



# 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 (RPGB)**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**Thursday, March 29, 2007, 2:00 p.m.**

The Regional Planning Governing Board met in regular session in the Reno City Council Chambers, One East First 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, Dwight Dortch, Jim Galloway, Ron Schmitt, and Bonnie Weber. Member Pierre Hascheff arrived at 2:15 p.m. Members absent: Robert Cashell and Mike Carrigan.

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

## **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 29, 2007, RPGB AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER GALLOWAY. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SEVEN (7) MEMBERS PRESENT.

## **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. May 11, 2006
- B. June 8, 2006
- C. January 11, 2007

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RPGB MINUTES FOR MAY 11, 2006, JUNE 8, 2006, AND JANUARY 11, 2007, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SEVEN (7) MEMBERS PRESENT.

## **4. SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

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

## **5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Cathy Brandhorst made comments regarding military personnel.

## 6. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

- A. Local government status report regarding detailed recommendations for the implementation of concurrency.

John Hester, City of Reno, stated that they are busy working on facilities plans and that their idea on infrastructure is “just in time, not too soon, not too late”. Reno is preparing its public services and facilities infrastructure plan. A draft will be ready for public review in June and the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) hearing will start in July. Mr. Hester stated that they are taking ordinance options to their Planning Commission in April and to the Reno City Council in late April or early May. Mr. Hester reviewed a table on concurrency including information regarding water, wastewater, flood management and local transportation and stated that those things are all in place at the time development happens. That leaves the regional system level transportation and freeway system level of service which are handled by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). Mr. Hester stated that they are looking there for what can be done that is proportional. They are also looking at proportional contributions for police, fire, parks and recreation, public works and parks maintenance facilities.

Margaret Powell, City of Sparks, stated that they are in final negotiations with a consultant for facilities master planning and they are also in final negotiations for a master plan update that includes a policy and a vision section and will also include a public facilities plan, conservation plan elements of our master plan. Ms. Powell stated that they hope to have both of those to their City Council for approval in April.

Adrian Freund, Washoe County, stated that he will provide an update on concurrency management to the Board of County Commissioners on April 10. In January a consultant was selected for completion of a master facilities plan. Mr. Freund stated that their schedule is that they will have a final product in October and a draft product in July. The nature of the product will be a summary document which will be submitted to the RPC for conformance. Mr. Freund stated that next month they will be going to their Planning Commission to initiate a development code amendment to Article 7 of the Washoe County Development Code which is titled Adequate Public Facilities.

*[Member Hascheff arrived at 2:15 p.m.]*

Member Galloway referred to Mr. Hester’s comment regarding the “just in time” infrastructure concept and stated that concurrency is that you don’t intensify the land use unless you have assurance that the infrastructure is available. Member Galloway asked how that can be reconciled with just in time infrastructure and if they are going to give people the land use and then hope the infrastructure is there. Mr. Hester responded stating that there are a number of tiers in the settlement agreement. The first tier is that you are in the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA). The second tier is that once you are in the TMSA you get a land use, if you have a two-map system like the cities do. That land use is used to determine the facility needs. Once you have a facilities plan that is found in conformance with the Regional Plan you can then do zoning. Once you have zoning you can come in for entitlement. As part of that process of getting that development entitlement, you have to identify that you can provide the facilities at the same time the development happens.

*[Member Aiazzi left at 2:20 p.m.]*

Mr. Hester explained that the just in time concept comes from things like just in time manufacturing where you try not deliver a lot of infrastructure that costs the developer and the public money that sits there unused.

Member Galloway stated that what Mr. Hester is describing is not how concurrency is described in the settlement agreement. Member Galloway asked Mr. Hester for confirmation that intensification on the master plan is not given unless there is a facilities plan. Mr. Hester responded that the way it works in the Cities is that you get land use until you have to do the facilities plan and then you get zoning. Zoning does not necessarily entitle you to development.

Member Galloway stated that they don't get the zoning in the City until there is a facilities plan but they could get the master plan. Mr. Hester responded that is right. Mr. Hester stated that with the two-map system, they actually give the land use to do the facilities planning and then don't do the zoning until the facilities plan is done.

Member Galloway stated that it is a weakened version of the concept and it is not adequate. Mr. Hester responded that there is a chart in the settlement agreement and a chart in the Regional Plan that is exactly where this is from. Member Galloway stated that he will go back and look at them but it is not his interpretation of the documents.

Member Hascheff stated that he is interested in how the other Planning Directors view that. Member Hascheff stated that it is not realistic to think that you could actually not do a master plan to look at the uses. The real issue for the County is they are on a one-map system. Member Hascheff stated that it is his understanding that the Planning Directors are all in sync on this issue.

