

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, February 17, 2006, 9:30 a.m.

Truckee Meadows Community College – Dandini Campus

Vista Building, Room B206

7000 Dandini Boulevard, Reno, NV

1. ROLL CALL

Rosanna Coombes, Senior Planner, opened the meeting at 9:35 a.m. A quorum was established.

PRESENT: David Anderson – Reno Sparks Indian Colony; Mike Boster – Washoe County School District; Debra Goodwin – Regional Transportation Commission; Claudia Hanson – Reno Community Development; Mark Harper – Washoe County Department of Community Development; Rob Joiner – City of Sparks and Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Margaret Reinhardt – Sun Valley General Improvement District; Jodi Royal-Goodwin – Reno Redevelopment and HOME Consortium; Mark Sullivan – Sierra Pacific Power Company; Dean Schultz – Reno Tahoe Airport Authority. Duane Sikorski – Washoe County District Health Department Air Quality Division, joined the meeting at 9:42 a.m. Hilary Lopez – Truckee Meadows Water Authority joined the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

ABSENT: Bill Bennett – Sierra Pacific Power Company; Greg Dennis – Regional Water Planning Commission; Robert Dickens – Nevada System of Higher Education; John Erwin – Truckee Meadows Water Authority; Adrian Freund – Washoe County Department of Community Development; Mike Genera – Waste Management; Andy Goodrich – Washoe County District Health Department Air Quality Division; John Hester – City of Reno; Diana Langs – Sun Valley General Improvement District; Robert Lichtenstein – Nevada System of Higher Education; Jack Lorbeer – Regional Transportation Commission; Greg Martinelli – Waste Management; Birnie McGavin – South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District; Scott Nebesky – Reno Sparks Indian Colony; Margaret Powell – City of Sparks and Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Robin Rose – Washoe County District Health Department Solid Waste Division; Jeanne Rucker – Washoe County District Health Department Solid Waste Division; Jeanne Ruefer – Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Jerry Schumacher – South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District; Wayne Siedel – Regional Water Planning Commission; Harold Shotwell – Palomino Valley General Improvement District; Jim Smitherman – Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Mark Stanton – Washoe County School District.

AGENCY STAFF PRESENT: Randy Baxley, Rosanna Coombes and Lora Richards.

ALSO PRESENT: Liz and John Howell, Robin Palmer, Patty Roggen and Arlo Stockham – CFA.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

It was moved by Mark Sullivan, seconded by Jodi Royal-Goodwin, to approve the February 17, 2006, meeting agenda, as written. MOTION CARRIED.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT*

Responding to Robin Palmer's inquiry about needing quorum for this particular meeting, Senior Planner Rosanna Coombes stated that a quorum of members was needed to conduct business.

Ms. Palmer then outlined her concern that a Washoe County area plan had not been completed in her area as yet.

Mike Harper, Washoe County Department of Community Development, explained that staffing constraints had delayed the process and suggested that he meet with Ms. Palmer after the meeting.

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

4-A. Initial consideration, educational presentations, and possible conceptual agreements on Module 1, Issue No. 4 – Boundaries for infill target areas – what's appropriate; how do we maintain community character?

Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, Inc., recalled the previous TAC (Technical Advisory Committee) meeting.

Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department Air Quality Division, joined the meeting at 9:42 a.m.

Ms. Schafer noted that Reno's Interim Planning Manager, Claudia Hanson, would provide the City of Reno's perspective on infill development. From that, Ms. Schafer recommends that the discussion focus on the scope of issues and service needs related to the Cities of Reno, Sparks and Washoe County perspectives on infill development. Toward the end of today's (February 17, 2006) meeting, TMRPA (Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency) staff will outline current Truckee Meadows Regional Plan policies followed by a brief presentation on infill development in other jurisdictions. Ms. Schafer noted that, in her opinion, the first priority is to identify the scope and then clarify the outstanding issues that may need further education.

Hilary Lopez, Truckee Meadows Water Authority, joined the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

Ms. Hanson provided a handout (copy on file) pertaining to Regional Center and TOD (Transit Oriented Development) Corridors, which intensifies density and intensity of uses in a transit oriented manner with pedestrian and human scale amenities to encourage the use of public transit and walkable neighborhoods. Typically, infill areas are identified as those neighborhoods that have been developed for thirty (30) or more years. In such areas new development may alter setbacks and buffering to reflect the character of the existing neighborhood. Currently, the City's code as it

relates to “granny flats” is on a fast-tracked review and update to determine which neighborhoods that type of development is appropriate.

Mike Harper – Washoe County Department of Community Development, suggested that a new definition of infill development is important should the McCarran ring be eliminated as the boundary.

Ms. Hanson suggested that infill development, though not appropriate in some neighborhoods, should focus along the Regional Centers, TOD’s and transit nodes, which she pointed out on the map (e.g., Virginia Street corridor).

Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department Air Quality Division, expressed his concern with the lack of setback in the downtown core, specifically the Washoe County District Court House and the Palladio development.

There was discussion about the definition of infill as well as the establishment of the McCarran Ring as the infill boundary. During the discussion it was suggested that other areas, such as the Pyramid Highway corridor may transition to a Regional Center in the future. Currently the City of Sparks is working with the RTC (Regional Transportation Commission) to assure that future needs are met. Therefore, while it may be premature to at Pyramid as a Regional Center in the 2007 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan update, it may be added to the next update.

