

TAC Members

- Nevada System of Higher Education
- Palomino Valley General Improvement District
- Regional Transportation Commission
- Regional Water Planning Commission
- City of Reno
- Reno Redevelopment Agency
- Reno-Sparks Indian Colony
- Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority
- Sierra Pacific Power Company
- South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District
- City of Sparks
- Sparks Redevelopment Agency
- Sun Valley General Improvement District
- Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency
- Truckee Meadows Water Authority
- Washoe County
- Washoe County Department of Water Resources
- Washoe County District Health Department, Air Quality Management Division
- Washoe County District Health Department, Environmental Health Services Division
- Washoe County HOME Consortium
- Washoe County School District
- Waste Management, Inc.

**MINUTES
2007 REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INFILL
Friday, July 21, 2006**

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee on Infill met in the Truckee Meadows Community College – Dandini Campus Vista Building, Room B206, Reno, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, at 11:35 a.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and TAC Infill Subcommittee Members in attendance were: John Hester, City of Reno; Margaret Powell, City of Sparks; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Co.; Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; and Rosanna Coombes, Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA). Member Adrian Freund, Washoe County, arrived at 11:43 a.m.

Members absent: Deborah Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission.

Also present: Dee Schafer, Corporate Solution, Inc., who was the facilitator for the meeting; Jeff Codega, Jeff Codega Planning/Design; Jim Rundle, City of Sparks; and Victor Villarreal, City of Sparks Planner.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER LANGS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JULY 21, 2006, TAC SUBCOMMITTEE ON INFILL AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER SULLIVAN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH FIVE (5) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, Inc., reviewed the objectives for today’s meeting.

[Member Freund arrived at 11:43 a.m.]

- A. Discussion and consideration of infill issues, including possible recommendations to the 2007 Regional Plan Update TAC, on:
 - 1) appropriate goals, policies and measurement tools for population and employment growth

Policy 1.2.4 – Referring to the handout on population growth, Ms. Schafer stated the discussion of Policy 1.2.4.

Ms. Coombes asked if the discussion should continue with the table on density. There was a discussion with the members and it was determined that the discussion would be put on hold for the moment.

[Member Hester left at 11:50 a.m.]

Ms. Schafer asked for comments and questions regarding Policy 1.2.4. Member Coombes explained this policy and stated that it ties into Policy 1.2.2. Member Coombes expressed concern regarding changing 1.2.1 as changes make it difficult for infrastructure. Member Sullivan stated that it is best to utilize what we have.

Ms. Schafer stated that 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 have been redefined and the language is broad. Member Coombes stated that 1.2.1 originally provided a regional vision to promote growth.

Ms. Schafer questioned what should be done with the last paragraph under 1.2.4. The following comments were made: delete the paragraph as it does not make sense; it has very little to do with the policies in the plan; and, it has no value and creates problems of interpretation.

Member Coombes suggested that CIPs could be included in Module #3.

Ms. Schafer stated that Policy 1.2.4 will be taken out. Member Sullivan stated that the upper portion has value. After discussion it was decided that Policy 1.2.4 will be put on hold.

Policy 1.2.11 – Ms. Schafer asked for comments on Policy 1.2.11. The following comments were noted: change wording to “meet the population goals” on 4 as it is difficult to measure population growth; include a goal on incentives; refer to the red table on page 25; meet the population projection; and, need sub-regional number.

Member Coombes suggested changing “meet the population and employment growth” to “meet the density.”

Member Powell suggested deleting “programs or policies” and “number 4” and suggested referring to the table.

Ms. Schafer asked if “programs or policies” should be removed. A brief discussion followed. Member Powell suggested including implementation tools.

[Ms. Schafer called a recess at 12:25 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 12:45 p.m.]

Goal 1.3 – Member Coombes passed out modifications to the Regional Plan for the members to review to aid in the discussion on Goal 1.3. Ms. Schafer requested comments. It was suggested that reference to 2002 be changed to 2007. The members agreed with Goal 1.3 as written in the modification handout.

Policy 4.1.3 – Ms. Schafer asked for comments on Policy 4.1.3. The following comments were noted: refer to densities in Policy 1.2.1 or just leave it off; RTC needs to have some benchmarks; referring to table on page 25 of modifications handout, what if a project does not meet desired residential density? It was stated that alternate densities would be allowed.

Policy 4.3.3 – Ms. Schafer asked for comments on Policy 4.3.3. It was suggested that this policy be referred to 4.2.1, minimum of 4 persons per acre. Member Powell suggested that this is redundant. A brief discussion followed regarding the comprehensive review and amendments

for expansion of the TMSA. Members Freund, Sullivan, and Langs stated that it is fine. Mr. Codega commented that the policy is not set in stone as it is a changing process and should be left alone.

Growth – Ms. Schafer asked if the definition of growth is sufficient. It was decided that the definition should be left as is.

Introduction – Ms. Schafer asked the members to look at paragraphs 4 and 5. It was suggested that it remain the same with the exception of updating it based on the 2000 U.S. Census.

- 2) appropriate goals, policies and measurement tools for monitoring emerging employment centers (EECs) and related growth

Planning Principles – Ms. Schafer stated that the next discussion would focus on the handout of emerging employment centers. Referring to page II.B.4, under Regional Form and Pattern, bullet 4, Ms. Schafer asked for comments. It was suggested that bullet 4 remain the same and add EECs to bullet 5 as well.

Policy 1.1.12 – Ms. Schafer asked for comments on Policy 1.1.12. Everyone was in agreement with the Policy as written.

Policy 1.2.14 – It was decided that Policy 1.2.14 would be deleted as it does not add value.

Policy 1.2.16 – Ms. Schafer asked for comments on Policy 1.2.16. A brief discussion followed regarding this policy and how it outlines characteristics, creates a vision, and does not restrict.

