

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
Wednesday, June 7, 2006**

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) subcommittee on infill met in the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency Conference Room, One East First Street, Suite 1100, Reno, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Dave Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning, at 1:20 p.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 & Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Company; and, Adrian Freund, Washoe County.

Member absent: Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID.

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) staff present was: Dave Ziegler, Patty Rogers, Joy Randall, and Rosanna Coombes.

Also present were: Dee Schafer from Corporate Solutions, Inc. who was the facilitator for the meeting; Jeff Codega, Jeff Codega Planning/Design; Jim Rundle, City of Sparks; and, Arlo Stockham, CFA, Inc. Marilyn Gross was also present to take the Minutes.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER POWELL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JUNE 7, 2006, TAC SUBCOMMITTEE ON INFILL AGENDA. SECONDED BY MEMBER SULLIVAN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH FOUR (4) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment presented at this time.

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

Ms. Schafer reviewed the objectives for today’s meeting. Ms. Schafer stated that she will walk through the handout from the notes of the previous meeting’s discussion with the members and then will request the members’ comments. Ms. Schafer stated that the goal is to discuss Goal 1.2, Table 1.2.1, and Policy 1.2.12 to see if there is any need to replace them and if so, with what.

A. Discussion and consideration of infill issues, including possible recommendations to the 2007 Regional Plan Update TAC, on:

- 1) specific, measurable infill goals and standards to replace the existing goals and standards set forth in Goal 1.2, Policy 1.2.1, Table 1.2.1 and Policy 1.2.12, and other related planning principles, policies, definitions contained in the 2002 Regional Plan.**

Ms. Schafer passed out the handout for the subcommittee’s review and read the section “Define Purpose” and requested comments from the members. Mr. Ziegler stated that standards criteria measurements are the same as opportunities.

Ms. Schafer questioned if the members were comfortable if the wording was changed from “including” to “consistent” with opportunities and incentives. Member Powell expressed concern that opportunities and incentives focus on the broader picture of the Regional Plan. Member Powell stated that measurements, criteria, and standards may miss those identifying factors.

Ms. Schafer requested to know how the members felt about removing the wording “opportunities and incentives.” Member Powell stated that she would not like it since she was the one to propose that.

Arlo Stockham, CFA, Inc. stated that incentives and opportunities are important.

Member Freund stated that it is hard to tie the opportunities directly to standards.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the point is about focus. Mr. Ziegler stated that it would be possible to adopt standards that could act as disincentives.

Member Powell stated that she does not want to lose sight of opportunities and incentives, as they need acknowledgement.

Ms. Schafer suggested keeping opportunities and incentives as part of the discussion of measurement tools to see if it would support the measurement tool in a positive way.

Member Sullivan stated that the language is fine at this broader level.

Member Goodwin stated that she has no problem with the purpose as defined.

Ms. Schafer stated that for today’s purposes that “consistent” will be left in the definition and “included” will be added as the members work through the discussion.

Ms. Schafer reviewed the infill discussion and questioned if the definition of infill should be left alone. The following comments were made: infill is different at the county and city level; entity to entity is different; and, have a more generalized definition later.

Ms. Schafer reviewed the “Define Standards” section and questioned if the members were okay with that.

Member Sullivan stated that the word “predictability” implies that it is fixed and suggested that it should be put in parenthesis for the time being.

Jeff Codega, Jeff Codega Planning/Design, stated that predictability can be a proxy for the lowest common denominator.

At this point in the meeting (at approximately 1:35 p.m.), Member Hester arrived.

Ms. Schafer reviewed the “What Works” notes of Goal 1.2, Table 1.2.1, and Policy 1.2.12.

Member Powell stated that according to the previous discussion that the actual percentage table was not used, but used more in the annual report. Mr. Ziegler agreed and stated that most of the conformance reviews done are not big enough to conform. Mr. Ziegler stated that there are other policies under goal 1.2 that are used more.

Ms. Schafer reviewed “What Doesn’t Work” and “Suggested Changes” sections of the notes and requested comments from the Members. A brief discussion followed regarding qualitative and quantitative.

Mr. Ziegler reviewed Member Hester’s suggestion to remove Table 1.2.1 and questioned if the discussion has gotten to the 35/64 policy and the standards for regional centers and corridors. Member Hester stated that he does not have a problem with the centers and corridors except to define more nodes. A brief discussion followed.

Ms. Schafer requested to know what will take the place of the items being removed. Rosanna Coombes passed out copies of Goal 1.2 to the members.

Member Sullivan questioned the use of tools as they work at the jurisdictional level that would work at the regional plan level. Member Hester suggested continuing with the regional plans as planned; however, improve the nodes and links. A brief discussion followed regarding determining the regional plan and the center plans.

