



REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD

MEMBERS
Geno Martini, Chair
Dave Aiazzi, Vice-chair
Mike Carrigan
Robert A. Cashell
Dwight Dortch
Jim Galloway
Pierre Hascheff
Robert Larkin
Ron Schmitt
Bonnie Weber
Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director

MINUTES
REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD (RPGB)
Regular Meeting
Thursday, July 19, 2007, 2:00 p.m.

The Regional Planning Governing Board met in regular session in the City of Reno Council Chambers, One East First Street, Reno, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Robert Larkin at 2:06 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and Regional Planning Governing Board Members in attendance were: Robert Larkin, Geno Martini, Mike Carrigan, Sharon Zadra for Robert Cashell, Dwight Dortch, and Pierre Hascheff. Member David Aiazzi arrived at 2:11 p.m. Member Dave Humke for Jim Galloway arrived at 2:16 p.m. Members absent: Ron Schmitt and Bonnie Weber.

Also present: Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA Interim Director; Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel; Lora Richards, TMRPA; Phil Caterino, TMRPA; Patricia Rogers, TMRPA; and Joy Randall, TMRPA.

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

A. Election of Chair (Sparks member)

MEMBER CARRIGAN NOMINATED MEMBER MARTINI AS CHAIR, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

B. Election of Vice-chair (Reno member)

MEMBER HASCHEFF NOMINATED MEMBER AIAZZI AS VICE-CHAIR, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Member Carrigan requested amending the agenda to address items 8.B and 6.D immediately following item 6.A.

MEMBER CARRIGAN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JULY 19, 2007, RPGB AGENDA, AS AMENDED, SECONDED BY MEMBER LARKIN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. December 14, 2006
- B. February 8, 2007

MEMBER LARKIN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 14, 2006, AND FEBRUARY 8, 2007, RPGB MINUTES, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH FIVE (5) IN FAVOR AND ONE (1) ABSTENTION BY MEMBER ZADRA.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

[Member Aiazzi arrived at 2:11 p.m.]

6. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

- A. PUBLIC HEARING – Consideration and possible adoption of proposed amendments to the 2002 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, including revising the boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA) or Future Service Areas (FSA) based on applications submitted by the following private property owners:

Lora Richards, Planning Analyst II, briefly reviewed procedural and background information for the following requests.

[Member Humke arrived at 2:16 p.m.]

- 1) Peavine Pines LLC (TMSA 06-001) (continued from February 8, 2007)

Ms. Richards reviewed information regarding this request.

[The public hearing was opened.]

Trent Averett, President of Peavine Pines, stated that the RPGB requested more information regarding the proposed development plans at their February meeting. Mr. Averett stated that Member Aiazzi's liaison requested that the development plans be presented to the Neighborhood Advisory Board (NAB). In order to accommodate that request, Mr. Averett asked that the hearing for this application be post-poned to the next RPGB meeting.

Tina Nappe asked that more information be provided regarding fire management and water before making a decision on this request.

[The public hearing was closed.]

Member Carrigan asked for confirmation that the City of Reno denied this application and the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) approved it. Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, responded that is correct.

Member Hascheff referred to Ms. Richards' earlier comment that approval of this application and the following Bayfish application would create an island and asked if the Bayfish application should be continued as well. Ms. Richards responded that it is at the RPGB Members' discretion.

Member Aiazzi asked Mr. Averett if he was given three months to bring this to the NAB when it was continued in February. Mr. Averett responded that he does not recall exactly what was agreed upon. Mr. Averett also stated that they have been acting in good faith in trying to proceed with the development plans.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO DENY THIS APPLICATION, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH.

Member Aiazzi stated that this application should be denied because the applicant has not done what they said they would do when it was continued in February.

Member Hascheff asked for confirmation that there are other requests for continuance. Ms. Coombes responded that is correct. Member Hascheff stated that as a matter of practice, if someone asks for a continuance, he usually grants it. Member Hascheff stated that he will not support the motion.

Member Larkin asked where the satellite and island would be created if this application and the Bayfish application were to be approved. Ms. Richards identified the potential satellite and island on a map.