[Member Hester returned at 1:24 p.m.]

A discussion followed regarding the regional significance of Policy 1.2.16. Mr. Codega cautioned that he has seen this type of language used as a limitation.

Member Langs stated that as a citizen she would like to know the future of the area in order to have a choice, such as investment possibilities.

After discussing possible changes to Policy 1.2.16, it was decided that it would be left as is.

Emerging Employment Centers – Ms. Schafer asked for comments on the definition of emerging employment centers. Member Sullivan suggested adding after “balance” the words “that has a significant regional impact.” Member Coombes suggested adding “regionally significant areas” at the beginning. Member Powell questioned where the balance is. Member Hester suggested deleting the word “areas” before the word “where.” Member Hester suggested wording the beginning “Regionally significant areas that may be...”

Ms. Schafer asked if the members agreed with the change “regionally significant areas that may be...” The members were in agreement.

[Member Freund left at 1:50 p.m.]

Member Coombes gave a brief history of the dialogue of EECs and an overview of the purpose of regional centers. Member Coombes stated that it is important to be conscious to apply the rule across the board in the different areas.

Ms. Schafer asked how you redefine policies and if it is limited. Member Langs questioned the definition of a regional center if it attracts a lot of people, such as the Sparks Marina. A brief review of the definition of a regional center was given.

Ms. Schafer asked if the definitions of the regional center and emerging employment centers add value. Member Hester stated that the definitions are helpful to the City of Reno. Referring to page II.B.19, Member Coombes stated that Stead is already covered on the Regional Center concept and could be removed as an EEC. A discussion followed regarding possible regional centers throughout the area, including Boomtown as the Western Gateway to the Region.

Ms. Schafer asked at what point a regional center is a regional center. Member Coombes asked if Boomtown is considered as the Western Gateway to the Region, why can't there be one on the east end.

A discussion followed regarding the Western Gateway and consistency across the board. Ms. Schafer stated that she likes the idea of changing Boomtown to the Western Gateway.

3) additional regional centers and extensions of existing TOD corridors

Ms. Schafer asked how to define the centers and how they are identified. A discussion followed regarding the TOD corridor boundaries.

Member Powell stated that after the previous discussion of the Western Gateway, it is important for her to talk to her officials regarding regional centers.

[Ms. Schafer called a recess at 2:25 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 2:30 p.m.]

B. Consideration of a final report from the infill subcommittee to the technical advisory committee including a review of subcommittee recommendations on infill issues.

Ms. Schafer asked Member Coombes to provide an overview of the handout regarding the Infill Subcommittee comments from previous meetings. The comments and changes are noted in red on the handout. Member Coombes encouraged all the members to review the handout in order to ensure accuracy. Member Coombes suggested reviewing the handout page by page.

Changes to page 2 are acceptable.

A discussion followed regarding the use of "consensus forecast." On page 3 reference to consensus forecast is made. Member Hester suggested wording it "according to forecast."

On page 5, the changes are fine.

On page 9, add "EEC" to 2b. The wording on 2e is fine.

On page 10, add "EEC" to 3a. Member Coombes stated that on 3b, the characteristics wording will be added. A brief discussion followed regarding designation of high frequency. Member Coombes stated that she will work with the members on the characteristics via e-mail.

On page 15, 1.1 and 1.1.2 are acceptable.

On page 25, the subcommittee reviewed Table 1.2.1. Member Hester expressed concern that the * on the 4 persons per acre cannot be done. Member Coombes asked for a recommendation. It

was decided that the * would not apply to the 4 persons per acre but to the others. Member Langs suggested spelling out “FAR” somewhere on the table.

Member Powell stated that she needs time to review Table 1.2.1.

On page 24, Member Coombes stated that 1.2 needs to be reworked. Member Powell stated that she wants EECs included on the Table. Ms. Schafer stated that they will wait on the secondary corridors for Member Freund’s input.

On page 29, 1.2.9 is acceptable.

On page 30, 1, 2, and 3 are acceptable. On 4, add “development standards and corridors,” delete “of best practices development guidelines for centers and corridors,” and add “station areas.”

On page 30, 6 is acceptable. Change grammar on 7, 8, 9, and 10.

On page 31, 11 is acceptable.

On page 32, 1.2.12, 1 is acceptable.

On page 33, 3 is acceptable. On 1.2.12 change “and” to “or.”

The rest of the changes on the pages are acceptable.

Member Coombes asked that the members help capture notes in all the areas plus the changes. Member Coombes provided choices to incorporate the changes. Member Coombes stated that she would like to avoid another meeting if possible in order to get the information to the Technical Advisory Committee meeting in August.

[A 15-minute break was called in order to review the changes from today’s discussion. When the meeting reconvened, discussion of the changes followed.]

On page 9, EEC was already added.

On page 27, move 1.2.4 to Module #3 and this is off the table for discussion now.

On page 28, change name of the center to “Convention Regional Center” and add Western Gateway Regional Center in the Verdi/Boomtown area.

On page 31, 1.2.11 replace “incentives, strategies, programs or policies” to “implementation tools.” Delete the current language in 4 and replace with language to the effect of “be consistent with densities summarized in Table 1.2.1.”

On page 34, delete 1.2.14.

On page 35, in 1.2.16 delete Stead and Boomtown.

On page 36, in 1.3 change “2002” to “2007.”

Module 4, Policy 4.1.3, delete the text after the word “and” then convert to density table.

Module 4, Policy 4.2.3, make a reference to Table 1.2.1, 4 persons per acre.

Member Coombes stated that it would not be necessary to hold another meeting as the changes could be circulated by e-mail.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by, Christine Birmingham

Reviewed by:

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

FILED ON _____, 2007.