

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, March 3, 2006**

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met in Vista Building, Room B206, at the Truckee Meadows Community College – Dandini Campus, 7000 Dandini Blvd., Reno, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Dave Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning, at 8:45 a.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and TAC Members in attendance were: John Hester, City of Reno; Randy Mellinger for Margaret Powell, City of Sparks and Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Harold Shotwell, Palomino Valley GID; Scott Nebesky, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; Dean Schultz, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Co.; Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID; Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; Hilary Lopez for John Erwin, Truckee Meadows Water Authority; Jim Smitherman for Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Mike Boster for Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District; and David Ziegler, Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission.

Member Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID, arrived at 9:00 a.m.; and Mike Harper for Adrian Freund, Washoe County, arrived at 10:00 a.m.

Members absent were: Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Greg Dennis, Regional Water Planning Commission; Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment Agency and HOME Consortium; Robert Lichtenstein, Nevada System of Higher Education; Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department (Air Quality); Jeanne Rucker, Washoe County District Health Department (Solid Waste); and Greg Martinelli, Waste Management.

Also present were: Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA; Patricia Rogers, TMRPA; and Joy Randall, TMRPA.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER HESTER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 3, 2006, TAC AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER SULLIVAN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH FIFTEEN (15) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency
One East First Street, Suite 1100, Reno, NV 89501-1625
775-321-8385; Fax 775-321-8386
<http://www.tmrpa.org>

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Dave Ziegler welcomed everyone in attendance and invited them to participate in the discussions. Those in attendance introduced themselves.

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

A. Consideration of and possible conceptual agreements on Module 1 Issue #4 - Boundaries for infill target areas – what’s appropriate; how do we maintain community character?

Dee Schafer, the facilitator for the meeting, reviewed the objectives for the date, which included: a) to briefly review the report on affordable housing issues; b) provide an update on the consolidation of the priority list issues for the 2007 Regional Plan Update as recommended by the subcommittee; and c) to finalize the process for module #1, issue #4 (boundary target areas for infill). Item 4 B was discussed first; there was no objection.

B. Status report on Module 1, Issue #3.2 – Adequate affordable housing. Should the plan call for inclusionary housing practices?

Members reviewed the status report and requested clarification regarding percentages, wages, household income, the work force and fund allocations.

C. Report on Subcommittee discussion on priority list of issues for the 2007 Regional Plan update and possible action to recommend modifications to the RPC.

At this time (at approximately 9:00 a.m.), Member Schumacher arrived.

Ms. Schaefer provided members with the subcommittee decisions for the priority list of issues as follows:

Module #1 – Regional Form and Development Patterns

Issues #1.1 and #1.2 have been completed.

Issue # 1.3 has been deleted.

Issue # 1.32 was assigned to the other committee.

Issue # 1.4 is currently being worked on.

Issue # 1.5 was discussed briefly to define the scope.

Issues #1.6, #1.10 and #1.10 should be combined with module #4, issue #1.

Issues #1.7 and 1.82 will be combined.

Issue #1.8.1 has already been addressed.

Issue #1.9 has no change.

Module #2 – Management of Natural Resources

Issues #2.1, #2.2 and #2.4 have been combined.

Issues #2.3 and #2.5 have been combined.

Issue #2.6 will be deleted, with the TAC's approval. The members discussed and agreed to combine issue #2.6 with issue #2.2.

Module #3 – Public Service and Facilities

Issues #3.1 and #3.4 were combined.

Issues #3.2 and #3.3 had no changes.

Issue #3.5 will be considered for possible deletion. After a short discussion, Members agreed to delete issue #3.5.

Issue #3.6 will possibly be redefined and moved forward with a different priority.

The members discussed the history and importance of regional corridors for utilities and transportation. Rosanna Coombes was directed to research the level of priority for this issue and provide members with a recommendation.

Module #4 – Regional Plan Implementation

Issue #1 had no change.

Issue #2 was moved to the number one spot in module #4.

Issue #3 was deleted.

Issue #4 had no change.

Issue #5 had no change.

