



REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION REGIONAL UTILITY CORRIDOR REPORT (RUCR) SUBCOMMITTEE Monday, November 20 2006

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

The Regional Utility Corridor Report (RUCR) Subcommittee met in the TMRPA Conference Room, One East First Street, Suite 1100, Reno, Nevada and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Kendall Mattina, Subcommittee member, at 12:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and RUCR subcommittee members in attendance were: Kendall Mattina (City of Sparks) and William Weber (Washoe County).

Members absent were: Dennis Romeo (City of Reno).

Also present were: Phil Caterino, TMRPA Connie Anderson, TMRPA; Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA Interim Director, Mark Sullivan and Bill Bennett, Sierra Pacific Power Company;; and, Barron Caronite, Sierra Land Solutions.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COMMISSIONER WEBER MOVED TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 20, 2006 AGENDA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MATTINA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH TWO (2) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. ELECTION OF THE CHAIR

COMMISSIONER WEBER MOVED TO NOMINATE COMMISSIONER MATTINA AS THE CHAIR. COMMISSIONER MATTINA SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment requests presented.

5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

A. Discussion of the Background and Purpose of the RUCR Subcommittee –

Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA Interim Director, explained that the RUCR was first adopted in the 1990s in response to work being completed by Sierra Pacific. The process used at that time was the establishment of a Citizens Advisory Committee who prepared the report over a two-year period. At this time, it was a stand-alone report. In 2002 during the Regional Plan Update, it was decided that the RUCR once reviewed for conformance would be adopted by reference into the Regional Plan. One of the implications of this decision is that when the RUCR is amended, it is also a Regional Plan Amendment. At the time of incorporation, there was direction to clean up the document. Sierra Pacific Power Company also came forward with changes to the document. At that point, it was decided to bifurcate the process. The

technical points were completed and a subcommittee was established to review the substantive requests from Sierra Pacific Power Company (SPPC) for amendments to RUCR. The subcommittee was composed of three members. To date, the subcommittee met one time and was then put on hold at the request of SPPC.

Over time membership of the committee has changed. Ms. Coombes explained that the current requests for amendments require clarification as the current request from SPPC varies from the prior request.

The subcommittee will review the requests and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission relating to the proposed amendments.

Bill Bennett, SPPC, stated that his company was hoping to affect changes in the Regional Utility Corridor Report relative to separation distances and the way it was thought of relating to power input to the Truckee Meadows and the export.

Member Mattina questioned a statement on page 3, B13 relating to consistency with master plans. She stated that development should always conform to the master plan. Ms. Coombes responded stating that since the creation of this document, the TMSA has been created which addresses where services are provided. A discussion followed. Ms. Coombes pointed out that changes can be made during the review.

Member Mattina commented that there is language which requires definition. She cited several examples. One example was to have every change relating to power approved by a review board. The threshold proposed for Washoe County was discussed. This threshold triggers an SUP. This threshold policy is not currently adopted.

Ms. Coombes stated that one of the items on the agenda is to scope the nature of the changes that the committee desires to review. She suggested recommending that the committee review:

- Specific recommendations from SPPC
- Specific changes from the subcommittee to the corridor report
- General review of the document

B. Review Requests to Update the RUCR –

This discussion began with the SPPC requests. Phil Caterino, TMRPA, referred to the October 2, 2006 letter from SPPC Company to Rosanna Coombes. This letter is incorporated herein by reference. The letter indicated that there are three main areas. These are: a) review of the purpose of intent; b) the setback of the transmission lines; and c) the identification of all the current and future transmission lines. In addition, TMRPA staff recommended that the mapping requires updating to reflect such items as the TMSA and new government boundaries.

Mr. Bennett stated that he reviewed the corridor plan a few years ago and identified areas which contain issues. Suggestive language was provided at the time of this review. The first

change was to rename the document from its current name, Regional Utility Corridor Report, to something which more clearly identifies the scope.

Mr. Bennett stated that the first main issue both in the 1999 and the 2004 issue, number 10, related to the Declaration Priority and Local Benefits. Mr. Bennett read the declaration to the Subcommittee. He stated that the problem with the language is that currently all of the transmission wires in and out of the Truckee Meadows provide for the area as stated in the declaration but also move electrons from the Truckee Meadows to other places, because this is based on network management. He explained the regional network management process and area. A technical discussion followed regarding the changes which are requested. Mr. Bennett reviewed future demands and expansions to the north.

