



# 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, October 12, 2006

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

The meeting was called to order by Chair Robert Larkin at 2:05 p.m.

#### 1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and Regional Planning Governing Board Members in attendance were: Robert Larkin, Geno Martini, Dave Aiazzi, Robert Cashell, Dwight Dortch, and Pierre Hascheff. Member Bonnie Weber arrived at 2:10 p.m. Member Jim Galloway arrived at 2:15 p.m. Members absent were: Mike Carrigan and Ron Schmitt.

Also present were: Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA Interim Director; Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel; Phil Caterino, TMRPA; Joy Randall, TMRPA; and Gretchen Eykelbosh, TMRPA.

#### 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 12, 2006, RPGGB AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

#### 3. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Norm Azevedo, Legal Counsel, led the salute to the flag and the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. July 27, 2006 (continued from September 21, 2006)
- B. September 21, 2006

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, stated that there are not enough members present who attended the July 27, 2006, meeting to take action on that item.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 21, 2006, RPGGB MEETING MINUTES, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**6. BUSINESS OF THE DAY**

- A. Status report from local government staff regarding preparation of detailed recommendations for the implementation of concurrency as described in Regional Plan Goal 3.5 and related policies.

*[Member Weber arrived at 2:10 p.m.]*

John Hester, City of Reno Community Development Director, reviewed facilities plans that are required and the process developed to make sure that they are concurrent with development impacts. The schedule is to have a draft plan ready in March 2007. Mr. Hester reviewed an outline for the Reno plan. Mr. Hester stated that the three jurisdictions have set up a stakeholders group. The first meeting was September 21. Representatives from both Cities, Washoe County, RTC, TMWA and other service providers attended. The meeting covered what the settlement agreement says, the kind of planning each jurisdiction is doing, forecast horizon and what land use assumptions everyone is using. Groups of issues were identified and subcommittees to work on those issues were established. Next week the stakeholder group hopes to get a conceptual agreement on how the issues in each group are being handled. Based on that conceptual agreement, each of the jurisdictions will develop their own ordinance consistent with the settlement agreement.

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

Adrian Freund, Washoe County Community Development, stated that Mr. Hester's overview will also be basically the contents of the Washoe County Public Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Plan. The County will set the framework for their approach and overall effort in the public services, facilities and infrastructure element of the County comprehensive plan, which will be updated shortly. That element in turn is required to be found in conformance with the Regional Plan. Mr. Freund stated that the County has fairly good coverage of facilities plans within the existing Truckee Meadows Services Area (TMSA) that is unincorporated. The County is looking at basically filling in the gaps in that coverage both in terms of subject areas and in terms of geography. The County will also be doing some conceptual level planning for the future services area. Mr. Freund stated that this is a three jurisdiction effort and that they are moving forward together.

Member Weber asked if there is a possibility for this stakeholder group to make a statement about what concurrency means so that everyone can be on the same page. Margaret Powell, Sparks City Planner, stated that the concurrency team that was started in the stakeholders meeting will be part of the driving force to determine and work with us to figure out what concurrency is. Ms. Powell stated that concurrency will be different for each specific resource and services. The general concept is to have services available when services are needed.

Member Weber expressed concern that the definition of concurrency is very general and that different people can say it differently.

Member Galloway agreed with Ms. Powell regarding the general concept of concurrency and stated that the effort here is to try to put details into that. The hard work is in determining what needs to be done to meet the requirements of regional planning.

Member Hascheff disclosed that Winnemucca Ranch and another client of his are on the map. Member Hascheff asked for clarification of Goal 3.5 in the Regional Plan regarding the Washoe County School District being part of the concurrency programs unless they decide not to develop a facilities plan. Mr. Hester responded that the reason the schools are optional is because they are not signatory to the settlement agreement. The City of Reno staff has talked with the school district staff and they want their facilities included in the City of Reno Public Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Plan.

Member Hascheff asked if the school district would have an option if we have a Regional Plan that says you are going to have Public Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Plan concurrency and that applies across the board including the school district. Mr. Hester responded that if the school district decides to prepare a facilities plan, then that facility plan has to be found in conformance with the Regional Plan. The school district has the option of not preparing a facility plan. Mr. Hester stated that he thinks the option the school district has chosen is to work through the three local governments and have their facilities included that way.

