

JOINT MEETING
BOARD OF WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
AND
RENO CITY COUNCIL
THURSDAY 5:30 P.M. JULY 8, 1999

Washoe County
Jim Galloway, Commissioner
Ted Short, Commissioner
Joanne Bond, Commissioner
Jim Shaw, Commissioner
Amy Harvey, County Clerk
Katy Simon, County Manager
Jim Barnes, Assistant District Attorney

City of Reno
Chairman Bill Newberg, Vice Mayor
Vice Chairman Pierre Hascheff, Councilman
Sherrie Doyle, Councilman
Tom Herndon, Councilman
Don Cook, City Clerk
Mike Milner, Deputy City Attorney

The Board convened in a Joint Meeting in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the pledge of allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

99-662 AGENDA

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Galloway ordered that the Agenda for the Board of County Commissioners meeting of July 8, 1999, be approved.

On motion by Councilman Herndon, seconded by Councilman Hascheff, which motion duly carried, Vice Mayor Newberg ordered that the Agenda for the City Council of Reno meeting of July 8, 1999, be approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sam Dehne, Reno Citizen, made remarks concerning the appointment of Geno Menchetti to the Airport Authority, which he openly opposed, noting that, to his dismay, Mr. Menchetti was elected chairman. He also reiterated his strong opposition to the Airport going postal cargo and mentioned the low-rate jobs that will result if this should occur.

99-663 RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN

This was the time set in a Notice of Public Hearing published in the Reno Gazette-Journal on June 28, 1999, to consider the recommendation of the Washoe County Planning Commission and Reno Planning Commission to adopt the Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan, a designated joint planning area, and to endorse the resolution of adoption as required by NRS 278.220. It was noted that the Regional Planning Commission found the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan, the amended North Valleys Area Plan to reflect the textual and graphic changes in response to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (PHCP Case Number CPA99-NV-1) and the amended Reno Master Plan incorporating the Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan as an element (PHCase No. 236-99) in conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan on June 23, 1999. It was noted that the Reno City Council and the Washoe County Commission will take independent action on the adoption of the Joint Plan, as per NRS 278.02786.

In response to Chairman Galloway, Jenny Brekhus, Reno City Assistant Planner, advised that design standards were discussed and that both entities need to adopt the same plan and neither entity may make amendments independently because this is a regional plan.

Chairman Galloway then opened the public hearing.

Cynthia Albright, Planner, Washoe County Community Development, gave a brief overview of the Reno-Stead Corridor joint planning process, the plan area, and the joint plan itself. She displayed a map showing the plan areas and advised that the plan addresses public facilities and transportation and that the sewer and water and transportation plans have to be developed. She added that it is her belief that this is a great plan.

Ms. Brekhus noted that Grand View Terrace (formerly Black Springs) is shown for inclusion in the sphere of influence; that the Planning Commission conducted a 6-hour workshop to review the policies in order to reach a decision as there have been conflicting messages about this; and that they felt they did not have a responsive business and that it was best to get in the sphere of influence. She informed the Board of all the steps taken in this and stated that they gave them the opportunity to make the decision to be annexed on a voluntary basis.

Washoe County Legal Counsel Jim Barnes, in response to an inquiry, stated that the whole area would have to be annexed and not just some of the area. In response to Commissioner Bond, Ms. Brekhus stated that Policy 13 in the Joint Plan would prevent the City from making annexation involuntary in that area.

She stated that the subcommittee spent lots of time on the slope stabilization where it was 15 to 20 percent; that another area is that the cities want to protect the northern entrance; and that the gateway has been marred, but the efforts to enhance that view should be included. She addressed jurisdictional cooperation in this, which must be maintained with respect to this plan, which was initiated at the regional level.

She noted that with relationship to implementation, if the governing bodies decide to adopt the plan this evening, the City is allowed under NRS to administer development regulations to those properties within the sphere of influence. In regard to the Grand View Terrace voluntary annexation, in response to Chairman Galloway, she advised that it is her understanding that the subdivision as a whole would be annexed and individual properties would not be taken. Legal counsels for both entities agreed with this. In response to Commissioner Bond, assurance was given that the City of Reno cannot unilaterally change that.

A dialog between John Hester, City of Reno Planning Director, and Chairman Galloway ensued concerning the process to be taken in the final action by both entities. Chairman Galloway stated that there may be some disagreement between the two entities and perhaps independent action by each entity would need to be taken on minor issues. City of Reno Legal Counsel Milner advised that the whole process would have to be redone so that a distinction could be made on that.

