



REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

MEMBERS
Jim Newberg, Chair
Florence 'Marge' Frandsen, Vice-chair
Scott Barnes
Todd Brabbin
Kendall Mattina
Christy Magers
Marvin Moss
Dennis Romeo
William Weber
Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director

MINUTES
Regional Planning Commission (RPC)
REGULAR MEETING
Wednesday, 6:30 P.M., December 13, 2006

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 Newberg at 6:30 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll and the following Commissioners were present: Jim Newberg; Marge Frandsen, Scott Barnes, Todd Brabbin, Christy Magers, Kendall Mattina, Marvin Moss, Dennis Romeo, and William Weber.

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

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COMMISSIONER MATTINA MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 13, 2006, RPC AGENDA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROMEO.

Commissioner Barnes requested that agenda item 5.D be addressed before agenda item 5.A. Chair Newberg stated that would not be a problem.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - City of Reno Master Plan Amendment, Westview at Lemmon Valley Subdivision (CR06-031), changing the land use from Single Family Residential and Unincorporated Transition to Mixed Residential (3-21 units per acre) on ± 11.99 acres located on the west side of Lemmon Drive at the western terminus of Surge Street $\pm 5,000$ feet north of its intersection with Military Road.

- B. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - City of Reno Master Plan Amendment, Panther Valley Neighborhood Plan (CR06-032), deleting the Panther Valley Neighborhood Plan and changing the land use from Special Planning Area on ±919.05 acres, to Single Family Residential on ±232.70 acres, Mixed Residential on ±331.89 acres, Industrial on ±105.25 acres, and Parks/Recreation/Open Space on ±249.12 acres, generally located southeast of the US 395 North Virginia Street interchange and northwest of the Regional Public Safety Training Center.

COMMISSIONER MATTINA MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE ITEMS PRESENTED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FRANSEN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

- D. Receipt of the Study of Safe Walking Routes for Public Schools in Washoe County, Nevada; an interim legislative study, and consideration to forward the study to the Legislative Counsel Bureau in fulfillment of Nevada Assembly Bill 231.

Lora Richards, Planning Analyst, gave a presentation on this study which includes a review and evaluation of existing walking paths and sidewalks within a radius of public schools, recommendations for improvements to those walking paths, and a review and evaluation of programs currently implemented in the county.

Commissioner Barnes expressed concern regarding unfunded mandates and some possible implications. Commissioner Barnes stated that a lot of times the school district, the cities and home builders work together well but that a lot of times the developer is out and finished by the time the school gets built. Everyone does their best to provide the right infrastructure at the site, but not knowing what is going to happen there makes it a real challenge. Commissioner Barnes asked Joe Gabica about the level of a possible facility plan that the school district does for all of their needs for the next 5 to 10 or 15 years. Mr. Gabica responded that they have been working on one for a long time. It is the intent to produce one by February of 2007. An allocation plan of the 2002 bond rollover for the next four years will be presented to the Board of Trustees of the school district on January 9. Mr. Gabica stated that their charge now is to try to develop a plan for the three years after that.

Commissioner Barnes asked Ms. Richards if it would be appropriate to have that document as part of this study. Ms. Richards responded that there is no specific requirement in the Assembly Bill to address facilities planning in any way. What is required in the Assembly Bill is that the study be transmitted to the Legislative Counsel Bureau prior to the 2007 session so it may not be possible if it were required.

Commissioner Barnes asked how the study can improve interagency cooperation. Ms. Richards responded that they actually saw it happen even though it was not a specific goal of the process. As folks from different agencies got in the room they simply started talking to each other and coordinating. There are things that happened during the course of the study that are not in the report that have already positively improved some of the relations.

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, stated that one of the things that has been identified in the report is that the school district needs to be more involved during the planning process. Ms. Coombes stated that is a mechanism that needs to be put in place between the local governments and the school district and they are actually in discussions about how to assure that the school district is more actively involved.

