

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, July 21, 2006**

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met in the Truckee Meadows Community College – Dandini Campus Vista Building, Room B206, Reno, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, at 8:47 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; Jim Rundle, Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Harold Shotwell, Palomino Valley GID; Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment and HOME Consortium; Dean Schultz, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority; Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID; Patty Bakka (non-voting) for Adrian Freund, Washoe County; Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Mike Boster for Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Company; and Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA. Member Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department (Air Quality), arrived at 9:00 a.m. Member Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; arrived at 9:28 a.m.

Members absent: Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Scott Nebesky, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; Greg Dennis, Regional Water Planning Commission; John Erwin, Truckee Meadows Water Authority; Robert Lichtenstein, Nevada System of Higher Education; Jeanne Rucker, Washoe County District Health Dept. (Solid Waste); and, Greg Martinelli, Waste Management.

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) staff present: Patty Rogers and Lora Richards.

Also present was Dee Schafer from Corporate Solutions, Inc., who was the facilitator for the meeting. Bill Von Phul, Washoe County Parks Commission; Jeff Codega, Jeff Codega Planning/Design; Arlo Stockham, CFA, Inc.; Ginger Pierce; Tina Nappe; Victor Villarreal, City of Sparks; Derek Wilson; and Trevor Lloyd.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER SHOTWELL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JULY 21, 2006, TAC AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER POWELL. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ELEVEN (11) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Bill Von Phul expressed concerns and stated the importance of Module #2 as it relates to the future of the Truckee Meadows. He requested plan amendments to be iron clad with regard to concurrence. Mr. Von Phul commented that open space, trails and trail corridors offer constraints to developers reducing development profits. Development should be porous, allowing pedestrian and bicyclist to travel through neighborhoods without funneling to busy traffic corridors. He opposed fenced developments that restrict travel and pose a danger to wildlife.

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

A. Discussion and consideration of:

- 1) Module 2, Issue #1 – Ensure master plans operate within the constraints of natural resources and recognize the policies regarding same in the Regional Water Management Plan; measure and monitor capacity of natural resources and determine whether there should be additional criteria for the Development Constraints Area (DCA).
- 2) Module #2, Issue #2 – Ensure plan preserves access to and adequate and appropriate open space, river, stream corridors and trails.

Dee Schafer reviewed the objectives for today's meeting, which included finalizing the Conceptual Agreement for Module #2, Issue #1 and to review Module #2, Issue #2, scope the issues and identify agency needs. Members will form small groups to review the current plan utilizing the issues and the agency needs to discover what conceptually can be kept, what should be eliminated and what should be changed with regard to that natural resource issue. The last objective for the day is to review the work process and recommendations for Module #3.

A brief discussion was held concerning the procedures for policy language and discussion material. Member Coombes suggested leaving elements in Module #1 until recommendations are received from the TAC Infill Subcommittee which may accomplish objectives.

Ms. Schafer started the discussions with the Conceptual Agreements (a copy provided to Members in the meeting packet) and finalizing Module #2, Issue #1.

Rosanna Coombes reviewed the Conceptual Agreements proposed at the last meeting:

1. A new principle was suggested and all Members agreed to use the principle without any changes (page 2);
2. The amendments to the "New Goals and Associated Policies" lists were to change the language "recreational areas" to "recreation management/uses," and to add "Wellhead protection" (page 3); and,
3. A new paragraph adding emphasis on including a communication strategy to ensure in the conservation plan there is some mechanism for open communication with regard to natural resource issues (page 3).

Ms. Coombes recommended making conceptual changes now and then moving on to highlight specific language to capture in the drafting process of policies and goals.

Member Hester asked about the term “conservation element” in the New Goals and Associated Policies. A discussion was held regarding the necessity to address conservation elements in the Regional Plan if already addressed at the local levels. Members agreed to change the language “conservation element” to “a conservation plan” (page 3).