Member Aiazzi stated that he understands Member Hascheff's position but that a continuance was already granted in February.

Member Larkin asked if the applicant can reapply if this is denied. Ms. Coombes responded yes.

Member Hascheff stated that his support of a continuance does not mean that he would support the application if it came back to the RPGB. Member Hascheff also stated that this application received low scores related to certain regional criteria.

Member Zadra asked Member Aiazzi if he received any communication or inquiries regarding this application after the applicant spoke under public comment at the NAB. Member Aiazzi responded no.

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH SEVEN (7) IN FAVOR AND ONE (1) OPPOSITION BY MEMBER HASCHEFF.

- 2) Bjorkman, Bayfish LLC, and MMC & Sons LLC (TMSA 06-002) (continued from February 8, 2007)

Ms. Richards reviewed information regarding this request.

[The public hearing was opened.]

David Bjorkman spoke about the property involved in this application and stated that it is a good fit for the growth of Reno.

Tina Nappe expressed concerns regarding management of adjoining areas and islands of open space.

[The public hearing was closed.]

Member Hascheff asked for a summary of the scores for this application compared to the previous application. Ms. Richards responded that the difference in the scoring is not substantial. The difference between things like distances to downtown centers and corridors is what gives this application a lower score.

Member Aiazzi stated that he does not believe the City of Reno should move any further up Peavine Mountain than it is right now. Putting this request into the TMSA would anticipate moving it into the City of Reno. A lot of the property is unbuildable. Member Aiazzi stated that if the applicant has a development project, they can still bring it forward to work with the City of Reno even if the RPGB denies the request today.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO DENY THIS APPLICATION, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH.

Member Hascheff stated that he will not support the motion for the same reasons stated regarding the previous application.

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH SEVEN (7) IN FAVOR AND ONE (1) OPPOSITION BY MEMBER HASCHEFF.

3) John Rhodes (TMSA 06-003) (continued from February 8, 2007)

Ms. Richards reviewed information regarding this request and stated that the applicant has requested a continuance to November.

Member Larkin asked Mr. Rhodes to explain his reason for requesting a continuance. Mr. Rhodes responded that he has been waiting for the County to adopt its South Valleys Area Plan. Mr. Rhodes stated that the adoption of that plan will have a significant impact on his application.

Member Aiazzi asked Mr. Rhodes what rights he wants to keep now under the 2002 Regional Plan that he would not have under the 2007 Regional Plan. Mr. Rhodes responded that he does not think his rights will change under the 2007 Regional Plan. Mr. Rhodes also disclosed that he works for Washoe County but is here as a private citizen.

[The public hearing was opened.] There were no requests to speak.

[The public hearing was closed.]

MEMBER HUMKE MADE A MOTION TO GRANT A CONTINUANCE TO NOVEMBER, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

5) J. Douglas Clark (TMSA 07-002)

[Agenda item 6.A.5 was addressed before item 6.A.4.]

Ms. Richards reviewed information regarding this request and stated that there is a request to continue this item to November.

[The public hearing was opened.] There were no requests to speak.

[The public hearing was closed.]

MEMBER HUMKE MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE TO NOVEMBER, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

4) Dolan Properties LLC (TMSA 06-011) (continued from February 8, 2007)

Ms. Richards reviewed information regarding this request and stated that the applicant has made a request to modify the proposal.

There was some discussion on procedure and options for action with regard to the request to modify. Ms. Coombes recommended that the RPGB be deliberate in making a motion to state that they are willing to allow the modifications to go back to the RPC without making a decision on the content of those modifications.

Member Larkin asked Jeff Codega if he would like to comment. Jeff Codega, Representative for Dolan Properties, stated that their preference would be to have this item remanded back to the RPC.

Member Humke asked Ms. Richards if the proposed modifications would change the score for this application. Ms. Richards responded that she does not know. Regional Planning staff has not been able to do a revised analysis.

Member Aiazzi stated that this application has changed a number of times.

[The public hearing was opened.]