Councilman Doyle inquired why Grand View Terrace is the only area that will be annexed voluntarily since there are also Anderson Acres and Horizon Hills to consider. Mr. Hester stated that they are representing the joint decision of both planning commissions on this plan and what affected their decisions is hard to say but this recommendation came from both planning commissions. He noted that properties on three sides of Grand View Terrace were clearly designated to go into the City of Reno without opposition from anyone in those areas, and it was determined that logically, Grand View Terrace should go in. He then addressed some concerns of Anderson Acres concerning density and also Horizon Hills regarding the creation of annexed islands, which both entities are trying to avoid. He explained more fully for the benefit of Councilman Doyle with the aid of a map.

Chairman Galloway noted that NRS does allow the creation of large islands. In response to Councilman Doyle, Ms. Albright stated that they do not know the population in Anderson Acres, but there are roughly 40-50 parcels and only approximately 10 to 15 existing homesites, and the vast majority is undeveloped.

Commissioner Bond stated that most about Forest Service land.

Councilman Hascheff asked for clarification on how many properties in Grand View Terrace would be needed to give consent in order to annex. Mr. Hester said that if any oneproperty owner would want to do that, not everyone would be tied to that, but if everyone but one wanted to annex, that one could hold it up if it did not fall within the 51% needed. Ms. Albright stated that the way this policy is worded, it would allow annexation by individual property owners, but the intent is to have 51% of the

neighborhood desirous of being annexed.

In response to Commissioner Short, Mr. Hester advised that there are three different annexation methods and statutes. Legal Counsel Jim Barnes said that if it is not completely voluntary, 51% of the property owners must agree to annexation. City of Reno Legal Counsel Milner said that that is not what was intended and that maybe we need to clarify the intention of the Commission and the Council for purposes of this matter. Councilman Hascheff commented that anyone in the area could voluntarily annex their own parcel as the policy is clear on that and would pertain even if it was surrounded.

Mr. Hester stated that if they could voluntarily do that, they could come in a parcel at a time, parcel number by parcel number, and that is not in the annexation program.

Counselor Milner said that the creation of an island by one property owner would be avoided by a refusal to the property owner to not accept the annexation. Councilman Herndon presented his views on this and said that he has a big problem with 51% of the property owners being allowed to decide for the other 49%. Councilman Doyle noted that there are needs specific to the area and mentioned water and the Alturas mitigation funds that were spent. Mr. Hester explained that they were putting forth issues, some related to water and their Alturas funding, and their foremost concern was with the water system which now has low pressure. It was noted for the record that there were about 40 present out of the Grand View Terrace population of 56 homes at one of the meetings Mr. Hester attended, and some may have been from a different mitigation group.

Commissioner Bond suggested that language be provided to make it clear that, if Grand View Terrace remains in the Sphere of Influence, 51% of that community must be willing to be annexed, as she opposes parcel by parcel annexation. Legal Counsel Milner advised that that would not be a substantive change but rather an explanation of what the intention of this language was. Legal Counsel Barnes said he agrees that this is setting forth the language to accomplish the intent. In response to Councilman Doyle's comment that this is not her main issue, Councilman Herndon suggested that this be further discussed after the public portion of the meeting.

Commissioner Galloway then called for public comment.

Lori Bushey, 463 Oregon Boulevard, Reno, advised that she owns property on Lemmon Drive which is a triangular piece; that she did not get notices on this issue until April when a friend informed her and she then became very active; and that she testified that she does want to be in the Sphere of Influence. It was pointed out that the list used for mailing purposes must have been an old one. Ms. Bushey stated that she has been on the mailing list in the Assessor's office since May of 1998 and for some reason that was not used in the notice process. She was advised that the Assessor's office made the database available some time ago and they can be as much behind as a month on their records.

Vice Mayor Newberg explored the possibility of including her in the Sphere of Influence because of the size of her property. She was further advised concerning the difficulty with sending this back to the Regional Planning Commission, which would have to be done. Legal Counsel Milner said this could be done if there was an appropriate boundary, but there may be complaints from other property owners. It was noted that this is a small triangular parcel, and following more discussion, Dean Diederich, Planning Manager, Washoe County Community Development, advised that Washoe County staff would not agree that this could be done at this time since the property is fully contained in the flood plain, which is why the property is currently designated general rural, and equally important, right at the pencil tip of this small property is the 7-11 property which is well identified with that Lemmon Valley community, and he would have to jog that 7-11 property out or bring it into the City but then there would be an issue of clarity of boundaries, considering that the City and County interface there. He suggested that it would be appropriate as part of the annual review, to sponsor the amendment for this to be considered, and with respect to the two legal minds, it was felt that when talking about a sphere line amendment, it needs to be sent to the Regional Planning Commission.