Commissioner Moss expressed concern regarding schools being built on arterials and stated that developers are tending to put elementary schools on major roads because they do not want to take housing space away. Joe Gabica stated that the school district, because of the funding mechanisms and other problems, was chasing growth and does not have the ability to get the schools in place and built at the same time that the developments are happening.

Commissioner Moss stated that in many cases the school district has put in the infrastructure so that the development can use it. Mr. Gabica responded that is correct but it seems like since about 1987 that we are chasing growth.

COMMISSIONER BARNES MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE STUDY OF SAFE WALKING ROUTES TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN WASHOE COUNTY, AS PRESENTED, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR OF THE RPC TO FORWARD THE REPORT TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU IN FULFILLMENT OF ASSEMBLY BILL 231, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MATTINA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

A. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - City of Reno Master Plan Amendment, West Fourth Street TOD Corridor Plan (CR06-028), amending the City of Reno Master Plan to adopt the West Fourth Street Corridor Plan and change the land use from Single Family Residential on ± 108.50 acres, Mixed Residential on ± 34.06 acres, Urban Residential/Commercial on ± 123.73 acres, Tourist Commercial on ± 24.64 acres, Industrial on ± 188.04 acres, Parks/Recreation/Open Space on ± 41.37 acres, Public Facility on ± 23.63 acres, and Special Area (Monte Vista Village) on ± 21.36 acres to Special Planning Area (West Fourth Street TOD Corridor Plan) on ± 565.3 acres generally located south of I-80, north of the Truckee River, west of Keystone Avenue, and east of the I-80 West Fourth Street interchange.

Connie Anderson, Regional Planner, presented information from the staff report regarding the evaluation of the proposed amendment. The Regional Planning staff has no significant issues with this amendment request and recommends that the RPC determine that this amendment conforms with the goals and policies of the Regional Plan, based on the findings listed on page 29 of the meeting packet.

[The public hearing was opened.]

Heather Singer expressed concern regarding the rate at which new homes are being built. The zoning and land use changes seem to be there to lay the groundwork for more subdivisions and more fast growth.

[The public hearing was closed.]

Commissioner Barnes asked if lowering the minimum required density is detrimental to the TOD. Ms. Anderson stated that this is an alternative density and that it is not being lowered further than what it is now.

Ms. Coombes stated that a transportation consultant was used when the 18 dwelling units per acre for a healthy TOD corridor was established in the 2002 update of the Regional Plan. The consultant indicated that they found that a minimum of 18 dwelling units per acre was a good benchmark for TOD corridors. It was also recognized that TOD corridors in our community were new and to go from nothing to 18 dwelling units per acre is quite a jump. The concept of allowing for alternative densities was to allow us to move along the gradient of increasing density but moving more towards a density that would allow for transit oriented development and the establishment of other forms of rapid transit over time.

Ms. Coombes stated that during the 2007 update the technical staff spent quite a bit of time talking about the idea that a wholesale alternative density escape clause probably is not getting us to where we want to go so the language has been tightened up on that item. The local governments will be required to bring their TOD corridor plans back in for an additional conformance review and it will require them to show over time that there is a plan to intensify.

COMMISSIONER ROMEO MADE A MOTION TO FIND THE WEST FOURTH STREET TOD CORRIDOR PLAN ELEMENT OF THE RENO MASTER PLAN IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLAN, BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WEBER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- B. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - Washoe County Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Cold Springs Area Plan (CR06-029), amending the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan to create a new area plan within the unincorporated county (to be known as the Cold Springs Area Plan) and replaces the remaining portions of the North Valleys Area Plan that were not updated as part of the comprehensive North Valleys Area Plan update.

Ms. Anderson presented information from the staff report regarding the setting and evaluation of the proposed amendment. The Regional Planning staff has no significant issues with this amendment request and recommends that the RPC determine that this amendment conforms with the goals and policies of the Regional Plan, based on the findings listed on page 43 of the meeting packet.

