



REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD

MEMBERS
Bonnie Weber, Chair
Mike Carrigan, Vice-Chair
David Aiazzi
Dwight Dortch
Jim Galloway
Toni Harsh
Pierre Hascheff
Geno Martini
Ron Schmitt
Jim Shaw
Dave Ziegler, Director

MINUTES

REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD Regular Meeting Thursday, January 8, 2004

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

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bonnie Weber at 2:35 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and Regional Planning Governing Board Members in attendance were: Bonnie Weber, Mike Carrigan, Dave Aiazzi, Dwight Dortch, Sharon Zadra for Toni Harsh, Pierre Hascheff, Geno Martini, Ron Schmitt, and Jim Shaw. Members absent were: Jim Galloway and Toni Harsh.

Also present were: Dave Ziegler, TMRPA Director; Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel; and Patricia Rogers, TMRPA, Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA, and Randy Baxley, TMRPA, who left during the Reno Annexation Program agenda item.

2. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

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

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 8, 2004, REGULAR MEETING AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. November 13, 2003, regular meeting

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 13, 2003, REGULAR MEETING MINUTES, SECONDED BY MEMBER SHAW.

Dave Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning, stated that there is a note in italics on page 7 of the minutes that needs to be deleted.

MEMBER AIAZZI AMENDED THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH THE CHANGE MENTIONED BY MR. ZIEGLER, SECOND CONCURRED.

Members Carrigan, Hascheff, Weber and Zadra stated that they would be abstaining.

Member Dortch asked if members could vote to approve meeting minutes even if they did not attend that meeting. Chair Weber asked Norm Azevedo, Legal Counsel, to comment. Mr. Azevedo recommended that members abstain from voting to approve meeting minutes if they did not attend that meeting.

MEMBER AIAZZI WITHDREW THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THIS ITEM TO THE NEXT RPGB MEETING, SECONDED BY MEMBER SHAW. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

6. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

- A. Consideration of, and possible action on Washoe County's appeal of the final determination of the Regional Planning Commission regarding certification of City of Reno Annexation Program, 2003-2009 as conforming with the Regional Plan (TMRPA 03-023).

Mr. Ziegler reviewed the suggested process for considering this appeal.

MEMBER SHAW MADE A MOTION TO HAVE DISCUSSIONS ON THIS ITEM TODAY AND CONTINUE THE VOTE TO THE NEXT MEETING SO MEMBER GALLOWAY WILL BE PRESENT, SECONDED BY MEMBER SCHMITT.

Member Hascheff asked Mr. Azevedo for clarification on this motion stating that the RPGB would take the evidence on this item today and then Member Galloway would review the tapes so that he will have the opportunity to vote on it at next month's RPGB meeting. Mr. Azevedo stated that would be fine.

Member Aiazzi stated that he will not support the motion. Member Aiazzi stated that this item has been an issue since July 2002 and it should not be continued because one member is absent.

Member Martini stated that he will not support the motion.

Chair Weber stated that Member Galloway does have a lot of input on this issue. Chair Weber stated that the board does need to move on with this item.

THE MOTION FAILED WITH FOUR (4) IN FAVOR AND FIVE (5) OPPOSITIONS BY MEMBERS AIAZZI, CARRIGAN, DORTCH, MARTINI, AND ZADRA.

Washoe County Community Development Staff Presentation of the Appeal

Adrian Freund, Washoe County, stated that the Board of County Commissioners has considered the City of Reno Annexation Program at least three times and has identified several serious concerns and reservations regarding the program. The prior Reno Annexation Program did a better job of addressing infrastructure service demands, public safety costs, and land demand associated with different patterns of annexation and build-out. The current program has serious shortcomings concerning the analysis required by the seven factors listed in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). The Reno Annexation Program fails to satisfactorily address the Regional Plan Settlement Agreement. Mr. Freund stated that the Reno Annexation Program includes approximately 59% of the City's 20-year Sphere of Influence (SOI). The program includes capacity for at least fourteen years of growth at current development levels.