Greg Evangelatos, Principal, FP&E Engineering/Planning, representing the Hoover-Echevery properties consisting of approximately 33 acres in the proposed Sphere of Influence concurred with the recommendation of staff. He stated that there is a lot of work with peninsulas that are essentially surrounded on three sides by the City of Reno, and the suburban designation reflects what is both to the north and to the east in terms of an urban designation, and south is the Tholl Road area, more rural, and therefore the one

to three unit designation is proper.

He then addressed the issue relating to the preservation of the existing viewshed on Peavine Mountain as a policy noting that he would approach this with caution as it may override existing land use rules and regulations, noting that, if there is a blocking of a viewshed, and a requirement mandating a reduction in height by some magnitude of one-half, that would deviate from current policy in treating everyone fairly and equitably. He noted that on the other hand, the viewshed must be considered, and as a private consultant, it would generate more work and thought on their part. He then cited some of the areas that could be considered to include a little bit of latitude in the enforcement of that.

Chairman Galloway inquired if there would be a difference concerning the planning for new development where the owners knew what the view would be when they bought it where those owners more interior in a subdivision would not have. Mr. Evangelatos advised that to a degree that is correct, that this is somewhat subjective, although it is probably workable, but he believes as far as land use is concerned, properties in a zoning district should be treated into the future in a similar fashion, rather than establishing new benchmarks. He noted that the height limitation of 30 feet is now 20 feet and it is challenging to exercise caution on how this should be applied. In response to Chairman Galloway inquiring if applying for a variance might take care of this, Ms. Brekhus stated that she cannot speak definitively whether or not the variance procedure would allow something like this because it is outside the code. She pointed out that there is only one area in the planning area where this could occur, and that the other applicants who were representing other property owners in this area, did not oppose this. She added that people on 5-acre size parcels had a series of meetings with Melissa Lindell representing some properties north of Mr. Evangelatos' clients, which resulted in this policy.

Tom Hay, 9756 North Virginia Street, congratulated staff on the wonderful job, hard work, and cooperation. He stated that he has not gotten any services from his large tax assessment out where he lives from the County and he is for annexation. He stated that the winters are particularly hard as he does not have good access. He inquired concerning the time constraints in applying for annexation, how much it will cost him, and if he can apply for industrial zoning since he is within the sphere. He noted that time is of the essence as his property is being foreclosed on. Bill Thomas, Summit Engineering, spoke concerning the street-front signs issue, and advised that he represents George and Denise Harding and Jim Segal who own about 50 acres on the north end of the corridor and also 20 property owners on 500 acres, all who are in support of the plan. He stated that his problem is that the maximum height of 8 feet is too restrictive and not realistic, and he wants something more reasonable than that. He then addressed the placement of utilities underground stating that this should be defined more clearly and asked that that be set aside until the regional core committee is done, or that the minimum definition of 25KV or less be placed underground, and above that, a special use permit be required, which is the current practice in both the City and County. He stated that a plan had originally been submitted for a minimum of 500 plus acres which was included in this joint corridor study, and that they had asked for the Flagg property to be urban and also for the Buck property, which has multiple designations. In response to Councilman Herndon, he advised that changing the word "shall" to "should" would allow an exception to the rule.

Ollie Westbrook, 345 Westbrook Lane, located in Grand View Terrace, complained that several people were not notified of the annexation issue and the change of land use designation. He suggested that a survey be done of the people who live in Grand View Terrace to see if there is a 51% favor for this process and that every property owner be included, even if a door-to-door survey must be done. In response to Councilman Doyle, he stated that when the water system was installed, there were 63 service lines so that would be the number of homes in Grand View Terrace, and in response to Councilman Herndon, Mr. Westbrook said that this is designated as an unofficial subdivision. Mr. Hester stated that this is the Grand View Terrace General Improvement District.

Gary Feero, 8275 Chippewa, a member of the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board, informed the Board that 75% of a general improvement district has to vote on an issue or for any other political subdivision to take that over, which is a tremendous representation of what the feeling is. He advised that he has seen a petition signed by 80% of the people that they do not want to have their water district taken over. He addressed other issues and said that a lot more work needs to go into how to get things running, particularly in informing the people of Grand View Terrace concerning their water quantity, and posed the possibility of setting a specific date down the road when this will be accomplished.