Member Powell expressed concern with changes and the original intent of the language “communication strategy.” Ms. Schafer suggested adding language in a parenthesis after “communication strategy” such as “(to ensure broad stakeholder participation).” Members agreed with the addition of language in a parenthesis (page 3).

Members discussed the new principle (page 2). Member Reufer asked how the Regional Plan would coordinate with other plans. Member Coombes stated conformance review is the only mechanism to coordinate master plans. Ms. Schafer suggested adding language for clarification, such as “The Regional Plan will coordinate through conformance review”. Member Schultz stated the airport authority does not provide an annual resource plan and asked if this was applicable. Member Coombes stated that the language addresses local master plans only.

Member Coombes reviewed the deletion of Policy 2.4.4 on page 8, as agreed by Members. The study referred to in the policy was complete, and the policy is inactive. She addressed the possible work program adjustments and the items suggested by the small group work that might impact the work program of the Regional Plan as an agency. The items did not rise to the level of needing policy in the Regional Plan since they are more of a conformance review tool. Suggestions made for work program amendments subject to the Regional Plan Governing Board work program and budget approval were: a) Preparing an inventory of regulations that apply to natural resource management; b) To provide a regional data center regarding natural resources; and, c) to better coordinate natural resource planning surrounding jurisdictions (page 10).

Member Hester acknowledged that some items should be policy and set the stage for planning. Members addressed Policy 2.5.1 and Member Coombes made a recommendation to place issues that may rise to policy level in Section 2. Members agreed with the recommendation.

Members discussed Policy 2.2.1.3 (page 5) with regard to protecting the function process and adverse effects on the community. It was decided to change for clarification “recharge areas are protected; and . . .” to “aquifer recharge functions are protected; and . . .”

[Member Diana Langs arrived at 9:28 a.m.]

Member Hester addressed Policy 2.3.1 noting the opposition by voters when presented with this issue by the County. Ms. Schafer recommended and it was agreed upon to place the policy in the scope of Module #2, Issue #2. Members agreed to add “coordinated effort” to Policy 2.3.1.

Member Dennis suggested a mechanism to encourage the community to use possible land exchanges get open space for transit-type areas. Ms. Schafer recommended adding this to the scope of Module #2, Issue #2 to be drafted for review.

Ms. Schafer directed Members to Module #2, Issue #2. Ms. Schafer addressed Member Powell’s request to know if Module #2, Issue 2 was different from Issue #1 and if it should be addressed separately.

Member Hester recommended if the issues were separate, then items should be pulled out from Module #2, Issue #1. He agreed it was sensible to combine the issues and to address working with federal agencies. Member Powell stated her concern with specifically identifying land exchanges for open space and requested that it not be restrictive since there are other various land exchange options and tools available that shouldn't be precluded.

Arlo Stockham suggested the use of broad language in order to not limit activities regarding preserving open space to just Federal collaboration. He agreed to provide proposed language.

Tina Nappe addressed the need for shared management of the urban interface. She explained the coordination and funding of the management by local governments in situations where adjacent areas are shared by governments. The governments will enter into a cooperative agreement for the protection of resources. She expressed her interest with government investing in management and the need to be proactive. Ms. Nappe suggested using language such as fiscal investment, shared costs and cost sharing.

After some discussion, Ms. Schafer recommended that small groups review and make recommendations for Policy 2.3 through Policy 2.3.4.

[Ms. Schafer called a ten minute break at 9:47 a.m. The meeting was called back to order at 10:00 a.m.]

[Member Sikorski left.]

Ms. Schafer announced the session would begin with small group work. Ms. Schafer reviewed the directions for the groups and they were given approximately 20-30 minutes to work.

Ms. Schafer asked each group to present their findings. The following individuals were in each group: Group 1 consisted of Members Dennis, Langs, Shotwell, Schumacher and Coombes; Group 2 consisted of Members Rundle, Schultz, Hester, Boster and Royal-Goodwin; and, Group 3 consisted of Members Powell, Sullivan, Ruefer, and Bakka.

