



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, September 13, 2007, 2:00 p.m.

The Regional Planning Governing Board met in regular session in the Reno-Sparks Convention Center, Room A20, 4590 S. Virginia Street, Reno, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Geno Martini at 2:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and Regional Planning Governing Board Members in attendance were: Geno Martini, David Aiazzi, Robert Cashell, Jim Galloway, Pierre Hascheff, and Robert Larkin. Member Bonnie Weber arrived at 2:04 p.m. Member Dwight Dortch arrived at 2:07 p.m. Member Ron Smith for Ron Schmitt arrived at 2:15 p.m.

Members absent: Mike Carrigan.

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

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER GALLOWAY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 13, 2007, RPGB AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER AIAZZI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. March 29, 2007
- B. April 19, 2007
- C. July 19, 2007

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, SECONDED BY MEMBER GALLOWAY. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

- A. PUBLIC HEARING – Consideration and possible adoption of RPGB Resolution 07-23, adopting proposed amendments to the 2007 Regional Plan related to military installations pursuant to SB 269 of the 2007 legislative session, as recommended by the RPC on August 22, 2007.

[Member Weber arrived at 2:04 p.m.]

Phil Caterino, Senior Planner, provided background information on Resolution 07-23.

Member Larkin asked if the language dealing with some of the locations of military installations like recruiting had been cleaned up.

[Member Dortch arrived at 2:07 p.m.]

Mr. Caterino responded that some of it was and other issues did not get resolved.

Member Larkin asked for information about the issues that did not get resolved. Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, stated that the bill was originally proposed to deal with compatibility of development around air force bases. The scope and size of facilities in this region do not have the same compatibility issues. Another concern was the fact that there are policies in the Regional Plan that require local governments to plan around the mission of a military installation. It might be hard for a local government to build a plan around something that may not be publicly available information. Ms. Coombes stated that this was addressed at the legislature and it was not something that was accepted in terms of a concern. Regional Planning staff also proposed alternatives to try and preclude Washoe County from being captured under the bill. The Legislature was not interested in segregating the legislation to preclude Washoe County under any of the proposed alternatives.

Member Larkin asked Ms. Coombes for a recommendation. Ms. Coombes responded that the recommendation is included in the staff report and stated that because the bill has been enrolled we are required to comply with it. Regional Planning staff has worked with the staff of local governments and has called together a group of representatives from the military to talk through proposed Regional Plan amendments. Based on those conversations, Regional Planning staff has proposed the Regional Plan amendments which are included in the meeting packet.

Member Larkin asked if there are no unintended consequences with this set of amendments. Ms. Coombes responded that the way this set of amendments has been crafted allows us to comply with the intent of the legislation and allows the local governments some flexibility in the way in which they implement it. Regional Planning has no authority over its requests for information from the military; they have been forthcoming and indicated that they would voluntarily provide information to help the jurisdictions implement this policy.

[Member Smith arrived at 2:15 p.m.]

Member Galloway expressed concern regarding number 5 under Policy 4.1.3 on page 29 of the meeting packet and stated that the compatibility should be with the existing military installations and consideration should be given to any future plans for military installations. Requiring absolute compatibility with a future plan is too strong. Ms. Coombes asked if using the language at the bottom of page 28 in the meeting packet would alleviate the concern. Member Galloway responded that what concerns him about the language under Policy 4.1.3 on page 29 of the meeting packet is requiring

compatibility with planned military installations. They should just be taken into consideration. If planned military installations need to be addressed, the wording at the bottom of page 28 can not be used again because it does not address planned military installations.

Chair Martini asked what latitude the RPGB has here with the language. Ms. Coombes responded that the RPGB has the capacity to extract the concern. Ms. Coombes stated that they tried to use the language from the bill as closely as they could, but in retrospect Member Galloway does raise an issue that may not have been clearly stated in the legislative language. If that amendment is made, it will need to be taken back to the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) and then back to the RPGB.

