



REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

MEMBERS
Jim Newberg, Chair
Florence 'Marge' Frandsen, Vice-chair
Scott Barnes
Todd Brabbin
Kendall Mattina
Christy Magers
Marvin Moss
Dennis Romeo
William Weber
Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director

MINUTES
Regional Planning Commission (RPC)
REGULAR MEETING
Wednesday, November 8, 2006

The Regional Planning Commission met in regular session in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Newberg at 6:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll and the following Commissioners were present: Jim Newberg; Marge Frandsen, Scott Barnes, Todd Brabbin, Christy Magers, Jackie Peterson for Kendall Mattina, Marvin Moss, Dennis Romeo, and William Weber. Commissioners absent: Kendall Mattina.

Also present were: Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA Interim Director; Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel; Phil Caterino, TMRPA; Lora Richards, TMRPA; Connie Anderson, TMRPA; Joy Randall, TMRPA; and Paige Menicucci, TMRPA.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COMMISSIONER MOSS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 8, 2006, RPC AGENDA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WEBER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - City of Sparks Master Plan Amendment, Golden Eagle Regional Park (CR06-025), changing the land use from Open Space/Rural to Public Facility on ±447.63 acres generally located south of Vista Boulevard and Southeast of Wingfield Springs.

COMMISSIONER MOSS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PETERSON. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

- A. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - City of Sparks Master Plan Amendment, Pioneer Meadows (CR06-030), changing the land use from SFR4 (Single Family), RD10A (Single Family), MF15 (Multi-Family), GC (General Commercial), BP (Business Park), OS (Common Area/Open Space), S (School), and P (Park), to SFR4 (Single Family), RD10A (Single Family), MF15 (Multi-Family), MF15A (Multi-Family), GC (General Commercial), BP (Business Park), OS (Common Area/Open Space), S (School), and P (Park) on approximately 650 acres in the Pioneer Meadows Planned Development generally located south of La Posada and east of Pyramid Highway.

Connie Anderson, Regional Planner, presented background information on the proposed amendment. The Regional Planning staff has no significant issues with this request and recommends that the RPC determine that the Pioneer Meadows Amendment is in conformance with the Regional Plan.

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

[The public hearing was closed.]

COMMISSIONER MOSS MADE A MOTION TO FIND THE PIONEER MEADOWS AMENDMENT TO THE SPARKS MASTER PLAN IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLAN, BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARNES. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- B. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - City of Reno Master Plan Amendment, East Fourth Street TOD Corridor Plan (CR06-024), adopting the East Fourth Street TOD Corridor Plan and changing the land use from Special Planning Area (Reno-Sparks Corridor Specific Plan District) on ± 146.4 acres, Public Facility on ± 47.2 acres, Industrial on ± 85.5 acres, Tourist Commercial on ± 7.0 acres, Parks/Recreation/Open Space on ± 11.3 acres and Urban Residential/Commercial on ± 38.5 acres, to Special Planning Area (East Fourth Street TOD Corridor Plan) on ± 335.9 acres, generally located south of Interstate 80, north of the Truckee River, east of Wells Avenue, and west of the City of Sparks boundary.

Ms. Anderson presented information from the staff report regarding the evaluation of the proposed amendment. The Regional Planning staff has no significant issues with this amendment request and recommends that the RPC determine that the East Fourth Street TOD Corridor Plan Amendment is in conformance with the Regional Plan.

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

[The public hearing was closed.]

Commissioner Frandsen stated that this is the second TOD Corridor plan that the RPC has seen where the density and the floor area ratios have been lowered and asked if it would be sufficient to support transit. Ms. Anderson responded that transit is pretty well established along Fourth Street at this time.

Commissioner Frandsen expressed concern that densities continue to be minimized while trying to accomplish a transit system. Ms. Anderson responded that alternative density option is available in the policy in the Regional Plan. It is something that the jurisdiction can choose to use in developing a TOD Corridor, if they see a reason to do so after meetings with neighborhood groups.