Ms. Schafer stated that a revised list would be provided at the next meeting. She announced that the meeting would take a 10-minute recess. She reconvened the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

Ms. Schafer instructed Members to form three small groups. She distributed handouts that included notes outlining discussions and decisions made by members. Each group was directed to identify the scope of the issues and the needs for each agency.

The first assignment for each group was to identify opportunities and solutions to help solve the issues and concerns of each entity so that consensus can be achieved on this issue.

Member Hester reported the consensus for Group Three, which included:

- To no longer utilize McCarran Boulevard
- Drop the 65/35 and add a required amount of absorption of land in the existing TMSA for expansion
- Require the minimum dwelling unit and the minimum floor area ration (FAR) policies in the transit corridors and regional centers to be more policy-based, expand definitions to include reinvestment at the same density and/or intensity for

some areas, and Regional Centers and TOD Corridors should be targeted infill areas and local government may add other areas at their discretion.

Ms. Schafer invited questions and comments from the Committee and public.

Member Mellinger stated his concerns with the FAR at times fitting with community character.

Member Lang stated that new land should have a Master Plan and older corridors need the infill.

Arlo Stockham discussed the fifty percent redundancy and the plan having capacity so that infill development does not require rebuilding infrastructure.

Mr. Ziegler reported the consensus for Group Two, which included:

- Spine in corridors with a gradient density working out from spine and access in/out
- Quality of life and amenities are critical for functioning purposes, including different levels and types of infill
- Characteristics are important
- Recognize that infill may be used as an excuse for a project incorrectly
- Recognize infill in unincorporated areas will have opportunities such as nodes, corridors and accessory units
- Must be specific and measurable for the purpose of meeting goals
- Gross Density evaluation

In summary, the group's opinion was that it is all about place-making, community-building, amenities and the quality of life.

Discussion, questions and comments were invited from the Committee and the public.

Member Lang recommended removing current plans in the TOD, if requirements are not met.

Member Hester stressed the importance of place-making.

Arlo Stockham commented on the importance of not segregating infill areas and the graduation of the quality of life.

Member Lang stated it was important for the community to have the same concept of infill and expectations in the region.

Patty Rogers requested to know who would determine what areas are defined as “infill” and will define the character. Mr. Ziegler replied that characters were not the role of the Regional Plan; however, they are needed.

Discussion included new urbanism, mixed use, livable communities, and community education.

Member Lang reported the consensus for Group One, which included:

- Analysis completed prior to determining infill area
- Look at infill in vacant lands
- Tear down inappropriate infill
- Emerging employment centers and well-paid jobs
- Redevelopment where appropriate
- The lot standards and locations for housing with granny flats

Ms. Schafer instructed members to indicate with colored pens the critical items for infill boundary, indicating whether important to the definition and/or policy. The following levels of priority, as decided by Members, were:

1. Amenities, measurable issues, quality of life, place-making, community development
2. Isolated areas with opportunities
3. Levels of infill
4. Infill analysis to identify infill areas; and,
5. Policy-based information as indicated in Item 2 and 3.

5. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Ziegler commented on the importance of this issue and requested members not rush to complete the process.

Member Smitherman requested to know if the TAC addressed the four-persons-per-acre issue and supported discussion at the next meeting.

At this time (at approximately 11:18 a.m.), Member Lang departed.

Ms. Schafer discussed Module #1, Issue #5, master planning of larger acreage rather than piecemeal planning. She requested to know what types of information and education were needed to review and process this item. A discussion was held and members requested educational information that included: a) examples of large acreage planning and piecemeal planning; b) provisions for planning required by laws and ordinances; c) examples of different incentives in other areas; d) examples of amenities and how they fit; e) examples of large and small acreage planning; and, f) developer requests for amendments to the local plans.

Ms. Schafer recommended starting wit education regarding the laws, limitations and capabilities and then to move forward with the process.

6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

There was no written correspondence presented for review.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Joy Randall

Reviewed by:



Rosanna Coombes, Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

FILED ON

May 1, 2008.