Member Hascheff agreed that Member Galloway makes a good point and stated that when he was looking through legislation he did not see anything about planned military installations. Member Hascheff stated that is a good catch and he would support that.

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

[The public hearing was closed.]

MEMBER GALLOWAY MADE A MOTION TO SEND IT BACK TO THE RPC WITH REGARD TO EITHER ELIMINATING OR REVISING LANGUAGE WITH REGARD TO PLANNED MILITARY INSTALLATIONS SO THAT WE WOULD NOT BE COMPELLED TO BE COMPATIBLE WITH A PLAN BUT ONLY WITH EXISTING, AND PLANS WOULD BE TREATED AS EVERY OTHER PLAN THAT COMES BEFORE THE RPGB, SECONDED BY MEMBER HASCHEFF.

Member Hascheff asked for clarification that this would basically alleviate “and planned”. Member Galloway responded that would be one fix to be considered.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- B. Discussion and possible acceptance of the Regional Plan annual report summarizing individual 2006 reports submitted by local governments and affected entities pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 278.028.

Patricia Rogers, Government Relations-Community Outreach Representative, stated that this report compiles the individual submittals that are required by the local governments and affected entities each April 1, according to statute. Regional Planning staff recommends that the RPGB accept the report.

MEMBER HASCHEFF MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT, SECONDED BY MEMBER DORTCH. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- C. Discussion and possible recommendations to the RPC regarding the annual review of the Regional Plan pursuant to subsection 7 of NRS 278.0272.

Ms. Rogers reviewed amendments listed in the staff report that Regional Planning staff is working on currently.

There was some discussion regarding addressing a density transfer issue. Norm Azevedo, Legal Counsel, recommended waiting for Agenda Item 5.D to address density transfer issues.

There were no recommendations for additional amendments to be sent to the RPC.

D. Status report on Regional Plan policies related to density transfer and possible action to sponsor a Regional Plan amendment.

Phil Caterino, Senior Planner, stated that Regional Planning staff met with the local Planning Directors to discuss the proposed amendments. The staff report includes a new draft policy for consideration that would allow a similar approach for density transfer to be applied to the City of Reno and the City of Sparks. Regional Planning staff recommendation is to work with the local entities to draft policy and clean-up amendments regarding density transfer and present it to the RPC for sponsorship and consideration.

Member Aiazzi asked if density transfers are allowed off of unbuildable slopes since it is not on the list in the proposed policy. Ms. Coombes responded that under the proposed policy development constraints area (DCA) can not be used for density transfer. The DCA in relation to slopes relates to those slopes that are 30% or greater. Ms. Coombes also stated that the definition of the DCA is a Regional Plan definition and applies to all jurisdictions.

Member Galloway stated that before that definition was put in the Regional Plan the County used to allow density transfer off of steep land. Member Galloway stated that he felt that was wrong and that this was a good amendment to put in the Regional Plan and should apply to everybody.

Member Hascheff stated that if you go to a hillside ordinance, it still allows the City or County to be more restrictive. Ms. Coombes responded that the Regional Plan does not preclude a local government from setting more stringent standards.

Member Hascheff mentioned wetlands and property outside the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA) and asked why that wasn't included in the Cities. Ms. Coombes responded that they had a dialogue with the Planning Directors on how to craft the new policy and in that discussion it was noticed that at the top of page 64 in the existing policy for the County that federal wetlands was separated from the DCA. Ms. Coombes stated that the Planning Directors were surprised that the DCA was separate. Ms. Coombes stated that they told them that currently federal wetlands are not part of the definition of DCA and so it was not an additional criteria. When we talked about the possibility of amending the language, and we crafted this new language there is an underlying tone, and you will see in the paragraph below the proposed language, that we would recommend tidying up the definition of DCA and imbedding federal wetlands in that definition so we would not have to repeat it in either of the policies. What will happen is the policy that currently relates to the County will only have six criteria in which federal wetlands will inherently be included under the definition of DCA and so when we draft the new policy all we need to do is describe DCA.