Mr. Freund stated that two of the criteria noted in the Reno Annexation Program are of great concern to the County. Reno will target land zoned by Washoe County for non-residential uses and land zoned for suburban development. These criteria appear to be fiscal equity criteria. Washoe County believes the criteria are questionable. The County believes that Reno can not mandate annexation through its extra-territorial planning jurisdiction. Further, fiscal equity is not believed to be a singular or overwhelming argument in a planning analysis of future annexation. The Reno Annexation Program fails to address significant future service costs of supporting annexed areas and new development.

[Chair Weber left at 2:50 p.m.]

Mr. Freund stated that a rough analysis by the County indicates that the area in the Reno Annexation Program is significantly oversized for seven years of development.

[Chair Weber returned at 2:52 p.m.]

Mr. Freund stated that the Reno Annexation Program can allow non-contiguous annexations anywhere within the annexation area. If non-contiguous annexations can occur, a finding can not be made that the program will promote more uniform boundaries or more efficient delivery of city services.

Mr. Freund stated that the County does not believe the Reno Annexation Program promotes infill. The Reno Annexation Program appears to promote more dense development on the urban fringe than is allowed in Washoe County. The County also does not believe that this program can conform to Policy 3.3.3 of the Regional Plan, which calls for programs to promote and not conflict with the form and pattern of the Regional Plan. Mr. Freund stated that annexation almost always promotes intensification of development.

Member Aiazzi stated that since the City of Reno can modify this program every year, the boundaries can still be made smaller on the next plan. Mr. Freund stated that some kind of commitment that Reno would work with the County jointly would be appreciated.

Member Aiazzi asked why the County would be opposed to a non-contiguous area outside the city. Mr. Freund stated that a non-contiguous area outside the city would not promote uniform boundaries that promote efficient service delivery. Member Aiazzi stated that while that would be allowed, it does not mean it would necessarily happen.

Member Aiazzi asked for some examples of annexation that resulted in intensification. Chad Giesinger, Washoe County Community Development Planner, stated that everything on the fringe of the southeast specific plan is proposed for intensification. Member Aiazzi asked if that was proposed not granted. Mr. Freund responded that is correct.

Member Aiazzi asked if Mr. Freund would say that historically, it is not true that annexation almost always results in intensification. Mr. Freund responded that historically, the County can probably agree. Mr. Freund stated that the County believes that one of the incentives for annexation is to get above the limit of three units per acre.

Member Aiazzi asked what the current approved but not built housing is in the three entities. Mr. Giesinger stated that he has not received any updated numbers for the City of Sparks and the City of Reno. In Washoe County, it is in the neighborhood of 4,000 units.

Member Aiazzi stated that the map he was given, that Washoe County agreed to years ago, showed almost 23,000 units. Mr. Giesinger stated that that map has always been disputed. That map is depicting just zoning, not necessarily approved tentative subdivision maps.

Member Shaw congratulated Mr. Freund and John Hester, City of Reno, on working together to bring some of the differences a little closer to resolution.

Review of Analysis Presented to the RPC and Deliberations of the RPC

Mr. Ziegler stated that Randy Baxley, Senior Regional Planner, worked on the Reno Annexation Program when he was a member of the staff of the City of Reno. For that reason, Mr. Baxley has not worked on the program with the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) and is not in attendance for this item on the agenda.

Mr. Ziegler stated that an important point to keep in mind is that the Reno Annexation Program only applies within Reno's SOI.

Mr. Ziegler reviewed the requirements for a finding of conformance with the Regional Plan on page 22 of the meeting packet. Mr. Ziegler reviewed the analysis presented to the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) on September 17, 2003, and November 13, 2003.

There appears to be little direct effect on land use when Reno annexes land that is within its SOI. The reason for this is that Reno has already taken extra-territorial jurisdiction for that land, and has incorporated the County's land use designations into its master plan. For areas added to the SOI as of May 9, 2002, the City's land use must be the same as the County's, as translated pursuant to a table in the Settlement Agreement, and amendments are subject to cooperative planning.

Annexation may create indirect effects on land use, since it changes development incentives and disincentives. For example, property tax rates change when annexation occurs. Staff research also indicates that other factors may change, including: applicable building codes, insurance prices, and the prices of certain services (e.g., sewer hook-up fees). These incentives are complex, variable, and administered independently of changes in the annexation programs.

In the area of resource management, the main effect of annexation within a city's SOI is to make the annexed land subject to city - as opposed to County - codes. Thus, the natural resource impacts of

annexation would flow from differences between city and County codes and their enforcement. Discussions among the planning staffs during and immediately after the settlement conference in the winter of 2002-2003 indicated that the differences between city and County codes were relatively minor.

