



# 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

## MINUTES

### REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD Regular Meeting Thursday, August 10, 2006

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

The meeting was called to order by Chair Robert Larkin at 2:08 p.m.

#### 1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and Regional Planning Governing Board Members in attendance were: Robert Larkin, Geno Martini, Dave Aiazzi, Robert Cashell, Dwight Dortch, Jim Galloway, Pierre Hascheff, and Bonnie Weber. Members absent were: Mike Carrigan and Ron Schmitt.

Also present were: Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA; Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel; Randy Baxley, TMRPA; Connie Anderson, TMRPA; Patricia Rogers, TMRPA; and Joy Randall, TMRPA.

#### 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 10, 2006, RPGGB AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER CASHELL. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

#### 3. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

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

#### 4. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

**5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY**

- A. Consideration of, and possible action on, RPGB Resolution 06-04, resolution of appreciation for the service of Dwight Dortch as chair of the Regional Planning Governing Board.

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, read Resolution 06-04 into the record.

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE RPGB RESOLUTION 06-04, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- B. Status report on the legislative strategy including:
- 1) Discussion and possible approval of the legislative memorandum of understanding (MOU).

Patricia Rogers, Community Outreach Assistant, stated that the MOU has been finalized and is included on page 5 of the meeting packet for approval by the RPGB.

Member Hascheff asked if this is the same protocol that has been followed. Ms. Rogers responded yes.

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE LEGISLATIVE MOU, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- 2) Discussion and direction to staff regarding collaboration on a proposal, pursuant to the Reno annexation settlement agreement, to propose changes to NRS 268.610 - 268.668 to allow annexation of non-contiguous territory by a city if that territory is included in the sphere of influence of that city.

Ms. Coombes presented a status report on options to bring forward this proposal. Staff met with Senator Raggio to discuss whether he was interested in carrying the proposed bill. Senator Raggio declined the opportunity noting a potential conflict of interest with his law firm. Ms. Coombes reported that legislative staff from the City of Reno indicated that they would take the matter back to the Reno City Council to determine whether the Council would like to use one of their four bill draft requests (BDRs) to carry the proposed legislative change. Reno currently has five issues they are considering for the next legislative session, but only have four BDRs.

*[Member Galloway left at 2:15 p.m.]*

Member Hascheff disclosed that his office does work with a party that could potentially be a beneficiary of this legislation and recused himself from any discussion on this item.

Member Cashell asked if the County could carry this forward since they have ten BDRs. Chair Larkin stated that the County already has six scheduled. Member Weber stated that the County was hoping that the City of Reno would carry it.

Member Cashell stated that since we are working together on this, he would like to try to see if the County could work with the City of Reno in doing that. The City of Reno only has four BDRs and the County has ten BDRs.

Chair Larkin asked if staff should work on that. Member Cashell responded that he would like to see staff work on that.

Chair Larkin asked Adrian Freund if he had a comment.

Adrian Freund, Washoe County, stated that he would convey this message to John Slaughter who is working on the BDRs.

Chair Larkin stated that he will ask Mr. Slaughter what the status is on this at the August 22 meeting.

Member Aiazzi asked when the BDRs have to be in. Ms. Coombes responded the first of September.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION THAT THE RPGB ASK THE COUNTY COMMISSION TO CARRY THIS BILL DRAFT REQUEST PROPOSAL.

Chair Larkin asked if this agenda item is styled for a motion action. Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel, responded that the agenda denotes this as an action item.

SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH.

Member Weber stated that two of the County members are not present. Members Dortch and Cashell stated that there is still a quorum.

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

Chair Larkin asked Mr. Freund if he would communicate the request to the appropriate County staff. Mr. Freund responded yes.

Margaret Powell, City of Sparks, stated that the City of Sparks does not feel this BDR is necessary, although, per the settlement agreement, the City of Sparks will work with the other folks to get this done.

Member Cashell asked why this BDR is relevant. Mr. Azevedo stated that there is a difference of legal interpretation on this point among the respective local jurisdictions and that this particular provision was placed in the agreement at the request of the Reno City Attorney, Marilyn Craig. Mr. Azevedo stated that he believes the thought process was to avoid any future disputes on the issue.

Member Larkin asked if this is adopted, would it resolve any future disputes. Mr. Azevedo responded that he is hopeful that whatever language is carried forward will stop some disagreements but it may cause other ones to arise.