[The public hearing was opened.] There were no requests to speak.

[The public hearing was closed.]

COMMISSIONER MATTINA MADE A MOTION TO FIND THE COLD SPRINGS AREA PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE WASHOE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLAN, BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FRANDSEN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- C. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - City of Sparks Master Plan Amendment, Population Plan (CR06-027), adopting the Population Plan, a required element of the Sparks Master Plan per Subsection 2 of NRS 278.170.

Phil Caterino, Senior Planner, distributed copies of a letter from Margaret Powell, City of Sparks, regarding a discussion of this item. Regional Planning staff has not identified any significant conformance issues with respect to the proposed amendment. Mr. Caterino stated that the populations contained in the population plan are based on the Washoe County Consensus Forecast. Sparks looked at three different methods to come up with their population plan. Regional Planning staff concludes that the proposed amendment conforms with the goals and policies of the Regional Plan, based on the findings on page 58 of the meeting packet.

[The public hearing was opened.] There were no requests to speak.

[The public hearing was closed.]

COMMISSIONER MOSS MADE A MOTION TO FIND THE CITY OF SPARKS POPULATION PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF SPARKS MASTER PLAN IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLAN, BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MATTINA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- E. WORKSHOP - Consideration and direction to staff on the 2007 update of the Regional Plan including but not limited to:
- 1) recommendations of the Regional Plan Update Technical Advisory Committee regarding Module 1 - regional form and pattern, Module 2 - natural resource management, Module 3 - public services, infrastructure, Module 4 - implementation of the plan, maps, appendices and other introductory sections of the plan; and,
 - 2) the adoption schedule.

Ms. Richards reviewed the adopted process and the overall strategy for the update of the Regional Plan. Ms. Richards reviewed the recommendations from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and other updated sections. Ms. Richards reviewed the next step options for the RPC. Ms. Richards stated that the local governments and affected entities are required to resubmit all of their plans for conformance review within 60 days of the Regional Plan adoption. The RPC then has 180 days to consider the plans and hold public hearings on conformance.

Commissioner Moss asked about deadlines for required entity plans to be completed. Ms. Richards responded that the TAC has not proposed any time requirement on the integrated natural resource plans and open space and greenways plans.

Commissioner Moss stated that they were supposed to be completed in the last Regional Plan. Ms. Richards stated that these two particular items are new requirements.

Commissioner Moss expressed concern that there were a number of requirements in the Regional Plan that were never completed or completed at the very last moment. The Regional Plan cannot

effectively operate unless those are complete in a timely manner. Ms. Coombes stated that there were a number of things that the local governments needed to complete in order to be found in conformance with the Regional Plan. A number of those required some substantial planning efforts from their staffs and the process that was used was to find their plans in conformance with a list of exceptions that they were required, over an agreed time frame, to complete. The local governments came forward to the RPC and asked for extensions on some of those. Ms. Coombes stated that it would be within the RPC's prerogative to establish time frames and manage them accordingly.

Commissioner Moss asked when those time frames would have to be established. Ms. Coombes responded that her understanding is that the strictest reading of statute would be that they would have 60 days from the adoption of the 2007 plan with which to submit their modified master plans. If the RPC chooses to give local governments extra time to do things, then that would be within the prerogative of the RPC.

Norm Azevedo, Legal Counsel, stated that the RPC has the authority to put a provision in the plan that has to be brought forward by a date certain. The statutes that provide for the subsequent conformance review require submission within 60 days and then action by the RPC in 180 days. If they could not adhere to those time lines, the RPC has the discretion to give them a time certain at that point in time.

Commissioner Moss asked what would happen if a date certain is set and not met. Mr. Azevedo responded that it could be deemed that the plan would be a non-conforming plan.

Commissioner Frandsen asked why the TAC changed Truckee Meadows Services Area (TMSA) to Metropolitan Services Area (MSA).

There was some discussion regarding the term metropolitan. Members of the RPC agreed that TMSA should not be changed to MSA.