Further, several natural resource components, e.g., air quality, wastewater discharges, stormwater, surface water, groundwater, endangered species, flood plains, and stream channels, are regulated in whole or in part at the federal, state, or regional level, and therefore, are more or less insulated from changes in local political boundaries.

Annexation may have an effect on some aspects of infrastructure and service provision, and little or no effect on other aspects. Consumers receive potable water from Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA), Washoe County's Department of Water Resources, or domestic wells, regardless of what political jurisdiction they live in. Sewage treatment and disposal is provided at the TMWA, South Truckee Meadows Wastewater Treatment Facility, other smaller treatment plants, or by private septic tanks. The location of that service does not change upon annexation; however, prices charged to consumers may vary.

Regional streets, roads, and transit systems are provided and maintained by the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), independent of local political boundaries. Annexation may alter responsibilities for local street and road construction and maintenance. Flood control infrastructure is constructed and maintained by federal, state, and local agencies, through a variety of funding sources. Annexation may have an effect on the construction and maintenance of localized flood control facilities. Solid waste disposal, ambulance service, and fire protection are provided on a regional basis. Upon annexation, responsibility for law enforcement services shifts from the County Sheriff to the City's police department. These entities generally have mutual aid agreements in place.

Mr. Ziegler addressed the three requirements in the Settlement Agreement. The areas identified for annexation within the expanded SOI are less than the area designated as the expanded SOI. The Reno Annexation Program says that Reno will not amend its annexation program more frequently than annually. Reno did adopt the Annexation Program after conducting a public hearing and considering the seven factors set forth in NRS 268.625.

Mr. Ziegler addressed comments made in the appeal letter dated December 8, 2003, and in the oral remarks by Mr. Freund on November 12, 2003, and again today.

Mr. Freund has said that the Reno Annexation Program fails to address the intent of the Settlement Agreement, since it includes lands in excess of those required for a seven-year program. Mr. Ziegler stated that it is Regional Planning staff's opinion that the Settlement Agreement only requires that the areas identified for annexation must be less than the area designated as the expanded SOI.

Mr. Freund has said that the Reno Annexation Program will not address efficient service boundaries or service delivery, since non-contiguous annexations may occur under the program. Mr. Ziegler stated that state law and paragraph A.10 of the Settlement Agreement require the City to consider the efficient

and cost effective provision of service areas and capital facilities. The record indicates that the City of Reno did consider this factor.

The County has said that the Reno Annexation Program and the City did not fully analyze, but merely recited the seven factors listed in NRS 268.625. Mr. Ziegler stated that the City's consideration of those seven factors is a matter of record and is included in the meeting packet.

Mr. Freund has said that the residents of Washoe County have not been shown the fiscal and service delivery impacts on annexation within the annexation areas delineated in the Reno Annexation Program. Mr. Ziegler stated that the Regional Planning staff is not aware of any requirement that the city or the RPC must disclose the fiscal and service delivery impacts of an annexation program.

Mr. Freund has said that the Reno Annexation Program tends to promote a more dense pattern of urban development on the urban fringe; the City does not have the same limits on density as the County does; the Reno Annexation Program does not promote in-fill; annexation almost always results in intensification of development; and annexation requests and master plan amendments come through in tandem. Mr. Ziegler stated that within the SOI, the Regional Plan places no upper limit on intensity for the city or the County. Mr. Freund said today that the County was limited to three units per acre. Mr. Ziegler stated that the County is not limited to three units per acre inside the SOI. Mr. Ziegler stated that since the City of Reno does require an application for annexation when a property owner requests additional density or intensity within the SOI, annexation is the result of intensification inside Reno's SOI. In the expanded SOI, the County participates in cooperative planning for any proposed intensification. Mr. Hester testified on September 24, 2003, that the Reno Annexation Program reduces fiscal inequity. If that is true, it weakens the incentives to develop the urban fringe and, therefore, promotes the desired regional form and pattern.

Member Carrigan asked if any new lands that are annexed would have to fall under the cooperative planning protocol as set up under the Settlement Agreement. Mr. Ziegler responded that they would if they are within the expanded SOI or are 670 annexations outside the SOI.