- C. Consideration and possible action on required program of training for members of the Regional Planning Commission.

Connie Anderson, Regional Planner, stated that the program of training for the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) has been revised and now includes informational speaker videos. In addition, the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy will provide a *Citizen Planners Resource Kit*, which includes books, policy focus reports and access to free on-line courses designed for planning officials. RPC members may also attend the National and State American Planning Association conferences, the Western Planner conferences, other land use conferences and local government training sessions to obtain further education and credits toward the twelve hour

minimum training in land use required by state law. Regional Planning staff recommend that the RPGB approve the proposed course of training for Regional Planning Commissioners.

Member Hascheff asked about the process for reviewing the informational speaker videos.

*[Member Galloway returned at 2:25 p.m.]*

Ms. Anderson responded that there will be a sign out sheet in the Regional Planning office and a card will be kept for each new member of the RPC to log how many hours of videos have been watched.

Member Hascheff asked if the RPGB members could do that same thing. Ms. Anderson responded that they can also contact Regional Planning staff and check out the materials.

Member Aiazzi asked if the videos could be put on the web. Ms. Anderson responded that they are working on that.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI.

Public Comment - Gary Schmidt suggested including on the list of training videos a video on the US Constitution and the Nevada State Constitution.

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

## **6. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

- A. Direction to staff regarding the process for filling the Director of Regional Planning position (continued from July 27, 2006).

Ms. Coombes stated that the staff report includes the process that was used by the organization in terms of past practice. One of the issues that the RPGB may need to contemplate is the future of Regional Planning and the desired qualities of the Director.

Member Cashell stated that he would like to wait for a while before determining filling the Director position.

Member Hascheff asked if it is still part of the process for the RPGB to interview the last few candidates. Ms. Coombes responded that the RPC is required to provide a list of three names of potential candidates to the RPGB.

Member Weber stated that there is a 2007 Legislative Session that will begin in February and that Ms. Coombes may provide stability for the next few months. If the RPGB is going to have discussion and possibly bring in another Director, it needs to be established at what point in time the RPGB would be looking at the final three names of potential candidates. Having Ms. Coombes in this position right now provides stability for the staff and it is a good thing.

Member Aiazzi stated that there has been a lot of discussion regarding whether Regional Planning is going to be around and stated that the RPGB needs to have that discussion before the legislative session and before looking for another Director.

Member Cashell agreed with Member Weber regarding having stability with the Interim Director and stated that he would like to see this postponed until after finding out more about what will happen during the legislative session.

Member Martini stated that he does not mind waiting and that he feels comfortable with Ms. Coombes, but if a dialogue is opened here about whether we want a Planning Commission or Regional or not, maybe a dialogue needs to be opened with the legislators because it will be up to them.

Chair Larkin stated that he would like to see the recruitment of a Director delayed and in the next 60 days ask each of the respective entities what they like and what they don't like about the regional planning process. Then have staff bring that back to the RPGB so that there can be some consideration on it and move forward with bringing the legislators in on the actions that the RPGB would like to propose and then get their thoughts.

Member Martini stated that if we come to the point where we don't think we need an RPGB or an RPC, then we are going to start losing employees. If we don't know what the legislators are thinking at that point, we would be making a decision that is premature. We need to find out if the legislators have an appetite for this to go away or stay.

Member Galloway stated that he does not want it to go away but that he just wants it to work. Member Galloway stated that he does not think that the latest revisions to the plan carried out the full intent of the negotiation or fully protected the public. Member Galloway stated that we should not give up even though we disagree on these things and that he would like a Regional Planning Agency (RPA) that works and protects the quality of life for the people that already live here.

Member Weber stated that what we might have to look at as well is that there could be different legislators as well as other people sitting at this table; if we are going to have that discussion, it might need to wait until November.

Member Hascheff stated that his preference would be to keep Regional Planning and that it does do a lot of good work at the regional level that ultimately sets the direction for the local governments. Member Hascheff agreed with Member Martini's point that if there is an appetite to do something different with this Board, then we probably should have staff make some contacts and figure out what that protocol is.

Member Aiazzi stated that he does have comments on the issue regarding the future of Regional Planning but he is not sure it is agendaized for discussion today and requested that it be put on the next RPGB agenda for discussion.