COMMISSIONER ROMEO MADE A MOTION TO FIND THE EAST FOURTH STREET TOD CORRIDOR PLAN ELEMENT OF THE RENO MASTER PLAN IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLAN, BASED ON THE FINDINGS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARNES. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- C. Discussion and possible action on sponsoring individual property owners applications to amend the boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA) or the Future Service Areas (FSA).

Lora Richards, Planning Analyst, stated that the content of the applications or proposals is not before the RPC tonight. Action to sponsor the amendments to initiate the process to evaluate the proposals is before the RPC tonight. Ms. Richards stated that members of the public have the right at any time to petition the RPC, Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) or any of the three local governments to amend the Regional Plan. Ms. Richards stated that ten applications have been forwarded to the local governments for evaluation and Legal Counsel will discuss one application submitted on behalf of Dolan Properties that was withheld.

Commissioner Moss asked about the role of the local entities and if it is up to the RPC to make a recommendation to the RPGB. Ms. Richards responded that is correct. The RPC will look at the proposals and make final decisions. The local governments review supplemental pieces for the applications and will make advisory recommendations.

[The public hearing was opened.]

Barron Caronite, Sierra Land Solutions, stated that he is representing the Virginia 40's application submitted on behalf of Dolan Properties. Mr. Caronite presented background information regarding the Virginia 40's property. Mr. Caronite stated that several issues with this application were identified by Regional Planning staff. Two original affidavits have been provided for all the parcels with the exception of one parcel. Mr. Caronite stated that he anticipates being able to get a second original affidavit for that parcel within the next two weeks. Some of the parcel owners that indicated they were going to participate did not send affidavits within the required period of time. Those parcels have been withdrawn from the original submittal. Mr. Caronite stated that the list provided tonight represents the entirety of the application and will not be changed. Mr. Caronite stated that he has committed to go back to the Regional Planning Agency's (RPA) offices to reorganize the package of the affidavits that were submitted. Mr. Caronite stated that the applicants executed the affidavits with full knowledge of the content of the proposal. Mr. Caronite stated that it is his hope that the RPC will look favorably on sponsoring this application so it can be processed with the other ten applications.

[The public hearing was closed.]

Norm Azevedo, Legal Counsel, stated that prior to the meeting today, he met with the representative of the Virginia 40's to address deficiencies with the application. The

representative of the Virginia 40's has made the statements on the record tonight that Mr. Azevedo requested. Mr. Azevedo stated that initially there were five items that needed to be addressed. Only one original affidavit was submitted for one of the parcels. Mr. Azevedo stated that it is his suggestion that the RPC exercise discretion regarding whether to sponsor this application tonight if the representative agrees to submit the second affidavit original within two weeks. The representative agreed to that tonight.

There were 15 or 16 parcels withdrawn from the application creating a concern that the agency has an adequate list of those parcels for consideration by the RPC. An updated list of parcels was distributed tonight. The proposal that was originally submitted to the RPA addressed all of the parcels including the 15 or 16 that have been withdrawn.

One of the concerns was that the proposal had not been modified and staff needed clarification as to whether the withdrawal of those parcels would modify that proposal. The representative stated tonight that the proposal would not be modified and that those parcels primarily constitute open space.

There was also a concern over the manner in which the affidavits were executed by the applicants. The representative stated tonight that the applicants executed those affidavits with full knowledge of the contents of the proposal. Mr. Azevedo stated that the last issue remaining for consideration is that Regional Planning staff noted that documents contained in each of the two original applications that were submitted were different to a degree. Mr. Azevedo stated that the representative agreed to come in to the RPA offices tomorrow morning and provide the RPA with two conformed original applications. Mr. Azevedo stated that there is concern over timing from the applicants perspective. There is some coordination with the City of Reno and Mr. Azevedo agreed to contact the City and address those issues. Mr. Azevedo stated that if the RPC finds the conditions as outlined adequate, the RPC is free to sponsor this application with the previous ten applications.

Chair Newberg stated that this is a new process and suggested moving forward with the ten applications that are set to go if the RPC feels comfortable with the sponsorship and then discuss the one application that is in contest.

Commissioner Moss asked if all of the areas are outside of the sphere of influence (SOI) of either Reno or Sparks. Chair Newberg responded yes.