Pamela Gallaway stated that the Virginia Range is prone to flash flooding and wildfires. Ms. Gallaway expressed concern regarding danger created for property below areas where infrastructure is being constructed and recommended that this item be denied.

Baron Carronite, Sierra Land Solutions, stated that the application has been modified only once and the reason for the modification was in response to comments from the Board. Mr. Carronite requested that the modified application be remanded back to the RPC for their consideration. Mr. Carronite also stated that they have been to the Southeast Truckee Meadows CAB twice. Once they spoke under public comment and they went back under an agenda item and gave a full presentation. Mr. Carronite also mentioned that there may be further modification to the proposal regarding the "L" shaped parcels.

Ted Short stated that he has no objection to including the lower elevation properties that abut the TMSA. Mr. Short expressed concerns regarding including the upper elevation 40 acre parcels.

Mr. Codega reviewed a map with information regarding the property involved and requested that this item be remanded back to the RPC.

[The public hearing was closed.]

Member Aiazzi asked for clarification regarding whether this item was agenda item at a CAB meeting. Member Humke stated that he was at a meeting where this item was agenda item. He stated that a full presentation was given and questions were asked and answered.

Member Aiazzi asked for information regarding comments at that CAB meeting. Mr. Carronite responded that the main comment was to come back and keep them posted as things were moving. One issue was why the entire area was not noticed. There was some discussion regarding hillside ordinance and what could and could not be developed under the current rules.

MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO REMAND THIS TO THE RPC AND LET THEM TAKE A LOOK AT IT AND MAKE A RECOMMENDATION ON THE MODIFICATIONS, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF.

Member Humke stated that there is no question in his mind as to Mr. Short's veracity on this issue. Member Humke also stated that Mr. Short was a fair hand when he was a commissioner and that he cited excellent points in the item received April 23. Extremely high elevations were noted as well as the 26 different owners of the 25 upper elevation parcels. Member Humke stated that it should be separate applications. Also noted were problems that have to do with concurrency. Member Humke stated that he voted to deny this application in February and that he will not support the current motion.

Chair Martini asked if the maker of the motion would include in the motion to have this brought back to the RPGB at the December meeting. The maker of the motion agreed. The second, Member Hascheff, asked if that would give Regional Planning staff enough time to process the revised application and get it back to the RPC. Ms. Coombes responded yes. Ms. Coombes also stated that the RPC may choose to remand this back to the City of Reno since it has substantially changed.

Member Aiazzi stated that this item should be sent back with some comments so the RPC knows what the RPGB is thinking. Member Aiazzi stated that he is concerned with the "L" shaped property because it would create an island. Member Aiazzi stated that he would like to know about the portion of the application that has the water tank on it that would also create an island. Member Aiazzi expressed concern regarding the substantial portion of the tracks that are unbuildable and stated that he does not know what the advantage is to putting it in the TMSA if it is an unbuildable area. Member Aiazzi stated that he appreciates the fact that the applicant has made substantial changes based on what the RPGB has asked them to do.

Member Larkin stated that the Board of County Commissioners has taken an aggressive stance with wildlife urban interface areas in light of the current fire burning. Member Larkin asked that whatever the planning commission considers incorporate standards related to this wildlife urban interface. Member Larkin asked that the RPC consider those portions with some kind of fire safe zones or in the planning of development some kind of fire related safety precautions.

Member Carrigan stated that Member Humke brought up some good points and asked him to share them with Regional Planning staff to be brought back to the RPC as well.

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH SEVEN (7) IN FAVOR AND ONE (1) OPPOSITION BY MEMBER HUMKE.

6) Brad and Sharon Stanley (TMSA 07-004)

Ms. Richards reviewed information regarding this request.

Member Aiazzi asked if this would create an island. Ms. Richards responded that this request is surrounded by Reno TMSA on three sides and RDA on one side.

Member Aiazzi asked about the cross-hatched area to the north shown on the map. Ms. Richards responded that it is one of the discrepancies in the Dolan proposed modification. Ms. Richards stated that it is already in the TMSA. Member Aiazzi asked for confirmation that it would not be creating an island. Ms. Richards responded that is correct. Ms. Coombes clarified that it would create a pocket of Washoe County TMSA surrounded on three sides by Reno TMSA and one side by RDA, regardless of what happens with the Dolan application.