Mr. Bennett stated that another issue is the separation distances outlined in the current utility corridor report. The distances chosen were in excess of the right of ways dictated by the National Electric Safety Code (NESC), which is the code used by all utilities across the nation. They are designed to provide adequate safety from all things considered with electric power lines. The areas differ by voltage. A new chart is being proposed. Mr. Bennett cited several examples of the difference between the RUCR and the NESC. Mr. Bennett stated that all systems use a low EMF design. A copy of the chart will be provided to the subcommittee.

Ms. Coombes pointed out that today's task was only to identify a list of items to update.

Mr. Bennett reviewed the wording proposed to be changed throughout the document to "low EMF that is economically feasible".

Mr. Caterino summarized the areas requested for review. These are:

- Purpose and intent
- Setback or separation of lines
- Identification of current and future lines
- Report name itself
- Regional benefit issue
- Language relating to visual and EMF
- Map updates
- General review of the document

C. Discussion regarding the process to update the RUCR including but not limited to background education, public involvement, technical review, and schedule of meetings and activities –

Ms. Coombes clarified that this is a Regional Plan amendment, and input from the three local entities will be needed. The formal process was reviewed. Ms. Coombes stated that direction from the subcommittee is required regarding how the process should proceed. She cited several examples of background information/education which may be required. Public involvement was discussed next. Ms. Coombes requested to know how much the subcommittee would like to advertise to notify the public.

Commissioner Weber commented that attendance at workshops is poor.

Commissioner Mattina stated that the time frame is short if the intent is to have the completion coincide with completion of the Regional Plan.

Ms. Coombes suggested bifurcating the issues in two; technical and future corridors. Mark Sullivan, SPPC, agreed with the concept of bifurcation. He reviewed how the updates could be divided into critical and long-term. The critical updates could be completed to coincide with the Regional Plan update and the longer-term changes could be addressed at a future date. Discussion followed. Commissioner Weber suggested that the corridor discussion could be expanded to include other utilities. Ms. Coombes stated that location of the corridors affects multiple utility providers which require representatives from all providers. The impacts of what is placed in the corridors were briefly reviewed. It was decided that a bifurcated list will be provided to the subcommittee at the next meeting for their review and approval. TMRPA staff will work with the SPPC representatives to prepare the list.

Ms. Coombes reviewed the scheduling which would be required should this report go through as part of the Regional Plan Update. Final sign-off, through the Planning Commission, would be required by December 13, 2006. There is a 30-day advertising requirement as part of the Regional Plan Update. A stand-alone amendment requires an 10-day advertising period. Ms. Coombes asked for direction from the subcommittee on an expedited process.

Commissioner Mattina commented that a meeting every three days is not feasible for her work schedule.

Ms. Coombes suggested a separate set of amendments with a target of spring 2007.

Commissioner Weber observed that there does not appear to be an urgency to include this with the upcoming Regional Plan Update.

Mr. Bennett commented that from his company's perspective, the urgency is not getting any increased costs which would not otherwise be mandatory to the PSC. If the set backs were to stand as presented, the result would be costly. He stated that late spring or early summer would be agreeable.

Ms. Coombes summarized the discussion stating:

- The committee will bifurcate the process to phases of shorter- and longer-term.
- A recommendation will be provided to the subcommittee relating to what list item should go into the shorter- and longer-term category.
- It must be decided if independent information is to be provided or if the education provided by the proponents of the change request is satisfactory. The example cited was EMF information. Discussion followed. It was decided

that third-party educational materials and presentations, as needed, will be provided.

- To prepare the documents will require some time. Another meeting will be scheduled after Christmas. It was suggested that the next meeting be on the same day or near the Reno Planning Commission meeting was requested.
- Other utilities will be invited to participate.

Use of the CABs and NABs for public input was suggested by Member Weber.

6. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The future agenda items were discussed under Business of the Day. No additional future agenda items were noted.

7. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

There was no written correspondence presented for review.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Joy Randall

Reviewed by:

Approved by:

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

Kendall Mattina
Chair, RPC RUCR Subcommittee

**APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL UTILITY CORRIDOR REPORT SUBCOMMITTEE IN
SESSION ON _____, 2007.**