

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 23, 2006**

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee on Infill met in the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) 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 9:48 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.; Adrian Freund, Washoe County; and, Dave Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning. Member Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID, arrived at 10:08 a.m.

Members absent: Deborah Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission.

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) staff present: Rosanna Coombes and Patty Rogers.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER HESTER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JUNE 23, 2006, TAC SUBCOMMITTEE ON INFILL AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER FREUND. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH FIVE (5) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA, acted as the facilitator for today's meeting as Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, Inc., was unable to attend. Ms. Coombes reviewed the objectives for today's meeting, which are: review "alternative density" paragraph of Policy 1.2.12; review Policy 1.2.9; and, move on to Module 1 Issue #6. Ms. Coombes briefly recapped the notes from the last meeting.

Member Powell requested to know what number was set for the numerical standard within so many feet of a node or station. Ms. Coombes replied that there was no firm agreement made. Ms. Coombes asked if it should be determined now. Member Sullivan stated that the criteria discussed today would describe that number.

A brief discussion followed regarding stationary spacing.

Dave Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning, recapped the discussion by saying that the corridor is a ribbon with little spacing. Member Hester suggested using a quarter mile radius to start. Member Sullivan suggested starting with the distance between nodes then plan for growth.

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. Coombes read the alternate option on page 2 of the handout under “Finalizing Policy 1.2.12. Ms. Coombes questioned what works and does not work within the policy. Member Powell requested clarification if Table 1.2.12 was eliminated due to the previous meeting’s discussion. It was clarified that only the McCarran portion is gone.

[Member Langs arrived at 10:08 a.m.]

Ms. Coombes requested comments regarding Policy 1.2.12. Member Hester suggested changing “TOD corridors” to “TOD corridor station areas.”

Member Sullivan stated that the criteria to measure entities should be consistent with facility plans. Ms. Coombes stated that this item would fall under another portion of the discussion.

Member Ziegler referred to “the escape clause” and cited several project examples where they fell back on “deemed incompatible” because of density. Mr. Ziegler suggested wording Policy 1.2.12 to state: “Alternative residential density and non-residential FARs may be specified in designated portions of TOD Corridors, station areas, and centers if (1) high densities are deemed incompatible and (2) there will still be a functioning transit system.”

Derek Wilson, Jeff Codega Planning/Design, stated that the escape clause is necessary.

Member Ziegler suggested a third item: “...and (3) an intensification plan is provided.”

Ms. Coombes recapped the suggestions for changing the language.

There was some discussion regarding the need for development and infrastructure to be economical.

Member Freund asked if there is anything in the plan to encourage higher densities in the second tier away from the station to help support and reinforce the corridor and station nodes. Member Freund stated that he would like that included in the plan.

Ms. Coombes asked if that could be included in the discussion regarding qualitative elements. Member Freund replied yes. Member Ziegler suggested including the concept of buffering.

Ms. Coombes summarized the members’ comments and asked if the members were comfortable with the changes in the language. The members agreed with the changes.

Ms. Coombes asked the members to take some time to review Policy 1.2.9 and identify the concepts that work. The following comments were made: #8 – good; #5 – find some way to

support agencies; #1 – add station areas; #4 – unsure of “Best Practices” as it is not defined; #6 – add “Reno-Tahoe”; #7 and #8 – combine them, needs to be broader than just working with RTC; #9 – good; #10 – add station areas and add feathering out; and, streetscape idea is good.

Ms. Coombes asked what should be deleted. Member Powell suggested deleting #11 as it is redundant. Ms. Coombes clarified that the intent was to think broader. Member Powell stated that the intent is good and to leave #11.

Member Ziegler stated that #2 and #3 are never applied in a conformance review as they imply a quantitative analysis that is not known. Member Powell suggested that #2 and #3 could be applied to just the plan review and not the conformance review of an individual project. A brief discussion followed regarding affordability and the need for connectivity of jobs and housing.

Member Ziegler suggested not mixing quantitative and qualitative policies in the same policy. Member Ziegler stated that qualitative is mixed use and quantitative is pedestrian oriented. These TOD corridors will come together in 10 to 15 years and to build an expectation that a strict analysis would be applied every time is misleading.

Member Sullivan stated that a measurement tool is needed.

Member Ziegler stated that there is a need for leadership and coordination in the corridors so that everybody works together.

Ms. Coombes stated that the links in between, due to the modifications of 1.2.12, might rely solely on the qualitative elements in the policy unless something else is added.

Member Hester drew a diagram of a service area that included regional centers, station areas, and multi-modal connections to illustrate the need to look at the whole system and to have all the pieces work together.

Member Sullivan addressed the idea from a property owner standpoint and affordability and stated that there is a need for something for people that cannot afford it.

Ms. Coombes summarized the discussion and asked what needs to change with 1.2.9. Ms. Coombes captioned the comments by stating that the policy should move to capture station areas as well; clean up #11 regarding linkage to the community; add centers and station areas to #10; and, mixing qualitative and quantitative elements. Ms. Coombes asked if the policy should be restructured, tweaked, and/or looked at for mixing qualitative and quantitative elements and possibly moving or creating a new policy for that.

Member Sullivan stated that the quantitative elements do not belong in the policy, combine #7 and #8, and define #11 more. Member Sullivan stated that less is better.

Member Freund suggested adding a statement on the end of #4 to say “and immediately adjacent areas” and add it to #10 also. Member Freund suggested that “require” may not be the right word to use on #4 as it should be promoting and encouraging. Member Freund stated that County Code does not have a provision for mixed use. Member Freund suggested adding something or modifying #10 to include encouraging higher densities and intensities at the edge of and adjacent to TOD station areas where feasible to support TOD corridor goals.

Mr. Wilson asked if the vision of the graphic suggests it is a regional item approach. Member Hester replied yes. Member Hester suggested the need if #7 and #8 are combined to add “and include provisions for intensification as rapid transit becomes available.”

Ms. Coombes asked if the members were okay with the language and combination of #7 and #8. Ms. Coombes stated that we may need to talk with RTC about striking the consultation with them. Member Hester stated that he does not want RTC agreements mandatory for the development of TOD corridors. There was some discussion regarding consulting with RTC.

Ms. Coombes asked for additional modifications or additions. Mr. Rundle asked if there were quantitative statements for #9. Ms. Coombes replied no and explained that the concept of human scale was more of a qualitative design element. Member Powell read the definition of human scale and a brief discussion followed.

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

Ms. Coombes suggested that the members look at the background information for review and then discuss it at the next meeting. Ms. Coombes explained that information on population and employment growth have been pulled out from the material and asked the members to think about this topic for the next meeting’s discussion. Ms. Coombes also passed out information on EECs for the members to review for the next meeting’s discussion.

- 3) additional regional centers and extensions of existing TOD corridors

Ms. Coombes asked if the members wanted to talk about standards for secondary corridors at the next meeting. The members replied yes.

Ms. Coombes stated that the next meeting will be held on Thursday, July 6, 2006, from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by, Christine Birmingham

Reviewed by:


Rosanna Coombes, Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

FILED ON 2/22, 2008.