Member Carrigan stated that since this is not part of the Settlement Agreement, it does not automatically get appealed to the District Court. Member Carrigan asked if that means that someone would have to file a new lawsuit about this. Mr. Azevedo stated that a new law suit would not be required. This would be a matter that would go before Judge Hardesty in the form of a review of one of the RPGB's decisions.

Member Carrigan asked for an example of how annexation of an outlying area would promote infill. Mr. Ziegler responded that the work on fiscal equity that was done prior to the update indicated that there was a transfer of wealth from the incorporated area to the unincorporated area because of the difference in the tax structures in the two areas. As a planner, that tilts the development playing field toward the unincorporated area. When annexation occurs, that playing field is leveled and weakens the incentive to develop at the fringe.

Member Aiuzzi asked if there is a program or policy that requires the County to provide a program that would aid infill developments. Mr. Ziegler responded that there is a policy in the Regional Plan that says

all of the local governments must incorporate into their master plans incentives, programs, policies and strategies to promote the regional form and pattern.

Member Aiazzi referred to Mr. Ziegler's statement that annexation may alter responsibility for local streets. Member Aiazzi asked if that means that it is not a requirement and that the County could still choose to maintain responsibility for those streets. Mr. Ziegler responded that for local streets, annexation would change the responsibility from the County to the City. There could be agreements forged for maintenance.

Member Aiazzi asked Mr. Ziegler if he knows of any state law that precludes the County from continuing to provide police service in an incorporated city. Mr. Ziegler responded that he does not know of any.

Member Hascheff asked if property in the County's cooperative planning jurisdiction is annexed into the City, would the County still have jurisdiction to cooperatively plan that property. Mr. Ziegler responded that they would. Anything in the expanded SOI is subject to cooperative planning.

Member Hascheff stated that there is an SOI that has twenty years of inventory for anticipated growth. The Reno Annexation Program has about seven years by way of a planning horizon. Member Hascheff asked if this proportionality makes sense from a planning perspective. Mr. Ziegler responded that based on the County's testimony, the annexation area should expand gradually over time toward the edge. Based on the City's testimony, there is development out there that has been approved and has entitlements. The City feels that the Reno Annexation Program is not driven by proportionality but by what is happening out on the ground.

Member Hascheff asked if at the end of the first year, since more than fifty percent of the property included in the SOI has been annexed, the parties would go back and look at the SOI and increase the amount of real estate and inventory in that twenty-year horizon. Mr. Ziegler responded that he has not heard any testimony that indicates that there is any desire on the part of the City of Reno to expand the SOI beyond where it was set in the Settlement Agreement.

Member Dortch asked for confirmation that there is no guarantee that all of the property outlined in the Reno Annexation Program will be annexed. Mr. Ziegler responded that is correct.

Mr. Ziegler stated that his research in this matter included a discussion with a private sector planning consultant with experience in this region. The consultant's opinion was that a smaller annexation area would result in a lot of paper shuffling because nobody knows which of the parcels will develop in the next seven years.

Chair Weber asked if the City of Reno or the City of Sparks is required to redo their annexation programs annually. Mr. Ziegler responded that they are required to review their annexation programs annually.

Interested Parties' Comments on the Appeal

Mr. Hester stated that the land demand analysis is not relevant. The Regional Plan update moved a lot of development in the unincorporated area into the City of Reno. The absorption trend of the City is not relevant when the SOI is moved. Mr. Hester also pointed out areas where development will occur

regardless of jurisdiction. Mr. Hester stated that it would be fiscally irresponsible not to annex into a jurisdiction that collects more revenue for the services that are required when development occurs. An EPS study states that all jurisdictions in the region benefit fiscally from development annexing. Mr. Hester stated that the Reno Annexation Program will not have an effect on development patterns.

Member Shaw asked if Mr. Hester has discussed these issues with Mr. Freund. Mr. Hester responded that he has. The three areas where the City and County disagree were listed in a report to the County Commission.

Member Hascheff asked Mr. Hester if he feels that determining what properties should come into the annexation program should be driven by market forces as opposed to land uses. Mr. Hester responded that he is arguing that the land absorption and land demand capacity model does not work for just one jurisdiction within a region.