Commissioner Moss asked if we are really trying to change the SOI as well as the service area. Chair Newberg responded yes.

Commissioner Moss asked if Legal Counsel recommended doing both simultaneously. Mr. Azevedo responded that the process tonight is to consider sponsoring the applications. Those discussions will be had going forward. The applications have not been evaluated for content by Regional Planning staff at this point. The question is does the RPC want to even sponsor initiating the process for amendment.

Commissioner Moss asked what would happen if the RPC does not agree to sponsorship. Mr. Azevedo responded that the application will cease to be valid and that the property owners could seek sponsorship else where or address that issue with the RPGB.

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, stated that there are five entities that can initiate a Regional Plan amendment. Any of the applicants could go to any of the local governments as well as the RPGB to see if they would be willing to come forward on their behalf with a Regional Plan amendment. Ms. Coombes clarified that the RPC is not determining tonight whether to change the TMSA. All it is doing is opening a case file so that Regional Planning staff can do the work and bring the analysis to the RPC. At that point, the RPC would determine if the amendment is appropriate.

Commissioner Moss asked if any of the applications are for properties that were removed from the TMSA that were in it previously. Ms. Coombes responded no. Commissioner Moss asked what happened to those. Ms. Coombes responded that when the amendments were adopted in July there were decisions by the RPGB to not roll back some portions of the TMSA which left some of those individuals' applications complete.

Commissioner Peterson disclosed she has known Mr. Dolan since high school and that she reviewed the application with him. Commissioner Peterson stated that it would not make any difference with regard to her decision.

Commissioner Romeo stated that if the RPC agrees to this, it is moving it forward so Regional Planning staff can analyze the applications and give a recommendation. Commissioner Romeo asked if it really matters at this time if the eleventh application is perfect or not. Mr. Azevedo responded that the concern of staff was an administrative concern that the application process be complete. Mr. Azevedo stated that it is his recommendation that the RPC and RPGB assist Regional Planning staff to adopt a regulation that articulates the application process so that everyone knows what needs to go in and the manner in which it goes in. The eleventh application, with the statements of the representative and their subsequent submissions, as a matter of law is complete for the RPC's consideration.

Chair Newberg stated that he would change his suggestion to have all eleven applications move forward if the RPC desires. Chair Newberg asked if a motion is needed for this. Ms. Coombes responded that she would like a motion. If those are the terms under which the RPC would like to see the eleventh application move forward, Ms. Coombes requested that those be expressed in the motion so that it is on record.

Commissioner Frandsen asked what would happen if the Virginia 40's materials are not submitted within the two week period of time. Mr. Azevedo responded that he would recommend that Regional Planning staff come back to the RPC to report the deficiencies and at that time the RPC could address what further action to take. The amendment process will not be too far along within the two week period that they have to get the last affidavit submitted.

Ms. Coombes stated that they can work with the two week time period. If the applicants do not comply with the process, staff would report that to the RPC at the next available meeting. Ms. Coombes stated that the applicant has made the assertions on the record that they will do this.

There was discussion regarding the deadline for applications and concern with setting precedent by sponsoring an application that is incomplete.

COMMISSIONER FRANDSEN MADE A MOTION TO SPONSOR THE TEN REGIONAL PLAN AMENDMENTS AS DESCRIBED IN TABLE 1 OF THE STAFF REPORT,

SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WEBER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Chair Newberg asked for confirmation that there is not a standard or regulation for the procedures on the forms that need to be sent in. Ms. Coombes responded that the RPGB has not adopted regulations on this process. However, the RPC did take action to adopt an application and in the application it actually states what needs to be submitted with the application.

Mr. Azevedo stated that the point of concern with setting precedent going forward is a valid point. Mr. Azevedo clarified that his recommendation to adopt a regulation is so that the action of this body tonight will not set a precedent. The regulation will determine the rule. Absent adopting a regulation on a going forward basis, the precedent will be created and will stand until such time as a regulation is in place.