Mr. Freund stated that the County is the odd duck because of the one-map system. Mr. Freund stated that implementing concurrency at the time of regulatory zoning changes in the area plans that the County conducts is actually completely impractical. The County is possibly 20 years ahead of implementation of actual development projects on the ground. The County has implemented concurrency for planned land uses in their area plans. The challenge currently in the County is where to implement the various pieces of concurrency for the various services and facilities. Mr. Freund stated that the two-map system is a better approach for a concurrency system. Mr. Hester stated that they recognize that the settlement agreement says that at the time intensification is granted, you will have a facilities plan also found in conformance and you will have a funding strategy for installation of those facilities. Mr. Freund stated that is the standard they are currently struggling with.

Member Galloway asked if this approach would force the County into a two-map system. Mr. Freund responded that if they do not move to a two-map system, they would have to find a point in the development process at which they could best execute the concurrency management requirements.

Member Galloway stated that in order for the process Mr. Hester described to work there should be some provision that zoning does not change until there is a facilities plan. Mr. Freund stated they are doing a balancing act because it is the development community's view that when they pay regional parks fees, RTC fees, provide streets and roads, and pay fees for water and sewer, they have met their adequate public facilities requirements.

Ms. Powell stated that her understanding of the flow chart in the settlement agreement is the land use decision to change, a facilities plan, and then the commensurate zoning to implement that. Member Galloway stated that is not how he recalls it.

Chair Larkin summarized the comments regarding status and asked if specific ordinances have been developed yet. Mr. Hester responded that they have identified ordinances that need to be changed but that they want to take this concept to their Planning Commission.

Chair Larkin stated that he likes how the table presented by Mr. Hester is organized for analysis purposes. Chair Larkin stated that transportation lags behind the most and that it is the biggest issue that faces his district. Mr. Freund stated that they have all been asked by RTC to clarify their position on transportation concurrency involving both the regional and federal roadway system. Throughout this concurrency debate there has been a significant amount of disagreement and debate with the RTC and the development community about whose responsibility is it to make up for existing deficiencies in the regional road system.

Chair Larkin asked Mr. Freund to bring a table like Mr. Hester's to the County Commissioners. Chair Larkin asked Mr. Hester about his comment regarding infill requiring public resources as well as private. Mr. Hester responded that there may be some cases where the local governments need to take some resources to help infill areas meet concurrency.

Member Weber suggested that the School District and the RTC need to be at the table for the concurrency discussion. Member Weber also stated that everyone needs to agree on one chart and that it should be very simple.

Chair Larkin asked the Planning Directors where we need to go next. Mr. Freund stated that they are initiating a development code amendment to Article 7 next month. A final master facilities plan should be ready in September or October. The current facilities planning is in good shape. Mr. Freund stated that they will be moving forward with their Planning Commission in the period between April and July to formulate and have public debate on these code amendments.

Member Hascheff asked about updates and if there will be some formation of what the facilities plan will look like before the end of July. Mr. Hester responded that it is anticipated that the Reno draft will be ready by June. All of them will have to come to conformance review.

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, stated that at the February meeting the RPGB directed the Planning Directors to come back every three months with a status report.

Ms. Powell stated that they will be back in three months to do an update but once they have contracts and a go-ahead they will be moving forward and planning more updates.

*[Member Aiazzi returned at 2:54 p.m.]*

It was decided that the Planning Directors would report back in July instead of June because this month's RPGB meeting is so late in the month.

*[Member Schmitt left at 2:55 p.m.]*

- B. Presentation by local government and affected entity staff regarding population forecasting in the region.

Lora Richards, Planning Analyst II, presented background information on this item and stated that they are looking for reprogramming and leveraging the existing resources more than funding or identifying new resources. Ms. Richards stated that Regional Planning staff will have a proposal following the presentations by the local government and affected entity staff.

Mr. Hester presented the general framework that the City of Reno is using.

Member Galloway asked about sizing facilities for 100 years if pipes only last 50 years. Mr. Hester responded that Ecologic said that 100 years is a good life cycle to use for water and sewer lines.

Mr. Freund presented information regarding population forecasting in the County. Mr. Freund stated that the County will complete their population element very shortly and will use a general approach that does not stray too far from the longer range approach used in the settlement agreement. Mr. Freund also addressed the time it takes to shift shares of population among the jurisdictions.

Ms. Powell stated that the City of Sparks has participated in the population forecast working group and addressed a shift showing that Sparks' portion of the total Washoe County population is increasing over time and the county's proportion is declining.

Member Hascheff asked Ms. Powell for clarification on her graph regarding the growth of Sparks versus the unincorporated county. Ms. Powell responded that between the years 2000 and 2006 Sparks has been growing at about 4 percent and the unincorporated county at 2.75 percent.