[The public hearing was opened.]

Sharon Stanley spoke about their property and surrounding property. Ms. Stanley stated that they are asking to be included in the Washoe County TMSA. Ms. Stanley also spoke about possible future plans for the property.

Mr. Carronite clarified information regarding the cross-hatched area to the north shown on the map stating that it is within the City of Reno.

[The public hearing was closed.]

Member Aiazzi stated that if this is annexed into the Washoe County TMSA, it would stop Reno's TMSA from ever expanding out there because it would always be creating an island.

Member Dortch asked the applicant what the advantage is to putting this in the Washoe County TMSA. Ms. Stanley responded that they are in the County and have never been in the Reno SOI. Ms. Stanley also stated that if this goes into the Washoe County TMSA, you will not be able to go south anyway because it is constricted land.

Member Dortch stated that if the land is not being developed, he does not know what the advantage is either way. Ms. Stanley responded that they are zoned for Medium Density Suburban and future generations may be interested in developing some day.

There was some discussion regarding the complexity of the applications and how this one related to the Dolan application. Ms. Coombes stated that they are separate applications and should be considered on their own merits. If the RPGB is concerned about the relationship of the two applications together, one option is to request that they continue through the process together. Ms. Coombes stated that one of the issues with the Dolan applications is that it keeps changing. Ms. Coombes stated for the record that just because the TMSA is not adjusted today, does not preclude a TMSA amendment from being proposed in the future. It will be dependant upon the rules in place at the time. There is also no prohibition from property moving from Washoe County TMSA into Reno TMSA in the future if it makes better sense in terms of the service provision. Ms. Coombes stated that there are complexities because the County plans for the service provision now in that particular area.

Member Carrigan asked the applicant why they want to go into the Washoe County TMSA instead of Reno's. Ms. Stanley responded that they have talked to the Director of Reno Planning and with Washoe County. Ms. Stanley stated that it was recommended to them on high authority that it should be done through Washoe County. Ms. Stanley also stated that it is not fair to lump this application in with a confusing plan the RPGB may have a problem with because they are not connected to it in any way.

Member Carrigan agreed that this application should not be lumped in with the Dolan application and stated that he does not understand why the applicant wants to go into the Washoe County TMSA when the property is surrounded on three sides by Reno.

Member Humke stated that this application is fairly straightforward. The property owner wishes to be in Washoe County and that should mean something. This application has a higher score than the Dolan application.

Member Aiazzi stated that he does not have a problem bringing this into the TMSA but wonders how Washoe County is going to provide services there.

Member Larkin stated that the condition of optimizing provision of infrastructure is an issue. Member Larkin expressed concern that there are intimations that there are no services there and stated that he wants to see the facts. Member Larkin stated that he would like to know where the services are if it is in the Washoe County TMSA, where those services are going to come from, how much they are going to cost, and if they are going to be more costly than if provided by the City of Reno. Member Larkin asked Ms. Stanley if there is anybody else in the County close to their property. Ms. Stanley responded showing areas on the map around their property that are in the County.

Member Larkin asked Ms. Stanley if she would have a concern if this was continued. Ms. Stanley responded no.

Member Zadra asked if this application can legally be held subject to the Dolan application. Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel, responded that this is a stand alone application and is agendized as such. It is appropriate for the RPGB to consider all the amendments and the impact it would have on the current 2002 Regional Plan or, later on the agenda, the proposed 2007 Regional Plan update.

Member Zadra stated that one reason she would support a continuance is that she would request that the applicant give a presentation on this to the south NAB because it is surrounded by City properties.

