



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, May 24, 2006, 6:30 p.m.

The Regional Planning Commission 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 Lokken at 6:33 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, Jackie Peterson for Kendall Mattina, Marvin Moss, Dennis Romeo, Steve Rogers, and 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;

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COMMISSIONER ROGERS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MAY 24, 2006 RPC AGENDA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MOSS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT*

NONE

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

**A. CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RPC RESOLUTION 06-03,
MEMORIALIZING CHRIS EXLINE**

COMMISSIONER MOSS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE RPC RESOLUTION 06-03, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROGERS.

Director Ziegler made a personal statement in memory of Chris Exline.

Chair Lokken acknowledged the presence of the Exline family, and Director Ziegler read into the record RPC Resolution 06-03, memorializing Chris Exline.

Chris Exline's son stated his father enjoyed all the time he spent doing regional planning here

One East First Street, Suite 1100, Reno, NV 89501-1625
775-321-8385; Fax 775-321-8386
<http://www.tmrpa.org>

in northern Nevada, and if he were still here he would be extremely touched. He thanked the Commission for their kindness and consideration of his father's memory.

Commissioner Rogers made a personal statement in memory of Chris Exline.

RPC RESOLUTION 06-03 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Chair Lokken made a personal statement in memory of Chris Exline.

B. CONSIDERATION OF, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON, RPC RESOLUTION 06-04, RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR THE SERVICE OF OSCAR SANDERS AS MEMBER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER ROGERS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE RPC RESOLUTION 06-03, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NEWBERG.

Commissioners Newberg, Rogers and Lokken made personal statements about Commissioner Sanders.

RPC RESOLUTION 06-04 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

C. CONSIDERATION OF, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON, RPC RESOLUTION 06-05, RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR THE SERVICE OF RANDY BARTON AS MEMBER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER ROGERS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE RPC RESOLUTION 06-05, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FRANDBSEN.

Commissioners Newberg, Romeo, Frandsen and Lokken made personal statements about Commissioner Barton.

RPC RESOLUTION 06-05 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

D. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - City of Reno Master Plan Amendment and Project of Regional Significance, Downtown Reno Regional Center Plan (CR06-014), (1) adopting the Downtown Reno Regional Center Plan as an element of the Reno Master Plan, for +461 acre area generally located south of Interstate 80, east of Keystone Avenue, west of Wells Avenue, and north of the Truckee River and California Avenue; and (2) a Project of Regional Significance for potential development resulting from implementation of the plan creating employment of 938 or more persons; hotel accommodations of 625 or more units; housing of 625 or more dwelling units; water usage of 625 or more acre-feet per year; sewage generation of 187,500 or more gallons per day; and/or traffic of 6,250 or more average daily trips.

Randy Baxley gave an update on the staff report regarding the Downtown Reno Regional Center Plan (CR06-014). Mr. Baxley stated that the plan area is divided into five districts:

- Wells Avenue District - located in the northeastern portion of the plan area;

- Entertainment District - located in the central portion of the plan area, north of the river;
- Keystone Avenue District - located in the northwest portion of the plan area;
- California Avenue District - located in the southern portion of the plan area, south of the river; and
- Truckee River District - located along both sides of the river throughout the plan area.

Mr. Baxley reported that Regional Plan Policy 1.2.12 establishes minimum density and floor area ratio (FAR) standards for area within those centers. With each of the five districts, there are differing standards for residential and non-residential density. Three of the districts - Wells, Entertainment and Keystone - meet the minimum standards for FARs. There is however an escape clause in Policy 1.2.12 that states:

Alternative residential density and non-residential FARs may be specified in Master Plans in designated portions of TOD Corridors and centers where high densities are deemed incompatible or if analysis prepared under Policy 1.2.9 determines that those standards are sufficient to support the desired level of public transit, and provide the required housing and jobs capacity outlined in Table 1.2.1.

Mr. Baxley reported both the California Avenue, and Truckee River Districts are adjacent to established, older, lower-density residential neighborhoods. In the interest of compatibility, the Regional Plan has set lower standards for density and testing these areas to provide compatibility between existing neighborhoods and also transition between those neighborhoods and the high intensity standards via the Entertainment and other districts. On that basis, Regional staff has concluded these provisions do meet the intent of Regional Plan Policy 1.2.12, and on that basis are recommending the determination of conformance for both the Master Plan amendment and the Project of Regional Significance based on the findings contained in the staff report.

