



# REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD

**MEMBERS**  
Dwight Dortch, Chair  
Robert Larkin, Vice-Chair  
David Aiazzi  
Mike Carrigan  
Robert A. Cashell  
Jim Galloway  
Pierre Hascheff  
Geno Martini  
Ron Schmitt  
Bonnie Weber  
Dave Ziegler, Director

## MINUTES

### REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD Regular Meeting Thursday, December 15, 2005

The Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGGB) 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 Dwight Dortch at 2:05 p.m.

#### 1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and Regional Planning Governing Board Members in attendance are: Dwight Dortch, Robert Larkin, Dave Aiazzi, Mike Carrigan, Pierre Hascheff, Geno Martini, Ron Schmitt and Bonnie Weber.

Also present were: Dave Ziegler, TMRPA Director; Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel; Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA; Lora Richards, TMRPA; Gretchen Eykelbosh, TMRPA; and Joy Randall, TMRPA.

#### 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 15, 2005, RPGGB AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

#### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 13, 2005

MEMBER WEBER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 13, 2005, MINUTES, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

#### 3. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

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

#### 4. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

**6. BUSINESS OF THE DAY**

- A. Consideration and possible acceptance of report from City of Reno regarding actions taken on conditions attached to the Regional Planning Governing Board's (RPGB's) determination of Regional Plan conformance for proposed amendment to the South Virginia Corridor Specific Plan

Chair Dortch relinquished the gavel to Vice Chair Larkin to run the meeting and abstained from participating in this agenda item.

*[Chair Dortch left at 2:07 p.m.]*

David Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning, stated that this agenda item is a report from the City of Reno on actions taken on conditions attached to Regional Plan conformance of the proposed amendment to the South Virginia Corridor Specific Plan by the RPGB. The City of Reno will present the report, and if appropriate, the RPGB should accept the report as being responsive to the conditions attached.

Mr. Ziegler noted that subsequent to the RPGB action on October 13, 2005, an action letter was sent to the City of Reno. The seven items that needed to be done by the City of Reno are outlined in the staff report on page 12. On November 16, 2005, the Reno City Council held a public hearing and amended the special use permit that was issued in conjunction with the master plan amendment. Mr. Ziegler testified at the City Council meeting that the amendments being made to the Special Use Permit (SUP) were consistent with the discussions among the staff. Mr. Ziegler stated that the City of Reno still needs to make a record to the RPGB regarding items five and seven of the list and will do so now.

*[Member Cashell arrived at 2:08 p.m.]*

John Hester, Reno Community Development Director, thanked the Chair and members of the Board. The SUP conditions that the City Council adopted in November were consistent with all of the staff discussions regarding all the issues that could be addressed through the special use permit. Mr. Hester stated he is present to address items five and seven.

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

Mr. Hester addressed item five, the identification of future transit station locations, relative to the property that had the master plan amendment. He noted the first transit stop is at the Meadowood Mall area, the next stop at Longley Lane, the next at the freeway crossing, the next mid-way between that and the next freeway crossing, and the final two at the Redfield Center. The Manogue High School is not a node, but between the stations. Mr. Hester noted that the RTC is in the process of preparing the environmental documentation for the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and alternative routes, which might affect the exact station locations. Additionally, this planning will aid the process of applying for federal funds.

Mr. Hester addressed item seven, the justification for alternative densities. Mr. Hester has four points to convey to the Board. The first point addresses the residential and floor area ratios (FAR) and the average for the corridor, with the ratios higher at the stations and lower in the corridor. Mr. Hester stated that the second point is the timing of federal dollars. Land uses that depend on rapid transit are not there now because the rapid transit is not yet available. The City

of Reno planned for land uses that will work now with the ability to translate these land uses into higher densities later. Mr. Hester stated that with the plan, the City can apply for federal funds.