Commissioner Frandsen mentioned Policy 4.5.1 regarding federal lands disposal legislation and Policy 4.5.2 regarding allowing annexation of non-contiguous territory and asked if it is appropriate for them to be in the Regional Plan. Ms. Coombes stated that Goal 4.5 and the two subsequent policies were proposed jointly by the three local jurisdictions during the joint amendments in January. That process occurred during the spring. The RPC recommended the language to the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGGB) and the RPGGB adopted it in July 2006. Ms. Coombes stated that the TAC did not go back and revisit the changes that had just been made by the RPC and the RPGGB. Ms. Coombes stated that she would defer to Legal Counsel as to whether they are appropriate to be in the Regional Plan. Mr. Azevedo stated that given the nature of the settlement agreement that brought the amendments forward, they are appropriate to be in the Regional Plan. They are not required or prohibited by statute.

Commissioner Moss asked if they could be removed from the 2007 Regional Plan. Ms. Coombes responded that what has been brought forward to the RPC are simply recommendations from the TAC. The RPC could suggest that this particular language be removed. The RPGGB still has the opportunity to put it back in if they don't agree with the recommendation.

Mr. Azevedo stated that these particular policy revisions were part of the most recent amendment that was approved by the RPGB. If the RPC wishes to remove or modify those, Mr. Azevedo recommended that the RPC clearly articulate the reasoning for it so there is a record of it when it is brought to the RPGB.

Commissioner Frandsen asked where the language pertaining to concurrency is included. Ms. Richards responded that it is under goal 3.5. Ms. Coombes stated that goal 3.5 and the two subsequent policies were put forward and agreed to by the three local governments and were adopted by the RPGB in July.

Commissioner Romeo stated that the only option for action in the report that he can support at this time is option three, to direct staff to reconvene the TAC to continue working on the update. Commissioner Romeo stated that there is a lot of language but not a lot of meat to the issues like flood control, infrastructure, inventory of natural resources, concurrency, and affordable housing.

Commissioner Moss asked which sections Commissioner Romeo was referring to. Commissioner Romeo stated that all throughout there is a lot of wording but no tools that can help guide him in the direction of sensible and smart planning for growth when approving items.

Ms. Coombes stated that if the RPC would like the TAC to address specific issues, staff will need to get some additional detail from Commissioner Romeo.

Commissioner Mattina stated that the Regional Plan is supposed to be an overall guideline. It is not to say that if you build so many houses in a neighborhood you have to have so many affordable houses or that they should be affordable within a certain price range. The idea is that there should be affordable housing. Commissioner Mattina stated that she does not know how detailed you can actually get with that on this level.

Commissioner Romeo stated that the TAC is made up of the experts in this area and in these fields. If they can't tell us what constraints we should be working under, how much sewer capacity and when it is needed, when schools need to be built, the infrastructure, and what we have for flood control, then we have no business doing smart planning. Commissioner Romeo stated that those tools are needed. Commissioner Romeo restated that his issues are with concurrency, natural resources, infrastructure, flood control, and affordable housing.

Ms. Coombes stated that the Regional Plan is meant to set some broad standards and that other entities go away and do the specific planning. The expertise for those issues lies with those entities' and their plans. It is when those plans come in for conformance review that the RPC gets to review that and determine whether indeed it is giving the detail needed. It is through the conformance review process that the RPC has the opportunity to delve into the specific detail and determine whether it is giving you what you need.

Commissioner Mattina stated that if you start getting into that level of detail in the Regional Plan, then you are having the Regional Plan plan for the cities and the county and they just don't have any discretion anymore because the Regional Plan is setting out the rules not the guidelines. That is not what the Regional Plan is for.

Commissioner Moss stated that the way he has always interpreted the Regional Plan is that the guidelines are there, these are the things that must be considered if a change is going to be

submitted and that has to be approved by the RPC. That is the way it has functioned and the way it should continue to function.