Member Hascheff asked about the difference between the starting numbers. Ms. Powell responded that there are currently more people in the unincorporated county than in Sparks. As Sparks grows, at some point, the population of Sparks will catch up.

Randy Baxley, Washoe County School District, stated that the School District is committed to participating in the process to develop population forecasts. The School District does not use overall population forecasting and is only concerned with a very specific subset of the general population. Mr. Baxley stated that the School District's only concern has to do with possibly being held to a specific population percentage growth in the future because what is projected for student growth is not going to match the overall population growth. Mr. Baxley also stated that the School District is committed to participating with the three entities regarding the concurrency issue and is in the process of developing their long-range facilities plan.

Jack Lorbeer, RTC, stated that the RTC is a user of the data that comes from the Community Development Departments of the local entities and that they support the efforts of the regional population working group.

Ms. Richards gave a presentation on a possible path forward for regional population forecasting. Regional Planning staff is working with staff at TMWA and looking at a model for small area population forecasting. Ms. Richards proposed pursuing this model and recommended that Regional Planning staff come back on May 10 with a detailed proposal for the RPGB to consider.

Chair Larkin asked for comments from the three Planning Directors. Ms. Coombes stated that Regional Planning staff will work with the Planning Directors and other entities to bring this proposal forward. Mr. Freund stated that it is a good process. Ms. Powell expressed concern that May is too soon and suggested bringing a proposal in June.

Ms. Coombes explained the reasons for suggesting May stating that if the 2007 Regional Plan is adopted at the next RPGB meeting, conformance reviews for the local governments' master plans and facilities plans will begin in June. There have been many private property requests to amend the TMSA. How the TMSA will be resized in the future is directly dependant on having some sort of a population number as part of that equation. Ms. Coombes stated that they would like to be as expedient as possible and that the proposal can be brought back in June if that is what the RPGB would like.

Chair Larkin asked if June is acceptable and then stated that it will be brought to the June meeting.

Ms. Coombes stated that there is a request to address agenda item 7.D. at this time.

## 7. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- D. Review and possible adoption of revised Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency staff position descriptions.

*[Member Hascheff left at 3:30 p.m.]*

Joy Randall, Administrative Services Manager, stated that the position descriptions have not been updated since the original adoption in November 2001. Ms. Randall stated that Larry Beller of, Larry Beller and Associates, was hired to review the Regional Planning Agency (RPA) position descriptions and personnel policies and is available to answer questions. There is also an Assistant Director position which had been considered at previous meetings. Ms. Randall stated that Regional Planning staff recommends adopting the revised position descriptions and directing the Interim Director to include the proposed position of Assistant Director in the compensation study just for budgeting purposes.

Member Galloway asked about the difference between the Director position and the Assistant Director position. Ms. Coombes clarified that the Assistant Director position would be a re-casting of an existing position.

Member Galloway asked which position would be upgraded. Ms. Coombes responded that it would depend on choices that are made in terms of appointing a new Director. If it is decided in the future to have an Assistant Director, it would depend on who the best candidate is for the position.

Chair Larkin asked if the review meets the expectations and needs. Ms. Coombes and Ms. Randall responded yes.

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE, SECONDED BY MEMBER GALLOWAY. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- A. Consideration and possible acceptance of annual financial audit for FY 05-06 prepared by Kafoury, Armstrong and Co.

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE, SECONDED BY MEMBER WEBER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- B. Consideration and possible adoption of FY 07-08 budget and work program.

*[Member Hascheff returned at 3:37 p.m.]*

Ms. Randall reviewed the proposed budget.

Chair Larkin asked if the budget proposal assumes salary savings. Ms. Randall responded that the budget assumes all positions will be filled.

MEMBER WEBER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE, SECONDED BY CHAIR LARKIN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SEVEN (7) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- C. Discussion and possible action on 208 Water Quality Plan contract revisions for:
- 1) Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
  - 2) Farr West Engineering

Ms. Coombes explained that this contract revision has no budget impact.

MEMBER HASCHEFF MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SEVEN (7) MEMBERS PRESENT.

## **8. REPORTS**

- A. Members' and Director's reports.
- 1) Status report on the 2007 update of the Regional Plan

Ms. Coombes reported that the RPC took action at last night's meeting and there was a unanimous recommendation to forward the 2007 Regional Plan Update to the RPGB for consideration at the April 12 RPGB meeting.

- 2) Status report and possible direction to staff on legislative matters, including pending legislation

Patricia Rogers, Community Outreach Assistant, reviewed Senate Bill (SB) 269 and asked for direction.

*[Member Martini left at 3:41 p.m.]*

Member Hascheff agreed with Regional Planning staff that the RPGB should oppose SB 269. Member Hascheff disclosed his connection with Winnemucca Ranch with regard to AB 287 and AB 160. Member Hascheff and stated that that he will recuse himself on AB 287 and that he will be able to vote on AB 160.