Mr. Hester stated that the third point is the redevelopment potential. He stated a critical issue for the cities is the assembling of small parcels into larger parcels; however, these property owners are keeping the land in larger parcels. The last rationale for alternative densities is compatibility. After speaking with Manogue and the CABS, the City concluded that the residents would like lower densities in parts of the corridor around residential areas; therefore, the lower FAR and densities for residential in the non-station areas are designed for compatibility purposes. Mr. Hester stated that the City thinks the RPGB could use the four justifications to find the densities consistent with the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) corridor policies of the Regional Plan. Mr. Hester offered to answer any questions.

Acting Chair Larkin asked if the members had any questions for Mr. Hester.

Member Hascheff indicated he had a question for Director Ziegler. Member Hascheff noticed in the staff report that Mr. Hester would be addressing items five and seven. Mr. Hascheff asked if Regional Planning is comfortable with the reasons for allowing exceptions as presented by Mr. Hester and if the reasons are consistent with the intent of the corridors policies.

Mr. Ziegler responded that the short answer is yes. He stated that the Regional Plan required a justification, but the adequacy of the justification became an item of discretion for either the RPC or RPGB. Mr. Ziegler stated that there is a justification presented to the RPC last night, and RPC determined it was sufficient.

Mr. Hascheff indicated that this action is precedent setting and another person in similar circumstances should be treated the same. Mr. Ziegler referred the question back to the members and indicated he is comfortable with the reasons.

Member Hascheff asked if the 1.5 FAR is an average. He stated that ultimately other property owners could come in a little bit less; if the owners came in higher, it would always balance out and achieve that particular objective. Member Hascheff indicated that in the future, action would be on a case by case basis.

Mr. Ziegler stated that there is nothing in policy 1.2.12 that says that the 1.5 is to be an average; never the less, it is not an unreasonable interpretation of what 1.2.12 says. Reno will be submitting a TOD plan for this corridor and if they are shooting for 1.5, it is not unreasonable.

Acting Chair Larkin asked if there are any other questions and if not, would any member like to make a motion. Mr. Ziegler indicated that the motion would be to accept both the written and oral report.

**MEMBER HASCHEFF MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT BOTH THE WRITTEN AND ORAL PRESENTATION CONSISTENT WITH THE COMMENTS ON PAGE 12 OF THE STAFF REPORT THAT THE CONDITIONS OF THE GOVERNING BOARD HAVE BEEN AMENDED THROUGH CITY OF RENO'S SPECIAL USE PERMIT ASSOCIATED WITH THE MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT AND THE TWO ADDITIONAL ITEMS THAT WERE ADDRESSED BY MR. HESTER, SECONDED BY MEMBER WEBER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH TEN (10) MEMBERS PRESENT.**

*[Chair Dortch returned at 2:20 p.m. and took the gavel]*

- B. Discussion and possible direction to staff on proposed changes to the RPGB's Regulations on Procedure regarding conformance review procedures and provision of notice

Mr. Ziegler stated there is a written staff report on page 23 of the packet. Mr. Ziegler stated the legislature granted the RPGB the authority to adopt regulations on procedure to detail-out the activities of the Regional Planning Agency. Mr. Zeigler stated that the RPC looked at this material in November and individual members were supportive of the changes.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the changes fell into three categories. He stated that the first category occurs regularly when the staff are asked to comment on conformance review matters prior to submission to the RPC. Legal counsel has advised staff to address the situation through the regulations. He stated the second category is the giving of notice when a decision of the RPC is subject to an appeal. Situations have arisen where parties appealed the final action, raising the question when the appeal clock started. Legal counsel had advised staff to give notice of the appeal rights in writing. The third is a few technical amendments.

Mr. Ziegler noted the first change would give the local governments the ability to ask for input and authorize the Director or designee to provide input that would not be binding on the Agency. He stated that the language on pages 29 and 30, clarifies that the notice must be given personally or by certified mail to the Community Development Director for any action by the RPC that is subject to the appeal and that proof of service must be received prior to hearing the appeal. Mr. Ziegler noted the other changes are technical, including the addition of definitions.

Mr. Ziegler stated he is looking for feedback from the RPGB; if it seems acceptable, the staff will prepare the changes and resubmit for formal adoption.

*[Member Cashell left at 2:22 p.m.]*

Chair Dortch asked if there are any questions or discussion.