Commissioner Newberg asked if the statement on p. 013 about the Downtown Reno Regional Center Plan partially addressing the exceptions is because of the California Avenue and Truckee River Districts.

Mr. Baxley replied it is included because the exceptions require doing plans for all Regional Centers and corridors. This is just one of the plans, and there are still several plans outstanding that need to be completed.

[The Public hearing was opened.]

Lori Wray, President of Scenic Nevada, stated she found out that billboards that were going to be excluded in some of the TODs and Regional Centers, were put back in. She inquired if billboards are excluded or included in the Downtown Regional Center Plan.

[The Public hearing was closed.]

John Hester, Director of Community Development for the City of Reno (COR), stated the plan does not address billboards. The planning meeting did discuss billboards though, and they are allowed by certain land uses in the building code, and industrial ICIP. The City of Reno planning commission asked to continue that item to the next agenda.

Claudia Hansen, Interim Planning Manager for City of Reno, added off-premise advertisement was listed as a prohibited use, but as Mr. Hester stated, it is being revisited. It is not a portion of the Master Plan, but is a part of the Code section.

Commissioner Brabbin stated the billboard issue has been continued to a June meeting, but the billboard issue was not added back in, but the committee has asked for some more time to address the issue and possible pile-up issue in other places if they are not allowed in the Downtown Center Plan.

Commissioner Moss inquired about the reason for excessive use of the word “should” and the phrase “are encouraged” in the plan.

Mr. Hester replied that Reno’s legal counsel has advised that “should” is the appropriate use in policies or plans such as this. “Should” is used in plans and policies, and “shall” is used in development code.

[Chair Lokken reopened the public hearing for Item D.]

Gary Schmidt stated city courthouses downtown on the river being remodeled and renovated is absurd. It is valuable property, being used for business purposes. He stated some policies encouraged development of key attractions on the river, and a courthouse is not a key attraction. Parking is non existent for the courthouse, and if the courthouse was moved directly across the street from the Commissioner’s Office on Ninth Street, it would be much more functional and extremely less expensive. He stated it was very poor planning to build the courthouse in a core area downtown.

[The public hearing was closed]

COMMISSIONER FRANSDEN MADE A MOTION TO FIND THE DOWNTOWN RENO REGIONAL CENTER PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE RENO MASTER PLAN IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLANNING, BASED ON THE FINDINGS IN THE STAFF REPORT. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROGERS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS MOVED TO FIND THE DOWNTOWN RENO REGIONAL CENTER PLAN, A PROJECT OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLAN BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MOSS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

E. STATUS REPORT ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE 2002 TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLAN, INCLUDING AMENDMENTS PROPOSED JOINTLY BY RENO, SPARKS, AND WASHOE COUNTY PURSUANT TO THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF RENO’S ANNEXATION PROGRAM (AUGUST 23, 2005)

Director Ziegler reported on the staff report beginning on page 21. On pages 22 - 24 there is a chronology leading up to the proposed Regional Plan Amendments. Staff of TMRPA is working on the amendments, and request listed in the chronology. He noted that previous discussion of notice to property owners who will be removed from the TMSA if the amendments proposed by the local governments on January 12, 2006 were to be adopted. Individual written notice to those property owners, which total fewer than 100, has been given and the Chair concurred with Director Ziegler that an item should be placed on the next June 14, 2006 agenda specifically to receive any written or verbal comment from such persons. It would also be the intent during that meeting to give a progress report on the requested drafted amendments.

[The public comment time was opened.]

Heather Singer stated it was foolish for Commissioner Mattina to say at last week's meeting that she sees no reason why growth in our area should not be developer driven. Anyone who stands to profit should never be allowed sole discretion in making those decisions on which their potential profit is based. These decisions impact everyone in our community. In essence, she said that although developers stand to profit from exploiting our local land and wilderness areas, she trusts them in setting their own restraints and boundaries. Looking around at the many construction sites where the land used to thrive with life, it seems clear the developers do not know where to draw the line. The housing market has slowed, and the need for new homes is dwindling. Yet the proposals for rezoning and subdivision permits continue to pour in and get approved. Water is scarce, and future taxpayers may have to bear the burden of bringing in water from outside sources. Acres of land continue to disappear each month to make way for more homes, roads and shopping centers. Las Vegas and Southern California were all painted by developers years ago as carefully planned communities that would ensure the "American Dream" for years to come. These people will continue to exploit the natural resources of others as long as allowed to do so. They will do the same in Reno as well. She urged the committee to reconsider their vote so energy can be directed toward the 2007 RPC Plan Update.

