

TAC Members

The HOME Consortium
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 School District
Waste Management, Inc.

MINUTES

2007 REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE Thursday, October 6, 2005

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met in the Northwest Reno Library, 2325 Robb Drive, Room 139 A&B, Reno, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Dave Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning, at 1:40 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and TAC Members in attendance were: John Hester, City of Reno; Rob Joiner for Margaret Powell, City of Sparks and Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Harold Shotwell, Palomino Valley GID; Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Dean Schultz, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority; Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID; Mike Harper for Adrian Freund, Washoe County; Jim Smitherman for Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department (Air Quality); Mike Boster for Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District; and Dave Ziegler, Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency.

Member Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Department of Water Resources, arrived at 1:47 p.m. Member Margaret Powell, City of Sparks and Sparks Redevelopment Agency, arrived at 2:12 p.m.

Members absent were: Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment Agency and HOME Consortium; Scott Nebesky, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Co.; Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; John Erwin, Truckee Meadows Water Authority; Robert Lichtenstein, UCCSN; Adrian Freund, Washoe County; Jeanne Rucker, Washoe County District Health Department (Solid Waste); Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District; and Greg Martinelli, Waste Management.

Also present were: Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA; Patricia Rogers, TMRPA; and Lora Richards, TMRPA.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER BOSTER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 6, 2005, TAC AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER SCHULTZ. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ELEVEN (11) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. September 16, 2005

Approval of the September 16, 2005, TAC minutes will be moved to the next TAC meeting so that the members have more time to review the minutes.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

- A. Review and discussion of the outcomes of the September 28, 2005, joint workshop of the Regional Planning Commission, Regional Planning Governing Board, and Technical Advisory Committee.

Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, reviewed the objectives for today's meeting.

[Jeanne Ruefer arrived at 1:47 p.m.]

Ms. Schafer stated that the issues and qualifiers for each module were reviewed and prioritized during the joint workshop.

John Hester stated that the process used at the joint workshop was a good process to get consensus on the ranking. Ms. Schafer stated that the main goal is to try and get consensus every step of the way in the process.

Mike Harper asked about the qualifiers under each issues. Ms. Schafer responded that a large majority of the qualifiers were the qualifiers that came from the TAC. Some additional qualifiers came from the other entities.

Mr. Harper asked if the ranking came solely from the joint workshop. Ms. Schafer responded yes and stated that this process is fluid and the priorities can be changed by the TAC with consensus.

Rob Joiner stated that all of the issues will be addressed and that the prioritizing just determines in what order they are addressed.

Jerry Schumacher asked if the public was involved in prioritizing the issues. Ms. Schafer responded yes and stated that there were not enough members of the public present at the joint workshop to skew the results.

- B. Consideration of goals and policies related to Module 1, regional form and pattern:

- 1) Review of 2002 Regional Plan goals and policies and status of implementation by local governments and affected entities

Ms. Schafer stressed the importance that the TAC has as much background and education materials as possible before making decisions within an issue or module. Ms. Schafer stated that each entity present will now have an opportunity to speak regarding successes in the implementation of issues under module 1 of the current Regional Plan.

Mr. Hester reviewed the status of regional center plans and TOD corridors for the City of Reno. Mr. Hester reviewed the status of high density development projects.

Mr. Ziegler reviewed information from the annual report regarding development within the TMSA, infill, and office development. Mr. Ziegler commented on a number of infill housing developments in Sparks. Mr. Ziegler encourage everyone to look at the annual report for more information on what has been going on in the land use area since the adoption of the Regional Plan.

[Margaret Powell arrived at 2:12 p.m.]

Mr. Joiner reviewed the infill projects in Sparks. The City of Sparks is supporting the existing housing stock. The City of Sparks is working well in the cooperative planning process with Washoe County to develop the East Truckee River Canyon into a mixed use area.

Mr. Harper stated that one of the successes for Washoe County is working with the City of Sparks on the East Truckee River Canyon plan. The County spent a considerable amount of time reorienting its entire focus of its area plans. Mr. Harper stated that they have stepped away from the concept that the County is a rural or large lot development area only and moved toward a model of creating a village concept. The County is making its area plans unique to the areas. Mr. Harper stated that the County has worked with the Bureau of Land Management and US Forest Service over the past 3 years and has been able to rezone most of their property to open space.

2) Review of issues and priorities identified in the pre-update process

Ms. Schafer stated that the preliminary issue prioritization stage of this process has already been completed. Even if the prioritization changes, it is critical to have the prioritization up front. The next stage is the TAC decision making process.

[Recess from 2:30 p.m. to 2:40 p.m.]

3) Discussion of process for resolving issues

Ms. Schafer reviewed a potential decision making process for the TAC. The decision process will be repeated for each module. The first critical step is that the TAC must have the background information and education necessary to make meaningful and solid decisions. Entities and individuals then need to identify concerns or what needs to happen in a particular issue in order to feel comfortable to go to the next step in making a decision. If there is something in a particular issue that an entity or individual can not live with, you need to be accountable for bringing that to the table early on so it can be addressed. The next step is working as a group to reach decisions and consensus. Ms. Schafer recommended breaking into small groups for discussions and then returning to the whole group for final decisions. One reason small groups work well is because people participate more. The next step is that the TAC recommendations for the Regional Plan will go to the Regional Planning staff to be incorporated into the plan. The TAC will review the changes made to the plan by Regional Planning staff before they go to the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) and the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB). Ms. Schafer asked for feed back on this proposed decision making process.

Mr. Ziegler expressed support for this process. It is important to recognize that each TAC member is here representing a constituency and needs to keep checking back with their decision makers during this process. The Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) will keep the RPC in the loop because they are the ones required by statute to propose the update to the plan.

Mr. Hester asked if it was the original intention to bring each module to the RPC for review and approval. Ms. Schafer responded yes. Rosanna Coombes, Senior Planner, stated that the plan is for the RPC to have a public hearing on what is being proposed at each stage for each module.

Mr. Hester stated that after each of the four modules are done, there will be a fifth process. Ms. Coombes responded yes. There needs to be a process at the end where we can go back and make sure there are not any gaps or overlaps when you look at it as a whole.

Dean Schultz asked how the small groups would work when discussing various issues that may affect only certain entities. Ms. Schafer responded that there may be issues where the TAC will say we are not going to go in a small group. The facilitator needs to be fluid enough to be able to do that.

Margaret Powell expressed concern regarding stakeholders that are not around the table and how to involve the individual property owner. Ms. Schafer added a qualifier to the list to outline a process for getting successful public input.

The TAC agreed to use the small group discussions in the suggested decision making process.

- 4) Consideration of and possible conceptual agreement on high-priority issues including, without limitation, locations of service area boundaries and infill target areas

Mr. Ziegler stated that the TAC will address the issue of the boundaries of the TMSA at the next meeting.

Mr. Ziegler stated that information regarding AB425 is included in the meeting packet.

6. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Hester asked that the annexation settlement agreement be included in the next TAC meeting packet. It was also requested that it be posted to the TMRPA website.

Ms. Schafer urged TAC members to email requests for information ahead of time so they can have it as education material before addressing issues.

Mr. Hester asked about the TAC meeting schedule. Mr. Ziegler responded that the TAC decided to meet on the first and third Thursday afternoon in October. At the next meeting, we need to decide on a schedule for November and December.

7. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

David S. Ziegler, Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

**APPROVED BY THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN SESSION ON
_____, 2005.**