



REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

MEMBERS

Florence 'Marge' Frandsen, Chair
Fred Lokken, Vice-Chair
Terry K. Herman
Kendall Mattina
Marvin Moss
Jim Newberg
Steve Rogers
Oscar Sanders
Mark Sullivan
Dave Ziegler, Director

MINUTES

Regional Planning Commission (RPC) INTERIM SUBCOMMITTEE - 2007 REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE WEDNESDAY, 5:00 P.M., November 10, 2004

The Regional Planning Commission Interim Subcommittee met in the Washoe County Community Development Department Conference Room, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Frandsen at 5:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The following Interim Subcommittee members were present: Marge Frandsen, Marvin Moss, and Oscar Sanders.

Also present were: Kendall Mattina, RPC; Dave Ziegler, TMRPA; Randy Baxley, TMRPA; Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA; and Patricia Rogers, TMRPA.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COMMISSIONER SANDERS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 10, 2004, INTERIM SUBCOMMITTEE AGENDA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MOSS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THREE (3) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

- A. Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding the process for the 2007 update of the Regional Plan.

Rosanna Coombes, Senior Planner, stated that the function of this subcommittee is to look at the process for the Regional Plan update and not focus on the content. Regional Planning staff prepared an options paper to open discussions with local government and affected entity staffs. After incorporating input from those discussions, there are seven process options for this subcommittee to review.

Ms. Coombes stated that the Community Partnership group is still in the discussion phase and their participation in this process can not be specifically addressed at this time.

Commissioner Moss asked about the make-up of the Community Partnership group. Ms. Coombes responded that there are representatives from Scenic Nevada, EDAWN, and the Chamber of

Commerce working on the Community Partnership model. There are also staff representatives from Reno, Sparks, Washoe County, and Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) assisting them. The current participants are not necessarily going to be the ones that will participate in the Community Partnership.

Ms. Coombes asked for input from the members of the interim subcommittee regarding what the process for the 2007 update of the Regional Plan should or should not include.

Chair Frandsen stated that the process should be quite different from the process of the last update.

Commissioner Sanders stated that there should be consensus among all parties.

Commissioner Moss stated that it should be kept in mind that this is a revision to the Regional Plan and not a re-write.

Chair Frandsen stated that the public is a necessary part of this whole process. One of the major problems of the last update was that we were not successful at getting buy-in from a great segment of the region. That is what drove a lot of the lawsuits.

Commissioner Moss stated that the lawsuits were more the result of in-fighting among the three entities. Commissioner Moss also stated that the public was not well informed in a lot of cases.

Ms. Coombes asked if one feature that needs to be focused on is to better inform the public. Commissioner Moss responded that it might be and suggested the idea of bringing one section at a time for public hearings as they are completed.

Concern was expressed regarding the lack of public involvement and understanding of the Regional Plan.

Ms. Coombes asked for feedback on what the success factor should be on the issue of education and public involvement.

There was some discussion regarding surveying the public when entering into the update process. Concern was expressed regarding the lack of effectiveness of previous surveys.

Commissioner Mattina stated that one of the biggest problems she has seen in the past is repeated instances of different entities not doing what they said they would do in the timeline provided. There needs to be buy-in and agreement to commit to fulfilling obligations in a timely manner.

Ms. Coombes asked if this is an issue for the interim subcommittee. Commissioner Moss responded that it has to be in order to meet the timeline. Commissioner Sanders stated that it is important to make it a satisfactory process for everyone involved. It is our duty to do everything we can for public outreach to get people involved.

Ms. Coombes asked for feedback on the use of technology such as hand held voting machines for the process of conducting surveys. There was some discussion regarding the lack of a good cross-section of the general public being reached. The trend seems to be moving toward technology but it should not be the only tool for conducting a survey.

There was some discussion regarding the timing for a survey. The issues should first be defined. A determination should be made regarding the sections of the plan that need to be updated before beginning a survey.

There was some discussion regarding the importance of making a survey easy to understand. It is also important to reach out to those in the public that will be affected by the issues addressed in a survey.

Ms. Coombes summarized that the issues should be identified and then, based on what the issues are, a more focused outreach can be done for the people who might be affected.

Ms. Coombes asked for comments on any other aspects of the process that should be included to ensure success.

Chair Frandsen suggested having professional staff sit down and craft the language.

Commissioner Moss stated that someone needs to identify what is not working in the current Regional Plan.

Ms. Coombes presented comments from the staffs of local government and affected entities regarding the update process including.

- It should be a tweak not a re-write.
- There should be consensus and no aggrieved parties at the end of the process.
- There should be broad involvement.
- Community input should be a feature of the process.
- There should be good data and analysis throughout the process.
- A strong education component is needed.