Washoe County Community Development Staff Final Statement

Mr. Freund stated that the language in the Settlement Agreement means more than its plain words. The County believes that there were significant discussions about proportionality of the seven-year Reno Annexation Program to the twenty-year SOI. As those words were mediated and negotiated, proportionality did not get put into the Settlement Agreement.

The County supports the policies of the Regional Plan for intensification and infill. The County believes that we are not moving well in that direction. Most of the new development takes place on the fringes. Mr. Freund stated that there may have been a general fiscal analysis that supports annexation, but there is no fiscal analysis specifically of this program in terms of fiscal impacts on residents of Washoe County, including those who live in the cities. The County believes that development expectations drive requests for annexation. It is likely that under annexation, properties will have the ability to gain greater entitlements. If there is some fiscal disincentive for development on the fringes, then we have to ask why such massive amounts of development are occurring on the fringe.

RPC Discussion and Motion

Member Aiazzi asked Mr. Freund for a definition of the word fringe. Mr. Freund responded that the fringe areas are areas that are the furthest away from the core of the downtown area. Anything that is close to the McCarran ring is considered core area.

Member Aiazzi asked if the St. James Village is an approved project in the unincorporated area. Mr. Freund responded that it is a twelve-year-old project that has no market feasibility at this point. Member Aiazzi asked how that project would help or hinder the Regional Plan land use if it is built. Since it is going to be developed, what difference does it make if it gets annexed to the City of Reno or not. Mr. Freund responded that in this case, the County is in a better position to provide utility services. Member Aiazzi asked what utilities the County would provide out there that the City of Reno would not provide. Mr. Freund responded that the County would provide water distribution and sewer service. Member Aiazzi stated that those lines do not change on boundaries of the Cities. Member Aiazzi asked what the difference is between the services that the County would provide and the services the City of Reno would provide. Mr. Freund stated that those unincorporated areas that develop without annexation are served by the County in other respects as well, e.g., public safety, health services, etc.

Member Aiazzi stated that those areas would still get health services whether they are in the City of Reno or the County.

Member Schmitt stated that the fringe is a relative term because of development in unincorporated areas, the fringe changes. Mr. Freund agreed. Member Schmitt stated that the fringe is not really an issue here. Mr. Freund stated that he raised it as an issue because, in looking at the actual hard data on building permits and population, the area loosely called the fringe is where the majority of that development is occurring. The concern is if anything is being done to move toward the Regional Plan goal.

Member Schmitt asked how any building in the County would contribute to the ability to do infill growth. Mr. Freund responded that by complying with requirements of the Regional Plan in the areas of rural development, maintaining densities of not more than three units per acre, and building commercial buildings not larger than 50,000 square feet, the County can have a role in dampening development that occurs on the fringe.

Member Schmitt asked Mr. Freund how he would respond to Mr. Hester's comment that it would be irresponsible to intensify development without annexation into the incorporated areas. Mr. Freund responded that the County does not agree with that statement.

Member Shaw asked if Mr. Freund and Mr. Hester are in agreement regarding the definition of fringe areas. Mr. Freund responded that he believes that they would agree on where the fringe areas are located.

MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO UPHOLD THE DECISION OF THE RPC, SECONDED BY MEMBER CARRIGAN.

Member Schmitt asked if the RPC and the City of Reno representatives should have an opportunity to speak a second time.

Mr. Ziegler stated that he has no further comments on behalf of the RPC. Mr. Hester stated that he has no further comments on behalf of the City of Reno.

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH SEVEN (7) IN FAVOR AND TWO (2) OPPOSITIONS BY MEMBERS SHAW AND WEBER.

[Member Schmitt and Member Martini left at 4:12 p.m.]

- B. Informational report on the update schedule for the Regional Water Planning Commission's Washoe County Comprehensive Regional Water Management Plan.

Mr. Ziegler stated that according to the latest schedule, the Regional Water Planning Commission (RWPC) will finish their work on the Regional Water Management Plan (RWMP) in February 2004 and submit the update to the Board of County Commissioners for adoption.

Member Aiazzi asked if the RWMP is appealable to the RPGB. Mr. Ziegler responded that the RWMP is appealable to the RPGB.

[Member Hascheff left at 4:14 p.m.]

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- C. Discussion of, and possible direction to staff on, policies and procedures for the 2005 legislative session.