Mr. Harper noted concerns about establishment of arbitrary boundaries for infill development. As the region continues to expand, different housing and employment opportunities need to be identified and developed to assure that necessary commercial/retail services are provided. Additionally, there may be some instances where large lot development is appropriate within an urban core.

Discussion the noted that infill development is generally intended to help close a development gap. Other discussion noted that historic preservation is another important consideration and that the existing McCarran ring boundary has not worked well.

Rob Joiner, City of Sparks/Sparks Redevelopment Agency, noted that the region appears to be on the proper course based on presentations by Smart Growth subject matter experts. Mr. Joiner noted that in some areas of Sparks it may be appropriate to downzone certain properties in older neighborhoods to preserve the more affordable bungalow housing style.

Rosanna Coombes, Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency, commented that the boundaries are always up for discussion and that whatever boundary is decided should be realistic and workable. If some concern is that the lack of an established boundary might not provide sufficient direction for service and infrastructure providers on where future development may occur.

Mr. Harper noted that while he does not disagree with Ms. Coombes, it is unclear how the 65/35 ratio in the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan could be accomplished.

Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Company, noted that the cost to provide services is significantly higher for large lot development compared to higher density development. It appears the large lot development in the outlying areas that may ultimately be annexed by one of the Cities may be

somewhat shortsighted. Therefore, the long term provision of infrastructure should, in his opinion, be provided by a limited number of entities.

Mr. Sikorski commented that without a boundary, infill development is difficult to grasp.

Ms. Coombes suggested that the existing policies and definitions be reviewed and where appropriate corridors and centers realigned.

Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission, noted that the current model used by the RTC has higher density within the McCarran ring and that roadways and bus routes are not necessarily planned for other areas. However, Ms. Goodwin agrees that the McCarran ring is not an appropriate boundary.

Arlo Stockham, CFA, explained that while he is not with a developer, his employer represents a number of developers in the region. Mr. Stockham explained that, in his opinion, the region needs to understand that the change suggested in development of TOD's will not occur overnight. Drawing attention to the number of individuals that did not use public transit to come to the meeting, Mr. Stockham pointed out that infill development is a range of gray areas and that months have been spent discussing boundaries. Therefore, it is Mr. Stockham's belief that the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan should focus on QOL (Quality of Life) issues such as trail connectivity, open space and other aspects of the Truckee Meadows lifestyle that has made it so attractive to developers and businesses. Mr. Stockham noted that the major concern of a developer is the barriers imposed by zoning and infrastructure rehabilitation. It is crucial, in his opinion, that a comprehensive analysis of existing infrastructure including expansion and rehabilitation be done on a regional basis to assure that sewer, water and electrical service needs can be met. Additionally, it appears that a developer would support an impact fee similar to the Regional Road Impact Fee Program that would cover the cost of infrastructure rehabilitation (e.g., undersized or crumbling sewer lines). Typically, the expenses of such rehabilitation are not known until after development commences. Mr. Stockham suggested that clear policy frameworks are needed to support infill development and that developers would be willing to participate in an equitable process to assure that appropriate infrastructure is in place.

During the discussion it was noted that the membership represented might not be wholly representative of the community and that home ownership in the Truckee Meadows is ± 10 -percent lower than the national average. Other discussion noted the equity issues associated with the region's schools with the lack of funding available to rehabilitate older schools.

The meeting recessed at 10:44 a.m. and reconvened at 10:51 a.m.

4-B. Review of priority list of issues for the 2007 Regional Plan update, including possible identification of additional issues or qualifiers.

Rosanna Coombes, Senior Planner, provided a handout (copy on file) and read a portion of the handout into the record. Drawing attention to the general language in the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, Ms. Coombes explained that while existing infill policies in the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan may need revision, it is crucial that specific definitions, policies and implementation procedures need to be developed.

Claudia Hanson, City of Reno, left the meeting at 11:05 a.m.

Ms. Coombes provided another handout (copy on file) showing infill projects in other jurisdictions and introduced Lora Richards.

Lora Richards, Planning Analyst, narrated a PowerPoint presentation (copy on file) showing a variety of infill projects. Ms. Richards drew attention to the specific standards and transit oriented node with more intense develop and pedestrian friendly amenities.

Rob Joiner, City of Sparks/Sparks Redevelopment Agency, left the meeting at 11:11 a.m.

Ms. Richards noted that in some jurisdictions storm water detention facilities include fountains and other amenities as well as a variety of housing products (e.g., condominium and Townhomes). Ms. Richards noted that Portland (Oregon) provide a “textbook” example of infill development using light rail, mixed use development and other design criteria.

Mr. Joiner rejoined the meeting at 11:14 a.m.

Ms. Richard commented that the different housing products depicted in the presentation include ground floor commercial/retail as well as a range of affordable housing opportunities.

Mike Harper, Washoe County Department of Community Development, noted that it is difficult to market certain development without sufficient parking. Although it is not uncommon to pay extra for parking in the City of San Francisco, California, the single occupant vehicle culture has not left the Truckee Meadows as yet.

Ms. Richards then noted infill develop styles used in San Jose, California and noted the narrow travel lanes, which reduces speeding and an average of 21-dwelling units per acre density.

Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Company, left the meeting at 11:18 a.m.

Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, Inc., expressed her appreciation to Arlo Stockham for providing his thoughts and perspective on the current Truckee Meadows Regional Plan.

5. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

No new agenda items were identified.

6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE*

There was no written correspondence.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned 11:20 a.m.