Member Larkin asked if the purpose of the amendments is to correct challenges or deficiencies that occurred in the last planning cycle. Mr. Ziegler responded that both correct deficiencies. The first deficiency is the lack of authority to comment on conformance review matters prior to submittal and the second is uncertainty regarding the start of the appeal clock.

Member Larkin asked if there is a formal process for noticing. Mr. Ziegler noted that the procedure at this point in time is an action letter filed with Mr. Ziegler as the Clerk of the RPGB and copies are mailed as a courtesy, but there is no requirement by state law.

Member Hascheff asked Mr. Ziegler whether the date of notice on pages 29-30 referred to the date of the decision or the date the notice is mailed to the applicant. Mr. Ziegler responded that the date is when notice is given. This notice date has a lag time from the meeting date and is usually given within twelve hours of the meeting but could be later if legal review of the notice is required.

Member Hascheff asked if this is the date of the letter. Mr. Ziegler responded that is correct.

Member Hascheff asked if the appeal needs to be filed and notice also to be given to Community Development Directors by mail or personal service within the 45 day period. Mr. Ziegler responded that is correct.

Member Hascheff asked when it says “delivered personally”, do the parties need to return the signed receipt on before the 45 days. Mr. Ziegler referred the question to legal counsel.

Mr. Azevedo, legal counsel, stated the concern first arose when it is unclear whether a local government had received a copy of the decision letter resulting in the question of when the 45 day period began. Mr. Azevedo stated that in the new language contemplated, the 45 days would run from the date of the notice. He responded to Member Hascheff’s question that if the letter was dropped in the mail on the 45<sup>th</sup> day; yes, that would be deemed timely, but that is not in the rule.

Member Hascheff expressed concern that the 45 days from notice language is not clear. He asked whether the time was from when the notice was received and the certified mail was signed and returned to sender. Mr. Azevedo indicated that the language could be adjusted. He stated the proposed revisions are designed to conform to the open meeting law. If there are concerns over whether certified mail means only to show receipt by the recipient and if the 45 days would run from the date of the letter, which is contemplated, that would apply in all instances.

Member Hascheff stated that if everyone understands the rule and is comfortable with the language, so be it.

Member Galloway agreed that a few clarifying words could be added regarding the date of mailing. He has a question regarding the section of the regulations where comments could be requested by the Director or the RPC, whether the current wording is selectively soliciting input, or if this could be clarified in order to specify a reason.

*[Member Cashell returned at 2:36 p.m.]*

Mr. Ziegler indicated the comment concerned item 4 on page 29. He indicated that the current language has been in use since 1996 and allowed for discretion. Mr. Ziegler noted one option would be to look at different language and discuss the language with the planning directors.

Member Galloway stated one reason would be when the party could be substantially affected.

Chair Dortch asked if there are any other questions. He asked if there is a reason that the regulations started the 45 days for appeal after notice is given instead of when the action is taken. He noted that using the meeting as the start date would remove the vagueness. Mr. Azevedo responded that typically the time for filing an appeal runs from the date the actual notice is given. Mr. Azevedo could check the statutes if the RRGB wanted to change it to the date of the meeting.

Chair Dortch indicated that with the Reno Planning Commission, the process to file for an appeal is within 10 days from the date of the meeting action and in person. He stated that the Reno process is plain and simple.

Member Galloway indicated that appeals of the County decisions are 25 days from issuance of the Clerks’ order. There are times when the Clerks’ order might not match what took place at the meeting.

Chair Dortch stated that the language needs to be clear.

Member Hascheff recommended that legal counsel look at the language, since the next step after appeal to the RPGB is district court. Then when the potential appellant gets the clerk's order, which would be the written reasons for the justification for the appeal that starts the clock. If the clerk is delayed in sending out the notice, the potential appellant would not get the full 45 days.

Member Weber recommended giving notice in person may be the answer, since once the date is identified; postage or mail could be a problem.

Chair Dortch asked if there are any other suggestions. He noted that none of the members are sure of the origin of their individual processes, but the language of the statutes could be reviewed.