Member Aiazzi stated that, with regard to filling the Director's position, he agreed with Chair Larkin's suggestion to come back with comments on what the RPGB members like and don't like with regard to Regional Planning.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO POSTPONE THE DISCUSSION ON THE PROCESS FOR FILLING THE DIRECTOR OF REGIONAL PLANNING POSITION UNTIL THE NEXT RPGB MEETING AFTER A DISCUSSION ON THE FUTURE OF REGIONAL PLANNING, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Member Weber requested that agenda item 5.B.2 be re-opened so that a letter from Carol Hart can be read into the record.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO RECONSIDER, SECONDED BY MEMBER CASHELL. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

**5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY**

B. Status report on the legislative strategy including:

- 2) Discussion and direction to staff regarding collaboration on a proposal, pursuant to the Reno annexation settlement agreement, to propose changes to NRS 268.610 - 268.668 to allow annexation of non-contiguous territory by a city if that territory is included in the sphere of influence of that city.

Member Weber read written public comment from Carol Hart requesting that the motion be turned down.

Member Aiazzi responded to Ms. Hart's comments stating that there are problems with growth and that is why we are trying to fix that.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION THAT THE RPGB REQUEST THAT THE COUNTY USE ONE OF THEIR BILL DRAFT REQUESTS FOR THE NON-CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION PROPOSAL, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH.

Member Galloway stated that it is a mixed bag because he does not feel that the way the settlement agreement was executed was proper. On the other hand, if we don't do this it could lead to some bad things like annexation of territory that is not even requesting development. Member Galloway stated that he will, with some reluctance, support the motion.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SEVEN (7) MEMBERS PRESENT.  
*(Member Hascheff recused himself from participating in the discussion of this item.)*

**6. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

B. Consideration and approval of a contract for the appointment of an Interim Director.

Ms. Coombes stated that there is a contract for the appointment of an Interim Director for consideration and possible acceptance by the RPGB in the meeting packet beginning on page 21. Ms. Coombes stated that if the RPGB approves an offer as described in the contract, she will accept.

Chair Larkin stated that there is an item in the contract which provides for a reinstatement of Ms. Coombes back into her previous job if at any time either party wishes to dissolve the interim directorship.

MEMBER CASHELL MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE CONTRACT FOR APPOINTMENT OF THE NEW INTERIM DIRECTOR, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Member Aiazzi asked when the terms of the contract begin. Chair Larkin responded that the contract is effective as of July 1, 2006.

Chair Larkin stated that the record reflects that if an offer is made, Ms. Coombes has accepted.

- C. Consideration and possible acceptance of FY 05-06 fourth quarter and end of fiscal year budget and work program report.

Joy Randall, Administrative Services Manager, stated that there is a projected year-end savings in the budget of one percent. There is a summary of work program accomplishments for this year on page 31 of the meeting packet.

Chair Larkin asked if the contributions by each entity remained the same. Ms. Randall responded that they have remained the same.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT, SECONDED BY MEMBER WEBER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- D. Discussion and possible action regarding filling Planning Analyst II position.

Ms. Coombes stated that this position has been advertised and candidates have been evaluated. An offer has been made to one of the Regional Planning staff members for a promotion, pending approval of the RPGB.

Chair Larkin asked about the procedure being used for filling staff positions. Mr. Azevedo responded that the process before the RPGB was brought into place during a previous administration where there were some significant personnel issues arising and it was his recommendation to the RPGB at that time to approve personnel appointments and selection.

Chair Larkin asked if this is procedural or if it has been written into policy for the RPA. Mr. Azevedo responded that it was a legal recommendation on his part and that he does not believe it has been included in the personnel manual at this time.

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- E. Consideration and possible action on the contract proposal with legal counsel to include, but not limited to, the topic of compensation.

Ms. Coombes stated that the proposal requests both a review of the compensation in Mr. Azevedo's contract and also a change in the mechanism by which he is compensated. Ms. Coombes stated that Mr. Azevedo is requesting consideration of a flat fee for an annual cost of \$138,000 for services rendered as opposed to an hourly rate. Regardless of the mechanism, there is a request for an increase in the compensation.

Member Cashell stated that Mr. Azevedo, at these rates, is very reasonable.

MEMBER CASHELL MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE CONTRACT WITH A FLAT FEE OF \$138,000.