Member Hascheff stated that it is the same standard to all three entities. Ms. Coombes responded that is correct.

Member Galloway asked if Mr. Freund could address property outside the TMSA.

Adrian Freund, Washoe County, stated that the issue has arisen several times that in order to accommodate smart growth on properties outside of the TMSA and to accommodate clustering at extremely low densities, there is no density transfer provision for clustering and there is no provision for doing that on properties within the rural development area (RDA). This causes a severe transition at the edge of the TMSA where essentially if you want to cluster, it causes those areas to be pulled into the TMSA to do it. It creates real issues because a TMSA designation in and of itself does not imply

what type of development will occur but it does allow development at much higher densities than would occur normally in the RDA.

Ms. Coombes stated that if the RPGB would like to explore the policies that relate to the RDA and the transition between the RDA and the TMSA, it can be included in a future agenda.

Member Aiazzi asked why density transfers from parks would not be allowed. Ms. Coombes responded that when this policy was established it was a collaborative drafting process and that she can't answer that at this stage. Ms. Coombes suggested asking the Planning Directors for their perspective.

Member Aiazzi stated that he is not sure what the definition is because people have donated land as open space and he does not know whether that is considered a park if it is just left wild but they give it to the City. Member Aiazzi asked if that is considered a park so you can't density transfer from that or if it is considered something other than this so that you can use density transfer. Ms. Coombes responded that in the policy there is a distinction between usable, passive open space which would not be classified as a park. A park by its definition would be a managed area for recreational purposes as opposed to being passive, usable open space.

Member Aiazzi stated that he would like to talk later on about why and stated that he felt that would be an incentive for a developer to build parks if it could be transferred.

Member Hascheff clarified that Ms. Coombes will be coming back to the RPGB with the issue on RDA as well as parks. Member Hascheff suggested including golf courses as well and stated that he would like to have staff look at it and possibly tighten up the definition so if it is a developer dedicated park and it is improved by the developer, they should not be penalized for it. Ms. Coombes responded that they will look at re-drafting the policies with those in mind.

Member Larkin stated that property outside the TMSA and the RDA question are two separate issues and asked if Ms. Coombes would be bringing something back on the RDA policy that would include the feathering they are talking about. Ms. Coombes responded that she sees them as two separate issues. Ms. Coombes stated that the particular policy that relates to density transfer really is related predominantly to land inside the TMSA. The policies that relate to the RDA are very specific to those lands which are included outside the TMSA and they are mutually exclusive. Ms. Coombes stated that if the RPGB would like staff to come back with information on the RDA, they would be pleased to schedule that for one of the future RPGB meetings.

MEMBER HASCHEFF MADE A MOTION TO DIRECT STAFF TO GO BACK TO MEET WITH THE PLANNING DIRECTORS AND APPROPRIATE STAKE HOLDERS TO LOOK AT THE ISSUE OF GOLF COURSES AND PARKS AS WELL AS THE COUNTY'S REQUEST TO LOOK AT THE RDA WITH RESPECT TO DENSITY TRANSFERS AND THEN BRING IT BACK TO THE RPGB, SECONDED BY MEMBER WEBER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

[Member Weber left at 2:49 p.m.]

6. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- A. Discussion and possible action to adopt regulations regarding the electronic delivery of agenda and supporting material.

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

- B. Consideration and possible acceptance of revised FY 07-08 work program and fee schedule.

Member Hascheff asked if the revisions are in blue. Joy Randall, Administrative Services Manager, responded that revisions are also in red.

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

- C. Discussion and possible direction to provide budget authorization for the Interim Director of Regional Planning to fill the position of Regional Planner I or Regional Planner II.

Ms. Coombes stated that the interviews have been concluded and an offer has been made to a candidate at the Regional Planner II level. Ms. Coombes requested budget authorization to appoint the candidate.

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

Ms. Coombes introduced Andy Simpson as the TMRPA Planning/GIS Analyst.