Jennifer Shaffer stated she is a fourth generation Nevadan, the third generation to attend the University of Nevada, Reno. Around her home in Lemmon Valley, subdivisions have been developed in many areas. Many homes are for sale. Foreclosures are happening everywhere. People buy a home, realized they can design one to their liking a few miles away, and then put their home on the market. Unable to sell their first home, and with two mortgages, families lose one to the bank. Some wells in the area are still in use, but most have dried up. Water is a huge issue. It is said that the water for the new developments will be taken from the Truckee River, but enormous businesses have drilled wells for their own use, and homeowners are now prohibited from owning their own. Hopefully the youth of the area will be able to fix all of the things that we screw up.

Lori Wray stated Scenic Nevada's mission statement is to preserve, protect and enhance the scenic character of Nevada. Scenic Nevada attended the meeting because it realizes the annexation decisions made today as a community will affect the scenic character of Nevada for generations to come. Scenic Nevada has been following the process, and has attended all of the RPC meetings, along with the workshop on May 1, 2006. Wray asked the committee to

consider the proposal of annexation amendments included in their packets as deliberation occurs on this topic. The desire of Scenic Nevada was to incorporate clear and simple policies that meet the goals desired by the community. The aim was to endorse policies that allow us to plan for growth, yet preserve our sensitive lands for future generations. Whatever amendments the committee chooses to support, Scenic Nevada hopes you will choose ones that consider a balanced approach as outline in the submitted proposal.

Erik Holland mentioned he has been following the annexation issue for awhile. He encouraged newer members of the RPC to step back and consider all the repercussions of approving a 100 year plan. He doesn't know why there were so many turnovers on the committee, but it takes awhile to consider the implications of such an extreme plan. The Reno Master Plan stated that growth will be redirected away from suburban fringe, and towards the urban core, and that is what will happen. At the last public hearing, contractors were here concerned about jobs and housing; those are important concerns. A retirement community 20 miles outside of town will not help affordable housing in town. Developers taking over projects because they are the only ones who can pay for it does not make any sense. We can't turn over control of our community to those who have the money to handle it. He commended those committee members who advocate rolling this process into the 2007 Update Plan, and urged newer members to step back and consider concentrated growth, not leapfrog growth.

Craig Smyers stated he grew up in the suburbs. Neighborhoods spring up around its families. He stated he lives downtown, and those inhabitants who live downtown use sidewalks to converse, meet and travel. Life downtown is rich in art, theater, special events, restaurants and people. Health and sociological studies show social interaction is good for people. Zoning for density is a good thing. Imagine Truckee Meadows before we built all over it. Plant and animal must have been spectacular. The unique and rich habitat is essentially gone. We built on the best land, and worldwide humans are destroying valuable habitats for plants and animals. We cannot stop the destruction elsewhere, but we can stop it here.

Amy-Louise Mazza stated she and her family have not been able to develop their family's ranch out in Gerlach, NV for years but there is concern and questions arising from the plans to start new developments in the area. Mazza read a poem called "Wrestling the Beast" by Carl Sproll. She stated environmental destruction is not a topic to be taken lightly, and it is presumptuous to think we can plan today for the next 100 years. The downside of sprawl is the loss of public community and pivotal community.

Gary Schmidt mentioned his disapproval of the annexation of Gerlach. He stated the quality of life will be desecrated by sprawl, and people will no longer want to move here. Long time residents will give up and move from the area, giving up their family homes to house any newcomers coming to the area. We are headed in that direction. He stated bodies of government officials such as the RPC should propose limits on the physical number of people allowed to move into cities or communities. When cities or communities grow larger, officials should form entirely new cities instead of overpopulating the existing ones. Growing up and not out is the way to go. Options for downtown living are needed, not continual sprawl.

Chair Lokken read the two written comments:

- Scott Kelley wrote "Please take your time and consider all proposals brought forward at the May 1, 2006 public workshop. The public and the commissioners need more

- time to absorb all of the information.”
- Doug Smith wrote “I support Lori Wray and Scenic Nevada’s comments considering the annexation.”