Member Hascheff stated that the date is only relevant if someone wanted to make an appeal, Mr. Azevedo stated he would review the language and come back with draft language that included options.

C. Quarterly report on facilities by representatives of Washoe County School District

Mr. Ziegler stated that this is a quarterly report from the representatives of the WCSD on facilities and introduced Mark Stanton, PE.

Mr. Stanton thanked the Board for the opportunity to give an update on the capital improvement plans and associated 2002 rollover bond program. He indicated his report consists of three parts: the capital improvement program, enrollment growth, and how WCSD is adjusting.

Mr. Stanton stated that in 2003, a capital improvement plan (CIP) was designed to take the school district through 2012. At the time, there was between \$400 and \$700 million in projected proceeds available. He noted that the bond proceeds are the only source for school facilities. At the time of the plan, the projected increased enrollment would be 22,000 more students.

However, construction costs have increased by 40 percent since 2003 and the experts predict another 40 percent increase by 2012. Financial advisors indicate that the proceeds will be reduced by 50 percent. As a result of the construction increase, the revenue decrease, and property tax relief, there will be a reduction of 12,600 seats that will be able to be built from 22,000 to 9,400.

Mr. Stanton indicated that student enrollment is flat this year, but the prior 20 year average is between two and five percent. The builders are consulted when projecting the future enrollment. Historically, the student yield factor has been 0.5 students per single family residence but the new student yield is 0.3 students per house. The school district has been looking at demographics to see the location of needed facilities. The school district is also looking for other sources of revenue. The school does not have the funds for facilities to provide quality education to the students.

Member Hascheff asked Mr. Stanton, if the growth rate stays flat and the planned capacity improvements are done, could the WCSD serve the student population. Mr. Stanton replied, yes, by bringing the students to the facilities. Member Hascheff asked what the growth rate is that needed to remain flat. Mr. Stanton responded that it is student enrollment.

Member Hascheff asked if the enrollment rates have been translated into growth rates within the communities. Mr. Stanton replied that issue is the student yield, which reflected the types of

residents and is a moving target. Member Hascheff asked if the school could take the student yield and extrapolate the community growth rates using some assumptions. Mr. Stanton replied that could be done.

Member Galloway commented that the property tax cap does not affect the low end of the school's revenue projections, but in fact guarantees them. He commented that the property tax cap would probably remain in effect.

*[Member Cashell left at 2:55 p.m.]*

Mr. Galloway asked if the cap remaining in effect would lead to impact fees and could the fees be calculated in order to make a difference. Mr. Stanton replied that in order to provide schools with the necessary funds, the impact for a development, with half a student per residence, would be \$16,000 per residence. Mr. Galloway asked if that would be the full cost, or to make up the difference. Mr. Stanton clarified that would be the full cost. Mr. Galloway asked for the number that would augment the cost. Mr. Stanton replied he would get that number.

Member Aiazzi asked if this is only on new construction. Mr. Stanton replied that is correct. Member Aiazzi asked if that would be assuming all new residents buy new houses. Mr. Stanton replied that is correct. Mr. Aiazzi asked what other revenue raising options the school district is considering. Mr. Stanton replied that to provide the amount of revenues needed, there are no other options except a change to the tax structure.

Member Aiazzi commented everyone will suffer and wondered if anyone has asked the legislative bodies to meet with the local governments to understand the impact of the laws they pass. Mr. Stanton indicated that the Superintendent meets with the Senators and Assemblymen on a regular basis and as recently as last week.

Member Aiazzi indicated the RRGB should ask the legislators to come, be on TV, and be asked to respond to the situation of cutting taxes to local governments.

Member Weber asked if the number of seats not being built in 2012 is 12,600. Mr. Stanton replied that is correct. Ms. Weber asked if that would be approximately 2,000 seats per year. Mr. Stanton replied it would be closer to 1,500 seats per year. Ms. Weber asked what has been done in the past. Mr. Stanton replied that since the rollover bond initiative, the WCSD has built two elementary, two middle, and two high school additions to provided 4,400 seats; with the 1998 bond, two elementary and three high schools were built to provide 7,000 seats.