Mr. Hester pointed out that there is no intent by the City in taking the water system of Grand View Terrace and they do not need

to have that as a concern. He added that the city is not in the water business and they are reading the policy on annexation as acquiring 100 percent as they believe in this area that is what it is, and if it is the desire to change that to 51%, there is no problem with that. It was noted that Anderson Acres and Horizon Hills are out of the sphere. Legal Counsel Milner stated that this is correct.

For point of clarification, Robert Sellman, Washoe County Director of Community Development, noted that the policy on annexation is being read as voluntary to require 100% agreement by every owner that wants to annex in order to get into the City within just this one area, and the 51% rule applies to everyone within the sphere of influence, and if this Board wants it to be 51% in Grand View Terrace, then they have to make that change. A discussion then ensued concerning this and other things that need to be worked out and the possibility of taking Grand View Terrace out of the sphere. Councilman Doyle said she believes there are other issues to be hashed out before a motion can be made and explored the possibility of sending this back to the Regional Planning Commission.

Commissioner Galloway closed the public hearing.

Vice Mayor Newberg called for a motion for the City of Reno. On motion by Councilman Herndon, seconded by Councilman Hascheff, which motion duly carried with Councilman Doyle voting "no," Grand View Terrace was identified as a sphere of influence on a voluntary basis, to be annexed only if 51% of the property owners are in support thereof.

Councilman Doyle commented that Grand View Terrace residents feel like they are being railroaded and that enough effort was not made to notify them of the intent. Councilman Herndon had indicated earlier in the meeting that he would prefer that in many instances in the Plan he would like the word "shall" to be changed to "should" to make it less restrictive. Commissioner Galloway suggested that they pass it the way it is and ask that certain things be re-examined with a view toward a possible amendment. Commissioner Shaw said that he would not support the change suggested by Councilman Herndon as it would change the North Valleys Plan which has been adopted.

Commissioner Bond then made a motion to amend the motion to state that this would be done with the assurance that any annexation has to be voluntary, which cannot be changed or modified by this plan, and further that if the property owners in the Grand View Terrace area decide they want to be annexed, owners of 51% of the total property owners have to agree.

Mr. Hester then read the definition of majority in State law as follows:

Majority of property owners is defined in a territory as the owners of real property whose combined value is greater than 50% of the total value of real property in the territory as determined by assessments for taxation and whose combined area is greater than 50% of the total area of the territory excluding lands held by public bodies. He commented that what this is is assessed property value of an area versus people, but if you wish to vary from the State law definition, that could certainly be done. In response to Commissioner Short's suggestion that Grand View Terrace be removed from the sphere, Council members reiterated that that would create an island and the policy is to avoid that.

Mr. Westbrook noted that there is a property owner, Dutch Cook, who owns more than the other property owners within the District but has other plans for his property and is located east of the original subdivision lines, and he has been getting his water service from the District through the previous owner. He noted that in the new water system, Mr. Cook was included so he could continue getting water service from the District. Commissioner Bond stated that she wants her motion to include individual property owners regardless of how much property they own.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Shaw, and duly carried by a unanimous vote of the Board of County Commissioners.

Following a motion duly made, seconded, and carried, Councilman Hascheff moved to amend the previous motion as stated above for annexation of Grand View Terrace by 51% of the property owners volunteering to do so, as made by Commissioner Bond above, which motion was seconded by Councilman Herndon and carried with Councilman Doyle voting "no."

Chairman Galloway asked for definitions from staff items which need to be looked at for minor changes. Councilman Herndon presented numerous amendments and cited the pages and policy numbers. Commissioner Bond said that her understanding of why these particular design standards are in this plan is that it was a joint effort between the two staffs to hold the integrity somewhat of the North Valleys Plan, and that is why the wording is in there, and she advised that she will not vote to approve that every "shall" in the plan be replaced with "should." Councilman Herndon stated that rather than approve this plan, that it be sent back because he is concerned that the restrictions may constitute an inverse condemnation. The Chairman requested an opinion from the two legal counsels concerning whether anything in the plan as it presently reads would do that. Legal Counsel Barnes stated that it does not, and Legal Counsel Milner stated that anyone can file an inverse condemnation action as it is, and that he is confident that, if this should occur here, it could successfully be defended because it is a reasonable standard and without the use of "shall" it would not be a standard.