Commissioner Frandsen asked if it would be appropriate to include LID and NEMO requirements under goal 2.1. Ms. Coombes responded that language could be added to address those elements. Commissioner Frandsen stated that low impact development standards would be appropriate.

Commissioner Frandsen asked for clarification regarding alternate densities being allowed in TOD corridor plans. Ms. Coombes responded that there is language in policy 1.2.14 that shows what the actual required densities are. It also notes that alternative densities are allowed but it now sets forth parameters under which alternative densities could be appropriate. It actually requires that if alternative densities are specified, an intensification plan must be completed. It goes on to tell what has to be included in the intensification plan.

Commissioner Moss asked about concurrency. Ms. Coombes stated that when the RPGB passed the motion in July to approve the language as addressed, there was a subsequent motion that was passed by the RPGB that put the onus on the three local governments to get together and come up with a more detailed description of what concurrency means and how it would work.

Commissioner Moss asked if that would then be placed in the Regional Plan. Ms. Coombes responded that one of her hopes in this process is that there will be greater clarification that is proposed in the language for the Regional Plan.

Commissioner Frandsen expressed concern that going to the public hearings without language that is identifiable by the public will cause major problems. This was one of the issues initially that the public was concerned about because the Judge had said there must be concurrency language in the Regional Plan and there was not. Commissioner Frandsen also stated that she does not consider this to be the responsibility of the TAC because it was the planning directors that were challenged to come up with this language. Ms. Coombes responded that is correct and stated that the motion that was passed by the RPGB tasked the local government staff with the task of further defining concurrency. Ms. Coombes stated for further clarification that goal 3.5 and the two subsequent policies were part of the package of the amendments that went through the public hearing process this spring and were already adopted into the plan.

Commissioner Frandsen asked Commissioner Brabbin about low impact development language she may have missed. Commissioner Brabbin referred to language in module 1 on page 20. Commissioner Frandsen stated that it is generic and not specific enough. Ms. Coombes stated that there is a new policy in module 2 on page 9 that requires the master plans, facility plans, and other similar plans to promote or encourage development practices promoting energy efficient building technology, the use of alternative or renewable energy sources, and the use of low impact development practices. Ms. Coombes stated that it could be repeated elsewhere in the plan but that all the policies really need to be read in concert. Commissioner Frandsen responded that she does not wish to have it repeated in the plan.

Chair Newberg stated that the TMSA renaming issue is the one thing that the RPC would like to have removed and asked for any comments on affordable housing. Ms. Coombes stated that a consulting firm was hired to look at best practices around the country and a white paper was

prepared for the TAC to consider affordable housing. This particular policy was replaced with a whole new goal and associated policies. The goal still puts the onus on the local governments to develop some strategies but it also requires the local governments to come up with some quantifiable goals. The local governments really need to go out and do the detailed work to determine what the needs of the community are and then come up with legitimate strategies on how to address it. Those can then be built back into the Regional Plan if need be so that there are some targets to aim for from a regional perspective.

Commissioner Magers asked why item 3 in module 1 on page 25 was deleted. Ms. Coombes asked John Hester to address this since it was a recommendation from the three local governments. John Hester, City of Reno, explained why it was deleted and that it is addressed in module 4 on page 5.

Commissioner Magers asked if migration paths could be added to module 2 on page 3 under number 4. Chair Newberg responded that it can be added.

Chair Newberg summarized that migration paths will be added on 2.1 number 4 and that Metropolitan Service Areas will be changed back to TMSA. Chair Newberg asked if the RPC was in agreement that concurrency was handled. Commissioner Frandsen responded that she is not satisfied with the language that is contained within the document that pertains to concurrency. Chair Newberg stated that some additional language for concurrency is also needed.

Chair Newberg asked if anyone wanted additional information on affordable housing to be included. Commissioner Romeo responded that he preferred the old language regarding affordable housing that is being taken out. If it is only being taken out because it was never implemented, maybe it should be implemented. Commissioner Romeo stated that there are still too many questions and that option 3 is the only option he can support at this time.