MEMBER LARKIN MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE TMSA 07-004 TO DECEMBER 2007, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF WITH THE CLARIFICATION THAT IT BE THE SAME DATE THE DOLAN APPLICATION COMES BACK TO THE RPGB. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

8. REPORTS

B. Legal counsel's report

- 1) Consideration of legal counsel's report and possible direction to staff regarding expiration of settlement agreements pursuant to Second Judicial District Court of Nevada case CV02-03469, Washoe County and SVGID adv. Regional Planning Governing Board (October 2002), including but not limited to Washoe County's petition for judicial review of the certification of Reno's annexation program as conforming with the Regional Plan (August 2005)

Mr. Azevedo explained that the settlement agreements expired on June 30, 2007. Mr. Azevedo stated that he and Regional Planning staff did an analysis of each of the agreements provision by provision and stated whether the requirements survived in another document or if there was something that is no longer in existence because of the expiration of the agreements.

Member Carrigan asked if the previous amendments on TMSA boundaries is lawful and substantially in place. Mr. Azevedo responded that those amendments are in the Regional Plan and that the proposed update does not address those boundaries of the TMSA.

Member Carrigan stated that when the settlement agreements expired in June, he thought that everything they were working on expired. Ms. Coombes stated that if it was not embedded somewhere else, it no longer exists. The boundary changes that were subsequent to the settlement agreement were included in the Regional Plan in July 2006.

Member Carrigan asked what was not included in the Regional Plan that is important enough to include. Ms. Coombes responded that one of the key things is the issue of population.

Member Larkin asked about the Policy regarding conversion from RDAs to TMSA. Ms. Coombes responded that is all related to the question of population. It does not specify what population number to use. Elsewhere in the Regional Plan it directs us to use the consensus forecast for planning. Ms. Coombes stated that there has been a great deal of anxiety among the local government planning staffs if we default to the consensus forecast methodology.

Member Larkin asked Adrian Freund, Washoe County, for confirmation that Washoe County has adopted population figures. Mr. Freund responded yes and that it is to come to the RPC for conformance in August.

Member Larkin asked for confirmation that the other two entities have adopted population figures as well. Ms. Coombes responded that the City of Reno has adopted a population plan based on the consensus forecast and it was found in conformance in 2004. The City of Sparks adopted a population plan based on the consensus forecast and it was found in conformance in 2006. Washoe County has submitted theirs and it is not based on the consensus forecast and has not been considered by the RPC for conformance review.

Member Larkin asked Mr. Freund what the population figures are based on. Mr. Freund responded that it is based on a series of population forecasts including the State Demographers forecast, the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) forecast, the settlement agreement forecast, and a low end estimate of an update of the consensus forecast. Mr. Freund stated that the consensus forecast is four years out of date.

Member Hascheff asked if there is any action that should be taken on this item. Member Hascheff asked for confirmation that there is now no obligation on the parties to work toward getting provisions that were in the settlement agreement into the 2007 Regional Plan since the settlement agreement has expired. Mr. Azevedo responded that is correct. It is within the discretion of the RPGB, under another agenda item, to address adding things that did not get included in the 2007 Regional Plan.

Member Hascheff stated that it is his understanding that the intent was to get all three jurisdictions using the same forecast. Member Hascheff stated that as the meeting moves on to the next agenda item, there is still unfinished business and asked what the options are. Mr. Azevedo responded that if all parties in the settlement agreement agreed, it would be possible with Court approval to reup the provisions for a period of time. That would require consensus among all the parties of the settlement agreement and approval of Justice Hardesty. Another option would be to include the provisions the RPGB deems important and relevant into the 2007 Regional Plan update. That would require the RPGB to take the appropriate action under the statutes.

Member Hascheff stated that the RPGB could wait until August to see what the RPC does with it and the RPGB can deal with it when it comes back.

6. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

D. Discussion and direction to staff regarding population forecasting methods.

Ms. Richards reviewed the key highlights included in the staff report on this item. Ms. Richards stated that Regional Planning staff is looking for a regular, predictable, consistent, empirical approach to population forecasting.

Member Carrigan asked if the City of Reno and the City of Sparks used the same methodology for forecasting population. Margaret Powell, City of Sparks, responded that the City of Sparks started with the consensus forecast for a low estimate and a snapshot of the last five years of actual population estimates and projected those forward. Ms. Powell stated that the City of Reno used a similar method.

