AGENDA

JOINT MEETING

Regional Planning Governing Board and Regional Planning Commission

School Subcommittees

Wednesday, January 15, 2020 2:00 pm

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

1105 Terminal Way, 3rd Floor Conference Room

Reno, Nevada 89502

1. Roll Call*
   A. Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB)
   B. Regional Planning Commission (RPC)

2. Salute to the Flag*

3. [For possible action] Approval of the Agenda
   A. RPGB
   B. RPC

4. Public Comment*

5. Business of the day
   A. [For possible action by both bodies] Election of Subcommittees Chair and Vice-Chair:
      i. RPGB
      ii. RPC
   B. [For possible action by both bodies] Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding options for Regional Planning review of land use planning for schools, including treating schools or certain schools as Projects of Regional Significance, consideration of the Washoe County School District facilities plan, development of Regional Plan policies and maps, and/or other options as recommended

[ Pg. 1 – 22 ]
Meeting Notes:
1. The announcement of this meeting is posted at the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency, Reno City Hall, the Washoe County Main Library, the Washoe County Courthouse, Sparks City Hall, the Washoe County Administrative Building and at www.tmrpa.org.
2. In accordance with NRS 241.020, this agenda closes three working days prior to the meeting. We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for persons who are disabled and wish to attend meetings. If you require special arrangements for the meeting, please call 321-8385 before the meeting date.
3. The following items may not be addressed in this order. Arrive at the meeting at the posted start time to hear item(s) of interest.
4. Asterisks (*) denote non-action items.
5. Public comment is limited to three minutes. The public is encouraged to provide information on issues not on the posted agenda during the Public Comment period. The public may sign-up to speak during the public comment period or on a specific agenda item by completing a “Request to Speak” card and handing it to the clerk.
6. Support meeting material for the items on the agenda provided to the RPGB and/or RPC is available to members of the public at the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency office at 1105 Terminal Way, Ste. 316 Reno, Nevada, and on the TMRPA website at www.tmrpa.org. You may also contact TMRPA at (775) 321-8385 to request supporting meeting material.
7. The RPGB and/or RPC may at any time recess the public meeting to consider legal matters regarding threatened and pending litigation.

6. Reports
   A. [For possible action] Members’ and Director’s reports
   B. [For possible action] Legal counsel’s report
7. [For possible action] Requests for Future Agenda Items
8. Public Comment*
9. Written Correspondence*
10. [For possible action] Adjournment
    A. RPGB
    B. RPC
STAFF REPORT

TO: Regional Planning Governing Board and Regional Planning Commission School Subcommittees

FROM: Jeremy M. Smith, Interim Director

SUBJECT: [For possible action by both bodies] Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding options for Regional Planning review of land use planning for schools, including treating schools or certain schools as Projects of Regional Significance, consideration of the Washoe County School District facilities plan, development of Regional Plan policies and maps, and/or other options as recommended (AGENDA ITEM 5.B)

This staff report broadly summarizes background information and previous activity over the past year by both the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) and Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) as pertains to Regional Planning review of schools.

BACKGROUND

Deliberation by the RPGB toward developing a method for Regional Planning review of schools planning (e.g. new school locations) was initiated during the December 2018 meeting of the RPGB. This initial consideration led the RPGB to ask the RPC to re-evaluate criteria for projects of regional significance (PRS) particularly as they relate to larger schools (middle and high schools). The RPC deliberated at two meetings early in 2019 and opted to continue the discussion such that more work could be done by TMRPA and Washoe County School District (WCSD) staff to develop viable options. A more complete timeline and accounting of events can be found in Attachment 1 of this staff report.

In May of 2019, TMRPA presented options to the RPGB that had resulted from meetings and discussion by the RPC, TMRPA and WCSD staff. In addition to TMRPA review of a new WCSD facilities plan, the following two options were proposed to allow for Regional Planning review of land use planning for schools (please see Attachments 2 and 3 for more detail):

Policy Option 1 - Making certain schools a project of regional significance
The development of a new school, or the expansion of an existing school, which will physically accommodate more than 800 students that is not identified in the facilities plan constitutes a Project of Regional Significance.
Policy Option 2 - Utilization of an adopted map to review school sites
The development of a new school, or the expansion of an existing school, which will physically accommodate more than 800 students but is not identified on Map X, constitutes an amendment to the Regional Plan to establish a new school location or to identify that the capacity of an already developed school is expanding to more than 800 students.