Chairman Galloway then asked Councilman Herndon to cite the rest of the sections he had a problem with, so that a vote could be taken if that will be approved by sufficient members to be accepted. He cited additional ones. Chairman Galloway advised that these are too many and that he would have been willing to send back those where public testimony came forward with a direction to look at them. Commissioner Shaw, in the spirit of compromise, said that he would like to hear from staff to explain why the word "shall" is used instead of "should."

Ms. Brekhus stated that the North Valleys Area Plan included the use of "shall," and is very typical in long range plans as an acceptable practice, and that use was continued in order to carry a little more strength. Counselor Milner noted that in Nevada "shall" is mandatory practice and means you must comply and "should" means if you want to comply with the standard, it is a nice idea but not mandatory.

Chairman Galloway then suggested a motion, and in accordance therewith, Commissioner Bond moved that those things related to the undergrounding of utilities, the size of signage, the issue on the blockage and preservation of views be reviewed and reconsidered for change or inclusion in the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. Commissioner Short seconded the motion, and in clarification thereof, Chairman Galloway stated that this will be looked at by Regional Planning at the next available amendment cycle, and upon call for the question, the motion was adopted unanimously by the County Commission.

Vice Mayor Newberg expressed his understanding that these suggested considerations are to be carved out and the rest approved and then sent back to the respective planning commissions for discussion and correction. Chairman Galloway stated that, according to legal counsel, only part of the plan approval could not be done.

Mr. Hester cited NRS 278.220(4) which states as follows:

No change in or addition to the Master Plan or any part thereof as adopted by the Planning Commission shall be made by the governing body in adopting the same until the proposed change or addition shall have been referred to the Planning Commission for a report thereon and an attested copy of the report shall have been filed with the governing body. Failure of the planning commission so to report within 40 days or such longer period as may be designated by the governing body, after such reference shall be deemed to be approval of the proposed change or addition.

He commented that staff members feel that what this says is action cannot be taken on part of the plan that you did not send back, and therefore this joint body must either approve the plan with the request that this be reviewed in the future, or alternatively, not approve the plan. Legal Counsel Milner agreed. Chairman Galloway then stated concerns in sending it back as it is advantageous to approve the greater good and then go back to the amending process, although there is a time delay.

Councilman Doyle stated that her problem is the particular items and how that can be accomplished in 40 days and she does not see why that can't wait and that she wants this sent back. Councilman Hascheff said that he would be for approving the plan in its entirety and follow that with the Regional Plan Amendment process. The time constraints involved were discussed and Chairman Galloway stated that design related issues do not have to go back to the Regional Planning Commission anyway and that both planning commissions need to agree that they will pass the same changes. Mr. Hester said that the issues of the Flagg, Bushey, and

Buck properties could be done through a plan amendment.

Councilman Hascheff said that he thought it would be more efficient to approve the plan and then take the "carve outs" and ask the regional planning commission to review those again.

Mr. Diederich outlined the options available in finalizing this today and the time element involved with referring this back to the Planning Commissions. He said that he agrees with Mr. Hester in that he does not believe 40 days will be enough time for them to come back with different conclusions. He respectfully disagreed with Councilman Doyle as a reflex vote on the Flagg and Buck properties noting that those areas are of major contention between those planning commissions and it was a delicate balance to come up with the resolved recommendation, especially the one property immediately adjoining Horizon Hills. He stated that he believes on the majority of the issues, the same response would be forthcoming in the 40 days.

Mr. Hascheff stated that if there is a lot of give and take in this, he believes it would be a mistake to unwind that negotiation process. Mr. Diederich stated that with regard to the fine distinction between "shalls" and "shoulds," and that with regard to including "shalls" in the North Valleys Area Plan, it was still possible to have the Alturas Power corridor placed there. He used this to verify that there remains a degree of flexibility as ultimately this is policy language and a determination to the contrary is allowed.

Councilman Hascheff then asked, if Reno were to follow the motion the County has just made to approve the plan in its entirety, what direction could they give the Planning Commission to fix the issues. Mr. Diederich suggested that both planning commissions be directed to report back within four or six months with specific recommendations with language changes to be considered as amendments to address these points raised. Chairman Galloway said that possibly their motion could be amended to address the design issues and report back within the next six months.

