

**MINUTES**  
**2007 REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE**  
**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Friday, September 22, 2006**

**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.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met in the Sun Valley General Improvement District Board Room, 5000 Sun Valley Blvd., Reno, Nevada and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning, at 8:45 a.m.

**1. ROLL CALL**

The clerk called the roll, and TAC members in attendance were: Margaret Powell, City of Sparks; Jim Rundle, Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Harold Shotwell, Palomino Valley GID; Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Wayne Seidel for Greg Dennis, Regional Water Planning Commission; Dean Schultz, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority; Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; Adrian Freund, Washoe County; Jim Smitherman for Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Dept. of Water Resources; Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Dept.; and Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director of Regional Planning.

Mike Boster for Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District, arrived at 9:20 a.m. John Hester, City of Reno, arrived at 11:20 a.m. Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Co., arrived at 11:30 a.m. Harold Shotwell excused himself from the meeting at 9:30 a.m. and returned at 11:43 a.m.

Members absent: Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment Agency and HOME Consortium; John Erwin, Truckee Meadows Water Authority; Robert Lichtenstein, Nevada System of Higher Education; Jeanne Rucker, Washoe County District Health Dept. (Solid Waste); Greg Martinelli, Waste Management; Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID; and Scott Nebesky, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony.

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

Also present: Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, Inc., the facilitator for the meeting.

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MEMBER SCHULTZ MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 22, 2006, TAC AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER LANGS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ELEVEN (11) MEMBERS PRESENT.

### **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

### **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. November 4, 2005

MEMBER LANGS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 4, 2005, SECONDED BY MEMBER GOODWIN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ELEVEN (11) MEMBERS PRESENT.

### **5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY**

A. Discussion and acceptance of:

1) Recommendations of the infill subcommittee regarding infill issues

Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, Inc., stated that final sign-off is needed on the recommendations from the Infill Subcommittee. Ms. Schafer noted that there were no additional comments forwarded to staff regarding the Infill Subcommittee's work. Member Powell stated that she thought there was going to be an opportunity at this meeting to go through the document and make comments. Ms. Schafer stated that the document could be reviewed prior to moving forward. Some language changes were made. There was some discussion regarding where air quality issues should be addressed. Member Coombes stated that air quality is addressed in Module 2 and provides conformance standards as it relates to district health. A broader, stand-alone policy could be added stating something along the lines of "to conform with the Regional Plan, master plans of local governments must coordinate mixed uses with district health".

*[Member Boster arrived at 9:20 a.m.] [Member Shotwell left at 9:30 a.m.]*

2) Policy agreements regarding Module #1 – Issue #3.2 – Adequate affordable housing. Should the Plan call for inclusionary housing practices?

Ms. Schafer presented the new goal and policy, 1.4 and 1.4.1 for comments.

Member Coombes stated that two letters with comments have been received from Ernie Nielsen and Member Royal-Goodwin. This correspondence was reviewed. This item will be considered signed-off after minor changes discussed today are made.

3) Policy agreements regarding Module #1 issues not related to infill and/or affordable housing

Ms. Schafer stated that this item would entail the review of issues highlighted on the right hand side of the Module 1 worksheet. The right hand column of the Module 4 worksheet was also discussed.

A discussion was held regarding the need for graphics and illustrations to go along with the Regional Plan, and the timing of the provision of this information. It was decided that these can be included over time rather than included as part of the Regional Plan update.

*[Ms. Schafer called a 15-minute break at 10:30 a.m. The meeting was called back to order at 10:45 a.m.]*

- B. Educational presentations, discussion and consideration of issues and policies related to infrastructure and public services including, but not limited to Module #3, Issue #4 – should the Plan identify different priorities for the provision of public facilities (infrastructure) and services, and Module #1, Regional Form and Pattern.

Ms. Schafer stated that in Module #3 there is a single issue that the TAC needs to review: “Should the Regional Plan identify different priorities for the provision of public facilities, infrastructure and services?” Ms. Schafer reviewed the material distributed to assist in discussion of this agenda item.

Lora Richards led the discussion of Module #3 and stated that the goals and policies in this part of the plan lend themselves to the coordination of other plans. The idea is to make the provision of services as efficient and effective as possible.

Member Powell noted that this issue ties into Module #3 with the new Goal 3.5, and the committee would need to decide if Goal 3.5 should be added to, clarified or revised. It was pointed out that there is already a team of people working on clarifying or providing greater detail at the regional or local level related to goals and policies pertaining to Goal 3.5. A discussion was held regarding what material is currently in Module #3 that won't be reviewed at this meeting.

Member Boster presented an overview of the planning process that is used by the school district and stated that the changing demographics of areas are tracked to stay abreast of how this will affect the need for facilities and services. Member Boster commented that the school district should be treated like any other infrastructure. In response to a comment, Member Boster stated that he was not prepared to say the collecting of connection/impact fees for the school district is something that the school district wants to pursue at this time. Member Boster stated that global facility planning is in the very early stages. There was some discussion regarding coordination with Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) when planning for new schools.

Member Goodwin reviewed the elements in the RTC Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The development of the document is federally mandated, it is a 3-year plan which is good until May 2008, it must plan for a minimum of 20 years, and the current plan is for 30 years. Member Goodwin suggested that the TAC members go on-line and read chapter two of the RTP which contains the objectives and policies that are used when planning for improvements.

A discussion was held regarding coordination with the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). Member Goodwin stated that the five-year section of the RTP has to be submitted to NDOT as they are the funneling agency for the federal monies.