Chair Newberg asked if the rest of the commission agreed with that. Commissioner Frandsen asked for clarification that Chair Newberg is asking whether or not the other commissioners agree with Commissioner Romeo that the wording that was in policy 1.1.13 in reference to affordable housing should be put back. Chair Newberg responded that is correct. Several commissioners raised their hands in agreement.

Commissioner Mattina stated that she would like to hear from somebody on the TAC to explain why they felt it was necessary to substitute one for the other. The TAC spent a lot of time reviewing this and reviewing information on it.

Commissioner Romeo stated that he is then back to option 3.

Commissioner Frandsen asked for an explanation of policy 1.3.3 under module 1 on page 29. Ms. Coombes stated that it is language that was agreed to by the three local governments and was put forward during the amendments in the spring. This was language in particular that the County felt very strongly about and wanted greater flexibility in the unincorporated area to have a wider range of opportunities for development.

Commissioner Frandsen stated that she was trying to figure out whether it was restricting the unincorporated county from having industrial warehousing development or not. Ms. Coombes responded that the change has actually taken the restriction away and it is enabling that to occur.

COMMISSIONER WEBER MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE DRAFT 2007 REGIONAL PLAN WITH MODIFICATIONS, THOSE BEING TO RETAIN THE TITLE TMSA, ADD THE TERM MIGRATION PATHS IN POLICY 2 2.1.1, ADD A CLEAR DEFINITION OF CONCURRENCY, AND BRING BACK POLICY 1.1.13 AS IT HAD BEEN PREVIOUSLY WRITTEN AND TO DIRECT STAFF TO SCHEDULE THREE PUBLIC ADOPTION HEARINGS BETWEEN JANUARY 24 AND FEBRUARY 14, 2007, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROMEO.

Commissioner Frandsen stated that she will support the motion but stated for the record that she disagrees with policy 4.5.1 and 4.5.2. Commissioner Frandsen stated that she felt it is inappropriate to be allowing annexation of non-contiguous territory.

Commissioner Moss asked Commissioner Frandsen if she is proposing an amendment to the motion. Commissioner Frandsen responded that she is not after listening to the advice of Legal Counsel.

Commissioner Moss stated that Mr. Azevedo said that there is only one that is required to stay. Commissioner Frandsen responded that that was his advice but then he also added a caution.

Mr. Azevedo stated that the RPC is free to exercise their discretion. The policies Commissioner Frandsen is referring to did come about as a result of the settlement agreement and Mr. Azevedo stated that his recommendation was that a clear record be made as to the reasoning if the RPC decides to either remove or modify them.

Commissioner Frandsen stated that the RPGB will know her thoughts on the subject by way of the meeting minutes. Commissioner Frandsen stated that she would like to see them removed but felt that it would be counterproductive because when it gets to the RPGB they will reinsert them.

Commissioner Moss stated that those items should be acted on individually by each government agency and not be contained in the Regional Plan. Commissioner Moss offered to second if Commissioner Frandsen wanted to make an amendment to the motion. Commissioner Frandsen responded that it would be counterproductive to do that. Our feelings are recorded in the minutes and there would be no advantage to making an amendment.

Commissioner Romeo asked about the difference between option 2 and option 3 and stated that we are asking for the questions we sent to the TAC or to staff to come back with answers and the only difference is that we are directing staff to schedule meetings starting January 24. Commissioner Romeo asked if that is correct and if that is enough time for the work to be done and to have the answers we need before scheduling meetings on January 24. Ms. Coombes responded that the way she interpreted the motion is that it was not posed as a question but as direction to staff to undertake four specific language changes in the plan. If there is a question or request for more information, more clear direction is needed.