Member Carrigan suggested that if all three entities could agree that the consensus forecast is the minimum, that would be a good place to start.

Member Aiazzi asked if the Planning Directors have a problem with Regional Planning staff's recommendation. Ms. Powell responded that the local jurisdiction planning staffs got together and the biggest issue is that the consensus forecast has not been updated.

There was some discussion regarding the requirement for use of the consensus forecast in the 2002 Regional Plan and the 2007 Regional Plan. Ms. Coombes clarified that both Plans have the same language as it relates to the consensus forecast. However, in the 2007 Regional Plan update, it is acknowledged that Regional Planning staff has spent 18 months with all of the staff from local governments and affected entities to try and get some agreement on what should be used as our forecast. Ms. Coombes stated that after two years of working on this it is apparent that there is no agreement on what this forecast is. Ms. Coombes stated that Regional Planning staff had only the alternative to come up with another approach.

Member Aiazzi asked if Sparks would have a problem if the RPGB makes a motion to adopt Regional Planning staff's recommendation. Ms. Powell responded yes and stated that Sparks has local input into the consensus forecast and no input into the State Demographer's forecast.

Member Aiazzi asked which forecast has been the closest.

Member Larkin briefly reviewed each of the five recommendations in the staff report and stated that he does not have a problem with them. For the first of the five recommendations Member Larkin suggested asking the Interim Director of Regional Planning to go back over the last ten years to see which forecast has been correct.

Ms. Coombes stated for clarification that currently the Regional Plan says that we shall use the consensus forecast for planning purposes. A population plan has been received that we have to find in conformance with the Regional Plan that does not use the methodology specified in the Regional Plan.

MEMBER LARKIN MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION EXCEPT FOR ITEM NUMBER ONE THAT THE RPGB DIRECT STAFF TO GO BACK AND DO THE NUMBERS ON THE CONSENSUS IN COMPARISON WITH THE DEMOGRAPHERS AND SEE WHO HAS DONE THE BEST, SECONDED BY MEMBER AIAZZI.

Member Aiazzi asked if the 2007 Regional Plan is adopted today, would this require a modification to the Plan. Ms. Coombes responded that it would not impact anything being discussed now. If the

RPGB chooses to change the policy in the future changing the data source used for population planning, a Regional Plan amendment would be required.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- B. PUBLIC HEARING – To receive testimony concerning final approval of the Draft Comprehensive 2007 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan.

Ms. Richards stated that she was prepared to make a presentation if desired. There were no questions.

[The public hearing was opened.] There were no requests to speak.

[The public hearing was closed.]

- C. Discussion and action regarding adoption of the 2007 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan.
 - 1) Resolution (RPGB 07-12) adopting the 2007 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan.

Member Larkin asked if all the things in the settlement agreement have been incorporated into the 2007 Regional Plan. Ms. Coombes responded that all of the items from a presentation by the three jurisdictions at the end of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) process have been included. The only issue outstanding is population.

Member Larkin asked for confirmation that the current update still incorporates the consensus forecast for population. Ms. Richards responded that is correct.

There was some discussion regarding the process for making changes after the 2007 Regional Plan is adopted. Ms. Coombes stated that for substantiative changes a Regional Plan amendment would be required.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REGIONAL PLAN AS IS, SECONDED BY MEMBER LARKIN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

[Chair Martini left at 4:46 p.m.]

- D. Discussion and direction to staff regarding population forecasting methods.

[Addressed earlier per amended agenda.]

- E. Discussion and possible action to adopt a fee schedule for private property owner requests to amend the Truckee Meadows Service Areas and the Future Service Areas.

Ms. Richards referred to the applicant fee options on page 119 of the meeting packet.

MEMBER HASCHEFF MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT OPTION D, SECONDED BY MEMBER ZADRA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SEVEN (7) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- F. Consideration and possible adoption of amendments to the Regional Planning Governing Board's Regulations on Procedure including matters related to:

- 1) clarification of the roles of the RPC and RPGB; and

MEMBER CARRIGAN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF.