Both options present tradeoffs in terms of process, timing and impacts to the WCSD, RPC, RPGB, and community. The School Subcommittee of both RPGB and RPC members was formed to further discuss the options, address potential issues resultant from implementation of either option, and/or to recommend new options to allow for Regional Planning review of land use planning for schools.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the RPGB and RPC School Subcommittees deliberate on these or other options for Regional Planning review of land use planning for schools and direct staff with next steps as desired.

Please do not hesitate to contact Jeremy M. Smith at 775-321-8390 if you have any questions or comments on this agenda item.

Attachments:
Attachment 1 – April 15, 2019 Legal Counsel Memorandum
Attachment 2 – May 23, 2019 TMRPA Staff Report to RPGB
Attachment 3 – May 17, 2019 Legal Counsel Staff Report to RPGB
20-01-15 RPGB-RPC School Subcommittees
Agenda Item 5.B
Regional Planning review of land use planning for schools
Attachment 1: April 15, 2019 Legal Counsel Memorandum
[This page intentionally left blank]
To: Norm Azevedo  
From: Jessica Prunty  
Date: April 15, 2019  
Re: Schools/PRS Issue

Set forth below is a history of the RPGB and RPC consideration/action on this item:

**December 13 RPGB Meeting** (Minutes Attached, but do not contain details of discussion):

All RPGB members present.

During discussion of schools as PRS item, members/staff made comments as summarized below:

Intro from legal counsel that RPC has statutory authority to adopt guidelines.

Member Duerr asked for item to be on agenda specifically. In her ward, questions re: where new schools will be located. Gave specifics on particular situation with proposed public charter school in an inappropriate location. Concerns re: parking/traffic. High school seem to have a regional impact. Wanted it on agenda to see if anyone else has concerns and what type of schools should/may be a trigger.

Member Bybee had questions about existing student population trigger. What is the meaning?

Legal/staff weighed in that historical interpretation that would increase students, not move students one place to the other. RPC has authority to change.

Member Brekkus: Thinks there is a procedural mechanism. By the time getting to building or special use permit, too late. We need to have a bite at the apple very early. Thinks that the facilities plan from WCSD should come in for conformance review. Want us to dwell on this and not rush to a decision.

Member Lawson: Thinks that these projects are regionally significant, look at example of Wildcreek. Send it to RPC and have Norm work with them to craft language.

Member Bobzien: Sensitive to issues, which appears to be project of regional significance, and maybe there should be some review. But, we should play this out to see what permutations. Is there going to be parity between private/public. What about blended populations, where similar in size to high schools. Hesitant to categorize high school, middle schools, etc. Also, worried about timing and do not want to come in too late. Want to look at facilities plan mechanism—regular review of facilities plan. In spirit of brainstorming, this may seem simple, but if we send down to RPC, do not want to send them on a wild goose chase.
Member Hartung: Do not disagree with comments. He is more focused on high schools and middle schools. Gives example of elementary school in his neighborhood and change in traffic patterns. Kids don’t walk anymore. Look at Wildcreek—will dramatically increase traffic.

Member Duerr: Not sure about capital improvement plan because of charter schools. Keep 325 and clarify, look at project. Need enough detail, very sympathetic re: timing.

Member Bozien: Exchange with Duerr, want to look at facilities plan. Need an early review. Want to ensure that we unwittingly do not burden WCSD because of a couple episodes. Do not want to create problems. Have a issue without hearing from WCSD. Want to see what they could bring forward.

Member Duerr: Bobzien is hitting on something. Need enough detail. Excellent point to have WCSD to come to TMRPA staff and create something together.

Member Abbot: What about universities and colleges, assuming do not hit any of existing PRS triggers.

Legal: this whole discussion on the detail will be decided by RPC, will come back only as an informational item to RPGB.

Director: If RPGB wants, can be part of meeting with RPC; confident RFC will want to know impact and then staff can look at things and bring back to you.

Member Bybee: If we support schools as being PRS, what is impact on school district and development—is there a negative impact, are they hamstrung, are there limitations/time constraints.

Member Hartung: All about mitigating impact upon multiple jurisdictions—that is what this conversation is about, and that is incumbent upon us to take up conversation.