Commissioner Romeo asked about the time constraints and if this has to be done by February 14. Ms. Coombes responded that the requirement is to adopt the updated plan by May, which would be an RPGB action. The current schedule is for it to go to the RPGB for potential adoption in March. It can be pushed closer to the deadline and be brought to the RPGB in April but that would mean that if the RPGB wants further changes, special RPC meetings may need to be called.

Commissioner Romeo asked if changes can be made after hearing from the public. Ms. Coombes responded yes. Changes can be made up until the time that it is recommended to the RPGB.

Mr. Azevedo stated that it is in the RPC's discretion to make changes based on what is heard in the public hearings. Mr. Azevedo also addressed the comment regarding the difference between option 2 and option 3. Legally they are entirely different. Option 2 is the approval of the draft by the RPC with only the exceptions noted being items for additional consideration by the TAC. Option 3 is no approval and the whole plan is remitted.

Commissioner Mattina stated that she is bothered about substituting the policy 1.4.1 back to 1.1.13. Policy 1.1.13 is more specific than what a regional plan should be and it is more than guidelines. The cities should look to their own master plans for specificity. Guidelines are needed on a regional level. Commissioner Mattina stated that policy 1.4.1 is what is really needed on a regional level. Commissioner Mattina stated that she will not support the motion if it is going to require the change.

COMMISSIONER WEBER MADE A MOTION TO AMEND THE MOTION TO PUT BACK 1.1.13 AFFORDABLE HOUSING SECTION OR SIMILAR VERBIAGE AND GIVE STAFF OR THE TAC THE OPTION.

Commissioner Mattina stated that is fine and that she did not want to say we are putting this back in and not going to deal with what the TAC recommended.

Commissioner Romeo asked for clarification that the amendment is saying to change to similar wording. Commissioner Weber stated "or similar verbiage".

SECOND CONCURRED.

Commissioner Frandsen commended the TAC on all their hard work and countless hours that went into the language that is contained in the draft. The suggested changes the RPC has made in no way is anything but complimentary to what they have done.

Ms. Coombes stated that the new proposed language on affordable housing has also been circulated to the new regional housing task force and they have recommended that it would be appropriate language to have.

Chair Newberg stated that there is a request for public comment and asked Mr. Azevedo if that would be appropriate at this time since a motion and a second have been made. Mr. Azevedo requested a recess in order to review the bylaws.

[Chair Newberg called a recess at 8:50 p.m. The meeting was called back to order at 9:00 p.m.]

Mr. Azevedo stated that the bylaws limit the type of activity the RPC can take while a motion is pending and that taking public comment is not a permitted activity. Mr. Azevedo also stated that the open meeting law does strongly favor public comment and recommended that the RPC continue deliberations and voting on the motions that are on the floor. Once that is done if the individual who has made the request for public comment is still desirous of speaking, he may do so at the conclusion of the action by the RPC.

Commissioner Mattina stated that she will not support the amendment or the motion. Policy 1.1.4 is much more appropriate than rewriting policy 1.1.13. Commissioner Mattina stated that Ms. Coombes said it has been blessed by the folks that deal with affordable housing on a regular basis and we should go in that direction.

Commissioner Brabbin agreed with Commissioner Mattina and stated that he does not want to change language until he has an opportunity to hear from the TAC.

Commissioner Frandsen asked for confirmation that there is already a TAC meeting scheduled for Friday. Ms. Coombes responded yes.

Commissioner Frandsen asked if having the TAC discuss this issue on Friday would pose any delays to the public hearing process as it is outlined. Ms. Coombes responded that the TAC could contemplate this issue and bring back a recommendation at the next RPC meeting in January. The RPC could then direct staff to schedule public hearings. There is a 30-day advance notice required to schedule public hearings. If the RPC decided at the January 10 meeting to go ahead with public hearings, it would be the middle of February before the first public hearing could be held. In order to keep on track with the update going to the RPGB in March, a series of special meetings could be scheduled to get it done in February. Another option is to push it out further and have the amendment go to the RPGB in April. Assuming the RPGB adopts it at that point it would still be well within the timeline required.