*[Member Hester arrived at 11:20 a.m.] [Member Sullivan arrived at 11:30 a.m.]*

Member Hester distributed a revised handout and stated the following:

- What the City of Reno is doing comes right out of the annexation settlement agreement. Part of the Master Plan is called public services facilities structure plan.
- In regards to water, sewer, waste water and flood management, we requested our legal counsel to review the scope of work for the areas on the attached map and the priorities listed. Counsel asked us to go to the Regional Water Planning Commission, and they

provided \$500,000 of the \$608,000, and the rest of the money needed is being split between the Sewer Enterprise Fund and Panic Enterprise Fund.

- Regarding transportation, discussion was held with Member Goodwin about coordination with the RTC's plan.
- The fire department uses a service response time for the location of fire stations. They have undertaken a planning process.
- There is a sales tax initiative on the ballot for the upcoming election that would be used by the City of Reno Police Department, Washoe County Sheriff's Department and Sparks Police Department. It is supported by all three of the local governments. Member Hester briefly reviewed the city's proposed decentralization plan and stated that Chief Poehlman could come to a future meeting and give the committee a presentation if they wished.
- The city is working with the Parks and Recreation Community Services Department, who have service standards in place.
- The City Manager and the Superintendent of Schools have had a series of meetings, and a working group has been set up. The city has suggested that one of the ways they could help work together is to include the school district's schools in the city's Facility Plan.
- Member Hester noted that the city has committed to Member Coombes that status reports will be given to the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) in October, January and March, and in July 2007 the master plan and zoning code updates will be presented.

Member Freund made the following comments:

- Member Hester's handout is very similar to what is envisioned being in the Infrastructure and Public Services element of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan. He noted that this is an existing document that has not been updated for a number of years.
- In the past month or so, dialogue has been started regarding doing facilities planning for the unincorporated jurisdictional areas. This is very similar to what Member Hester has described. Discussions will begin in the near future.
- The Regional Capacity Constraints in Regional Infrastructure Networks report points out some of the current weaknesses. Some of them are geographic gaps in facilities planning.
- In depth discussions with fire service providers on future station locations is underway. One thing that was discovered was that the fire agencies didn't have a good handle on where future approved development was located, and this information gap is being addressed.

Member Smitherman presented information on facility plans with regard to regional water resources.

Member Siedel commented that another positive thing that he has seen in the Regional Water Planning Commission in the past couple of years is that integrated water resource plans are being requested.

Member Freund asked Member Smitherman to review the different levels of detail of facility planning. Member Smitherman stated that he has spoken to some of the consultants and engineers in his office to see if there are natural sub-divisions of level of detail, and as far as he can find there are not. There are some general breakpoints such as:

- The reconnaissance level where you would be looking into the level of detail that would be going into a future service area like the Bedell Flat area. He reviewed the different issues that would be reviewed for that level.
- The feasibility study level where you would review exactly what kind of facilities you might need, e.g. pipes, infrastructure, etc.
- The next level would be getting closer to construction plans and would branch off into design for a single facility.

Member Coombes clarified that the Regional Plan by definition is a back-up plan for the development of public facilities that will have a regional impact or aid in accomplishing regional planning goals. It does not relate to the development of a specific site. Ms. Schafer stated that the Regional Plan would look more to what coordination efforts are happening at the jurisdictional levels in regards to infrastructure planning and to avoid duplication of planning efforts.

Member Smitherman asked if someone could relate what Member Coombes said back to the annexation settlement agreement and what Justice Hardesty may have meant by facility plan when he called for the July, 2007 deadline. Member Hester described the history of the settlement agreement.

*[Member Shotwell returned at 11:43 a.m.]*

Member Schultz reviewed the information in his hand-out regarding the Airport Authority.

*[Member Siedel left at 12:02 p.m.]*

*[The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:10 p.m. and reconvened at 12:53 p.m.]*

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

Ms. Schafer reviewed the list of issues for the 2007 Regional Plan Update and asked members to discuss the scope of issues to be addressed in the draft policies. Following a discussion of possible issues, it was agreed that the list to be utilized for draft policies and returned for review includes:

- Downtown Centers
- Other Centers – Regional and Employment
- TOD Corridors
- Secondary Corridors
- Infill Opportunities as Defined by Local Governments
- Remaining MSA

It was suggested that colors be added to the map that has been developed for identification of areas, along with the policy, and that this map be available at the next open house.

Ms. Schaefer stated that Goal 3.5 and Policy 3.5.1 and Policy 3.5.2 are being presented for review. It was noted that this language is almost verbatim from the settlement agreement.

The members agreed to review Goal 3.1 and policies through Goal 3.4 and policies and e-mail any changes to Member Coombes by September 29, 2006.

**6. DISCUSSION ON TAC MEETING SCHEDULE AND PROCESS TO COMPLETE THE PLAN UPDATE INCLUDING REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

The next meeting is scheduled for October 6, 2006. At that meeting, final review will be done and then Module #3 will be ready to go to public comment. While public comment is being received, the TAC will work on Module #4. Following this work, there will be another open house where all four modules will be presented for public comment. It was requested that any TAC member who won't be at the meeting on October 6, 2006, communicate to their alternate that the final review of the draft of Module #3 will be held at that meeting.

Member Coombes noted that the previous discussion regarding issues for the next meeting and steps to be taken after that meeting addressed this item. Member Coombes stated that it has been requested by one of the Planning Commissioners for consideration by the TAC members that the TAC meetings take place in the evening rather than during the day. Members agreed that in order to get public input it was more meaningful that the open houses be held during the evening hours.

**7. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

None

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by

Reviewed by:

---

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director  
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

**FILED ON \_\_\_\_\_, 2007.**