WCSD Liason: Having this conversation because of WC1; our staff needs to be a part of the conversation so we can understand. I do not see anything in existing guidelines re: particular types of projects being PRS vs. criteria. Modifying PRS guidelines may be one solution, but there may be others. Urge not to rush and explore all options and don’t set a back precedent about setting criteria just for schools.

Chair Berkbigler: Want to make sure not more complicated to build new schools, regardless of where they are being located.

Member Hartung: This is not a knee-jerk reaction. This is a learned reaction. Try to get in and out of Reno High.
Member Duerr: Did come at this with a school overlay—but there is another facility going in South Reno—a DMV in area without access to arterials. No analysis, just getting plopped in because State owns the land. I struggle with that too. When Abbot brought up universities and colleges, that is a great point. I want to broaden the conversation. Want to keep on schools at the moment. Maybe a project (school) with population of 325 is a starting point, but just for that. In favor of joint meeting. But before adoption, want to come back to RPGB.

Member Lawson: Want to give voice to people effected. Take Wildcreek. To me, this is regionally significant and citizens from impacted jurisdictions should have a say.

Member Duerr: Are you proposing concept of within a certain distance of jurisdictional lines.

Member Lawson: I think Norm can help as well as RPC, not about schools in particular, a DMV would be problematic if at Wildcreek too.

Member Brekhus: If we told WCSD at time WC1 passed you need to bring your facilities plan forward, conformance review would have involved everyone and looked at it at that level for WCSD schools. When charter/private schools come in for building permit, we can have them come forward for review at that time. Touched on state issues.

Member Hartung: Our intent is not to hobble WCSD or any entity, but what will happen is will plan more thoughtfully. If you have a high school or middle school, effect multiple jurisdictions.

Public Comment

MOTION

After discussion, Member Duerr made the following motion:

“Refer to this issue to the Regional Planning Commission a charge to evaluate a change of criteria for added clarity for evaluating certain schools or all schools as PRS, and prior to coming to final conclusions to reconvene with this Board before moving forward to adopt any changes.”

Seconded by Member Lawson.

Member Bobzien: Going to oppose on procedural aspect, the role of RPGB is to send this down to RPC, started to the ball rolling—do not want to impinge on authority.

Member Duerr: Want some input.

Member Lawson: I support it, for RPC to craft language—RPGB would not be part of that process, but back to us for review.
Member Hartung: Sending it down with our ideas to get it started.

Member Bybee: Want clarification from attorney. RPC will craft language–will it come back as just informational.

Legal: As I understand it, have RPC go through process, get to final language, prior to adoption bring it back for RPGB comment, and then to RPC to adopt.

Member Abbot: Sending it to RPC, they could make no change or 20 changes, right?

Legal: Yes

Approved by unanimous vote of all members.

Member Bobzien: Do not want to lose track of facilities plan, better served than doing PRS on back end.

January 24 RPC Meeting:

NJA provided staff with recommendation to have draft resolution for adding high schools as a PRS if RPC chose to proceed down that road.

Staff introduced the PRS item and summarized direction/comments/concerns of RPGB from December meeting.

Presented 3 options:

1. “Direct staff to add [insert school type] as a PRS and authorize the chair to sign a new resolution.”
2. “Direct staff to draft a new resolution based on feedback provided to be brought back at next RPC meeting.”
3. “Take no action.”

Discussion:

Sarah Chvilicek (WCty) believes high schools, maybe middles schools, should be PRS; take into account size of campus (playing fields, etc)

James Fewins (Sparks)–high schools are too broad, use current thresholds, felt strongly that singling out schools as PRS is slippery slope and cherry-picking a certain use, which he is against

Dian VanderWell (Sparks)–want to see some language re: existing neighborhoods and impacts; agree should start with high schools; seems current threshold only takes account increase of that
development project, not cumulative impact of school itself.

Additional discussion re: current 325 student trigger in PRS guidelines and what that means

Motion by Sarah Chvilicek: “To direct staff to utilize the feedback provided this evening to draft a new RPC resolution adopting guidelines for the definition of PRS and bring back to us in February.”

Motion carried, with James Fewins voting no.

February 13 RPC

Potential option presented by TMRPA staff as requested by RPC in January meeting:

Model off existing employee threshold (938 employees). Proposed language: “The project . . . which, if approved, will allow for a school that will have a student population of 938 or more.”

