



# 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

#### Regular Meeting

Thursday, December 14, 2006

The Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) 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 2:10 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, Mike Carrigan, Robert Cashell, Dwight Dortch, Jim Galloway, Pierre Hascheff, and Ron Schmitt. Member Bonnie Weber joined the meeting by phone at 2:14 p.m.

Also present were: 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 DECEMBER 14, 2006, RPGB AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER AIAZZI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

#### 3. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

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

#### 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. July 27, 2006 (continued from October 12, 2006)

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JULY 27, 2006, RPGB MEETING MINUTES, SECONDED BY MEMBER AIAZZI. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH SEVEN (7) IN FAVOR AND TWO (2) ABSTENTIONS BY MEMBERS GALLOWAY AND HASCHEFF.

#### 5. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

*[Member Weber joined the meeting by phone at 2:14 p.m.]*

## **6. BUSINESS OF THE DAY**

- A. Receipt and consideration of a summary paper on infill development in the region.

Phil Caterino, Senior Regional Planner, provided updated information to the staff report included in the meeting packet. The West Fourth Street TOD was approved last night by the Regional Planning Commission (RPC). The two parcels that were recommended by Washoe County for transfer to the City are being reconsidered now.

Public Comment - Pat McAlinden, Chair of North Valley CAB, stated that by a unanimous vote, the North Valley CAB did not support the proposed disposal of 13 acres of County land and suggested that the property be retained for future County facilities. Ms. McAlinden shared the CAB members' comments and concerns.

Member Galloway stated that the County Commission did hear the same report on Tuesday and do weigh the feelings of the CAB in the balance. In consideration of all things it was the vote of the County Commission on my motion to keep those parcels on the table for negotiation.

Member Aiazzi thanked the County for putting a program in place to address infill development.

Member Hascheff agreed with Member Aiazzi and stated that this is a great step in the right direction.

Member Galloway stated Commissioner Sferrazza asked that it be put on the record that he was the no vote because of the opposition by the CAB.

Member Weber stated that she appreciated the North Valley CAB members stating their opposition to this but on the whole this is a good opportunity to have discussion about this infill project and working with the City of Reno and making it best for all the communities.

Member Hascheff stated that this is just one of many steps for the County Commission and they should keep the CAB in the process as these parcels move forward.

- B. Consideration of issues including, but not limited to, the role, structure, or function of the program of regional planning in Washoe County and surrounding areas.

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, reported that an independent facilitator was employed to conduct a workshop with the RPC on these issues. Included in the staff report is the facilitator's report on the outcome of that meeting. Following that meeting, the same facilitator was employed to have a meeting with the planning directors and Ms. Coombes. Input from the RPC was contemplated at that meeting and recommendations were made for the RPGB. Ms. Coombes reviewed the following three main issues: Focus of the program of regional planning and the participants; Uniform objectives, standards, data and measurement / shared vision and approach; and Clarification of roles. Short-term and long-term options were also reviewed for each of the main issues.

Chair Larkin asked what a reasonable time frame would be to implement any of the changes. Ms. Coombes responded that if the RPGB is going to move to something fairly substantial in terms of structural change, the first stage that would need to occur would be agreement on what

that model would be and what it is trying to do. That would be a medium term decision-making process maybe something over the next 12 months. If the RPGB were going to change substantially the role and function of regional planning, it would require statutory change which may not be pulled together for this coming session. Ms. Coombes stated that if the RPGB is going to make those kinds of changes, you would want to make sure that you are going to something better than what you have now as opposed to just making a change. Ms. Coombes stated that the answer is somewhat how long is the piece of string you want to cut off.

Member Hascheff asked if the council of governments model assumes that there is just one board and no RPC. Ms. Coombes responded that there are many different models from around the Country. Some other regions will have a large board that may be multi-jurisdictional that is its governing board. They may meet quarterly and then they may elect another body from within that may meet on a more regular basis in order to manage the day-to-day operations of the program. The functions may be different and you may have one or two organizations or boards operating.

Member Hascheff stated that it does not necessarily mean that the RPC is eliminated to go to a council of governments. Ms. Coombes responded that you could have whatever you want and that form should follow function.

Member Hascheff stated that the suggestion to look at a variety of different models and see how they are working in other jurisdictions makes a lot of sense. Also the suggestion to provide a smooth transition between the RPC and the RPGB in the meantime by setting some regulations or rules so that the parties feel comfortable and know what their roles are without any legislative changes. Member Hascheff stated that the long-term options that Ms. Coombes went through are very good. Member Hascheff stated that he sees regional planning taking that leadership role and basically providing information, studying, and setting a 20-year vision for the region with respect to infrastructure, planning, etc. and then providing that information and direction to local government. It makes a lot of sense to go in that direction.

Member Weber suggested that it would be wise to come up with a subcommittee to research this. The subcommittee could come back and report to the entire RPGB.

Member Dortch stated that staff should go out and find the different models and bring those back to the RPGB and at that time if a subcommittee is needed to get into it further one can be established. Member Dortch also stated that he does not know what would be accomplished by drafting regulations to define the roles. Member Dortch stated that he felt Mr. Azevedo did a good job defining the roles and suggested that the RPC just did not like the role they have.

