on it.

Christian Peek reported he is being removed from the TMSA and is not sure why. He was told in 2002 that his land met criteria, and is not aware of any new criteria. He asked why the RPC would bring property into the TMSA from 26 miles out of Reno to the north and then remove closer land owners. No property owners want to be removed.

Adrian Freund explained the applied number of criteria for the new TMSA inclusion and removal. First were low density general rule or low density rural zonings that hadn't shown activity since 2002 plan. Areas such as Arrow Creek were excluded because some areas were permanently deeded against development. The RPC also wanted owners to come forward as they have tonight.

Mr. Freund also stated the settlement agreement has already been proposed, and because Washoe County is in a relatively fixed TMSA, many property owners in the county expressed their desire to move ahead with development in the last few years. Some were not provided with TMSA inclusion in the 2002 Regional Plan, or were ready to provide development in settlement agreements. The RPC is simply asking for flexibility to move ahead with proposals.

Adrian Freund reported that with proposing some of the rollbacks in January, the RPC has looked again at them and would like to note that under Washoe County's one map system, this Board will get final approval on every settlement or proposal that comes through. Every planned amendment will get to be discussed at these meetings for a complete review. If the Board decides to leave these in the TMSA, it would still have complete discretion as to how they would be developed.

Mr. Freund stated some areas may be less than five acres, but are entitled to one unit per parcel. Owners may need municipal services to develop even one unit and possibly if less than 5 acres. Currently in first division of these parcels there may occur developments that would still be under Washoe Health Department rules if they split into many lesser parcels.

*[The public hearing was closed.]*

Commissioner Romeo inquired why the parcels were already included in the TMSA. He stated his approval of the suggestion from Washoe County about asking people whether or not they would like to be included or removed from the TMSA. He mentioned this way the Board can deal with projects as they come up in the future and avoid many disagreements with landowners.

Commissioner Lokken stated open space lands could be taken out, and also those who would voluntarily like to be removed. It is not the intent of the Board to take force changes, but to recognize and suggest where services can logically be given. That's why the TMSA has offered its services.

Commissioner Frandsen inquired what will happen to the state of the acreage dilemma if the new TMSA amendment is not approved.

Adrian Freund replied there is information included in the settlement agreement that lays out the acreage of each TMSA. Proposed rollback areas were footnoted in the proposal for the county. No one has reached a decision whether those rollback areas were in or

excluded from the settlement agreement. He mentioned flexibility for the additions the county had proposed are the desired response as the county intends to use open areas to provide that flexibility.

Commissioner Frandsen stated there has to be a balance because the same situation could happen to other landowners, and changes need to be made to ensure it does not before additional amendments are voted on.

Mr. Freund replied the county has enough reserve resources to satisfy the additions being proposed in the settlement.

Commissioner Frandsen inquired why this open space is not being used instead of the existing property areas.

Adrian Freund replied the county used a variety of lands. Some open space areas are federal land especially in north Stead off of Lemmon Drive. A Large amount used is also Arrow Creek open space allocated fully to the county. The county was only allowed to include federal land because some limited areas were included in the FEMSA.

Commissioner Rogers stated the proposed changes go out to Warm Springs and Cold Springs. He mentioned Mr. Freund never answered why some people may be removed from the TMSA when they have the facilities to hook up to within a reasonable distance.

Mr. Freund replied he was unclear if Commissioner Rogers was referring to actions of the 2002 Regional Plan or these rollbacks. With respect to the southern portion of Warm Springs, the specific land area has moved forward to five acre parcels. These are being parceled out and will not need municipal facilities. The areas were proposed for rollback on that basis. Since 2002 those areas no longer require services.

Commissioner Rogers inquired if Warm Springs is being removed from the TMSA completely?

Mr. Freund replied only the specific parcels as outline will be removed.

*[The public hearing was closed.]*

- C. Progress report on the 2007 update of the Regional Plan and consideration and possible action to revise the membership of the RPC's update oversight committee

Rosanna Coombes reported there has been a change in membership on the TAC Committee and suggested the appointment of Jim Newberg to the TAC to replace Oscar Sanders who recently resigned from the Reno Planning Commission.

**COMMISSIONER FRANDSEN MADE A MOTION TO AFFIRM THAT THE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE CONSISTS OF THE RPC CHAIR, VICE-CHAIR, AND IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIR, AND APPOINT JIM NEWBERG TO THE COMMITTEE TO REPLACE OSCAR SANDERS.**

SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FRANDBSEN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Commissioner Mattina inquired why Module 1 specifically targets only emerging employment tools for monitoring.