Commissioner Romeo stated that this is the first time the RPC has gone through this and a process is being created. There is also a question about how long the applicant will have to wait for the next bundle of amendments to come forward. Commissioner Romeo stated that he can't say that he will not sponsor this application when Legal Counsel has said that the applicant can have the application in compliance by 9:00 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. Caronite stated that the additional information that will be added to the application will be one original affidavit. The rest of the exercise is to simply take the information that is in the application right now and put it in an order that is more conducive for staff's review.

COMMISSIONER MOSS MADE A MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE THE ELEVENTH APPLICATION, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROMEO. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

COMMISSIONER ROMEO MADE A MOTION TO SPONSOR A REGIONAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CONSIDER THE DOLAN PROPERTIES APPLICATION TO MODIFY THE TMSA AND DIRECTED STAFF TO FORWARD THE APPLICATION TO THE CITY OF RENO FOR EVALUATION, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PETERSON.

Commissioner Weber disclosed that he is friends with one of the property owners included in the application and that he feels comfortable voting on this item.

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

- D. Consideration and possible adoption of advance schedule of meeting dates for calendar year 2007.

Joy Randall, Administrative Services Manager, stated that there are two items of discussion for consideration before approving the calendar. In August the RPC discussed the possibility of changing the scheduled meetings from bi-weekly to once monthly. RPC members have expressed a desire to keep two meetings a month and asked staff to streamline the agendas. After the end of the first part of 2007, the meeting schedule may be able to be streamlined and the RPC will always have the possibility to change, reschedule or cancel meetings.

The second item is that the 2007, Regional Plan update schedule will possibly affect the advanced meeting schedule included in the meeting packet. The schedule calls for the recommendations from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to be heard at the December

13, 2006 meeting. Then there are three public hearings in January or February to be scheduled prior to recommending adoption of the amendments to the RPGB. In order to meet the 30 day notice requirement, the first time that one of the three public hearings could be heard would be January 16, 2007. Regional Planning staff has put together two alternatives for the RPC to discuss. If the RPC wants to keep the schedule to hear the amendments at the February 8, 2007 meeting, the public hearings would have to be held between January 16 and January 24. That would mean having two special meetings in addition to the regular meetings. The other alternative would move the schedule forward by one month to the March 8 meeting. The three public hearings would then be able to be held between January 16 and February 21. Then two of the public hearings could be held during regular RPC meetings with only one special meeting.

Commissioner Frandsen stated that it would be easier to cancel a meeting that is not needed than it would be to add a second meeting when only one is scheduled. Ms. Randall stated that is correct.

Commissioner Frandsen asked what the deadline is for the update. Ms. Coombes responded that the deadline is May 9, 2007. Regional Planning staff is trying to complete the update prior to the next legislative session. If no further work is required by the TAC, the update can still be completed and the hearings can be held in the January/February period.

Commissioner Frandsen expressed concern that it can't be predicted what the acceptance level of the amendments is going to be. Ms. Coombes stated that each of the entities has been working with their commissions and Regional Planning staff has been bringing regular updates to the RPC so she is hoping that the process will not be starting from scratch again.

Commissioner Romeo stated that we should go ahead with the recommendation of moving it ahead to the March time frame and giving ourselves a target to have it wrapped up and ready for that discussion in March. Ms. Randall asked for clarification that staff will bring the amended schedule back to the RPC in December as an agenda item. Chair Newberg responded yes.

COMMISSIONER ROMEO MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE AS STATED EARLIER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MAGERS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH NINE (9) MEMBERS PRESENT.

E. Status report on Safe Routes to School Study.

Ms. Richards stated that Regional Planning staff has hired a consultant to help complete this study. Ms. Richards stated that the intent is to bring a draft final report to the RPC at the December meeting.

Commissioner Barnes asked if the school district is using the same consultant. Ms. Richards responded that Catherine Hansford has been hired by the RPA and no one else has contracted with her.

Commissioner Barnes asked if the school district is very involved or just giving input. Ms. Richards responded that the school district is cooperating and is also taking the lead on a couple pieces of the study.