Norm Azevedo, Legal Counsel, stated that the roles are very clear. The benefit of the regulations are twofold. It sets forth a clear path between the RPC and the RPGB as to process. Additionally, for those property owners that interact with the Regional Planning Agency (RPA), it sets a road map that is clear for them to understand as well. As far as whether the RPC likes the roles or did not understand the roles, Mr. Azevedo stated that his perspective is that, given the last dispute that occurred, it was more of a lack of understanding. Mr. Azevedo stated that since he has been Legal Counsel to the RPA over the last six years, two of the major disputes have arisen with respect to the roles of the RPC and the RPGB and the RPA as well as the local governments interacting with the RPA. Mr. Azevedo stated that to the extent that those would be clarified, that would be his recommendation.

Chair Larkin commented on the issues raised in the staff report and stated that the RPGB's appropriate role is to moderate TMSA changes because that is growth but some of the other changes should be between the entities. The RPGB needs to be looking more at the long-term and cumulative impacts when it comes to individual planning changes. Chair Larkin also stated that the RPGB may be in the position of establishing a scorecard with which to track progress or the cumulative impact of successive decisions. Chair Larkin stated that as far as different statistical figures, mapping systems, and forecasts, those are problematic. We are in a modern day of computers and one system can easily integrate into the other. Chair Larkin stated that the short-term goal to agree on and promote a shared vision on how our region should grow and develop over the next few decades has already been done. It was decided that we would grow to the north and east and that should not be on the table. Ms. Coombes clarified that the statement was actually trying to ensure that that is communicated across all entities, including those that are not sitting at this table.

Member Hascheff stated that, by way of direction to make sure staff knows what the next steps are, he likes Member Weber's comment about a subcommittee. If we do a subcommittee it should involve the RPC particularly on our respective roles. Member Hascheff stated that he understood Chair Larkin's comment to be that maybe we should have some kind of report card for this Board to say we made a decision and let's look at it annually and every 5 years to the update to see if those decisions are sound decisions. Chair Larkin stated that we should have at least a scorecard that would reflect the cumulative nature of the action.

Member Hascheff stated that direction to staff could be to go out and look at different government models and bring back different approaches. Also give direction to staff to provide the RPGB with some bullet points on what those regulations would look like defining the respective roles between the RPGB and the RPC. Also give some thought and report back to the RPGB on this report card and give us some kind of critical path as to when staff thinks these can be accomplished over the next 6 to 12 months.

Chair Larkin asked Ms. Coombes if she feels empowered. Ms. Coombes responded yes, and that she has a sense of the Board.

Member Galloway stated that what Chair Larkin outlined is minimal. Under the current Regional Plan we are doing less than we used to. Member Galloway suggested having professional planners address whether you should go as far as you described because there is always the issue of the boundaries. Member Galloway expressed concern that if regional is not doing anything except where the TMSA is, what would happen when Reno is building something right next the Sparks that Sparks does not like and where would that get resolved if not at regional.

Chair Larkin asked what the plan is on that one. Ms. Coombes responded that what staff will do, based on the direction of the Board, is to look at government models that are out there, bring back bullets on regulations regarding the roles of the RPC and the RPGB, bring back some information on options for a scorecard or some way of being able to look at cumulative impact, and bring back critical path on when all this can be achieved.

Chair Larkin asked if that would be sometime in the new year. Ms. Coombes responded that staff will bring that back to the RPGB in January.

Member Hascheff clarified that it include Member Galloway's comment and that the RPGB hear from staff on anything they see that we have not mentioned that can be resolved through regulations or the way we govern ourselves. Ms. Coombes clarified that what can be brought back in January is the issue of critical path.

## **7. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

- A. Consideration and possible adoption of advance schedule of meeting dates for calendar year 2007.

Chair Larkin stated that there is a question on the March and July meetings and asked for any suggestions.

Member Martini asked why there is a problem on those meetings. Joy Randall, Administrative Services Manager, responded that the issue would be travel time to the NACo Legislative Conference and the NACo Annual Conference and Exposition.

Chair Larkin asked if the recommendation is to shift those to a week later. Ms. Randall responded yes.

Member Hascheff asked what the dates would be. Ms. Randall responded a week after the March 8 meeting would be March 15 and a week after the July meeting would be July 19.

There was some discussion regarding schedules. Chair Larkin stated that there does not appear to be any desire to change the March 8 meeting. There was some discussion regarding the July meeting and it was decided to change that meeting to July 19.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT STAFF RECOMMENDATION WITH A CHANGE FROM JULY 12 TO JULY 19, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH TEN (10) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- B. Consideration and possible acceptance of quarterly report on FY 06-07 budget and work program.

Chair Larkin asked if there were questions. There were no questions.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT, SECONDED BY MEMBER CARRIGAN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH TEN (10) MEMBERS PRESENT.

## **8. REPORTS**

- A. Members' and Director's reports.