*[Member Aiazzi left at 3:06 p.m.]*

Ms. Weber asked if construction of new schools is the answer. Mr. Stanton replied that schools are built once a facility exceeded capacity by 15 percent. Ms. Weber has been an advocate for building bigger schools or to have bigger sites or adding modulars. Ms. Weber asked if it has been determined, in the last building boom, whether more seniors moved in or if people stayed but relocated. Mr. Stanton replied that is included in the student yield.

Member Carrigan asked whether the number of elementary schools in the summary table presented reflects all of the schools the district could get out of the \$400 million rollover bond funds. Mr. Stanton replied the other assumption in the slide is \$20 million a year to be used for renewal and technology. Member Carrigan asked how much of the \$400 million represents land costs. Mr. Stanton indicated the land costs range from \$120,000 to \$250,000 per acre. Mr.

Carrigan indicated the local governments might be able to ask the developers to donate land. Mr. Stanton indicated that some developers are already donating land.

Member Larkin asked what the school district's exit strategy is for areas of declining enrollment and indicated that issue would be a good starting point for the joint meeting between RPGB and WCSD. Mr. Stanton replied this issue is being considered and some schools have been identified; however, other older areas of the community have experienced drops, such as the Parklane Mall area, where enrollment has increased. Now portables are needed and the schools have gone to multi-track schedules. Mr. Larkin indicated that disposal is an extreme exit strategy and indicated other strategies might include leasing the building, converting uses, etc. Mr. Stanton indicated they are looking at other options.

Member Weber stated her appreciation of the school district reports.

- D. Discussion and possible acceptance of report on pending update of the water quality management plan (208 plan) and related reports on wastewater and water quality

Mr. Ziegler stated that this item is a report requested at the last RPGB meeting and Ms. Coombes will present the item.

Ms. Coombes stated the staff report on page 51 discusses 208 planning from two perspectives: 1) status report on the plan and 2) background information on the current water quality and waste water management plans being conducted in the area. Ms. Coombes stated 208 planning, at the regional level is a requirement of the Clean Water Act; the current plan was adopted in 1994. Ms. Coombes stated that the staff has secured funding from Nevada Department of Environmental Protection (NDEP) and through an interlocal agreement, let an RFP, and will recommend a candidate to undertake the 208 plan update this afternoon.

Ms. Coombes noted that the staff report includes a list of the more detailed analyses and facility planning reports. Ms. Coombes noted that no individual project listed meets the requirements of the 208 plan; however, the projects would provide input, data and a knowledge base for the 208 plan update. Ms. Coombes acknowledged the work of Gretchen Eykelbosh, Regional Planning, and the local governments in the 208 planning process. Ms. Coombes introduced local governments and Water Planning Commission members who are present to answer any questions: Jim Smitherman, Water Planning Commission and Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Greg Dennis and Terry Svetich, City of Reno; Andrew Hummel, City of Sparks; and Sam Stegeman, NDEP.

*[Member Schmitt left at 3:15 p.m.]*

Member Galloway understood that a 208 plan is a water quality management plan versus a regional water management plan. Mr. Galloway asked whether the element of water runoff are only considered in terms of water quality or did that include flooding, detention requirements or is the plan only trying to reach a non-detriment non-degradation standard for water quality. Ms. Coombes indicated her understanding is that the focus of the 208 plan is water quality.

Mr. Galloway asked if there is more than one standard or just the non-degradation standard on water quality. Mr. Ziegler responded the 208 plan should demonstrate that the region can attain and maintain the water quality standards that are adopted by the state and those would include, in

addition to the non-degradation standard, specific narrative statements and numerical criteria for all the surface water bodies in the region. Mr. Ziegler clarified that non-degradation included both not giving up beneficial uses of the water and the numerical standards. Mr. Galloway thanked Mr. Ziegler for the clarification and stated that he feels the arsenic standards are excessive, but the others are reasonable.