Member Hascheff asked for confirmation that this gives the ultimate authority to the RPGB to make decisions whether it is action or inaction. Mr. Azevedo responded that is correct.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SEVEN (7) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- 2) private property owner requests to amend the Truckee Meadows Service Areas and Future Service Areas.

Ms. Richards referred to the draft regulations in the meeting packet. There were no questions.

MEMBER DORTCH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SEVEN (7) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- G. Discussion and direction to staff regarding possible meeting dates and times for a joint meeting with the Regional Planning Commission to discuss cumulative impacts of planning and development in the region.

[Chair Martini returned.]

Phil Caterino, Senior Planner, reviewed information in the staff report. There was some discussion regarding scheduling the date and time for the joint meeting.

It was decided to schedule the meeting on October 11 at 5:00 p.m.

7. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- A. Consideration and possible action regarding the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency compensation study findings including related human resource policies.

Joy Randall, Administrative Services Manager, reviewed the staff report included in the meeting packet.

MEMBER HASCHEFF MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION, SECONDED BY MEMBER LARKIN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- B. Discussion and possible action to amend the policies of the TMRPA regarding distribution of agendas and packets.

Ms. Randall reviewed the staff report and recommendation included in the meeting packet. Ms. Randall requested direction for staff to work with Legal Counsel to develop regulations to implement digital distribution of agendas and packets for adoption by the RPGB at a future meeting.

Member Carrigan asked if a regulation is required legally. Mr. Azevedo responded that the concern rests with the agenda support materials that are required by the open meeting law to be distributed in a certain manner. Mr. Azevedo stated that it is his recommendation to develop a regulation outlining the distribution process for Regional Planning staff.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION, SECONDED BY MEMBER LARKIN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

8. REPORTS

A. Members' and Director's reports.

1) Legislative end-of-session report

Patricia Rogers, Government Relations-Community Outreach Representative, stated that Regional Planning staff is currently working on drafting policies to satisfy the requirements of SB 269, which requires that the Regional Plan consider military installations when looking at the master plans of local governments.

B. Legal counsel's report

1) Consideration of legal counsel's report and possible direction to staff regarding expiration of settlement agreements pursuant to Second Judicial District Court of Nevada case CV02-03469, Washoe County and SVGID adv. Regional Planning Governing Board (October 2002), including but not limited to Washoe County's petition for judicial review of the certification of Reno's annexation program as conforming with the Regional Plan (August 2005)

[Addressed earlier per amended agenda.]

2) Discussion and possible direction on proposed Regional Plan amendments to the Regional Utility Corridor Report and related conformance matters

Mr. Azevedo stated that Sierra Pacific Power Company has requested a significant reduction in the size of the overall width of the corridors. The utility went forward and had parts of a project approved where the corridor widths are smaller than what is required by the Regional Plan. Preliminarily, it looks like there is a non-conforming use to the Regional Plan. Mr. Azevedo requested direction to continue to find out what the facts are as to what has occurred and how it has occurred. Mr. Azevedo also stated that there are parties other than utilities that are concerned about this corridor width issue and are looking to see what kind of action this agency will take.

Member Hascheff disclosed that one of the third parties is a client of his and stated that it is appropriate for him to recuse himself.

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 briefly reviewed information from the staff report in the meeting packet. Ms. Coombes also stated that Ms. Richards will be leaving the TMRPA to work for TMWA.

Member Aiazzi stated that he asked at yesterday's TMWA meeting that the new Water Board look into sub-contracting administrative work out to the TMRPA. Ms. Coombes stated that she and Ms. Randall have a meeting scheduled tomorrow with Jim Smitherman on that issue and that they will do what they can to assist.

Member Carrigan asked that an agenda item be included at the next meeting for possible amendments to the Regional Plan.

10. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None

11. ADJOURNMENT

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 5:07 P.M., SECONDED BY MEMBER CARRIGAN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

Reviewed by:

Approved by:

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

Geno Martini, Chair
Regional Planning Governing Board

**APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL PLANNING GOVERNING BOARD IN SESSION ON
_____, 2007.**