*[Member Martini returned at 3:45 p.m.]*

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO SUPPORT AB 287, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH.

*[Member Hascheff left the dais at 3:46 p.m.]*

Member Galloway stated that Washoe County agreed in the settlement agreement to bring forth this bill but that he does not support the settlement agreement that agreed to do that and he will not support the motion.

Member Weber stated that she will not support the motion because she does not support non-contiguous annexation.

Member Aiazzi expressed concern regarding showing good faith in all the bargaining and give and take that was done on this issue.

Member Weber stated that she supported going forward with it and now wants to leave it to the Legislature to have that discussion.

Member Dortch questioned how the settlement agreement could be supported knowing that this was part of it.

Member Galloway stated that he did not support the settlement agreement and that just because Member Weber supported something as a package as a compromise it does not mean she has to put her individual name today in a vote behind one component of that compromise that she does not agree with.

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH FOUR (4) IN FAVOR AND TWO (2) OPPOSITIONS BY MEMBERS GALLOWAY AND WEBER.

*[Member Hascheff returned at 3:51 p.m.]*

Ms. Coombes reviewed AB 160 and circulated copies of amendments to the bill prepared by the City of Reno. Ms. Coombes recommended that the amendments be forwarded to the RPGB Legislative Subcommittee to review and provide direction to Regional Planning staff.

Member Aiazzi stated that the Legislative Subcommittee is not supposed to take positions until the RPGB meets and takes a position. Member Aiazzi asked if a motion is needed to at least follow the Legislative Subcommittee's position of opposition at this point.

Norm Azevedo, Legal Counsel, recommended that the RPGB either affirm, modify or reverse whatever position is taken by the Legislative Subcommittee.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AB 160, KNOWING THAT WITH THESE MODIFICATIONS THAT COULD CHANGE OVER TIME, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI.

Member Galloway stated that he will not support the motion to oppose this bill and that it should be dealt with at the Legislature.

Member Weber stated that she will support the motion because she did have the opportunity to review the comments by people on the Legislative Subcommittee as well as the proponents of the bill.

Member Hascheff asked if there is any way to support the bill in some form if certain amendments are made. Ms. Coombes responded that is what would happen with the amendments proposed by the City of Reno.

Member Hascheff asked Member Aiazzi if the RPGB would be opposing the bill without the amendments. Member Aiazzi responded no and stated that the purpose of this is if the Legislative Subcommittee goes through the amendments and wants to then support the bill, they have the ability to do that. If there is a time that there is a hearing on this between now and when they make that determination, Regional Planning staff can oppose it.

Member Hascheff asked if the opposition is tempered with the idea that if certain amendments are made, the Legislative Subcommittee can bring something back to the RPGB for support. Member Aiazzi responded that is correct.

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH SIX (6) IN FAVOR AND ONE (1) OPPOSITION BY MEMBER GALLOWAY.

Ms. Coombes asked if there were questions about Senate Bill (SB) 269.

Member Aiazzi asked if there are any military installations that this bill is trying to address in Washoe County. Ms. Coombes responded that there are a number of military installations in Washoe County that could be captured with this bill but that it was really aimed at other counties.

Member Aiazzi suggested that the RPGB ask for a modification that it only applies to military installations over so many square miles.

Chair Larkin asked if a position is needed today. Ms. Rogers stated that she can take the concerns expressed here today about the size being a determining factor and have that included in the proposed amendments to the bill.

Member Hascheff stated that for the purpose of direction to the Legislative Subcommittee the RPGB would oppose the bill unless amendments could be made to either exempt Washoe County or define what they mean by military installation.

*[Member Galloway left at 4:00 p.m.]*

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO TRY TO ADAPT SOME FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS AND MAYBE THAT INFORMATION GET BACK TO THE LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE AT THE TIME, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF.

Member Dortch clarified that without the amendments the bill would be opposed.

THE MOTION WAS AMENDED TO INCLUDE MEMBER DORTCH'S COMMENT, SECOND CONCURRED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Member Aiazzi asked about AB 57. Ms. Coombes stated that the Legislative Subcommittee took no position on AB 57.

B. Legal counsel's report:

Mr. Azevedo stated that there is no litigation pending against the RPGB.

**9. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

A. Consideration and possible action on calendar of agenda items.

Ms. Coombes reviewed future RPGB agenda items.

B. Members' and director's requests for agenda items.

Member Weber stated that she will be sending an alternate to the April 12 RPGB meeting and asked if it is possible to get a video copy of the meeting and comments for review. Ms. Coombes responded that Regional Planning staff can provide a SNCAT DVD of the meeting.

**10. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

None

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 4:05 P.M., SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

Reviewed by:

Approved by:

---

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.**