7. REPORTS

- A. Members' and Directors reports

- 1) Presentation, discussion, and direction to staff on a report on governance models

Mr. Caterino stated that this direction was based on the outcome of the two workshops held in November. The report is included in the meeting packet. Mr. Caterino stated that Catherine Hansford would give the presentation on governance models.

[Member Weber returned at 2:53 p.m.]

Catherine Hansford, Hansford Economic Consulting, stated that the purpose of this report is to document different regional planning entity governance models. The report includes solutions and collaborations of local governments to address regional growth issues, explores applicability of different governance structures for regional planning in Washoe County and the wider region, and provides options for continued regional stewardship.

Member Hascheff asked Ms. Hansford if she saw a gold standard model and if effective regional planning requires combining the transportation piece with the regional planning piece. Ms. Hansford responded that all of the case studies had both transportation and land use planning functions.

Member Hascheff asked if water and other issues that go along with planning growth were included in what would be perceived as a gold standard regional model. Ms. Hansford responded that is heavily dependent on the circumstances of the region and that she did not look specifically at water.

Member Hascheff asked if the models that were not multi-county had any mechanism in place that would allow one county to comment on or deal with the kind of land uses and impacts that may be happening in an adjacent county. Ms. Hansford responded that she did not explore that specifically.

Member Aiazzi stated that the RPGB should think about whether there is a desire to look at implementing some of these options and suggested that it might include some way of combining the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and regional planning.

Member Hascheff agreed with Member Aiazzi and commented on the need to also interface with the Regional Water Planning Agency.

There was some discussion on forming a subcommittee of the RPGB to work on this.

Ms. Coombes asked if direction on the scope for this subcommittee would be given later. Member Dortch stated that putting this subcommittee together needs to be agendaized before having a discussion as to what it is going to look like and what the membership is going to be. Mr. Azevedo stated that would be appropriate.

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO AGENDIZE THIS ITEM, SECONDED BY MEMBER CASHELL.

Member Weber stated that water does need to be included and asked if there could be a study done on a county that is similar to Washoe County. Ms. Hansford responded that she looked for counties that were similar to Washoe County and did not find any that were good matches.

Member Dortch stated that the agenda item should be kept broad enough to allow for alternatives.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

B. Legal Counsel's Report

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

None

8. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None

Chair Martini called a recess at 3:27 p.m.

[Member Cashell left at 3:27 p.m.]

- 9. WORKSHOP** – Consideration and possible adoption of a three year (FY 2008-09 to 2010-11) strategic plan for the program of regional planning.

The meeting reconvened at 3:37 p.m.

Seating for workshop:

Table 1 = Members Weber, Martini and Dortch

Table 2 = Members Hascheff and Galloway

Table 3 = Members Smith, Aiazzi and Larkin

Ms. Coombes stated that by the end of this fiscal year the current three year strategic plan should be implemented. The purpose of this workshop is to affirm or modify the direction to the TMRPA in order to know how to proceed over the next three years.

Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, Inc., reviewed the process and objectives for this session.

Ms. Coombes reviewed the status and progress of the current three year plan.

Ms. Schafer facilitated the discussion on the goals for the FY 2008-2009 through FY 2010-2011 Strategic Plan. Corporate Solutions, Inc. will provide the TMRPA with a report capturing the comments and suggestions on each of the goals for the Strategic Plan.

[Member Dortch left at 4:30 p.m.]

[Member Weber left at 4:35 p.m.]

[Member Hascheff left at 4:40 p.m.]

[Member Weber returned at 4:41 p.m.]

Ms. Coombes recommended having Regional Planning staff put something together on what has been discussed at this workshop and review it at a future RPGB meeting.

MEMBER GALLOWAY MADE A MOTION TO DIRECT STAFF TO PROCEED AS SUGGESTED BY MS. COOMBES, SECONDED BY MEMBER LARKIN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) MEMBERS PRESENT.

10. ADJOURNMENT

MEMBER AIAZZI MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 4:43 P.M., SECONDED BY MEMBER WEBER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH SIX (6) 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.**