Public Comment - Gary Schmidt stated that every board and every agency in this community should have its own private counsel.

SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI.

Chair Larkin commented on the hours Mr. Azevedo is involved with the RPA steadily increasing and asked if it would be a continued trend. Mr. Azevedo responded yes, if the past is any indication.

Chair Larkin asked if Mr. Azevedo is recommending that he would accept the flat fee and that would include any increase in those average amounts of time spent. Mr. Azevedo responded yes.

Member Hascheff asked Mr. Azevedo if he would submit a flat monthly invoice or if he would still put his time down. Mr. Azevedo stated that he envisioned just a flat monthly billing.

Member Aiazzi asked if Mr. Azevedo if he would include on the invoices how many hours he spent. Mr. Azevedo responded yes.

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

## **7. REPORTS**

A. Members' and Director's reports.

- 1) Report on possible barriers to infill and best practices to promote infill
- 2) Report on constraints and carrying capacities of the region's infrastructure networks

Ms. Coombes thanked Randy Baxley for his work with the RPA and stated that he will be leaving on August 18 to work for the School District.

Randy Baxley, Senior Planner, stated that these reports were presented to the RPC on June 14 and that copies of the PowerPoint presentation given to the RPC are included in the meeting packet. This is an informational item and no action is required.

Chair Larkin mentioned the key findings and recommendations listed in the report on page 74 of the meeting packet and asked what will be done with the findings now that we have received them. Mr. Baxley responded that each of the recommendations are under consideration at the Regional Plan Update Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Ms. Coombes stated that the TAC established a subcommittee called the Infill Subcommittee. The Infill Subcommittee made some recommendations that are going to the full TAC for review.

Chair Larkin asked if those will include recommendations to each entity in terms of code changes. Ms. Coombes responded that the conformance criteria that then cascades down to the local governments will be pretty clear in terms of the proposed densities that should occur in the local master plans to promote infill.

Chair Larkin asked if those densities are going to be done by consensus. Ms. Coombes responded that the recommendations from the Infill Subcommittee were developed by consensus. The three local governments were participants and there was consensus on what those infill targets should be and the densities that should be established in the Regional Plan. The TAC will continue to work on the recommendations until there is consensus. The recommendations will be brought forward as consensus recommendations to the RPC and folded into amendments during the update process.

Chair Larkin asked if that will occur during this update. Ms. Coombes responded that is correct.

Chair Larkin asked for more information on the issue identified regarding the need for coordinated population and employment forecasting methods. Mr. Baxley stated that there is a group that has been meeting for several months now to develop a coordinated approach to the

population and employment forecasting methods. A work program is being developed for this group to take a more formalized approach to their work.

*[Member Dortch left at 3:04 p.m.]*

Chair Larkin stated that there was an issue with the annexation agreement with the three entities having different methodologies and asked if the goal here is to reach a consensus on these forecasts so we don't end up with three entities doing three different things.

*[Member Cashell left at 3:05 p.m.]*

Mr. Baxley responded that is one of the goals the group is working toward.

Chair Larkin asked where the group is in that process. Mr. Baxley responded that the group has met several times and is in the process of developing a work program to identify specific outcomes to achieve in the next year. One of those is trying to develop an agreed upon approach for doing future forecasts.

Chair Larkin asked when it will be brought back to the RPGB for an update on how that is progressing. Mr. Baxley responded that he can't comment right now on what is anticipated in terms of presenting a work program to the RPGB or what the time frame would be to provide results. It is hoped that during this current year a consensus will be reached on the approach.

Member Aiazzi asked if this working group is doing just future or current population forecast methods. Mr. Baxley stated that the group is working on three main areas. One of them has to do with population and employment forecast for the future. The group is also working in conjunction with a state demographer and the RPA to discuss and look at methodologies and approaches used for current population estimates. The third area has to do with more detailed demographic information.

*[Member Dortch returned at 3:08 p.m.]*

Member Aiazzi asked Mr. Baxley if as far as he knows, the group has not made any changes yet. Mr. Baxley responded that is correct. At this point there has been a fair amount of discussion in terms of what is being done now and how it is being done.

Member Aiazzi commented on the recommendations to establish boundaries for more targeted areas for infill and to create a minimum density structure and stated that is what the cities are doing already with the TOD Corridors.