MEMBER HASCHEFF MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT ON THE WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN (208 PLAN), SECONDED BY MEMBER LARKIN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SEVEN (7) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- D. Report (pursuant to the RPGB's October 13, 2005, request) on process for designating tribal trust lands

Mr. Ziegler stated that this agenda item is in response to the RPGB questions regarding the designation of tribal trust lands. He introduced Mr. Arlan Melendez, Chairman of the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony Tribal Council, and Scott Nebesky, Community Development Director for the tribe, who will make a presentation and have submitted written material.

Mr. Arlan Melendez stated he is pleased to be present to answer any questions the RPGB might have regarding lands in trust. The process for putting lands in trust is a federal process found in 24 CFR, Section 151, which allows Indian tribes to take lands into reservation trust status. This law is passed by Congress to recapture the lands lost through the Dawes Act (The Allotment Act) in the 1890s that gave Indians 160 acre parcels, which subsequently were lost to the tribe through sale, tax delinquency, etc. The only sizable reservations in the area are the Walker River and the Pyramid Lake Paiute Reservations.

Mr. Melendez outlined the history of the Indian Colony land acquisitions. In 1916, 28 acres near Second Street were acquired. In 1928, eight more acres were acquired and in 1986, Hungry Valley was acquired in trade for land in Stead, which interfered with the air races, to alleviate overcrowding at the downtown reservation. At the same time, two acres were acquired on South Virginia for economic development.

Mr. Melendez clarified a question that recently arose as to whether a local automobile dealership could move to the Indian Colony site instead of the site near Manogue High School. He stated the tribe was approached on this issue, but the Tribal Council recognized the displacement of taxes issue. Instead of displacement of taxes from City of Reno to the Indian Colony, the tribe enticed the Mercedes dealership from Sacramento to come. Mr. Melendez noted the Tribal Council has the same challenges that local governments have in providing services to their people.

Mr. Melendez indicated that for years the Indian tribe has worked with the City of Reno Planning Department. The federal 151 process required city and county governments to comment on the applications for land to be transferred into trust. He stated that the tribe also has voluntarily submitted projects to planning to get comments. The Tribal Council is committed to working with the local governments.

*[Member Aiazzi returned at 3:30 p.m.]*

Chair Dortch thanked Mr. Melendez and asked if any members had questions.

Member Galloway thanked Mr. Melendez, Mr. Nebesky, and other staff for visiting personally with him and clarifying their policy on non-displacement of tax revenue. The tribe also has offered to have pre-meetings with the local governments prior to the land application hearings.

Member Hascheff commented that the tribe is its own self-governing entity, which provides government services that the other local governments do not have to provide; it is only fair to allow them to generate the revenues they need to provide those services.

Member Galloway stated that an entity should have the ability to raise revenues in proportion to population. He stated that this could be a criterion in the application process.

Mr. Melendez noted that it is more difficult to put land in trust now. The application for the clinic was submitted in 2002 and just approved today. He noted the issue of gaming has necessitated tribes working with the local governments; the clinic application was approved because of local government support of the project.

Chair Dortch thanked the tribal representatives for coming.

## **7. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

- A. Consideration of and possible approval of professional services contract for the update of the water quality management plan (208 plan)

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO EXECUTE THE 208 CONTRACT, SECONDED BY MEMBER MARTINI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SEVEN (7) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Ziegler introduced Brent Farr, Farr West Engineering, who will be working on the report.

## **8. REPORTS**

- A. Members' and Director's reports
  - 1. Report on Truckee Meadows Growth Task Force

Mr. Ziegler introduced Phil Satre and Stacey Crowley from the Truckee Meadows Growth Task Force (TMGTF).

Mr. Satre, co-chair of the TMGTF, thanked the members for support and the opportunity to update them on the TMGTF's activities. He noted that the task force is organized into five subcommittees: reinvestment fund, down town revitalization, transportation, open space and natural resources, and affordable housing. Mr. Satre stated that the TMGTF has contacted Strategic Development Solutions run by Deborah La Franchi, a leader in double bottom line reinvestment solutions. Ms. La Franchi's assistance would include a feasibility study, assess the likelihood of success of double bottom line reinvestment, work with stakeholders on the structure of the fund, hire a fund manager, establish the not-for-profit controlling entity, and assist in implementing the fund. The first phase of the process is an initial meeting with the stakeholders. A proposal would be submitted for phase two, feasibility, and phase three, implementation.

