

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 Friday, March 17, 2006

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met in Vista Building, Room B206, at the Truckee Meadows Community College – Dandini Campus, 7000 Dandini Blvd., Reno, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Dave Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning, at 8:45 a.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and TAC Members in attendance were: John Hester, City of Reno; Margaret Powell, City of Sparks and Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Harold Shotwell, Palomino Valley GID; Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment Agency and HOME Consortium; Dean Schultz, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority; Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; Hilary Lopez for John Erwin, Truckee Meadows Water Authority; Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department (Air Quality); and Dave Ziegler, Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency.

Member Mike Boster for Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District, arrived at 8:47 a.m.; Member Adrian Freund, Washoe County, arrived at 8:54 a.m.; and Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID, arrived at 9:35 a.m.

Members absent were: Greg Dennis, Regional Water Planning Commission; Scott Nebesky, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; Robert Lichtenstein, Nevada System of Higher Education; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Co.; Jeanne Rucker, Washoe County District Health Department (Solid Waste); and Greg Martinelli, Waste Management.

Also present were: Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA; Patricia Rogers, TMRPA; Lora Richards, TMRPA; and Joy Randall, TMRPA; Susan Briganti, Corporate Solutions, Inc.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER RUEFER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 17, 2006 TAC AGENDA, WITH THE AMENDMENT TO HEAR AGENDA ITEM 4B AFTER ITEM 4D. SECONDED BY MEMBER

POWELL. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ELEVEN (11) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. David Bjorkman, owner of 200 acres of property near Peavine Mountain, provided a brief report regarding plans for his property. He stated other adjoining property owners intend to create a large Planned Unit Development (PUD) that includes one person per acre and 3,000 housing units. The property is consistent and located along the forest service boundaries. The property has some development constraints due to steep slopes.

B. Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID, reported that the top priority concern in the Sparks and Sun Valley areas were growth and water. She requested the record to reflect that the TAC is aware of the citizens' concerns.

C. David Ziegler welcomed attendees and invited them to participate in the discussions. He invited introductions and those in attendance were Craig Knudsen, David Bjorkman, and Lee Weston.

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

Mr. Ziegler announced to the members the objective of today's meeting is to work on infill goals and locations.

- A. Consideration of and possible conceptual agreements on Module 1, Issue #4 – boundaries of infill areas – what's appropriate; how do we maintain community character?**
- B. Education presentations on Module 1, Issue #5 – How should the Plan provide for master planning of large areas rather than piecemeal planning?**
- C. Status Report on Module 1, Issue #3.2 – Adequate affordable housing. Should the plan call for inclusionary housing practices?**
- D. Review of, and feedback on, conceptual agreements of the TAC on Module 1, Issue #1 – Boundaries of the TMSA, and Module 1, Issue #2 – How to make sure there is an appropriate amount of land for all land uses, in the right location?**

Agenda Items 4A and 4D were discussed together.

Member Royal-Goodwin stated the affordable housing staff continues to meet every other week. The group is currently working on a draft policy statement and will provide it to the TAC when completed. The statement addresses housing overall with specifics regarding affordable/attainable housing.

Susan Briganti, facilitator for the meeting, stated the objectives for the day's meeting, which include:

- Letters regarding agency and constituent feedback
- The restatement of issues at a future meeting
- Infill as the priority discussion during the morning
- Possible draft policy statement #4
- Education

Ms. Briganti reported the results of the small group discussions on March 3, 2006. The groups were requested to: 1) discuss the scope of issues on infill; 2) consider the agency needs; 3) consider the information provided during the education session; and 4) to then look at the opportunities and solutions in order to come to a consensus.

She requested that members review each of the results for better definitions.

Member Lopez requested to know how the current discussions to designate TODs and Regional Centers, where appropriate, for local service providers relate to discussions and meetings regarding large annexations plans without consideration of natural resources, particularly in accordance with the old plan.

Member Hester clarified that Future Service Areas (FSA) are not annexation areas. Resource planning and public facilities need to be in place before lands in the FSA will be added to the Truckee Meadows Service Area.

Ms. Briganti requested members to provide comments regarding "gross density tiers," amenities, place-making and community building.

Mr. Ziegler noted that concepts need to be in the context of specific and measurable goals. He explained that place-making addresses whole communities and is similar to community building.

Members provided comment regarding opportunities, blobs, clumps of infill, areas of emphasis, amenities and services.

Mr. Ziegler noted the idea of "blobs and clumps" was to identify areas for infill and focus to push the creation of infill areas.

Member Hester noted the downtown area redevelopment districts in Reno are following the centers and corridors. The developers favor this, and entitlement is quicker.

Member Langs expressed her concerns with the necessity to provide citizens with information and maps describing infill plans. She noted that citizens have expectations and choose where they reside and their surroundings.

Member Sikorski noted infill needs must be balanced with property owners' needs.

Mr. Ziegler recommended view corridors as a connection to the environment.

