



Community Development

"Dedicated to Excellence in Public Service"

Adrian P. Freund, FAICP, Community Development Director



DATE: November 10, 2010

TO: Katy Simon, ICMA-CM, County Manager
Rosemary Menard, Director, Department of Water Resources

FROM: Adrian P. Freund, FAICP, Director, Community Development Department

SUBJECT: Summary of November 9 Board of County Commissioners Agenda Item #23

The following item was discussed by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) at their meeting of November 9, 2010:

SUBJECT: Discussion and possible direction to staff to compile and transmit Board comment to certain multi-jurisdictional Boards regarding potential changes to representation on the Regional Planning Governing Board ("RPGB"), and the respective governing boards of the Regional Transportation Commission ("RTC") and the Western Regional Water Commission ("WRWC"), as discussed by the Regional Planning Governing Board at its October 14, 2010 meeting. (All Commission Districts)

A summary of the Board discussion and motions related to this item follows, and the BCC staff report is attached.

On October 14, 2010, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) Subcommittees on Collaboration and Governance voted, at a joint meeting, to recommend to the Regional Planning Governing Board that it consider approaching the RTC and the Western Regional Water Commission (WRWC) regarding possible modification of those Boards to "mirror" the membership structure of the RPGB. It was acknowledged that these changes in Board structure would require legislative action. Also on October 14, the Regional Planning Governing Board voted to accept the recommendation of the Subcommittees and directed Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency staff to approach the RTC and WRWC to seek an agenda item to determine the interest of these two Boards in the proposed changes (WRWC is scheduled for November 12 and RTC for November 19).

The BCC discussion on November 9 focused on the purpose of these potential representation changes, and on the concerns of some members regarding the potential for the changes suggested to result in limiting the opportunity for some elected officials on each governing body (Washoe County, Reno, Sparks) to serve on these boards.

In noting advantages of the possible realignment of Board memberships, it was indicated that common membership structures would bring about a higher level of collaboration, coordination and shared knowledge on important matters of regional growth and development and infrastructure. It was also indicated that if such an approach were pursued, it might make sense to consider modifying the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) Board to have the same membership as having the active engagement of water providers in addition to the WRWC would probably make a lot of sense.

In discussing the potential for ultimately having one regional agency board oversee land use, transportation and water resources planning, some Commissioners felt such an approach would provide an opportunity to make more sense of regional planning and growth issues through involvement of all the bodies having key roles.

Post Office Box 11130, Reno, NV 89520-0027 – 1001 E. Ninth St., Reno, NV 89512

Telephone: 775.328.3600 – Fax: 775.328.6133

www.washoecounty.us/comdev/

"Your Community Development Department"

Based on a matrix of membership on the Boards of the RTC, RPGB, WRWC and TMWA, three members of the Board of County Commissioners expressed concerns about the discrepancies in representation through the appointment process since individual Commissioners currently hold appointments on none, one, two, three or four of the Boards under discussion and there may be elected officials who are left out of critical decisions that affect their districts. While limiting the terms of appointments and rotating appointments could help to address this concern over a concentration of decision-making authority in some elected officials, some of the Boards have appointments that are specified in NRS (e.g. *the Regional Planning Governing Board where it is specified in statute that there shall be three representatives appointed by the Board of County Commissioners, at least two of whom must represent or reside within unincorporated areas of the county. If the representative is a County Commissioner, his or her district must be one of the two districts in the County with the highest percentage of unincorporated area. Since the Board's appointees are County Commissioners, this means that both District 4 and District 5 must be represented on the Regional Planning Governing Board*).

One Commissioner noted that there was no effort to define what the problem is that needs to be solved through the realignment of Board representation. Staff should work on defining the problems or issues related to the current structure of these regional entities and then suggest alternatives that bring about better governance (form should follow function). It was requested that a Board item be placed on a future BCC Agenda to discuss this matter. It was noted more efficient and thoughtful planning and allocation of resources is a positive goal.

Discussion took place around whether this proposal was a precursor to consolidation of local governments or a perhaps an attempt at a different form of consolidation (consolidation light?). Again, a member of the RPGB Subcommittee noted that this was not viewed as an attempt to combine or integrate staffs of the various regional agencies but as a means of doing a better, more comprehensive job of addressing issues of regional growth and development. He also noted that the realignment of Boards was not proposed to accommodate more convenient scheduling of Board meetings for elected officials (this was mentioned in an earlier meeting of the RTC/RPGB Subcommittees).

As to a possible Bill Draft Request (BDR) and legislation, discussion centered on the possibility of unintended consequences of the legislative process, noting that proposed legislation may bear little resemblance to the requested changes. Concerns were expressed about opening the Regional Planning legislation and the discussion also considered what priority this legislation might have for the County or other local governments given the expectation that each agency may have other legislative issues that have a much higher priority for them in the upcoming Legislative Session.

Following discussion, the Board passed the following two motions (Clerk's record not available as of the date of this memorandum):

Moved by Commissioner Breternitz and seconded by Commissioner Jung to transmit the comments of the Board of County Commissioners on item #23 to the Regional Water Planning Commission and the Regional Transportation Commission: passed on a vote of 3 for (Larkin, Breternitz and Jung) and 2 against (Humke and Weber).

Moved by Chairman Humke and seconded by Commissioner Weber to direct staff to provide comment that the BCC does not wish to see changed representation on these Boards at this time, nor is it in favor of seeing a Bill Draft Request regarding the changes discussed on Item #23 at this time; passed on a vote of 3 for (Humke, Weber and Jung) and 2 against (Larkin and Breternitz).

Enclosure: BCC Staff Report of November 9, 2010, Item #23

cc: Rosanna Coombes, Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency
Lee Gibson, Regional Transportation Commission
Board of County Commissioners