Rosanna Coombs replied the TAC is working on general infill standards and environment standards at the moment. Module 1 is simply another category the committee is looking at.

Commissioner Mattina inquired what monitoring will be done.

Rosanna Coombes replied the TAC is discussing whether monitoring should even be done for these areas. More information will follow as the TAC continues the discussion.

**D.** Consideration and possible direction to staff regarding:

1. Resolution of the Washoe County Commission (May 9, 2006) initiating an amendment to the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan that provides for conformance for the Sun Valley Area Plan update and
2. Pending Regional Plan conformance reviews of Washoe County's updated Sun Valley Area Plan and North Valleys Area Plan

Randy Baxley stated on December 13, 2005, the Washoe County Commission adopted an update of the Sun Valley Area Plan (SVAP), which is a component of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan. Part of the SVAP included identification of a "Downtown Character Management Area" along portions of Sun Valley Boulevard that allowed for a combination of commercial land uses and multi-family development at densities up to 14 dwelling units per acre.

Randy Baxley inquired how the Board would like to proceed with the amendment and performance reviews:

- Direct staff to meet with Washoe County staff to develop specific language to amend one or more Regional Plan policies to allow the SVAP to be found in conformance, and to bring that proposed language back to the RPC in the form of a resolution to amend the Regional Plan;
- Defer consideration of the proposed Regional Plan amendment pending completion of consideration of the Regional Plan amendments the local entities approved for submittal on January 12, currently under consideration by the RPC;
- Direct staff to process the conformance request for the SVAP and bring it forward with a recommendation to the RPC under the existing Regional Plan policies.

Mr. Baxley reported the second issue has to do with the North Valleys Area Plan and similar areas. The plan has not been addressed before, to RPC staff would like some direction on which of the following actions to take:

- The limits on density apply to the whole of the planning area - I.e., the land use designations for portions of the planning area may exceed 3 du/ac, as long as the overall density within the plan area remains below that level

- The density limits are applied to individual development projects (e.g., tentative maps, special use permits); individual properties may exceed this density as long as the overall density for each project conforms with the 3 du/ac restriction (e.g., individual portions of a project that may exceed the density restriction are balanced by others within the project that are developed below 3 du/ac).
- The restriction applies to each individual parcel within the plan area. No parcel may have a land use designation that allows a density greater than three dwelling units per acre.

Dave Ziegler stated if any action is taken on this agenda item RPC staff will still be sending out a 60 day public notice before the amendment takes place. July 12<sup>th</sup> is the final day for the notice to be sent out.

Commissioner Moss stated no homeowners have appeared in the public hearing so far inquired if they need to speak at the hearing before an amendment can be voted on?

Mr. Ziegler replied with the Sun Valley plan there would need to be a stand alone amendment or a generic one such as the one proposed on January 12<sup>th</sup>. The North Valleys plan is a bit different. It doesn't require an amendment and is open to interpretation by the Board.

Eric Young reported there is a pre-existing high density land use designation. It was maintained in the North Valleys plan. No down zoning was done.

Commissioner Rogers inquired if that means the zoning cannot go about seven dwelling units?

Mr. Young reported zoning will be seven units per acre for detached single family units and nine for attached dwellings.

*[The public hearing was opened.]*

Melissa Lindell stated she has attended over 30 public meetings on the North Valley plan. It received unanimous approval from all county commissioners. The plan is at three dwelling units per acre right now and has some zoning differences, but density in the overall plan is well under three units per acre. She stated it still meets density requirements and would like to see move forward with no technicalities.

Ms. Lindsey stated the Board found the Sierra Reflections amendment in compliance with plan, and would like to see the Sun Valley plan approved. The Sierra Reflections amendment has much more than three dwellings per acre and they can be a higher density. With a plan like North Valleys, there are vast open areas designated for general rule space. He asked the Board to review projects, not master plans and change the master plan if needed at a later date.

Bill Whitney reported he has been working for few years on the Sun Valley area plan update. He described downtown Sun Valley and said the vision is to achieve a vibrant and attractive downtown area through a mix of high density residential and commercial spaces with offices and attractive landscaping. Property owners are waiting to develop along the boulevard.