Ms. Coombes reviewed the different models for the update process listed in the options paper.

- 1 - Citizen Committee Model
- 2 - Consensus Building Workshop
- 3 - Staff Facilitated RPC Subcommittee
- 4 - Full RPC
- 5 - Joint RPC/RPGB Committee
- 6 - Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
- 7 - Springboard - Blind Consultation Process

Ms. Coombes stated that a total of fourteen staff members from Sparks, RTC, Reno, Airport Authority, TMRPA, District Health, Air Quality Management, SVGID, RWPC, and TMWA attended the initial meeting regarding the update process. Regional Planning staff met with representatives from Washoe County and the School District at a later date. As a result of the initial meeting, it was determined that the TAC process is the number one choice of those consulted. The second choice was the consensus building workshop method. The third choice was the process used during the last update process. The springboard process was not included in the initial meeting but can be used as a tool in any of the other processes.

Chair Frandsen asked what the feedback was from the school district and Washoe County. Ms. Coombes responded that the school district strongly supported the TAC process and also supported the consensus building process. Washoe County was non-committal but they did raise a number of the same issues raised in the initial staff meeting. Ms. Coombes stated that Regional Planning staff can go back and be more specific and ask Washoe County exactly what they want.

Dave Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning, stated that Washoe County representatives did discuss the springboard or blind consultation concept. They did suggest that Regional Planning staff visit with all of the players and draw them out as to their needs, interests, and desires so as to avoid a downward spiral of picking apart someone else's proposal.

Commissioner Moss asked for clarification that the entities would bring what they think are the problems and solutions and not try to develop them with everyone present. Mr. Ziegler responded that is correct, at least to get things rolling.

Chair Frandsen stated that is one way to bring out the issues.

Commissioner Mattina commented that a part of any of the models should be that if you come with a negative, you also should be required to have a positive to go with it.

There was some discussion regarding the function and productivity of an RPC subcommittee. The subcommittee should not be writing anything. There should be a springboard process and technical people writing the update. The subcommittee should then review it before it comes to the full RPC. There should also be some involvement during the process with the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB).

Ms. Coombes stated that Regional Planning staff came up with an option for an update process. Stakeholder and public input is a strong feature of this process. A technical committee supported by staff would do a lot of the heavy lifting in terms of the language and identification of the issues and solutions. The process would look at each of the elements of the Regional Plan as segments. There would be some sort of a kick off or survey to start the process. Within each of the planning principle evaluation periods, there would be some form of education. As each planning principle is completed, there would be a public workshop process that would involve the full RPC and possibly the RPGB. An RPC subcommittee could have oversight of the whole process. Staff would consult with that subcommittee. When all of the principles are completed, the draft plan then goes to a public workshop for the RPC and the RPGB gets an initial look at it. The final step would be adoption by the RPGB.

Chair Frandsen asked who would be part of the TAC. Ms. Coombes responded that the TAC would include representatives of local government and affected entities and possibly representatives from the broader region. It would be people that have some understanding and knowledge of the issues. The people participating in the TAC could change for each principle that is being updated.

Chair Frandsen clarified that the TAC would give the Regional Planning staff the ideas and then staff would craft the language. Ms. Coombes responded that it would probably be done at a meeting like this. It would be a consensus scenario.

Commissioner Moss asked about the timeline for the update. Ms. Coombes stated that it has to be completed no later than May 2007. It would be nice to set a target date well in advance of that.

There was some discussion regarding completing the update in 2006 in order to get back on track with the regular update cycle.

Ms. Coombes stated that the other staffs have not seen this model yet and asked for direction.

Commissioner Moss suggested getting agreement that we will do one section at a time.

Commissioner Sanders suggested including the springboard idea as well as public education and outreach for each section.

Chair Frandsen stated that having the public involved as each section is being completed is better than overwhelming the public with the whole plan at the end.

Commissioner Mattina stated that there might be more participation if people are interested in a particular aspect of the plan but not the whole thing.

Ms. Coombes stated that comes back to the idea of having the focused community involvement once we know what the issues are in a particular area. We will build that into this model as well.

Ms. Coombes asked for confirmation on the direction that Regional Planning staff will add those elements discussed to this process and then shop that around to the different entities and see if they are comfortable with that as a model.

The interim subcommittee members agreed.

The next interim subcommittee meeting was scheduled for December 8, immediately before the next regular RPC meeting.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

6. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Frandsen adjourned the meeting at 6: 30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

Reviewed by:

Approved by:

Dave Ziegler, Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

Florence 'Marge' Frandsen, Chair
Regional Planning Commission
Interim Subcommittee

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION INTERIM SUBCOMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 10, 2004
PAGE 6

**APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION INTERIM
SUBCOMMITTEE IN SESSION ON _____, 2005.**