The reinvestment committee is seeking input from community leaders prior to submitting a funding request for the second two phases. The TMGTF has invited Ms. La Franchi to come to Reno on January 18 and 19, 2006. Mr. Satre noted that the fund could become an umbrella to accomplish critical goals in the areas of transportation, revitalization, affordable housing, and open access and natural resources. Mr. Satre requested time on January 19 for Ms. La Franchi to

meet with the Governing Board members to discuss issues and opportunities. He indicated he is working with the city and county managers to schedule a time to meet with the elected officials.

Stacey Crowley stated the affordable housing subcommittee is working on several avenues. The first is ACR 11, which is a state interim committee considering a housing demographer. The second is that committee member Nancy Muniz, from Schwab Bank, is assisting with the legislature.

Ms. Crowley stated that a proposal is received for a study to identify the barriers to affordable housing. The committee is working with HUD, the HOME Consortium, and some of the banking community to get this proposal funded and implemented by spring 2006. Ms. Crowley asked the RPGB for support. Ms. Crowley stated that the open space and natural resource committee is working with the County on a public lands bill to address growth and open space issues together.

Member Larkin asked what date is the committee requesting a meeting with Ms. La Franchi and the Board. Mr. Satre indicated the schedule included meetings with the task force members on the evening of January 18, with the developers for breakfast on January 19, and with the banks at noon on the January 19. He requested time to meet with the RPGB either between breakfast and lunch or lunch and dinner on the January 19; he is working through the respective managers due to an awareness of the open meeting law requirements.

Member Weber suggested we scheduled it now so it could be agendized. Mr. Satre indicated his desire to do so, possibly at 2 p.m.

2. Status report and possible direction to staff on plans for joint meeting of RPGB and Washoe County School District's Board of Trustees

Mr. Ziegler stated that the work plan and strategic goals for this year include a joint meeting with the Board of Trustees of the school district. He has been in touch with the Mr. Dugan, School Superintendent; both he and the President of the Board of Trustees are eager for a joint meeting. Mr. Ziegler suggested three agenda items: facilities planning, between RPGB and WCSD resulting in completion of school facilities plan that could come in for conformance review per the settlement agreement negotiations, ongoing desire for a good working relationship and coordination, and possibly an MOU. Mr. Ziegler sought the RPGB's guidance on whether to have the RPGB attend a WCSD meeting, have the trustees attend the RPGB meeting, or set up a special meeting.

Chair Dortch commented that Mr. Ziegler has made a great start on the agenda items. He noted his personal preference would be for the Trustees to come to a regular RPGB meeting, to a meeting with a light agenda, with the joint portion of the meeting agendized first, then regular business. Mr. Ziegler responded his understanding is to pick a light agenda and put the joint meeting as the first order of business. Chair Dortch suggested possibly starting an hour earlier.

Member Galloway asked when the regular school board meetings are held. Mr. Ziegler responded they meet on Tuesdays at 5:00 p.m. Mr. Galloway noted that the first Tuesday would be the only meeting that would not interfere with the County Commission.

Member Aiuzzi noted that Councilwoman Zadra also asked for a joint meeting with the school district.

Member Weber stated there has been discussion in the past indicating that all the entities should meet with the school district at the beginning of next year. Member Aiazzi asked if it would be similar to an all government summit. Ms. Weber responded yes.

Chair Dortch noted that the more entities you have, the more logistical problems there might be. Member Weber suggested doing the meeting at a Governing Board meeting but not in January, but possibly February or March.

B. Legal counsel's report:

1. Status report and possible direction to staff on Washoe County's petition for judicial review of the certification of Reno's annexation program as conforming with the Regional Plan including, without limitation, schedule for considering possible Regional Plan amendments affecting the Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA) pursuant to settlement agreement (August 23, 2005)
2. Discussion and possible direction to staff in response to Washoe County's request to initiate a possible amendment of the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan pursuant to paragraph A.1 of the settlement agreement (October 17, 2002) to roll back Reno's sphere of influence in the vicinity of St. James's resort and Pleasant Valley (continued from August 11, 2005, meeting)

Mr. Azevedo stated there was a status conference with Justice Hardesty on December 6, 2005, at which time he continued it for approximately two months. There will be another status conference on the settlement of the program of annexation, litigation, and its implementation on January 26, 2006, at 4:00 p.m.