*[Member Cashell returned at 3:10 p.m.]*

Mr. Baxley responded that this has been the subject of quite a bit of discussion. The 2002 Regional Plan said that the infill target area is basically everything within the McCarran loop. In certain areas, particularly in the area of Sparks, that was creating a hardship because there was not a lot of infill capacity inside the McCarran loop there. The approach is to get rid of that kind of an arbitrary boundary and try to develop more of a targeted infill concept.

Member Galloway stated that if these recommendations are accepted, you want to take a very careful look at the minimum density structures and make sure that we really intend to enforce them. Member Galloway also stated that he became aware that in the Southern Nevada Public Lands Act, an amendment is planned to go in that any disposal of property by the Federal Government over 200 acres would have a minimum affordable housing content. In this area, the

Federal Government might dispose of areas that are too far from the population center for that to apply, thus compelling affordable housing to be outside the transportation route and too far away from jobs. We should take some care that if there is a lands bill for Northern Nevada, that we don't have inappropriate restrictions put on us in that bill because they are just copying them over from Southern Nevada. Mr. Baxley stated that there is another work effort underway with the RPA addressing affordable housing.

Member Galloway stated that he just wanted to flag it for a future look before we say we will buy into everything. It could interfere with establishing a boundary and targeted areas for infill if the government is requiring affordable housing outside those boundaries.

Member Weber asked what areas, other than the school district, the group is looking at with regard to a more detailed demographic. Mr. Baxley responded that there are a number of entities that have need of various types of information. Mr. Baxley mentioned a few examples of information that would be important for water purveyors, local emergency service providers, and the school district.

Public Comment - Gary Schmidt commented on affordable housing stating that it has disappeared in this community in just five years. Mr. Schmidt stated that subsidizing rural sprawl discourages and jeopardizes infill.

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 including, without limitation, schedule for considering possible Regional Plan amendments affecting the Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA) pursuant to settlement agreement (August 23, 2005)
- 2) Discussion and possible direction to staff in response to 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

Member Hascheff disclosed a potential conflict of interest and recused himself from participating in this item until the appeal period ends.

Mr. Azevedo stated that the two items under this report reference amendments that were adopted by this body. There had been a litigation filed with respect to those amendments and the time to appeal to the Nevada Supreme Court has lapsed on that litigation. The amendments have been adopted and an action letter has been offered. Without any subsequent legal action being filed by anyone, the amendments will be final. There is a status conference with Judge Hardesty regarding the status of what this body has done in furtherance of those amendments.

Member Galloway asked if since a settlement has been reached, it would now be appropriate to make a motion that the sphere of influence be amended in the vicinity of the St. James' resort and Pleasant Valley. Mr. Azevedo stated that it would be his recommendation to wait until Judge Hardesty has approved the implementation of the settlement agreement.

Chair Larkin asked when the status meeting with Judge Hardesty will be. Mr. Azevedo responded that it will be on August 31.

Member Weber expressed concern that she and Member Aiazzi are part of the negotiating team and will not be in town for the August 31 status meeting. Mr. Azevedo stated that one option is that he could advise the Court of the conflict of the two negotiators and they could potentially reschedule the August 31 status conference. The difficulty with that is that Justice Hardesty is very busy and it may get kicked off for a long period of time. Another option is the RPGB could appoint substitute members to attend the hearing.

Member Aiazzi stated that the August 31 meeting should go forward. Member Galloway agreed stating that all the entities have their legal counsel and staffs and they will represent the majority position of their bodies.

Chair Larkin stated that we will move forward with the August 31 date for the status conference.

## **8. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

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

Ms. Coombes reviewed future agenda items for the RPGB.

Chair Larkin asked if the RPGB would consider moving the September 14 meeting to September 21. There were no objections to moving the meeting date.

Public Comment - Gary Schmitt suggested a future agenda item for consideration of a AAA ballpark.

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

Member Aiazzi stated that he would like to see a report from the County on what they are going to do for infill development before he can support the roll back of Reno's sphere of influence.

## **9. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

None

## **10. ADJOURNMENT**

MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 3:35 P.M., SECONDED BY MEMBER AIAZZI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

---

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director

---

Robert Larkin, Chair

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

Regional Planning Governing Board

**APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD IN SESSION ON  
\_\_\_\_\_, 2006**