Commissioner Rogers agreed with a lot of the North Valley area plan except for the last sentence saying, "as long as the overall density remains below that level" on option 1 on page 62.

Eric Young stated if the Board chooses to go approve that option there would be very few area plans in the county that would comply with the three units per acre. He pointed out the other two options and suggested option two as the best choice.

Commission Moss stated the three units per acre section was put in the proposal so the county didn't participate in urban development. If allowed to occur, it can take any piece of land and increase the density.

Commissioner Mattina confirmed the general establishment of three units per acre would apply to the entire Sun Valley area plan. If this is correct, verbiage will be needed saying that developers will not build on every piece of land available.

Adrian Freund reported only a fraction of open space in the area is considered developable. It is not merely a matter of taking out the areas considered in the Regional Plan. Regional conformance should not be applied to every plan. With the case of the Sun Valley corridor, there were a number of preexisting high density areas before the current proposal. Currently the TAC is discussing secondary or tributary corridors. He suggested a three unit per acre cutoff is arbitrary for urban development areas. The number of dwellings per acre needs to be increased. County commissioners have voted unanimously on both area plans; both are excellent cases of smart growth. He asked the Board to consider a favorable outcome to this area plan.

Commissioner Romeo asked if Mr. Freund was asking for guidance from the Board as well as approving option two as the most favorable option?

Mr. Freund said yes.

Commissioner Newberg said he is in support of the Sun Valley and North Valley plans.

Commissioner Rogers stated his approval of the Sun Valley plan. He stated his favor of option one (if modified) in the North Valleys plan.

Commissioner Moss stated the county is interpreting the original 2002 plan with three units per acre, and now are trying to stretch the plan and add more units. He said the plan will end up with more units per acre in the county instead of the city and would like to stick with 2002 plan of three units per acre.

Commissioner Mattina agreed with Commissioner Moss.

Randy Baxley reminded the planning commissioners that the three unit per acre rule only applies to areas included in the TMSA. Areas outside of it will not have to use that density.

Commissioner Frandsen stated the Sun Valley community is largely in favor of the plan, and it is

time to start listening to people who reside there.

Commissioner Lokken stated that when people start mixing uses of land management and density, the mistake of not talking comprehensively about the plan can often be made.

Commissioner Frandsen said she would agree under normal circumstances, and it would go to the update instead of becoming an amendment, but in this case it is not a normal circumstance.

*[The public hearing was opened.]*

Diana Langs said Sun Valley is unique. It does not look suburban, but urban because of its density. Residents have the uniqueness of being near a community college as well as a high traffic volume through the area and affordable community housing. The new strip mall and more employment will be arriving soon; realty, restaurants and small businesses are all going in. Residents are staying in the valley. The community has undergone, and still desires to, change in more positive ways.

Jim Jackson said people have been working since 2001 trying to develop a better Sun Valley area plan. Businessmen, realtors, lawyers, and more than 20 people have been working on it for many years. Sun valley Boulevard runs for miles and has mixed development the whole way. People would like to give property owners incentive to dress up their property and grow further. The community is trying to keep businesses on the boulevard, but the lots in Sun Valley are mostly 1/3 acre parcels. They are liked and most people don't want to break them up.

Jeff Miller invited the Board to tour Sun Valley and see the new developments and landscaping. The look of the valley is changing. Incentives to develop land along the boulevard have worked. There is a need to develop higher densities to serve and support the businesses. Eliminating excessive sprawl would be good too.

*[The public hearing was closed.]*

Commissioner Lokken said he appreciated all comments and stated the second TOD in Sun Valley is a reason why the update should wait. It is an intense process. It would be premature to rush into the Regional Plan Update.

Commissioner Moss stated the Board should treat all areas of the county equally, giving equal opportunity for all communities. Sun Valley Boulevard could be a great commercial area. Many other valleys could ask for approval on the same basis though. He stated precedent will be made on this decision.

**COMMISSIONER FRANSDEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE DENSITY LIMITS FOR THE SVAP AND NVAP AS APPLIED TO INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (E.G., TENTATIVE MAPS, SPECIAL USE PERMITS); INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES MAY EXCEED THIS DENSITY AS LONG AS THE OVERALL DENSITY FOR EACH PROJECT CONFORMS WITH THE 3 DU/AC RESTRICTION (E.G., INDIVIDUAL PORTIONS OF A PROJECT THAT MAY EXCEED THE DENSITY RESTRICTION ARE BALANCED BY**

OTHERS WITHIN THE PROJECT THAT ARE DEVELOPED BELOW 3 DU/AC).  
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NEWBERG. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH 6  
MEMBER FOR, AND 3 AGAINST.