Consider limiting to schools constructed in existing neighborhoods.

Legal presented background information and clarification of meaning of existing 325 student population and derived from housing unit PRS trigger and directly tied to increase in students as a result of new development. Indicated RPC within authority to change.

Kevin Weiske (Reno): want to wait to until meetings with WCSD/TMRPA staff occur

Frank Peterson (Sparks): new to all of us, staff has done a good job to put together proposed guideline, but really want to understand this and have a separate meeting for fine-tuning compatibility and how arrive at 938. Need more explanation and need to be schooled to understand. Recommend defer until can meet again with staff and WCSD and “chew the fat”

James Fewins (Sparks): there is already quite a bit for PRS, to pull out one use and cherry-pick it for one use is a bad idea; use existing threshold and do not go after one use. That is a slippery slope.

Motion by Kevin Weisk: Move to continuation of item until staff can bring back additional information from staff after meetings with WCSD, with no set timeframe to bring back to RPC.

February 14 RPGB: (minutes attached)

Staff reported on status of RPC consideration and informed RPGB of planned meeting with WCSD.
Legal gave historical overview of existing 325 student population trigger and legislature made it clear that projects that would impact schools could be encompassed by PRS guidelines.

Member Duerr: Thank you to staff. Schools have planning issues. Hard to set a threshold. Pleased with direction and progress. Surprised to learn that RPC makes rules, not RPGB in this case—somewhat unusual to give advice/consult. Want to find out what happens before RPC votes.

Member Hartung: Our request is to amend regional plan, so shouldn’t it come back to RPGB.

Legal: clarified, this process lies with RPC, only could come to this body if there is an appeal.

Member Duerr: What I would like to see is better define, refine or lower threshold re: schools as PRS – wanted to see clarity and disconnect from tie into housing units. Just because elementary school. Would like to see it covered, if you can.

Member Hartung: I am possibly a little looser. High schools and middle schools effect multiple jurisdictions. Has impacts. Highly supportive of changes to PRS.

Subsequent Events

TMRPA staff met with WCSD staff as directed by RPC.

March 13 RPC Workshop: 2 hour workshop with WCSD present. Robust discussion. RPC members had variety of questions for WCSD. During course of workshop, touched on idea of a Regional Plan Map and plan policies as an alternative to PRS. During workshop, WCSD volunteered to develop facilities plan that would come before RPC for conformance review after Regional Plan is updated and if there are any schools of a certain size (trying to capture high schools and middles schools) that are not identified in facilities plan, would come forward for regional plan amendment (which would be seen by both RPC and RPGB). The “school facilities” map would encompass private and charter schools, which would not be encompassed in WCSD facilities plan.

March 18 Legal Staff Meeting with WCSD: Norm and Kim met with WCSD (Pete Etchart and Adam Searcy) upon their request to discuss applicable law to PRS.

April 10 RPC: Identified 2 options, both of which include WCSD submitting updated facilities plan for conformance review after plan update:

First option would entail making any schools with more than 800 students (intending to capture high schools, certain middle schools or schools of blended populations) that are NOT identified in facilities plan come forward for PRS conformance review.
Second option would entail creating a regional map and policies for location of any school of over 800 students. Map would use WCSD facilities plan for location of school sites on map, but any school over 800 students that is not on map would require a regional plan amendment (which would go first to RPC and then RPGB).

RPC voted to recommend and report to RPGB to move forward with Option 2.
Regional Planning review of land use planning for schools

Attachment 2: May 23, 2019 TMRPA Staff Report to RPGB
TO: Regional Planning Governing Board
FROM: Lauren Knox, Regional Planner
SUBJECT: [For possible action] Discussion and possible action regarding schools (Projects of Regional Significance, school facilities plan, and/or Regional Plan policies and map). (AGENDA ITEM 5.B)

This staff report provides the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) with an update on previous direction provided to staff pertaining to the potential creation of new policy language regarding the review of schools or certain schools.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

During the review of the Wildcreek Utility Corridor Relocation (TMRPA Case RPA18-002), the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) recognized that the future development of certain schools should be discussed and potentially reviewed regionally, as impacts of schools have regional significance. In December of 2018, the RPGB directed staff to bring an item forward to the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) regarding the idea of schools as a Project of Regional Significance (PRS). The following indicates the sequence of actions that have transpired since this direction was provided:

- **December 2018**: RPGB directed staff to bring an item to the RPC regarding the potential amendment to the PRS guidelines.
- **January 2019**: RPC provided direction to staff to work on drafting a new resolution based on feedback provided.
- **February 2019**: Staff provided the RPC and RPGB with additional information and an update on conversations.
- **March 2019**: RPC hosted a workshop to assist in better defining the issues and have a discussion with WCSD present.
- **April 2019**: Staff provided policy options, RPC recommended policy option 2 to the RPGB. RPGB continued the item.