Commissioner Romeo asked who is funding this study. Ms. Coombes responded that the portion of funds that the consultant was hired is coming out of the adopted RPGB budget. It was built into the work program and budget. The cost of the study is less than \$10,000.

Commissioner Moss asked why it was so late getting started. Ms. Coombes responded that the study was built into the 06-07 work program. Staff anticipated starting it in the June/July period. With the changes that occurred in the RPA it was delayed until August.

Commissioner Moss asked if the RPC is responsible for the study. Ms. Coombes responded that the RPC is named in the bill as is the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition, to deliver the report.

Commissioner Romeo stated that the bill says in any county whose population is 100,000 or more so it is Washoe County and Clark County. Ms. Coombes responded that is correct.

Commissioner Romeo stated that they said we need to do this but did not give us any money to do it from the state. It is being funded through Reno, Sparks and Washoe County. Ms. Coombes responded that is correct.

6. DIRECTORS, MEMBERS, AND LEGAL COUNSEL INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Director's reports:

1) Progress report on the 2007 update of the Regional Plan

Ms. Richards stated that they are still on schedule to deliver a draft plan to the RPC for review at the December, 2006 meeting.

Commissioner Weber asked about the turn out at the TAC open house, excluding staff and commissioners. Ms. Richards responded that there was roughly 50 people that attended the open house.

2) Informational presentation on cooperative planning as described in the Regional Plan

Ms. Coombes stated that the request for this item came from one of the commissioners who wanted further information on what cooperative planning is. Cooperative planning is something that is not in statute. It was a product of the 2002 settlement agreement over the Regional Plan lawsuit. It came from the observation that Justice Hardesty made that the local governments at the time seemed to be spending a lot of energy arguing over boundaries and where the SOI should or should not be. Through the facilitated process he used, he came to the conclusion and made the recommendation to the entities that what they should be doing is spending their energies cooperatively planning these areas instead of worrying about where the boundaries were.

There was a process established in the settlement agreement that asked each of the local governments to identify where they felt they would like to have a cooperative process for planning to occur. Each entity self nominated areas and they were adopted in the settlement agreement. The settlement agreement required the local governments to develop criteria to be used for land use amendments in the cooperative planning areas. Disputes over the criteria were resolved by the Court and then adopted by each of the three local governments. The local governments were also required to provide a notification process. Cooperative planning manifests itself either through large area planning or a parcel by parcel basis. The RPC is the adjudicators of disputes.

Commissioner Moss asked how the RPC receives assurance that cooperative planning has taken place in those areas that have been designated. Ms. Coombes responded that the dispute resolution guidelines address that point. It is a self regulating process.

Commissioner Moss stated it seems to me that any report that comes here should indicate whether or not it was a cooperative planning area before we consider it and that cooperative planning has been accomplished. Ms. Coombes responded that Regional Planning staff attempts to identify if something is in a cooperative planning area when we provide you with maps. The way the regulations are established, we are not set up as a policing body. It is a self policing action.

Commissioner Magers asked if the RPC can ask that it be demonstrated in some way that these elements have been satisfied instead of going to a dispute resolution. Ms. Coombes responded that one of the issues with cooperative planning is that it also applies to zoning decisions and the RPC never sees those unless it requires master plan amendment as well. There could be elements that you could add to the Regional Plan or procedural elements when we do our conformance reviews. A number of zoning decisions never come to the RPC and they are still subject to cooperative planning provisions, but we cannot police that because it is not within the jurisdiction of the RPC.

3) Report on actions and agendas of the Regional Planning Governing Board

Ms. Coombes reviewed actions taken at the October RPGB meeting and agenda items for the December RPGB meeting.

B. Legal counsel's report:

Mr. Azevedo stated that there is no litigation pending at this time. Mr. Azevedo stated that he will prepare a draft regulation for future potential applications to amend the TMSA.

7. REQUESTS FOR AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

A. Review of tentative calendar of agenda items

Chair Newberg stated that staff needs to set up a standard for the regulations and procedures for forms and documents required when sponsoring amendments for additions into the TMSA. Ms. Coombes responded that staff will bring that to the RPC as soon as the information is available from Legal Counsel. Ms. Coombes reviewed future agenda items for the RPC.

8. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

Ms. Coombes stated that the meeting packet includes a copy of a letter addressed to the RPC and was received by the RPA on November 2.

[Recess at 7:25 p.m. to reconvene in the Caucus Room for the remainder of the meeting.]

[Commissioner Moss left at 7:25 p.m.]

9. WORKSHOP - Facilitated discussion and possible recommendations to the RPGB on the future of the program of regional planning, including but not limited to what is working, what is not working and possible changes to the role, structure or function of the program in Washoe County.

Overview

A. Reconvene the meeting

The meeting reconvened in the Caucus Room at 7:35 p.m.

The clerk called the roll and the following Commissioners were present: Jim Newberg; Marge Frandsen, Scott Barnes, Todd Brabbin, Christy Magers, Jackie Peterson for Kendall Mattina, Dennis Romeo, and William Weber. Commissioners absent: Kendall Mattina and Marvin Moss.

Also present were: Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA Interim Director; Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel; Phil Caterino, TMRPA; Lora Richards, TMRPA; and Joy Randall, TMRPA.

B. Background

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, stated that from time to time the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) reviews the program of regional planning. With Mr. Ziegler's departure from the organization, the RPGB has decided to do an audit of regional planning and use the information when choosing a new Director. Ms. Coombes stated that the Regional Planning Agency (RPA) has entered into a contract with Cole Campbell from UNR. Mr. Campbell is the Dean of the Journalism Department at UNR; he facilitated the RPC's May workshop at Lawlor Events Center. The outcomes of this workshop will be combined with input from the planning directors and will go to the RPGB at their meeting in December.

C. Process

Mr. Campbell reviewed the SWOT analysis process that will be used for this workshop.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analysis

A. Opportunities and threats related to regional growth and development

Mr. Campbell asked the RPC members to identify opportunities facing the Truckee Meadows in terms of growth and development. Mr. Campbell reviewed the list of opportunities identified with the RPC members.

Mr. Campbell asked the RPC members to identify threats facing the Truckee Meadows in terms of growth and development. Mr. Campbell reviewed the list of threats identified with the RPC members.

B. Strengths and weaknesses of regional planning system now in place

Mr. Campbell asked the RPC members to identify strengths of the RPC, RPGB and RPA. Mr. Campbell reviewed the list of strengths identified with the RPC members.

Mr. Campbell asked the RPC members to identify weaknesses of the RPC, RPGB and RPA. Mr. Campbell reviewed the list of weaknesses identified with the RPC members.

Process Checks

A. Do strengths and weaknesses relate to opportunities and threats?

Mr. Campbell lead discussion to check the list of strengths and weaknesses against the list of opportunities and threats.

- B. Which strengths ought to be developed further in relation to which opportunities or threats

Mr. Campbell lead discussion to identify strengths that are needed in order to secure the opportunities listed.

- C. Which weaknesses ought to be mitigated in relation to which opportunities or threats?

Mr. Campbell lead discussion to identify weaknesses that need to be mitigated in relation to the threats listed.

Wrap Up

- A. Next steps

Mr. Campbell stated that he will take the comments from tonight and turn them into prose and get it back to Ms. Coombes.

Ms. Coombes stated that the planning directors will go through a similar exercise. The information from the RPC and the planning directors will be pooled together and provided to the RPGB at their December meeting.

It was decided that the RPC members will be sent copies by email of the report that will go to the RPGB.

Ms. Coombes offered to help the RPGB with possible solutions on where to go with this and to draw suggestions for the RPGB on where they could go to deal with some of these weaknesses or problems. Ms. Coombes asked if the RPC is comfortable with that. Chair Newberg responded yes.

- B. Process feedback form

Mr. Campbell asked the RPC members to provide written feedback on tonight's process.

- C. Conclude the workshop and return to the RPC meeting agenda

Chair Newberg adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Newberg adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

Reviewed by:

Approved by:

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

Jim Newberg, Chair
Regional Planning Commission

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

November 8, 2006

Page 12

**APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION IN SESSION ON
_____, 2007.**