

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
Thursday, July 6, 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 Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, at 1:32 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and TAC Infill Subcommittee Members in attendance were: Adrian Freund, Washoe County; Jim Rundle, City of Sparks; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Co.; and Rosanna Coombes, Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA). Member John Hester, City of Reno, arrived at 1:50 p.m.

Members absent: Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; and Deborah Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission.

Also present: Dee Schafer, Corporate Solution, Inc., who was the facilitator for the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER SULLIVAN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JULY 6, 2006, TAC SUBCOMMITTEE ON INFILL AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER FREUND. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH FOUR (4) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, Inc., reviewed the last session whereas the Subcommittee reached a conceptual agreement with regard to items 1.2.1, 1.2.9 and 1.2.12. Ms. Schafer informed the Members that TMRPA staff will assemble all conceptual agreements by the Infill Subcommittee for presentation and approval at the next meeting. The last item for review and discussion is Issue #10. All recommendations will be forward to the TAC at their first meeting in August 2006.

Ms. Schafer reviewed the objectives for today's meeting. The issues included determining the role of the secondary corridor in relation to the Regional Plan and the use of enabling language not restrictive language.

Member Freund presented information regarding the goals and purpose of secondary transit corridors based on his research of secondary transit corridors located in the cities of Corvallis, Oregon and Arlington, Virginia. Secondary transit corridors: help provide coverage and connectivity for transit throughout the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA); provide access to primary TOD corridors; and support the function and role of the primary corridors without conflicting with goals. Member Freund explained further that they are in essence feeder routes to provide transit and passengers to support the primary corridors. They also provide access to the primary corridors for travel back into the community. Additionally, they provide support and compliment land uses in the primary corridor but not necessarily located on the primary corridor.

Member Rundle asked about the necessity for secondary corridors to attach to a primary TOD.

Member Coombes commented that if functions were similar to a TOD corridor with regard to transit, land uses, and the community, then an isolated corridor in terms of land use would not mean isolated in terms of transit facilities since some fashion of connecting service would be available.

After some discussion it was concluded that "connectivity" could have a wide variety of definitions such as a multi-modal. Member Coombes commented that the key is the interaction and relationship to surrounding areas whether a TOD corridor, neighborhood or community.

Member Rundle requested the goals not be restrictive in secondary corridors.

Ms. Schafer asked what type of enabling language could be used in the plan to support the concepts of multi-modal for broader connectivity.

Member Coombes stated that in most places in the plan where something is required, the word "must" is used. She suggested in this case replacing the word "must" with the word "may" since it is enabling. This would then allow for the opportunity to nominate and provide characteristics.

Member Freund provided examples of performance standards discovered in his research. He was not in favor of incorporating rigid performance standards; however, reasonable criteria would be suitable. He stated that standards were difficult to develop at this time without a point of reference and suggested local levels develop the standards in their master plans.

[Member Hester arrived at 1:50 p.m.]

Members discussed enabling language with broader characteristics and criteria that enabled natural transformation. This would allow the local levels to define further broader characteristic.

Mr. Codega recommended that regional centers and primary corridors in new developments incorporate various types of centers within that area.

Member Hester stated that he would like to see enabling language.

Member Coombes suggested extracting concepts in the Regional Plan addressing TOD corridors to use as tools for secondary transit corridors. The concepts have quality and may be supplemented to be more specific for review by the Subcommittee as part of the conceptual agreement.

MODULE #1 ISSUE #6

Ms. Schafer stated the next items for review are population growth and emerging employment centers. Members were asked to respond to three (3) questions utilizing documents provided for review and discussion. The questions for response were: 1) Does it stay as it is in the Regional Plan; 2) Should it go away completely; and, 3) Should it be refined?

There was some discussion regarding the need to change population numbers. There is a requirement that the Regional Plan make some statement about population. There was discussion regarding the consensus forecast and the use of a placeholder until the data is available. Member Hester suggested adding 10,000 per year to the 2005 estimations. It was agreed by Members to use this formula.

Ms. Schafer directed Members to page 2 B (4) Regional Form and Pattern to review.

Member Coombes stated that Table 1.2.1 originally provided a conceptual distribution of population and addressed intensification in centers and corridors. If the table will not be utilized, then it does not make sense to state the Regional Plan will provide a desired distribution of population.

After some discussion, Member Coombes suggested changing the language to read "The regional intensifying downtown centers, regional centers and TOD corridors to accommodate the increasing population and growth over the next 20 years."

Member Hester stated that it is the highest priority for development and intensification.

Members agreed to change the language as suggested and to add EECs and secondary corridors.

GOAL 1.1

Members reviewed this section and decided to change the language "Truckee Meadows Service Area" to "Municipal Service Area". It was also decided to change the date "2007" to "2030".

POLICY 1.1.1

Member Coombes stated this policy was never implemented. After some discussion, it was decided to revisit this item under Module 3.

POLICY 1.1.2

Ms. Schafer asked if this policy should be changed or eliminated since Policy 1.2.1 is to be eliminated. Member Coombes stated that the modifying the table was discussed, not doing away with it.

Member Coombes stated that the intent of the goals and policies was to provide guidance and conformance standards in order to create an urban footprint with definition that included an agreed pattern within that footprint. Member Coombes stated that she is in favor of simplification but clarity is the important part.

Ms. Schafer briefly reviewed previous discussions and recommended moving forward with other consensus decisions, find where they fit in the chart, revise the chart and then discuss amending the language.

POLICY 1.1.12

No changes were made to Policy 1.1.12

GOAL 1.2

Ms. Schafer asked the Members to review this section for discussion and noted that the dates must be changed.

Member Hester suggested having 99% of all the population and employment growth measured in terms of residential and non-residential development be within the metropolitan service area.

Members discussed standards and concluded: To change the dates; to set the standard as 4 persons per acre; to set the standard for FAR as .25; to set the minimum residential densities for new development as 18 units per acre; and to leave the escape clause in place.

Ms. Schafer discussed completing all reviews and discussions at the next meeting. Members scheduled the next meeting for Friday, July 21, 2006, immediately after the Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by, Christine Birmingham

Reviewed by:



Rosanna Coombes, Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

FILED ON 2/22, 2008.