**6. DIRECTOR, MEMBER, AND LEGAL COUNSEL INFORMATION ITEMS**

**A. Director's reports:**

Report on actions and agendas of the Regional Planning Governing Board\*

Mr. Zeigler reported the next meeting of the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) will take place on June 8. The agenda for that date includes: (1) a status report on the proposed amendments to the 2002 Regional Plan, (2) consideration of the City of Reno's appeal of the RPC's determination of non-conformance regarding the proposed Reno master plan amendment known as Butler Ranch North, (3) consideration of the legislative memorandum of cooperation and the possible addition of the University of Nevada to the memo, (4) receipt of the final draft program of work for FY 06-07, and (5) various reports and administrative items.

The July RPGB will take place on July 13.

**2. REPORT ON TRUCKEE MEADOWS GROWTH TASK FORCE**

Mr. Zeigler reported the Truckee Meadows Growth Task Force has issued its preliminary report, including an executive summary and committee reports on:

- Natural resources and access to open space;
- Affordable housing;
- Transportation;
- Downtown revitalization; and
- Community reinvestment fund.

**3. Consideration and possible acceptance of individual annual reports submitted by local governments and affected entities pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 278.0286.**

Patty Rogers reported no additional reports are available since the last meeting.

**4. Report on possible barriers to infill and best practices to promote infill**

**5. Report on constraints and carrying capacities of the region's infrastructure networks**  
*[Both reports were oral presentations given via slideshow. Media versions of the presentation are available at the RPC office.]*

**B. LEGAL COUNSEL'S REPORT**

**1. Status report and possible direction to staff on Washoe County's petition for judicial review of the certification of Reno's annexation program as conforming with the Regional Plan and related settlement agreement dated August 23, 2005**

**2. Status report on Washoe County's request to initiate a possible amendment of the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan pursuant to paragraph A.1 of the settlement agreement (October 17, 2002), to roll back Reno's sphere of influence in the vicinity of St. James's resort and Pleasant Valley**

3. Status report on *Voters for Sensible Growth, et al. vs. RPGB et al.*, amended petition for writ of prohibition or, alternatively, mandamus

Norm Azevedo reported he has been fully briefed now. Supplemental pleading will begin tomorrow. He had the agency do research from a historical standpoint on how RPC has handled denied proposals brought forward in the past. Beginning in 1993 through the present, it appears there are four denials on file. This is important because it shows past practice and the courts will see that when the board denies a proposal, the governing board does review and sometimes does disagree.

Commissioner Moss inquired if the temporary order by the judge affects the Board?

Norm Azevedo said no. All business can be conducted as usual. The group who filed the petition is trying to restrain the board, but they are changing their case and it isn't factual.

## 7. REQUESTS FOR AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Zeigler reported the RPC should anticipate the following items on the agendas for the next meetings:

- June 28<sup>th</sup> - (1) public hearing and possible action to recommend RPGB adoption of proposed Regional Plan amendments submitted jointly by Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County pursuant to the August 2005 settlement agreement, and technical amendments proposed by Regional Planning staff; (2) consideration and direction to staff on criteria for evaluation of individual requests for Regional Plan amendments to modify the TMSA (also known as the "group 3" amendments); (3) receipt of final draft work program for FY 06-07; and (4) regular reports.
- July 12<sup>th</sup> - election of chair and vice-chair; conformance reviews; receipt of summary annual report for 2005; further action as appropriate on criteria for evaluation of "group 3" amendments; and regular reports.

Dave Ziegler stated June 28<sup>th</sup> will be his last meeting. He submitted his resignation on June 9<sup>th</sup>. He reported the proposal to have the urban land council come for an evaluation will be done in the future, but has been cancelled for this year.

## 8. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

Commissioner Lokken resigned from the RPC effective immediately.

## 9. ADJOURNMENT

9:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Hope Hepner.

Reviewed by:

Approved by:

---

Rosanna Coombes, Acting Director  
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

---

Jim Newberg, Chair  
Regional Planning Commission

**APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION IN SESSION ON \_\_\_\_\_, 2006.**