

**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  
Tuesday, May 30, 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 10:15 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 & Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Roger Hanson sitting in for Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Company; Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; and, Adrian Freund, Washoe County

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) staff present were: 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; Sue Doyles, Reno Gazette/Journal; and Jim Nadeau, Nevada Representative. Marilyn Gross was also present to take the Minutes.

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MEMBER FREUND MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MAY 30, 2006, TAC SUBCOMMITTEE ON INFILL AGENDA. SECONDED BY MEMBER HESTER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH FIVE (5) MEMBERS PRESENT.**

Member Powell questioned if the Regional Center and the TOD Corridor were to be added to the agenda. Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, replied that it has been added within the scope, but may not be discussed on this particular agenda, due to the meeting length. Mr. Ziegler stated that West Fourth Street and Boomtown may also be included for discussion.

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment requests presented.

#### **4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY**

Ms. Schafer reviewed the objectives for today's meeting. Ms. Schafer reported that today's discussion will be on the following: define work scope of subcommittee; define the purpose of the subcommittee; discuss standards, measurements, criteria as they exist; and, Goal 1.2, Table 1.2.1, and Policy 1.2.12. Ms. Schafer reviewed the work scope for the meeting, which is Module 1, issues #4, #6, and #10.

- A. Discussion, and consideration of infill issues, including possible recommendations to the 2007 Regional Plan Update TAC, on 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 a handout for the subcommittee's review and requested that the members identify missing items that are critical for the work scope. The following items were mentioned: issue of secondary corridors; West Fourth Street and Boomtown; purpose of the group to establish specific measurable standards to use down the road; absorption and making sure land use plans and transit plans reinforce each other; define what infill is; talk about the concept of nodes and transition within the corridor; where blobs, clumps, and opportunities fall under; place-making standards; opportunities with unincorporated parcels near transit corridors; Goal 1.3, which could be brought up in the discussion due to overlap; and, minimums that are higher.

Ms. Schafer stated that the purpose is to define, develop, and establish standards, criteria, and measurement tools. Ms. Schafer requested additional comments and thoughts regarding the purpose. The following comments were made: define infill as it relates to locations; separate definition of infill by subcategories; set absorption standards; areas with separate criteria with different incentives; complimentary opportunities that would support the Regional Plan; opportunities, incentives, and visions; and, subcommittee is getting too detailed for regional planning.

Ms. Schafer questioned if the comments fit the subcommittee's purpose.

Mr. Ziegler replied no. Mr. Ziegler explained that one purpose of the subcommittee is to develop specific standards and criteria, which is part of the conceptual agreement.

Ms. Schafer requested to know if there was a way to combine the conceptual agreement and the vision. A brief discussion followed regarding measurable standards, incentives, and if other plans follow the regional plan.

Ms. Schafer requested comments from the members pertaining to the purpose of the subcommittee. The following comments were made: the comments were adding to, not supplanting; measurements come from local jurisdictions; items are consistent with opportunities, incentives, and vision; and, do not lose sight of vision.

Ms. Schafer requested to know how the standards are currently utilized within the Regional Plan, such as alignment, conformance, etc. and if there are other ideas. The following comments were made: used for conformance review; predictability and infrastructure (incentive); keeping track of whatever needs to be kept track of; use of existing plan as a criteria; and infill versus redevelopment infill.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the Facilities Plan is more than just Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County. Mr. Ziegler commented that facilities means more than one plan.

At this point in the meeting (at approximately 11:05 a.m.), Ms. Schafer called for a five-minute break. The meeting was re-called to order at 11:10 a.m. Member Freund returned at 11:12 a.m. and Member Langs returned at 11:15 a.m.

Ms. Schafer passed out Goal 1.2, Policy 1.2.1, and Table 1.2.1 for the members' review. Ms. Schafer requested to know what works, what does not work and why and how those standards, criteria, measurements, and tools should be redefined based on the previous discussion.

Member Powell suggested using two components, measurement and areas, when determining ideas.

Mr. Ziegler suggested that the table addresses population and jobs growth.

Ms. Schafer asked what works. The following comments were made: the idea of more intensity in the centers and corridors; the idea of identifying specific areas and trying to meet the specifications; set of standards for long term analysis; and, cooperation of all the entities.

Ms. Schafer asked what does not work with the table 1.2.1. The following comments were made: how to measure jobs and has not driven conformance review.

Ms. Schafer asked if the table has been a hindrance. Member Freund stated that reference in the table to area outside the McCarran ring has been a hindrance due to the fact that it has not sold projects that represent good opportunities out in the community.

Mr. Codega stated that the best infill opportunities lie outside the McCarran ring.

Roger Hanson questioned how you control the percentage in any category. Ms. Schafer explained that it is a measurement tool. A brief discussion followed.

Member Hester requested to remove Table 1.2.1 in its present form and re-orient to an overall density floor area ratio Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and dwelling units per acre before expanding the TMSA and the centers and corridors. Member Sullivan agreed.

Ms. Schafer asked if the members agreed.

Mr. Ziegler stated that he agrees with Member Hester, but cautioned that the subcommittee stays within the consensus model.

Ms. Schafer asked for additional comments on the current table. Member Powell stated that Policy 1.2.2 is a companion piece to Table 1.2.1 as it pulls out every part of town.

Member Freund suggested that Policy 1.2.2 may spill over into nodes.

Ms. Schafer asked if the members are comfortable to start the discussion on changes beginning with overall density, density, and corridors, as well as other measurement standards as identified. Ms. Schafer asked if the change discussion could begin.

Mr. Ziegler asked if there could be a standard for mixed use, as multiple and mixed use are not the same. Mr. Ziegler suggested keeping nodes and transition standards in mind.

Member Powell stated that these are good areas; however, she suggested that the constraints in Sparks are different than in other areas.

Member Hester suggested that Policy 1.2.9 addresses qualitative measures. A brief discussion followed.

Ms. Schafer asked if the members are comfortable with starting the discussion with overall density. Ms. Coombes stated that the Technical Advisory Committee already has a conceptual agreement concerning density.

Mr. Ziegler suggested that a discussion is a good idea to take it to the next level, but not to rehash what has already been discussed.

Member Freund asked the meaning of overall density. A brief discussion followed; it was decided that another meeting is necessary to discuss overall density.

At this point in the meeting (at approximately 11:45 a.m.), Member Powell left the meeting.

Member Hester defined overall density as the three parts of TMSA together depending upon jurisdiction.

Member Langs asked about the four-persons-per-acre standard and how it relates. Mr. Ziegler stated that information could be provided prior to or at the next meeting. Member Freund stated that it only works in the context of the entire TMSA.

Ms. Schafer requested to know if the members are comfortable with talking about overall density and that it is three parts together and individually when talking about the TMSA depending upon jurisdiction.

Mr. Ziegler reserved the right to come back to this discussion as necessary. Mr. Ziegler stated that he does not want to be locked in.

At this point in the meeting (at approximately 11:47 p.m.), Member Hester left the meeting.

Ms. Schafer stated that the next meeting will be held on June 7, 2006 at 1:00 p.m.

## **5. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

**MEMBER LANGS MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. SECONDED BY MEMBER SULLIVAN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Respectfully submitted,

APPROVED:

---

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director  
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

**FILED ON**

---

\_\_\_\_\_, 2007.