Robbin Palmer read a letter indicating her disgust that the public workshop was not held before the meeting to determine the outcome of the annexation proposal. She stated the meeting was beneficial, and it was good to have a meeting with such beneficial forum opportunities to speak and give opinions. She stated she attended the May 10, 2006 RPC meeting. Those who thought the workshop was worthless were those who wanted the annexation, and those who thought the workshop was beneficial were those who thought more time and more consideration was needed before any decisions about annexation were made.

Jim McGill, President of Rancho Haven Property Owners’ Association, stated he has been to RPC meetings before, mentioned his regret at not being able to attend the last meeting where a vote of 5-3 was given to send these annexation proposals onto the Governing Board for approval. He stated his surprise and puzzlement at the vote, because at the previous meeting the same commission voted 7-1 to do just the opposite - allow the amendments to be considered as a normal part of the 2007 Update process. He wondered what happened between the two meetings. Turnover on the board is obvious, but many in the audience view the proceedings with skepticism because of the determination of the board to overcome the obvious will of the people, in order to force the amendments and undercut the normal amendment process and give developers what they want. The Rancho Haven road will become extremely dangerous should projects like the Winnemucca Ranch development be approved. He urged commissioners to let the amendments be part of the normal 2007 update process.

[The public comment time was closed.]

F. STATUS REPORT ON THE 2007 UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL PLAN, INCLUDING

1. Report on conceptual agreements of the technical advisory committee and
Rosanna Coombes directed the committee’s attention to page 26 of the staff report. At the last TAC meeting, members came to the conclusion that Module 1 has been completed except for Issues 8, 9 and 10. They would like to come back to these items if time allows after more pressing matters are handled.

2. Possible action to amend the membership of the technical advisory committee

A request from Margaret Powell, City Planner for the City of Sparks, has been made to change their alternate member on the TAC. RPC staff would recommend the approval of replacing Rob Joiner with Jim Rundle as both the City of Sparks alternate, and also the Spark Redevelopment Agency alternate on the TAC.

COMMISSIONER MOSS MADE A MOTION TO REPLACE ROB JOINER WITH JIM RUNDLE AS BOTH THE CITY OF SPARKS ALTERNATE AND ALSO THE SPARKS REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY ALTERNATE ON THE TAC. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PETERSON. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Chair Lokken inquired how the TAC feels it is doing on the timeline to take care of all issues.

Mrs. Coombes stated the process put forward and adopted by the RPC last February had some issues that had not yet had an opportunity to be discussed. A timeline was split into four different segments. When the discussion of the priority of those issues was handled last December, Module 1 was essentially the heavy lifting in terms of the work of the TAC. Dividing the time by four was a bit simplistic. To specifically answer the question, the timeline is going well, but the TAC may need to have a few extra meetings to get things done in the timeline provided.

Director Zeigler reported the TAC is trying to keep in mind that the TAC hopes to have the Urban Land Institute under contract this week or next, to bring an advisory panel to Reno in mid September to review progress on the update and implementation of the plan. In terms of a deadline or target to get that work done, the mid September date is the goal.

Mrs. Coombes went back to the first item of the TAC agenda's staff report. Conceptual Agreements of the TAC are being worked, but would like to present two issues (Issue #2 and Issue #4) to the committee tonight.

Mrs. Coombes directed the committee to page 29 of their packet, listing Module 1, Issue 2. It states the need to make sure there is an appropriate amount of land uses and that they are in the right locations in the region. What is being proposed are some modification to the existing plan, not new plans.

- The first one states the importance of taking maximum advantage of some of the existing resources in our region so that Master Plans to list the existing resources in the community.
- The second sets of changes being proposed are to provide some illustrative examples of compatibility in the region. Nothing is actually illustrated in the plan right now, so the idea is to actually add that to the plan in the future.
- The third proposal in this section is that the Master Plans of local governments should provide for a wide range of land uses, and should address adjacency issues acknowledging the diversity of our community and proper management of the interface between the uses.
- The fourth issue is regarding Master plans promoting the shift towards mixed-use human scale development, focusing on building communities and providing transportation choices and conserving resources.
- The fifth element of the issue is a recognition of part of the broader region, and recognizing there is room for better coordination, and information sharing; not only within our region, but with others in surrounding counties. Some language suggests any informal multi-county working group to share information and discuss land use planning concepts at a broader level. The second element of that would be proper caring house of regional land use data to raise the bar in terms of our knowledge of what is

happening in the region.