At the March RPC meeting, the RPC was provided the opportunity to have a discussion regarding this topic with Washoe County School District (WCSD) staff. A facilitated discussion was hosted, which provided TMRPRA staff with additional direction regarding defining the issue and potential solutions that
would address planning issue concerns. RPC members recognized the regional impacts of schools and the need for additional regional planning involvement in the school planning process. They also identified concerns with ensuring that planning processes are aligned between WCSD plans and the Regional Plan and ensuring that the public was provided opportunities to be made aware of new school developments and be able to partake in the process.

With this in mind, TMRPA staff and WCSD staff met for a third time to develop potential policy choices for the RPC and RPGB’s consideration based on all of the past conversation regarding this topic. At the April 2019 RPC and RPGB meetings, staff provided two potential policy options based off the feedback and discussions that were hosted. It was identified at the April meetings that the RPC and RPGB may choose either option, a mix of the two options, or something else entirely. The two options provided at the meeting were as follows:

Policy Option 1 - Making certain schools a project of regional significance

Policy wording for potential adoption into the 2019 Regional Plan Update: The Washoe County School District Facilities Plan will be updated every five years. The location of existing and planned school facilities, as identified in the facilities plan, must support the Population Growth and Regional Form identified in the Regional Plan. School sites will be reviewed as part of the conformance review of the facilities plan.

The development of a new school, or the expansion of an existing school, which will physically accommodate more than 800 students that is not identified in the facilities plan constitutes a Project of Regional Significance.

Considerations:

- Requires 5-year school facilities plan be submitted by WCSD after the regional plan is updated that must be found in conformance with regional plan
- If a new school, or school expansion, of over 800 students is contemplated and is not in the facilities plan, requires the conformance review of a school as a project of regional significance
- A PRS is later in the review stage for a school development which is a potential risk for the WCSD
- Necessitates the adoption of a new PRS Resolution
- Final conformance approval is by the RPC for PRS (unless the item is appealed)

Policy Option 2 - Utilization of an adopted map to review school sites

Policy wording for potential adoption into the 2019 Regional Plan Update: The Washoe County School District Facilities Plan will be updated every five years. The location of existing and planned school facilities, as identified in the facilities plan, must support the Population Growth and Regional Form identified in the Regional Plan. School sites will be reviewed as part of the conformance review of the facilities plan and school sites that accommodate more than 800 students are identified on Map X (Regionally Significant Schools Map).

The development of a new school, or the expansion of an existing school, which will physically accommodate more than 800 students but is not identified on Map X, constitutes an amendment to the
Regional Plan to establish a new school location or to identify that the capacity of an already developed school is expanding to more than 800 students.

Considerations:

- Requires 5-year school facilities plan be submitted by WCSD after the regional plan is updated that must be found in conformance with the regional plan
- Necessitates the creation a map adopted into the Regional Plan of school locations that are over 800 students
- If a new school, or school expansion, of over 800 students is contemplated and is not in the facilities plan, requires the review as a Regional Plan Amendment to identify the site on the map
  - Earlier in the process for school development
  - Regional Plan Amendments go to the RPC and RPGB for a public hearing and the RPGB has final approval
- Not a specific project level review, but a review of the school site in relation to Regional Plan goals and policies

Both options require that a school facilities plan be created and found in conformance with the Regional Plan to ensure that there is coordination between Regional Planning and the WCSD. Option 1 (the PRS option) requires a conformance review for PRS for schools with a capacity of over 800 students that have not already gone through a conformance review process with the school facilities plan. Option 2 (the Regional Plan Map option) requires a Regional Plan Amendment to review and add new school sites, with a capacity of over 800 students that have not already gone through a conformance review process with the school facilities plan, to a map that is adopted into the Regional Plan. Staff recommended these two options as they seemed to provide the most specificity with regards to discussions surrounding the desire to not review all school types, the ability to review schools that are not part of the WCSD, and address the overall concerns regarding regional planning review and an increased public participation expressed by the public, the RPC, and the RPGB.