Member Hascheff asked if there will be a facilities plan in place that some policy-maker when looking at a development says we have school facilities that are concurrent with the impacts of the development. Mr. Hester responded yes. It will be in the County, Sparks, and Reno Public Service, Facilities and Infrastructure Plan.

Member Hascheff agreed with Member Weber's comment regarding a definition of concurrency and asked if there is something that can be done at a staff level by way of a mission statement or something that would get people comfortable with what we are trying to accomplish. Mr. Hester responded that they can go to the stakeholder group and get a general definition.

Member Hascheff stated that one other definition that he has heard is basically making sure that critical public facilities and services are in place at the time the development is coming on line. There is a level of service that is attached to that, what does the community expect and that all gets folded into the definition.

Chair Larkin asked what the RPGB will be getting in March. Mr. Hester responded that the RPGB will have public service and facilities plans for all three jurisdictions that will go to regional for conformance review and there will be out of the working group a conceptual agreement about how to address all of these issues. From that, each of the jurisdictions will write code to do adequate public facilities and services when needed. The target date is July 1, 2007, to have that in place.

Chair Larkin asked Ms. Coombes if it was her vision that this process would be a conformance review of the facilities plan or a plan incorporation. Ms. Coombes responded that any time any facility provider updates their service plans they need to bring those in for conformance review.

Chair Larkin asked if this process will be incorporated in the Regional Plan or if it is simply going to be a conformance review. Ms. Powell responded that it will still be three individual plans adopted by three local jurisdictions and regional will be doing the conformance review. They will not become a part of the Regional Plan.

Chair Larkin asked if the settlement agreement team thought this would be an amendment to the plan or a conformance review. Ms. Coombes responded that her understanding of what the RPGGB asked the local governments to do is to put greater definition around the concept of concurrency. The local governments are working through the stakeholders on what this actually means and what it would look like. Ms. Coombes stated that her expectation was that if there is a requirement for an amendment to the Regional Plan, that would come out of this process as well.

Member Galloway stated that the settlement agreement requires that the Regional Plan will do things that will assure that concurrency occurs. It does not satisfy the settlement agreement if the regional plan has nothing to say of concurrency and just leaves it to the three entities.

Chair Larkin asked if other settlement agreement team members had any comments. Member Aiazzi stated that the settlement agreement team did what we did and then put it out to the RPGGB and now it is up to everybody. The most important thing to address first is the definition of what it meant and that is what they are working on now.

Chair Larkin asked Ms. Powell if she wanted to comment on the discussion. Ms. Powell stated that in the July RPGGB meeting when changes to the Regional Plan were adopted, it did include a concurrency policy. That is why we are working on the process that was outlined today. Ms. Powell stated that she agreed with Ms. Coombes' comment that if through this process we identify some additional information that needs to be included, that is something that we would bring forward as well. There is right now policy in the Regional Plan that talks about concurrency in the eight areas of service so that broad goal and policy is what the plans will be found in conformance with.

Ms. Coombes concurred with Ms. Powell's comments. Ms. Coombes stated that when the Regional Planning Agency (RPA) through the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) does a conformance review it can only be done against the quality of the policies in the Regional Plan. At the moment the policies in the Regional Plan are broad. Ms. Coombes stated that her interpretation of what the RPGGB directed the staffs to do is to look at whether this needs to be tightened up or not. If it needs to be tightened up, then a Regional Plan amendment will be brought back to the RPGGB to tighten up those requirements so that the RPC can be much more clear in the way it interprets a facility planning process and whether it actually meets requirements for concurrency. If the policies remain broad, there will be a broad conformance review.

Chair Larkin expressed concern regarding the possibility that all three planning directors may not agree to one process. There needs to be agreement on whether it is conformance review or a plan amendment.

Mr. Freund stated that the planning directors feel we need to be consistent in how the Regional Plan governs the local plans and that has always been a process of conformance review. During the Regional Plan update process we are working to articulate the policies for conformance review related to concurrency and adequate facilities. Mr. Freund stated that one of his concerns is whether in fact it is wise to have all facilities plans individually come through for conformance. What we are envisioning is a services plan that tells you what services are expected to be provided when, where and how. For any given area plan or plan amendment, we could come in with various service plans. Mr. Freund stated that he thinks they would agree that

they would like to keep that at a comprehensive service plan level that would then be found in conformance with the Regional Plan.