Commissioner Frandsen asked what will happen if time does not allow the TAC to come back to Issues 8, 9 and 10.

Mrs. Coombes replied the list of issues being in priority order included a type of wish list for things that were not necessarily essential, but the TAC would like to complete in the timeframe given. Some items at the bottom of the list were not time specific, and some issues were critical. On page 26 the item noted as Issue #10 was actually a specific request put forward by the City of Reno, and their council did take action to request the amendment. The TAC did have the discussion that if it did come back to those three items, the duty was to acknowledge the consideration of that particular item before the others.

Commissioner Moss stated he would like to see the plan and the wording before approving anything.

Mrs. Coombes replied that is the next step for the TAC. To extract the policies that this will affect will be a lengthy process, but the TAC has already started a substantial spreadsheet listing all of the policies that this will affect. The amendment is still at the conceptual level, and no draft language has been completed yet.

Director Ziegler added some TAC members had the same concerns, and would like more specifics before approving anything.

Mrs. Coombes moved on to Module 1, Issue 4. She focused on pages 36 and 37 of the staff report. The TAC has proposed five separate clusters of proposed changes:

- There are many different types of infill projects with different objectives;
- The Regional Plan should emphasize developing neighborhoods and place-making;
- Infill planning must be integrated with plans for public services, infrastructure, and such natural and man-made features as parks, ponds, bikeways, greenbelts, flood ways, drainage ways, and outdoor recreation sites;
- While there is a need for specific, measurable infill goals, they need to be revisited; and
- The Regional Plan should convey positive impressions of infill, through the use of drawings, photographs, and specific examples.

Chair Lokken requested the consideration of incentives at the Regional Planning level that would make the conformance process more attractive. He also stated improving the quality of life in many areas relates to the image of infill. People are asked to adjust to a number of negative, but very few positive realities to the new ways of life in their area.

Chair Lokken stated good, logical planning is something that is an ongoing dialogue. A number of issues that don't address the immediate workability of the Region Plan might be allowed for a longer discussion or dealt with by land committees, but that is

okay. It affects the future.

Commissioner Romeo stated, in reference to Module 3, the committee needs to know what resources and funding opportunities are available before talking about infill and larger acreage for the Master Plan. Sewer, water and transportation are a considerable part of the aspects of starting on new projects. Research on gas and electrical utilities as well are important to the planning structure of the community. Several thousand projects have been approved, but where will the resources come from? He stated the details and research information must be considered before more consideration of growth occurs.

Director Ziegler replied in response to Commissioner Romeo, that his comments are in line with the motive of the TAC. They addressed in the packet that a common misperception of infill is that it utilizes abandoned or underutilized infrastructure, and is therefore easy to do. However, the TAC members have been quite clear that more often than not, that is not the case. There are always barriers to infill. The best incentives that we as a region can provide are certainty and infrastructure, and the TAC is trying to provide that through the local government and providing special use permits, etc. Proactive infrastructure is being discussed.

Commissioner Romeo stated he would still like to know the limits of our capacity, and what limits have been reached, or have room to grow in the future. It is critical to a good plan for the future.

Director Ziegler reported there will be two reports on the next agenda prepared by contractors on infill barriers and also capacity constraints on the infrastructure network. Both items are pertinent recommendations and were designed to feed into the update process at the next meeting.

Commissioner Moss stated people should follow the Regional Plan instead of what transportation would like.

Chair Lokken concurred with Commissioner Romeo's comments and stated the timing and details of infrastructure are important to the planning process. Also, historically it would be prudent to know these details before pressing ahead and identifying the lands in future proposals or amendments such as the annexation proposal.

Mr. Hester stated several comments made about infrastructure are in line with the TAC work. Some issues slightly differ though, such as Issues 8, 9 and 10. The coding of those issues are not *as* important as the infrastructure. The direction the TAC came to was that the infrastructure is the critical element and priority right now.

Margaret Powell stated that Issue 10 would be priority, but that the TAC committee felt that Issue 8 would occur at a local level and the Regional Plan shouldn't dictate what kind of zoning classifications that will follow in the next few years. Issue 9, the jobs/housing balance was discussing the appropriate amount of lands in the right location. Not to say the jobs/housing discussion would not be addressed if time was available, but many comments made this evening about infrastructure are great

because it has been a missing link in many ways. That is a major reason why those discussions were included in the settlement agreement.