Ms. Schafer summarized by stating that Table 1.2.1 would be removed and not replaced with anything.

Mr. Ziegler stated, for example, that the airport plans do not lend themselves to residential development. Mr. Ziegler reviewed the Dandini area and suggested averaging the job and population targets to establish a mixed use, which might be possible. Mr. Ziegler reviewed the idea of 1/3 of the population wanting a walkable environment, 1/3 a suburban environment, 1/3 indifferent. Mr. Ziegler reviewed the idea that 35-40% of the population wants a walkable urban environment. Mr. Ziegler questioned if there could be a goal of 35-40% to build upon. A brief discussion followed regarding the target to hit. Mr. Ziegler stated that the point is to establish goals for conformance review.

Member Freund described the percentages and stated that the problem with the development community is that it does not provide for the wants and needs.

Mr. Stockham stated that the more aggregate the better the measurement tool.

Ms. Coombes stated that this is a circular issue and questioned how service providers know where to put the utility if not enough guidance is given to say where it is wanted. Mr. Stockham stated that the facilities need to be more consistent.

Mr. Codega explained that there are not good indicators of where property is available.

Member Powell questioned how much capacity there is. Member Powell stated that she views the goals as the annual report measurements. Member Powell stated that she does not know how to get to the number.

Mr. Ziegler expressed concern that without goals one could slip further away from the form and pattern. Mr. Ziegler stated that when a node plan is in place, you are covered.

Ms. Schafer summarized the comments by stating to do away with Table 1.2.1 and allow the jurisdictional plans to drive conformance with other policies within the Regional Plan and the center and corridor plans, once approved, help drive the infrastructure of the service providers. Ms. Schafer questioned if the summarization was correct. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the standards could be built from the bottom up rather than imposing a top down standard. Mr. Ziegler expressed concern that the present standards have an escape clause that is used extensively.

Ms. Schafer questioned if target numbers based on adding the nodes and what is thought they actually give and put that as a target goal into the Regional Plan. A brief discussion followed that that is what is being done already with utilities and the corridors.

Member Powell stated that there has not been a lot of communication between planners and the infrastructure and plans will always evolve and develop.

Mr. Ziegler invited Mr. Codega to comment on hierarchy of nodes and the urban geography. Mr. Codega stated that urban form is complicated and suggested looking at the land to see what tiers there are in the community.

Mr. Ziegler stated that it may or may not be possible to set goals for progress.

Member Hester stated that the City of Reno is looking internally at the corridors to see if the infrastructure capacity is there.

Ms. Schafer questioned if a number is needed as a target, if the 4.0 person per acre number should be used or the 35/64. Mr. Ziegler suggested that there are three things to do: (1) work on the four persons per acre, (2) table the discussion on Table 1.2.1 and work on Policy 1.2.12, and (3) come back to a discussion to summarize the Master Table. Member Powell added a fourth item, which is to discuss centers, corridors, and address Pyramid Highway as a secondary corridor.

Ms. Schafer questioned if the members want to discuss Policy 1.2.12 first and then get back to Table 1.2.1. The following comments were made: address specifics then return and leave the door open as secondary corridors may change.

Ms. Coombes suggested identifying the characteristics.

Ms. Schafer directed the discussion to the 4.0 persons per acre. The following comments were made: 4.0 is the total area of the city minus the water bodies; it is currently not in the plan, but it is a settlement agreement; and, carefully examine the figure as a numerator and denominator. A discussion followed regarding the definition of numerator and denominator. Member Hester suggested that the numerator is the 2030 projection of people and denominator is TMSA minus water bodies.

A brief discussion followed regarding the time horizon, the population plan, and the numbers derived from the settlement agreement. Member Hester stated that 20 years is in the state law. The members agreed that the starting point is 20 years.

A brief discussion followed regarding determining the people figure, the population plan, and comparing the city's forecast against the consensus. Member Hester stated that there is a policy in place for forecast.

Member Freund stated that if a methodology ratio based on scenarios totals is not controlled by the overall consensus forecast.

Mr. Codega stated that there are different reasons for different numbers. Mr. Codega suggested putting a confidence interval around it. Mr. Codega expressed concern that the discussion the last two months over the settlement agreement has been on expanding service areas in order to do planning.

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

This item was not discussed.

3) additional regional centers and extensions of existing TOD corridors

This item was not discussed.

Due to a room conflict, Ms. Schafer stated that this meeting would have to end. Ms. Schafer stated that the next meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 14, 2006 from 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

MEMBER POWELL MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. SECONDED BY MEMBER HESTER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Ziegler, Director

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

APPROVED BY THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN SESSION ON

_____, 2006.