Mr. Hester stated that their plan is going to be part of their master plan and by state law those have to come for conformance. Mr. Hester stated that Ms. Powell's point is if you want to make the conformance standards a little different, that may be something you do through the Regional Plan amendment process. Mr. Hester stated that in response to Member Galloway's comment, the steps we agreed to in the annexation settlement are still there. We are all pretty much on the same page until we get to specifics which will have some variation.

Chair Larkin summarized stating that the planning directors are recommending that we move forward with conformance reviews of a broad facilities service master plans and that they will be bringing those back to the RPGB in phases with completion on or before July 1, 2007. Mr. Hester responded that all three planning directors will be bringing the RPGB public service and facility infrastructure plans next spring and that those will all have to be found in conformance.

Chair Larkin stated that it is the conformance approach that we are moving forward with. Mr. Hester responded that that approach is in the Regional Plan now and in the settlement agreement.

Chair Larkin asked if there were any questions about that so that there will not be an argument in six months when they bring these back.

Member Martini stated that he understands that they would be doing conformance reviews and that he hoped that everyone on the RPGB understands. In the past there have been decisions where the planners have all decided to do something and then pressures have been borne against some of the staff and things have changed all of a sudden. Member Martini stated that he wanted it clear again that everyone on the RPGB knows that we are doing a conformance review so that nobody leaves this meeting and goes to their planner and says they need to do an amendment to the plan. Mr. Hester responded that they are all bringing forward plans for a conformance review.

Member Galloway stated that since he has been asked with inadequate information to say this rather vague description of a conformance review process is adequate or forever hold his peace, he does not have enough information to know that. Member Galloway stated that it seems okay so far and that he will try to look into it further and if there is any problem, he will let the RPGB know before next spring. Member Galloway stated that he is not going to say on the basis of one meeting that there is not some implementing language that needs to be put in the Regional Plan to make that work.

Member Hascheff ran through the steps he thought the settlement agreement was to provide. Mr. Hester reviewed exactly what is in the settlement agreement from the flowchart on page 28 of the meeting packet.

Ms. Coombes stated that it is not only the three local government master plans and their facilities plans that this impacts, it also impacts other service providers in the region.

- B. Discussion and possible action to support the housing task force regarding a regional approach to affordable and workforce housing issues including, but not limited to the nomination of an RPGB member to participate on the task force.

Ms. Coombes introduced a new RPA staff member, Phil Caterino.

Phil Caterino, Senior Planner stated that if the RPGB would like to have a representative on the housing task force, there are a number of options available. Mr. Caterino stated that some entities have a staff member representing them on the task force.

Member Dortch stated that the RPGB should support this but did not feel that someone from the RPGB needed to be appointed to the task force.

Chair Larkin stated that the discussion was to have someone from regional planning be represented at that and that it would be a RPA staff member or the Director.

**MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO APPOINT THE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY DIRECTOR OR DESIGNEE TO THE HOUSING TASK FORCE, SECONDED BY MEMBER WEBER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.**

## **7. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

### **A. Discussion and possible action on recruitment of Director of Regional Planning.**

Joy Randall, Administrative Services Manager, reviewed the process that was used in the last two recruitments for the Regional Planning Director. This position has been vacant since July 7, 2006.

There was some discussion regarding negotiating a deal with the Interim Director, Ms. Coombes. Member Cashell stated that Ms. Coombes is doing a good job and that he is very pleased with the results from the RPA staff and Interim Director. Member Cashell stated that he sees no sense in going out and bringing in somebody that does not understand the territory or understand what we are working on.

Chair Larkin stated that he believes Ms. Coombes is not interested in the position. Ms. Coombes clarified that without clarification on the future of Regional Planning or the terms or the position she does not know at this time if she is interested in the position. Ms. Coombes stated that there is a process directed in statute for the appointment of the Director and that she does not know whether that process can be modified. Ms. Coombes stated that her assumption is that an application or selection process of some kind would have to occur. At the time that process were to initiate, Ms. Coombes would contemplate whether or not to put her application in for the position.