Chair Dortch asked if the members had any questions.

**9. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

- A. Consideration and possible action on calendar of agenda items, including schedule for development of FY 06-07 budget and work program
- B. Members' and director's requests for agenda items

Mr. Ziegler noted there is a written staff report on page 99. Mr. Ziegler indicated he would like discussion at the next meeting on the strategic plan by revisiting the goals that were workshopped a year ago. Mr. Ziegler stated that on the next agenda is the discussion on an Urban Land Institute (ULI) visit to the region in late spring or early summer, legal report, RPGB regulations, and regular reports. He noted the next fiscal year budget cycle is starting. Mr. Ziegler stated staff have done some internal strategic planning and would like to engage the RPGB in January on goals, deliver the tentative budget in February, and adopt the budget in March.

Member Galloway asked about Mr. Satre's desire to meet with as many elected officials as possible on January 19, whether it would be possible to shift the January 12 meeting to January 19. Chair Dortch wondered how full the agenda is at this point in time. Member Larkin stated with the annexation issues, the RPGB would need the January 12 meeting date open. Mr. Galloway agreed that is a good point and withdrew the suggestion.

Member Hascheff asked, assuming the annexation program would move forward at the joint meeting, if the annexation amendment would come to the RPGB on January 12. Member Larkin stated that his understanding of the process is that there would be a joint meeting of all the entities on January 12 and that it might be possible to have a draft amendment to the RPC after that.

Member Hascheff asked if Mr. Ziegler would have to have an agenda item on the January 12 meeting to give direction to the RPC on the amendment. Mr. Ziegler stated that the process would include a joint meeting on the morning of January 12, at which time the three local governments would forward it to the RPC as a Regional Plan amendment on Truckee Meadows Services Area (TMSA). Mr. Azevedo has advised, the RPGB has agreed, and the RPC has begun to consider having one public hearing in Reno, one in Sparks and one in the unincorporated area; therefore, it would not be feasible to vote on a Regional Plan amendment on the afternoon of January 12. Mr. Ziegler stated it would be possible for the RPGB to sponsor the amendment, but some discussion of substance and process would be appropriate.

Member Weber asked about the RPC having three separate meetings. Ms. Weber indicated her understanding for having a joint meeting of the three local entities is so everyone could hear the same information at the same time. Ms. Weber suggested that the RPC should be doing the same thing to avoid confusion.

Member Aiazzi stated that the RPGB's roll is to deliver something to the RPC and how the RPC handles the amendment would be up to state law.

Member Larkin suggested that the joint meeting be in the morning with the regular RPGB meeting in the afternoon of January 12, where they could direct the RPC to handle the amendment in a timely fashion.

Member Weber asked if the RPC recommends approval before the RPGB approves amendments.

Member Larkin thought the suggestion is that the RPGB sponsor the amendment with some direction to the RPC.

Mr. Ziegler stated the actions contemplated are in an unprecedented area and the RPGB had some discretion on designing the process. Because Justice Hardesty wants the amendment expedited, Mr. Ziegler feels they could discuss the procedures on the afternoon of January 12, workshop the substantive issues, and give some direction to send to the RPC. He asked the RPGB to keep in mind, when the amendment is sent to the RPC and they hold their public hearings, there are newspaper advertising requirements that will have to be worked out.

Chair Dortch stated the RPGB would hold the regular meeting on January 12 and Mr. Satre would work out the schedule with the managers for January 19.

## **10. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

Mr. Ziegler noted there is one letter in the packet.

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

MEMBER MARTINI MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 4:53 P.M., SECONDED BY MEMBER AIAZZI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Respectfully submitted by Joy Randall.

---

David S. Ziegler, Director  
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

---

Dwight Dortch, Chair  
Regional Planning Governing Board

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