



# REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

**MEMBERS**  
Jim Newberg, Chair  
Florence 'Marge' Frandsen, Vice-chair  
Scott Barnes  
Todd Brabbin  
Kendall Mattina  
Marvin Moss  
Steve Rogers  
Dennis Romeo  
William Weber

## **RESOLUTION NO. 06-10 (RPC)**

### **RESOLUTION ADOPTING EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR REQUESTS OF INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO THE BOUNDARIES OF THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS SERVICE AREAS (TMSA) AND CITIES' SPHERES OF INFLUENCE, AND FUTURE SERVICE AREAS (FSA)**

**WHEREAS**, the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) adopted a comprehensive five-year update to the Regional Plan on May 9, 2002; and

**WHEREAS**, *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 278.0272 and the RPGB's *Regulations on Procedure* establish the required procedures for amending the comprehensive Regional Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, on January 12, 2006, the three local governing bodies (Reno, Sparks and Washoe County) meeting in joint session, approved for submittal to the RPC a joint staff report and map describing proposed Regional Plan amendments pursuant to a settlement agreement in the Reno annexation case, dated August 23, 2006 (CV02-03469); and

**WHEREAS**, on February 8, February 22, February 27, and March 8, the RPC held public hearings to gain input from the community on all proposed amendments; and

**WHEREAS**, on May 1, the RPC held a public open house and workshop to gain additional public input from the community; and

**WHEREAS**, during this time numerous property owners have submitted requests for their properties to be included within the TMSA, or for changes to cities spheres of influence; and

**WHEREAS**, on May 10, the RPC directed staff to work with local government staff to prepare draft evaluation criteria for consideration of these private property owner requests; and

**WHEREAS**, on June 28, staff presented to the RPC draft evaluation criteria developed jointly with the planning directors of Reno, Sparks and Washoe County regarding amendments to the boundaries of the TMSA, and cities spheres of influence, requested by individual property owners; and

**WHEREAS**, on June 28, the RPC directed staff to prepare a resolution adopting the proposed evaluation criteria;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Regional Planning Commission does hereby adopt the attached evaluation criteria replacing RPC Resolution 06-07 for consideration

of proposed amendments revising the boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA) and the Future Service Areas (FSA).

Adopted this day, August 23, 2006, by an affirmative vote of \_\_\_ members of the Regional Planning Commission: Ayes: \_\_\_; Nays: \_\_\_.

Approved by:

Attest:

---

Jim Newberg  
Chair  
Regional Planning Commission

---

Rosanna Coombes  
Interim Director of Regional Planning

/lr

*Attachment* – Evaluation criteria for requests of individual property owners regarding amendments to the boundaries of the TMSA and cities' spheres of influence, and the FSA.

**CRITERIA FOR REQUESTS OF INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY OWNERS REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO THE BOUNDARIES OF THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS SERVICE AREAS (TMSA) AND CITIES' SPHERES OF INFLUENCE, AND THE FUTURE SERVICE AREAS (FSA).**

---

**Need**

Is Reno, Sparks, or Washoe County willing to accept the proposal as part of its designated portion of the TMSA? If the proposal were adopted, how much more could that local government expand its portion of the TMSA?

**Spatial/locational**

***Regional form and pattern***

Relationship with existing service area. If the proposal were approved, what would be the relationship between the new TMSA area and uses in the existing TMSA? How much opportunity for synergy and interaction would exist between the new and existing areas?

Consistency with goals, policies, and principles. To what extent would the proposal be consistent with the goals, policies, and principles on regional form set forth in the Regional Plan? What is the distance (by car) from the nearest TOD corridors and regional centers or emerging employment centers (EECs) and the two downtown centers? To what extent would residents and businesses in the proposed area be able to take advantage of services and uses in existing and planned corridors and centers?

Transportation corridors. To what extent would the adoption of the proposal create an opportunity to extend an existing TOD corridor?

Clear, logical boundary. If the proposal were approved, would the resulting TMSA boundary give local governments and service providers a clear, logical boundary to administer?

***Natural resource management***

Development constraints. How much of the area included in the proposal consists of slopes over 30 percent, significant water bodies, flood ways, flood zones, critical habitat, special management areas, and other development constraints? How is the balance of the area configured?

Streams and drainages. What is the relationship between the area included in the proposal and major streams and drainages? What is the condition of streams and drainages in and around the area?

Connected open space. If the proposal were adopted, would it break up large, connected areas of open space that may be important for continuity of wildlife habitat?

Urban/rural interface. Given the size of the proposed area, would it add a disproportionate amount of urban/rural interface area?

### ***Public services and infrastructure***

Leveraging existing services and facilities. To what extent is the area included in the proposal adjacent to or contiguous with existing urban/suburban areas that could provide services and facilities, and provide logical starting points for extension of services and infrastructure? To what extent could existing services and facilities provide service to the proposed area?

Service and infrastructure plans. To what extent are necessary services and infrastructure included in existing, approved master plans, facilities plans, similar plans, and/or capital improvement programs (CIPs)? How feasible would it be to provide all necessary services and infrastructure? Who would provide them, when, and how?

Priorities. What would be the effect on existing CIPs and facilities plans of providing services and infrastructure to the proposed area? How would the provision of services and infrastructure affect already-established priorities, particularly with respect to infill opportunities elsewhere in the region?

Additional infrastructure. How would the proposal affect plans and opportunities for creating parks, bikeways, greenbelts, flood ways, drainage ways, recreational trails, and multi-purpose corridors?

Cost of service. In terms of per-unit and/or per-capita costs, would the capital and operating costs of providing services and infrastructure be higher, lower, or about the same as they are within the existing TMSA, considering both monetary and non-monetary costs? How would monetary costs (capital and operating) be defrayed?

### ***Other criteria***

Cumulative effects. Considering other known proposals to include adjacent property or other property in the same vicinity in the TMSA, what would be the additive effects of those proposals on regional form, natural resource management, and public services and infrastructure?

Requests to not remove property from the TMSA. Did the affected property have a land use designation at the time of the 2002 update (May 9, 2002) that would have allowed division of the property into parcels smaller than five acres? If so, it should be retained in the TMSA. Did the affected property have a land use designation on May 9, 2002, that would not have allowed

division into parcels smaller than five acres? If so, the RPC should generally defer to Washoe County's recommendation as to whether or not the property should remain in the TMSA.

Requests to add property to the Future Service Areas (FSA). Future Service Areas (FSA) are areas identified for future (beyond the 20 year Truckee Meadows Regional Plan) inclusion in the TMSA. Does the proposed modification to the FSA promote a clear and logical boundary for the region and local planning of (a) regional form and pattern, (b) natural resources, and (c) public services and facilities?