Commissioner Frandsen asked about the appetite for having a non-scheduled meeting of the RPC rather than waiting until the next scheduled meeting on January 10 so that the process is not delayed. Ms. Coombes responded that staff can do anything the RPC asks as long as it is within the confines of the open meeting law. The question that would be posed to the commissioners would be regarding availability over the holiday period for a special meeting.

Commissioner Romeo asked for clarification that the policy on affordable housing is currently 1.1.13 and that 1.4 would be a change in what is existing. Ms. Coombes responded that is correct. Commissioner Romeo clarified that policy 1.1.13 is what is existing and the motion is to keep what is there in place with some modified wording. Commissioner Weber clarified "or similar policy."

There was discussion regarding policy 1.1.13 being in place and policy 1.1.4 being recommended as a new policy and whether policy 1.1.4 had been approved by affordable housing people. Ms. Coombes confirmed that policy 1.1.4 had been approved in its draft form by those involved with affordable housing.

Commissioner Weber clarified his modification to the motion stating that he wanted to give flexibility to staff and the TAC to either use 1.1.13 or something similar. Commissioner Weber also stated that this is not being adopted tonight.

Commissioner Frandsen clarified that by accepting this draft with the modifications the RPC has suggested, we are not taking away the opportunity in the future for this particular policy to be discussed.

Commissioner Brabbin clarified that we are not deciding on which one is better but we are opening the topic of discussion.

Commissioner Mattina stated that if we are saying for sure that this is not coming back and it is a done deal, which is fine.

Commissioner Frandsen suggesting asking Mr. Azevedo if the interpretation of the action is correct. Mr. Azevedo responded that the RPC is not closing any gates that can not be reopened.

This is a preliminary draft subject to public hearing and public comment. By statute you are required to have those hearings and it is contemplated in statute that after those public hearings, this body may decide to go in an entirely different direction based on what you hear.

Commissioner Weber restated the original motion including the amendment to the motion.

Chair Newberg called for an action on the amendment to the original motion.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Chair Newberg called for an action on the whole motion as amended.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Ms. Coombes asked for clarification on scheduling public hearings. Commissioner Weber responded that the public hearing schedule included in option 2 was part of the original motion.

6. DIRECTORS, MEMBERS, AND LEGAL COUNSEL INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Director's reports:

- 1) Informational presentation from staff of the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN) regarding Target 2010

Patricia Rogers, Community Outreach Assistant, introduced Chuck Alvey with EDAWN.

Mr. Alvey reviewed highlights of the EDAWN Target 2010 project.

Commissioner Brabbin thanked EDAWN for doing a phenomenal job. The business you are looking to recruit are they seeing and voicing challenges to the existing plans that the RPC would want to know about that maybe we could address. Mr. Alvey responded that when EDAWN asks existing CPO's what they think of what is going on here. The single most important thing they reference is there is a perception that there is a lack of planning.

Commissioner Mattina stated that maybe the organizations that reach out to these folks are the conduit of spreading the word that we do work hard at planning. Mr. Alvey stated when we hear that question we point them back to what you all have done. Mr. Alvey also commented that staff has been particularly attentive.

- 2) Status report on Regional Utility Corridor Report subcommittee

Mr. Caterino stated that Commissioner Mattina was elected as Chair and Commissioner Weber as Vice-Chair at the startup meeting on November 20.

- 3) Report on actions and agendas of the Regional Planning Governing Board

Ms. Coombes reviewed agenda items for the December RPGB meeting.

B. Legal counsel's report

Mr. Azevedo stated that there is no litigation pending at this time. Mr. Azevedo stated that he reviewed the preliminary draft plan and there were no significant legal issues that arose.

7. REQUESTS FOR AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- A. Review of tentative calendar of agenda items

Ms. Coombes reviewed future agenda items for the RPC.

8. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Newberg adjourned the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

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.**