City of Reno

Councilman Hascheff made a motion to adopt the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint plan, a designated joint planning area in its entirety with specific direction to staff to deal with the signage issue that was brought forth as well as the utility corridor and the view issues with a report to be given at the next Regional Governing Board meeting, if possible, and a report from the respective planning commissions no later than 6 months as to how to deal with those specific issues, along with endorsement and execution of the Resolution of Adoption. Councilman Herndon seconded the motion.

Councilman Doyle mentioned for the record her discomfort with the potential of Lemmon Drive being twelve lanes, and Commissioner Bond mentioned the Pyramid Highway potential of sixteen, and this plan puts Stead at eight. Councilman Doyle stated that this traffic flow for the next fifteen years will keep both of them busy. Vice Mayor Newberg called for the question, and the motion carried unanimously. It was further ordered under the same motion, second, and vote that the Reno Master Plan incorporating the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan as an element of the master plan be adopted and that the Resolution of Adoption as required by NRS 278.220 be endorsed and executed.

Washoe County

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Galloway ordered that the motion made previously be reconsidered.

In conformance with the City of Reno action taken above, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Galloway ordered that the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint plan, a designated joint planning area in its entirety be adopted with specific direction to staff to deal with the signage issue that was brought forth as well as the utility corridor and the view issues, with a report to be given at the next Regional Governing Board meeting, if possible, and a report from the respective planning commissions no later than 6 months as to how to deal with those specific issues, along with endorsement and execution of the Resolution of Adoption.

It was further ordered that CaseNo. CPA99-NV-1, the amended NorthValleys Area Plan, to reflect the textual and graphic changes in response to the Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan be adopted and the Resolution of Adoption as required by NRS 278.220, be endorsed and executed.

* * * * *

The following is the Resolution as acted on by both entities in their motions above:

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE RENO CITY COUNCIL AND THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ADOPTING THE RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN

WHEREAS, Section 278.150 and 278.210, Nevada Revised Statutes, specifies that the City of Reno Planning Commission may prepare and adopt a master plan for all or any part of the City of Reno, subject to Reno City Council approval, and the Washoe County Planning Commission may prepare and adopt a master plan for all or any part of the County, subject to County Commission approval;

WHEREAS, The Truckee Meadows Regional Plan identifies the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN as a part of the City of Reno Master Plan and the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan and, further, NRS 278.02784 and 278.02786 specify the purpose and procedure for the adoption of a joint plan consistent with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan;

WHEREAS, The City of Reno Planning Commission and the Washoe County Planning Commission have found that the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, provide a long-term general plan for the development of the City of Reno and Washoe County including the subject matter currently deemed appropriate for inclusion in the City of Reno Master Plan and the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan;

WHEREAS, NRS 278.02784 specifies that the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN shall be submitted to the Regional Planning Commission for review of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan pursuant to NRS 278.028; and, further, that a public hearing on review of conformance of the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, was held on June 23, 1999, and the Regional Planning Commission found that the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, was in conformance with and promotes the goals and policies of the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan;

WHEREAS, The City of Reno Planning Commission, the Washoe County Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Commission have submitted the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, to the City Council of the City of Reno, Nevada, and the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada, for approval and adoption;

WHEREAS, Pursuant to NRS 278.02786(5), a joint public hearing on the adoption of the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, was held on July 8, 1999, by the City Council of the City of Reno, Nevada, and the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada;

WHEREAS, Under the provisions of NRS 278.220, the City Council of the City of Reno, Nevada and the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada find that the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, conserve and promote the public health, safety and general welfare; and

WHEREAS, The RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, an element of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, are the desired pattern and guide for the orderly physical growth and development of the Reno-Stead Corridor based on the projected population growth, with the least amount of natural resource impairment, and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services; now, therefore, it is hereby

RESOLVED, BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RENO, NEVADA, AND THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA, That the Council and Board do hereby adopt and endorse the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, to serve as a guide for the orderly growth and development of the City of Reno, Nevada, and of Washoe County, Nevada;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City Council of the City of Reno, Nevada, and the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada, do hereby agree and direct that any amendments to the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, must be approved by both the City of Reno Planning Commission and the Washoe County Planning Commission before being forwarded for adoption to the Council and Board.

8:15 p.m.

The meeting of July 8, 1999 adjourned.

Bill Newberg, Vice Mayor, City of Reno

ATTEST:

Don Cook, City of Reno Clerk

Jim Galloway, Chairman, County Commission

ATTEST:

Amy Harvey, Washoe County Clerk

JULY 8, 1999 PAGE 424