Member Hascheff stated that we are right in the middle of a Regional Plan update and there are concurrency plans and other critical things on the RPGB agenda. Going out and recruiting now would be difficult. The focus should be on this process right now and if Ms. Coombes is willing to stay on, we can get through this process and the Board can decide whether or not to go out for recruitment.

Member Galloway stated if the RPGB does go out for recruitment, we need to be advised whether at any point we can intervene and reserve the right to just bring the applications directly to the RPGB without violating statute. Mr. Azevedo responded that the RPGB does have the authority to defer a decision to a later time. The statute is specific and the requirement is that the RPGB is to make a selection from a list of three names which is to be provided from the RPC.

**MEMBER HASCHEFF MADE A MOTION TO DEFER THE DECISION WHETHER TO RECRUIT OR NOT RECRUIT UNTIL AFTER THE REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE,**

SECONDED BY MEMBER WEBER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

## **8. REPORTS**

A. Members' and Director's reports.

1) Status report on 208 water quality management plan

Chair Larkin asked if there were any questions on this report. There were no questions.

2) Status report on the 2007 update of the Regional Plan

Chair Larkin asked if there were any questions on this report.

Member Aiazzi asked for information regarding secondary Transit Orientated Development (TOD) corridors that are mentioned on page 60 of the meeting packet. Ms. Coombes responded that there was a discussion among the TAC members that it would be nice to be able to have a mini TOD. This would be something that might support transit and be an efficient development pattern within certain areas but not need to come to the full standards of a TOD corridor. The way the draft language is written in the plan, it provides enabling language only and not a requirement.

Member Aiazzi asked if that would allow each entity to decide what infill is instead of regionally. Ms. Coombes responded that it would be a little of both. What was decided at the TAC is that the designation of the McCarran ring was broad and did not provide all the direction that was useful from a planning perspective. The TAC is recommending that we remove that particular designation and focus infill predominantly in the centers and corridors and secondary corridors, if that concept is adopted. It would also allow the local governments to identify areas that may be prime for infill.

Member Aiazzi asked if there would be a line on a map as to what infill is. Ms. Coombes responded that her understanding of what the local government staffs have represented at the TAC is that they would designate those areas in their master plans through their local planning process.

Member Aiazzi stated that he thought there would be a solution as a region and not leave it up to local jurisdictions. Ms. Coombes stated that the discussion at the TAC was why use an arbitrary designation of McCarran when it might be better for a local planning perspective to designate that. Ms. Coombes stated that her expectation is that when the master plans come in they would have designated infill areas with incentives and other enabling strategies that they might put in place should be geared at encouraging infill in those designated areas.

Member Hascheff stated that it is a regional issue and there should be consistent standard criteria in identifying infill. Member Hascheff also agreed that just saying McCarran ring is not the perfect solution. Member Hascheff asked if it could be done like the concurrency plans and have the local jurisdictions work on an infill plan and bring it to the RPGB for conformance review.

Member Galloway asked if there should be a message as to what standards we will use in determining whether an entity's TOD submission is appropriate or not. Member Galloway suggested that the Director could suggest a list of things that we will be looking at to determine whether or not we find it in conformance. Ms. Coombes responded that the TAC established an infill subcommittee. The provisions that relate to the standards for centers and corridors have been strengthened in the draft document.

Member Galloway asked if there are adequate guidelines already as to whether a proposal for a given area to be designated as infill or TOD is appropriate or not. Ms. Coombes responded that there are standards in the Regional Plan and they would maintain through the update process that actually describe the desired characteristics of a TOD and a center. Ms. Coombes stated that she can take it back to the TAC and have them review that.

Member Galloway stated that there is a need for some standards regarding infill areas being designated by each entity.

B. Legal counsel's report:

None

**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. There may not be a need to meet in November.

Chair Larkin asked for feedback regarding the meeting in November. There was some discussion regarding when the infill report would be ready. It was decided to not meet in November unless something comes up that needs to be addressed before the December meeting.

**10. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

None

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 3:25 P.M., SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

---

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director  
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

---

Robert Larkin, Chair  
Regional Planning Governing Board

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