- 1) Status report on the 2007 update of the Regional Plan

Lora Richards, Planning Analyst II, stated that the RPC held a workshop on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommendations regarding the draft 2007 Regional Plan last night. Ms. Richards reviewed the four things the RPC took action to direct the TAC to do. The TAC is scheduled to meet tomorrow to address the RPC's direction. The RPC also took action to proceed with scheduling their public hearing process for accepting the final draft Regional Plan. The RPGB is required to adopt the 2007 Regional Plan no later than May of 2007. Staff anticipates that the RPGB may consider the RPC's recommendations on the draft plan as early as March.

Chair Larkin asked when the RPGB will get a look at all the changes for 2007. Ms. Richards responded that it will come to the RPGB in March.

Chair Larkin asked if the RPGB will get an advanced view of it. Ms. Coombes responded that staff could provide a current draft of the Regional Plan. Traditionally what has occurred is the RPC completes its work through the public hearing process before it forwards something to the RPGB.

Chair Larkin asked if there is any desire to have an advanced look. Member Galloway stated that any of the Board members can request it from the RPA.

Ms. Coombes stated that the current draft is available on the front page of the RPA website.

- 2) Status report on a Study of Safe Walking Routes for Public Schools in Washoe County, Nevada; an interim legislative study to be completed by the Regional Planning Commission in fulfillment of Nevada Assembly Bill 231, for submission to the Legislative Counsel Bureau prior to the 2007 legislative session

Ms. Richards stated that the RPC took action last night to accept the Study of Safe Walking Routes for Public Schools in Washoe County. The RPC authorized its Chair to forward the study to the Legislative Counsel Bureau in advance of the 2007 session.

Chair Larkin asked if anything was learned. Ms. Richards responded that inter-governmental coordination and coordination within the departments of an individual government makes things better.

Chair Larkin asked if any errors were found. Ms. Richards responded that it was found that a number of programs both at the school district as well as the local governments are working well to make sure that students get to and from school safely.

Chair Larkin suggesting putting that on the website.

- 3) Status report and possible direction to staff on implementation of the legislative strategy including but not limited to, progress to finalize the legislative memorandum of understanding (MOU)

Patricia Rogers, Community Outreach Assistant, stated that the legislative MOU has been approved by all governing bodies. Legal Counsel was asked to provide some draft language for the addendum to the MOU and that language is included in the meeting packet.

Member Hascheff asked about the new parties to the MOU being bound by the same protocol in the MOU regarding an entity introducing legislation that may conflict with one of the parties to the MOU. Ms. Rogers responded that as she understands the legislative MOU, while it does not prohibit one of the participants to the MOU to present information that might be in conflict with another entity, it does request that the party inform the other parties of the potential conflict.

**MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE ADDENDUM AS INCLUDED IN THE MEETING PACKET, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH TEN (10) MEMBERS PRESENT.**

- 4) Status report on the process to consider private property owner requests for Regional Plan amendments to amend the Truckee Meadows Service Areas and Future Service Areas

Ms. Richards stated that in November the RPC took action to sponsor eleven applications that were submitted to the RPA. Those applications have been forwarded to the local governments for analysis and processing. The local governments are to forward their advisory recommendations back to the RPA by December 26. The application is included in the meeting packet. The RPGB may see the proposed amendments for consideration at its February meeting.

Chair Larkin stated that Washoe County has just processed two of the applications.

Member Hascheff asked if the criteria in the staff report would apply to the applications on page 96 of the meeting packet. Ms. Richards responded yes.

Member Hascheff disclosed that he works for Winnemucca Ranch and asked Mr. Azevedo if he should be recused from this item. Mr. Azevedo responded that he would recommend recusal.

Ms. Richards stated that the RPC adopted the criteria. Chair Larkin stated that the RPGB is not adopting it and does not sit in overview of the process. Each governing body is responsible for forwarding a recommendation and at a time when this comes for conformance review that would be an appropriate time for a recusal. Ms. Richards responded that is mostly correct. It is not a conformance review, it is a Regional Plan amendment.

Chair Larkin asked Mr. Azevedo if he would like to comment. Mr. Azevedo stated that with respect to the statement of the process, that is correct. Mr. Azevedo stated that he would still recommend that Member Hascheff recuse himself on these matters.

Member Aiazzi stated that the Reno City Council took action yesterday and forwarded the projects except for 06-001 and 06-002.

B. Legal counsel's report:

Mr. Azevedo stated that he has been working with staff on the update and these private property owner applications. There is currently no litigation pending. Mr. Azevedo stated that he has done a preliminary review of the update to make sure there are no problems with any applicable statutes. Once that process is completed through the public hearing process, he will again do a review prior to submission to the RPGB.

**9. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

- A. Consideration and possible action on calendar of agenda items.
- B. Members' and director's requests for agenda items.

Ms. Coombes reviewed future agenda items for the RPGB.

Chair Larkin asked if they are on track for the detail recommendations for recommending concurrency. Ms. Coombes responded that the planning directors had a meeting today and that she has not heard anything from them that they will not be in a position to do that.

**10. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

None

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 3:10 P.M., SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH TEN (10) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

\_\_\_\_\_  
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**