At the April 10 RPC meeting, the RPC made a motion to recommend that the RPGB consider policy option 2. At the April 11 RPGB meeting, the RPGB voted to continue this item until the full regular Board was present for the discussion.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the RPGB provide comment and direction regarding policy language for schools or certain types of schools.

Possible motion:

I move to provide the following direction {insert direction here} to staff regarding policy changes relating to schools or certain schools.

Please do not hesitate to contact Lauren Knox at 775-321-8397 if you have any questions or comments on this agenda item.

/lk
20-01-15 RPGB-RPC School Subcommittees
Agenda Item 5.B
Regional Planning review of land use planning for schools
Attachment 3: May 17, 2019 Legal Counsel Staff Report to RPGB
[This page intentionally left blank]
MEMORANDUM

TO: Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB)
RE: RPGB, May 23, 2019 Agenda Item 5.B – Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Schools
DATE: May 17, 2019

This item was continued from the RPGB’s April 11, 2019, meeting to allow all interested RPGB members to be present and participate in the discussion and consideration of the item. Attachment 1 to this memorandum is the TMRPA staff report, setting forth the background and discussion of the two options the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) forwarded to the RPGB for consideration. Attachment 2 is an internal legal memorandum previously provided to Members Duerr, Hartung and Lawson setting forth the details of the RPGB’s and RPC’s prior consideration of this item.

RPC RECOMMENDATIONS

The RPC proposed that the RPGB adopt a regional plan policy addressing schools. Specifically, the policy options presented by the RPC to the RPGB couple the submission of an updated Washoe County School District (WCSD) facilities plan with two alternatives:

1) all schools (private or public) not identified on the WCSD Facilities Plan, with a student population greater than 800, will be Projects of Regional Significance (PRS); or

2) all schools (with a student population greater than 800 will be identified on a Regional Plan Map (utilizing the present and future school sites identified in the WCSD Facilities Plan); the siting of any additional schools, private or public, meeting the 800-student threshold will have to come forward for a Regional Plan Amendment.

ELEMENTS OF PROPOSED PLAN POLICIES

1) WCSD Facilities Plan: The WCSD is an affected entity under NRS 278.026. The WCSD currently has a 2009 Facilities Plan which was found in conformance with the 2012 Regional Plan. Upon adoption of the 2019 Regional Plan, the WCSD is statutorily required to review its facilities plan, amend it to conform with the Regional Plan and submit to the RPC for conformance review. See NRS 278.0278. If the WCSD amends its Facilities Plan, that amendment must also come forward to the RPC for conformance review. See NRS 278.0282. The proposed regional plan policy language under either option requires the WCSD Facilities Plan to identify current and future school location sites and those sites must conform to the Regional Plan.
PRS: PRS are statutorily defined in NRS 278.026(5); the RPC is also statutorily delegated the authority to adopt guidelines defining PRS pursuant to NRS 278.0277. Nothing in statute prohibits the adoption of Regional Plan Policies which further define PRS. Once a project is deemed to be a PRS it must be submitted to the RPC for conformance review before final local government approval and before the commencement of construction. However, nothing prohibits a PRS from being brought forward at an earlier time, provided the RPC has adequate information to conduct the conformance review. The RPGB would not review any schools as a PRS unless the matter came before the RPGB as an appeal of the RPC’s conformance determination.

2) Regional Plan Map: The RPGB is statutorily charged with adopting and amending the Regional Plan, which includes any plan maps. NRS 278.0276. If the RPGB adopts a Regional Plan school siting map, any changes to that map must come first to the RPGB for approval.

OPTIONS

The RPGB may provide direction and feedback to TMRPA staff re:

1) moving forward with policy language for inclusion in the Regional Plan as set forth in either option identified in the staff report; and/or
2) modifying or combining the options.

The RPGB may also form a sub-committee, which could be a joint sub-committee with members of the RPC to further deliberate and consider this item.

cc: Kimberly H. Robinson, TMRPA Executive Dir.