Patricia Rogers, Community Outreach Assistant, reviewed legislation of current interest from the 2003 session of the Legislature.

Ms. Rogers reported that the RPGB has asked Regional Planning staff to explore the possibility of obtaining a separate funding source for the program of regional planning. Regional Planning staff was also asked to determine whether legislation would be needed to adjust or clarify practice on appeals within the context of regional planning.

Ms. Rogers stated that Regional Planning staff are meeting with local governments and affected entities to track proposed legislation.

Ms. Rogers stated that a memorandum of legislative cooperation is in place. The RPGB may choose to amend this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The RPGB may also wish to consider whether an outside consultant should be engaged to represent the RPGB during the upcoming session of the Legislature.

[Member Martini returned at 4:18 p.m.]

Member Aiazzi suggested continuing any decisions on these items since there are only seven members present.

[Member Zadra left at 4:19 p.m.]

7. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- A. Informational report on Director of Regional Planning's execution of "Guiding Principles" agreement with Webmasters in Nevada Government (WING).

Mr. Ziegler reported that he has signed an agreement with Webmasters in Nevada Government.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

8. REPORTS

- A. Members' and Director's reports

None

- B. Legal counsel's report

- (1) Status report and possible direction to staff on the outcomes of the hearing held on December 19, 2003, in the 2nd Judicial District Court regarding the Settlement Agreement dated October 17, 2002.

Mr. Azevedo reported that there was a subsequent mediation on the Beckworth/McMullen matter yesterday in Judge Hardesty's courtroom. Mr. Azevedo is hopeful that this matter will ultimately be resolved as a result of that subsequent mediation.

Mr. Azevedo stated that there was a consensus among the local governments for modifications to be made to the RPGB regulations on procedure. Mr. Azevedo will bring the modifications to the RPGB for final approval after they have been approved by each of the local governments.

On the matter having to do with Judge Hardesty, he said he would like to take that matter back to the Court, indicate that he has briefed you, and at your next meeting, potentially take a vote on that particular issue.

- (2) Status report and possible direction to staff on the Washoe County and Sun Valley GID appeal to the 2nd Judicial District Court of RPGB Decision 03-02 in Case DR03-001-RPGB: Washoe County and Sun Valley General Improvement District appeal of Regional Planning Commission Decision 03-03 in dispute resolution case DR03-006-RPC.

Mr. Azevedo stated that a draft notice of intent to participate is included in the meeting packet. Mr. Azevedo asked for permission from the RPGB to file this notice.

MEMBER CARRIGAN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE DRAFT NOTICE OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

9. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

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

Mr. Ziegler stated that Regional Planning staff has developed a twelve-month calendar of agenda items for the RPC and the RPGB.

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

Member Aiazzi asked that items 11 and 12 be moved to the next RPGB agenda based on the number of members leaving early.

Member Martini stated that there is a schedule of RPGB meetings a year in advance. The RPGB members should be able to schedule around these meetings when there is something important on the agenda. Member Martini agreed that items 11 and 12 should be addressed when there is a full board present.

Chair Weber agreed that the members need to make sure that they are here for the meetings or have members that can be.

Member Aiazzi suggested having the closed personnel session first on next month's agenda.

Chair Weber asked that next month's agenda start at 1:30 p.m. for items 11 and 12 and that the regular meeting begin at 2:30 p.m.

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE AGENDA ITEMS 11 AND 12 TO THE NEXT RRGB MEETING, SECONDED BY MEMBER AIAZZI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

10. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None

11. CLOSED PERSONNEL SESSION PURSUANT TO NRS 241.030 TO DISCUSS THE PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF THE DIRECTOR OF REGIONAL PLANNING.

This item continued to next meeting.

12. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF THE DIRECTOR OF REGIONAL PLANNING.

- A. Discussion of, and possible action on, the performance evaluation of the Director of Regional Planning.
- B. Discussion of, and possible action on, adjustments, if any, of compensation for the Director of Regional Planning.

This item continued to next meeting.

13. ADJOURNMENT

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 4:28 P.M., SECONDED BY MEMBER CARRIGAN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham

David S. Ziegler, Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

Bonnie Weber, Chair
Regional Planning Governing Board

**APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD IN SESSION ON
_____, 2004**