Mr. Ziegler concurred with the statements made.

5. DIRECTOR, MEMBERS, AND LEGAL COUNSEL INFORMATION ITEMS

A. DIRECTOR'S REPORTS:

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

Mr. Ziegler reported on the staff report located on page 43 of the committee packet. At the May 11, 2006 Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) the following issues were discussed:

- Received an educational presentation, "Hallmarks of success for Western communities," by Luther Propst, Sonoran Institute, Tucson, AZ;
- Received a status report on the RPC's deliberations on the proposed amendments to the 2002 Regional Plan, including amendments submitted jointly by Reno, Sparks and Washoe County on January 12, 2006;
- Accepted the third quarterly report on the FY 05-06 budget and work program; and
- Approved the required program of training for RPC member William Weber.

The next meeting of the RPGB will take place on June 8, 2006.

Chair Lokken inquired if the committee is done now with the year's presentations.

Director Ziegler reported the RPGB may be able to line up a speaker on affordable and workforce housing in July. A pending contract with Robert Grow, from Envision Utah and he will be here in August.

Chair Lokken inquired if this will continue into next year.

Director Ziegler reported it is in the budget and will continue next year.

Chair Lokken acknowledged the Governing Board for budgeting for these types of presentations, and finding the kind of presentations that we need to hear to further benefit the community. Each presentation was well worth our time.

Director Ziegler reported that one of those sessions for next year may be dedicated to skill building and a more detail oriented presenter who would do hands-on work.

Chair Lokken suggested considering the jobs/housing issue as well, if it has not been considered yet. Success stories in the region would be good to note as it is one of the hardest imbalances to correct.

Ziegler stated the RPGB did receive an appeal from the City of Reno on the year determination of non-conformance on Butler Ranch and that has been placed on the Governing Board's June agenda.

2. Report on Truckee Meadows Growth Task Force *

Director Ziegler directed the committee to the staff report on page 45. He reported the Task Force continues to work on many projects with national resources/open space; affordable housing; transportation; revitalization of downtowns; and reinvestment funds. The Task Force hopes to publish its preliminary recommendations this month. They would like to combine their public engagement processes to reach the public more effectively partnering with the RPGB. On May 11, the Director informed the RPGB of his intent to cooperate with the Task Force on public engagement, to the extent possible.

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

Patricia Rogers, TMRPA, directed the committee to the staff report on pages 47, 48. She reported on May 18, 2006 the Washoe County District Health Department, Air Quality Management Division, submitted their annual report that was sent to the committee under a separate cover through the postal service. Staff recommends the RPC review and accept the annual report as submitted.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE ANNUAL REPORT AS WRITTEN. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PETERSON. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

B. LEGAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

1. Status report and possible direction tot 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, Legal Counsel reported that Voters for Sensible Growth alleged that at some point prior to March 8, 2006 this body took action against the proposed amendments. It was that factual allegation that was the basis for their entire petition. They based their argument on a fact that never occurred.

6. REQUESTS FOR AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

A. Review of tentative calendar of agenda items

Director Ziegler directed the committee to the staff report on page 55 and listed there are some conformance reviews in addition to the others listed.

Director Ziegler reported June 28, 2006 is the date that the committee will be taking possible action on recommending the RPGB adoption of proposed Regional Plan amendments; receipt of final draft work program for FY 06-07; receipt of summary annual report for 2005; and regular reports.

B. Review of 12-month calendar of projected RPC and RPGB actions

7. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

Director Ziegler reported the letter from Scenic Nevada, referred earlier to by Lori Wray is on page 73 and is a no action item.

Ziegler reported on page 77 of the packet, there is a letter from the Community Development Department of Washoe County regarding the Sun Valley Area Plan, and a related letter addressed to Ziegler from March of 2006. On this, Washoe County amended the Sun Valley Area Plan in December of 2005 and submitted it for conformance review; because the plan relies on some of the amendments that are part of the package of proposed amendments submitted by the three local governments, the county waived the 60 day conformance review deadline. The new letter updates the previous letter and gives newer information. The newest letter will be placed on a future agenda for more discussion.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Lokken adjourned the meeting at 8:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by Hope Hepner.

Reviewed by:

Approved by:

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

Jim Newberg, Chair
Regional Planning Commission

**APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION IN SESSION ON
_____, 2007.**