Group 1 provided a brief overview of their discussion and provided recommendations which included:

The group's goal was to change encouraging Washoe County to encouraging all stakeholders to participate in developing and revising their master plans to incorporate green and open space where possible; to pursue linked plans; and to include coordination of planning management and implementation of master plans.

Policy 2.3.1 was identified as a funding policy that should be more inclusive to include coordination of efforts with all stakeholders for funding sources and to encourage all stakeholders to participate.

Policy 2.3.2 was identified as an implementation policy. The group decision was to make implementing an open space plan mandatory by changing the language "encourage" to "will" and to include language that ensures that it occurs. Discussion included establishing a time to implement an open space plan or to regard it as an ongoing process. The group identified a need for a policy to address ongoing management and maintenance needs in the open space urban interface areas and to identify who is responsible.

Policy 2.3.3 addresses the adoption of a plan by reference. This may be problematic since referenced areas seldom get referred to.

Policy 2.3.4 creates a network of access points. It was suggested to include the connectivity concept in the policy; however, some individuals felt it was not necessary since it existed in other areas.

Member Coombes discussed the language "adoption by reference" and questioned deleting the language severing the relationship between the Regional Plan and the Open Space Plan.

Member Powell discussed the process of creating a coordinated effort with the commitment to adopt plans, which should eliminate the need to adopt by reference.

Group 2 reviewed their discussion which included:

Policy 2.3 Open space includes incorporated and unincorporated areas; and broader coordination between public and private entities.

Policy 2.3.1 Addressing specific funding plans and Policy 2.3.4 which addresses revitalization of infill necessitates open space acquisition.

Policy 2.3.3 Open Space Plan to Address Infill. There is a necessity to discover how this issue can address the core of city and how the Open Space Plan and mass transit connectivity will work.

Policy 2.3.4 Revitalization of infill and the necessity for open space acquisitions - Discussion held concerned the types of urban parks and spaces that require public funding and urban open space as part of TOD corridors.

Group 3 gave a brief overview of their discussion, which included the following items:

The concepts in this goal should be coordinated efforts with counties, cities, districts, state, federal, and private sectors that include a center with accountability, to form an urban interconnected system, and to incorporate protecting natural resources.

Policy 1 Planning - Through the conformance review process, the Regional Plan should address the city, county and school districts plan for consistency. The state and federal levels should be coordinated with local levels and open space development should also be incorporated.

Policy 2 Area Facility Acquisition - Use a wide range of funding mechanisms. Develop review process for local governments. Landowner partnerships for exchanges and transfer of developments.

Policy 3 Management - Fire, vandalism, access, firearms, maintenance, funding, recreation, public information, natural resources, maintenance, law enforcement.

Discussion included the Regional Plan encouraging the management list and the mechanism used for conformance in the plan.

Tina Nappe commented on the importance of Washoe County acting as the lead, as well as a coordinating entity for funding purposes. Ms. Nappe stated that acquisition and development often go together. She suggested a coordinating format for use by all three governments to comply with the Regional Plan.

Ms. Schafer addressed the objectives for the next session. Members will be provided with a copy of the final recommendations from the TAC Infill Subcommittee and a copy of the conceptual language contained in the issues discussed today. Ms. Schafer stated Module #3 would be reviewed to identify areas that need to be addressed by the TAC and recommendations.

Member Coombes noted that the Affordable Housing Issue White Paper is nearing completion by the consultant and will be available for the second meeting in August. In addition, the Growth Task Force may also be available.

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

Member Coombes stated that the Members were provided with a list of issues to review for modifications. She asked the Members to add, delete or make changes to the list and return them for review with Module #3.

5. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Tina Nappe addressed a County policy to support alternative energy sources as a priority and energy savings development. She asked to know if this would be of interest. Member Coombes stated that she would address the topic at a future meeting.

6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by, Christine Birmingham

Reviewed by:



Rosanna Coombes, Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

FILED ON 2/22, 2008.