Member Ruefer commented that infill is broader than redevelopment. The Regional Plan needs strength to provide solid guidelines for preserving the view corridors so that master plans have guidance.

Members discussed view protection ordinances that only control issues within the local jurisdiction.

Ms. Briganti stated this issue would be addressed again in the future. Comments were invited regarding the analysis to determine infill areas and the infrastructure capacity, service provisions and land use patterns. The analysis is to be completed first.

Member Powell stated infill issues must be identified, as well as the infrastructure.

Mr. Ziegler stated the need to designate infill areas and the possibility of ranking the areas.

Member Sikorski recommended identifying the types of infill and where they are needed.

Member Freund stated infill was a dynamic issue and difficult to map or predict.

Member Ruefer favored mapping areas to strongly identify corridors and centers, not just parcels.

Ms. Briganti stated discussions were held addressing the policy-based priority and invited comment. The issue was tabled.

Discussion was invited addressing the levels of infill, mid- to high-rise, low-rise, and whether or not to include TODs.

Mr. Ziegler stated the intent was to recognize the different types of infill and utilize the appropriate type.

Member Freund recommended focusing on secondary corridors and their opportunities.

Member Hester discussed the policy-based issue. Policies based at a local level for different slopes and characteristics versus at a regional level are preferable.

Comments were provided regarding density gradients. Mr. Ziegler noted that bell-shaped density gradients and feathering was better versus placing boundaries. He discussed different levels of density along the corridor, three-dimensional planning and cross streets.

Member Freund stated it was important to provide flexibility and mixed use development can support transit corridors.

Member Ruefer requested to include drawings in the plan and not just words.

A discussion to expand the definition to include reinvestment at the same density and intensity followed. Members noted the importance of the flight zone and historic areas.

At this point, a five-minute recess was declared. The meeting reconvened after the five-minute break.

Ms. Briganti noted some common themes the group discussion have provided, which include:

- Specific and measurable goals
- Flexible policy that provides opportunities
- Framework for local jurisdictions to include a view policy provision
- A provision for analysis

Ms. Briganti invited discussion regarding the Regional Centers and TOD Corridors and other areas at local discretion. Locals work with utility providers in designating other areas. Discussion included the need for coordination, pro-active ideas and leadership for opportunities to occur.

A discussion was held regarding the map, the quality of life and characteristics. A vision of quality with amenities and the high cost of graphics was held.

Arlo Stockham commented on the role of regional and local governments, avoiding redundancy and design standards and specifics.

Ms. Briganti summarized decisions to eliminate McCarran Boulevard as the target infill area and eliminating the 65%-35% splits in Table 1.2.1. Discussions were held regarding infill in the unincorporated areas to include the opportunities, corridors, nodes and mixed use.

Member Freund provided different types of infill in unincorporated areas as follows:

- 1) Major arterials with potential for transit service;
- 2) Density gradient with low to high; and,
- 3) Opportunities or blobs that are close to transit with land not utilized.

Secondary corridor development would be smaller than TOD development.

Members discussed ingress and egress, the meaning of wetlands and streams, and drainage areas. It was noted that most streams and drainageways were private property and there may be a need to identify them to preserve them. The opportunity for measurable goals as close to the 65/35 percent split as possible was discussed.

Ms. Briganti requested discussion regarding granny flats, the lot standards and location. Comments included using flexibility as a tool to reach affordable housing goals, the regional impact on schools and bus ridership, and water, sewer and absorption.

Members were instructed to state what ideas they liked from the discussions held for the purpose of reaching consensus to draft policy. These included:

- Flexibility
- Policy based
- Analysis first
- Absorption targets
- Focus on Regional Centers and Corridors
- Location and sensitivity to wetlands and streams
- Locals working with service providers
- Secondary corridors
- Infill and unincorporated as complimentary policy
- Opportunities that include geography and time
- McCarran is out
- Improve quality of life
- Place making for the whole community
- Look at blobs and clumps
- Infill not appropriate for all
- Report the completion of analysis
- Public education for visualization
- Location
- Characteristics

A discussion was held regarding the use of subcommittees to draft policies. Members agreed to call a work session, post an agenda and meet around a conference table to work on details. Mr. Ziegler stated he would consult with legal counsel on to how the work session should be noticed. It was recommended to meet on Friday afternoons.

Ms. Briganti stated staff will provide a report to the group regarding the meeting substance and after consulting with legal counsel.

At this point (approximately 11:15 a.m.), Member Langs left the meeting.

The purpose will be to discuss and recommend a solid statement for policy.

Mr. Ziegler stated the next issue for the TAC is piecemeal planning versus planning for large areas. Cumulative impacts are a concern and amendments were requested. He

addressed the consistency doctrine relative to large and small acreage and where they should nest.

5. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Future agenda items should be submitted to staff. There were no specific items requested for the next meeting.

6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

There was no written correspondence presented for review.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Joy Randall

REVIEWED BY:

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

FILED ON:

_____, 2007.