

**MINUTES**  
**2007 REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE**  
**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Friday, December 15, 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 at the Sparks Police Department Training Room, 1701 East Prater Way, Sparks, Nevada and conducted the following business:

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

**1. ROLL CALL**

The clerk called the roll and TAC Members in attendance were: Margaret Powell, City of Sparks (departed at 10:45 a.m.); Jim Rundle, City of Sparks; Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Greg Dennis, Regional Water Planning Commission; Dean Schultz, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority (departed at 9:40 a.m.); Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power; Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; Hilary Lopez, Truckee Meadows Water Authority; Adrian Freund, Washoe County; Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Department of Water Resources (departed at 11:15 a.m.)

John Hester, City of Reno, arrived at 9:06 a.m.; Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment & HOME Consortium, arrived at 8:50 a.m.; John Erwin, Truckee Meadows Water Authority, arrived at 10:05 a.m.; Mike Boster, Washoe County School District, arrived at 9:15 a.m.

Members absent were: Claudia Hanson, City of Reno; Harold Shotwell, Palomino Valley GID; Jack Lorbeer, Regional Transportation Commission; Wayne Seidel, Regional Water Planning Commission; Scott Nebesky, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; David Anderson, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; Bill Bennett, Sierra Pacific Power; Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID; Birnie McGavin, South Truckee Meadows GID; Margaret Reinhardt, Sun Valley GID; Robert Lichtenstein, Nevada System of Higher Education; Robert Dickens, Nevada System of Higher Education; Mike Harper, Washoe County; Jim Smitherman, Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department (Air Quality); Andy Goodrich, Washoe County District Health Department (Air Quality); Jeanne Rucker, Washoe County District Health Department (Solid Waste); Robbin Rose, Washoe County District Health Department (Solid Waste); Mark Stanton, P.E., Washoe County School District; Greg Martinelli, Waste Management; Mike Genera, Waste Management

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) staff present were: Rosanna Coombes; Patty Rogers; Lora Richards.

Also present were: April Hale, Tanamera; Robin Palmer; Susan Speta-Briganti and Dee Schafer, facilitators from Corporate Solutions, Inc.; Marilyn Gross (to take Minutes)

## **2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MARGARET POWELL AND SECONDED BY MARK SULLIVAN TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH TEN (10) MEMBERS PRESENT.**

## **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public comment was given. April Hale, Tanamera, and Robin Palmer introduced themselves. They were invited to join the discussion.

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

### **A. Review feedback from Regional Planning Commission (RPC), stakeholders, TAC Members, legal counsel, and the public on Modules 1 (regional form and pattern), 2 (natural resource management), 3 (public services and infrastructure), 4 (plan implementation), and all appendices, maps and introductory sections of the draft 2007 Regional Plan**

Ms. Schafer asked if everyone had a copy of Draft F of the Plan and if not, a copy was distributed to them. She stated that feedback has been received from the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) that she would like to present to the group. Also, any final stakeholder comment should be presented for final discussion.

RPC feedback was presented by Ms. Schafer:

- The RPC has requested two language changes in the Plan:
  - They do not see the merit of the term “Metropolitan Service Area (MSA”) and have requested that “Truckee Meadows Service area (TMSA)” be used.
  - Policy 2.1.1, Subsection 4 (Module 2, Page 3), RPC has requested that an additional bullet point be added that would state “Migration paths for wildlife”.
- Requested better definitions for Affordable Housing and Concurrency (Goal 3.5 and the two policies underneath it).

Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment and HOME Consortium, arrived at the meeting.

Stakeholder feedback offered was:

- Member Diana Langs stated that she had no feedback to present.
- Member Adrian Freund reported that the only substantive comment from the Planning Commission was on the use of “MSA”. He noted that the Board was given a presentation on the county’s role in assisting compact growth and development, infill, transportation, etc. and they were very pleased.

A discussion was held regarding the RPC’s request to keep the language “TMSA” versus “MSA” throughout the document. Following discussion, the members agreed to leave the term “TMSA” throughout the document.

Per RPC’s request, following discussion regarding the type of wildlife, it was agreed by the members to add a bullet point “Migration path for wildlife” to Policy 2.1.1, Subsection 4, Page 3.

Member John Hester arrived at the meeting.

A discussion of the affordable housing policies was held. Ms. Schafer referred to a comparison of the current policy (1.1.13) and the proposed policy (goal 1.4 and policy 1.4.1) developed by staff as a discussion tool. She reported that the RPC had made a motion to either keep the policy that is currently in the plan (1.1.13) or to develop similar language. She noted that one possibility is that a combination of the current policy and this new goal and policy be developed at this meeting.

Rosanna Coombes reported that the concern expressed by one of the Commissioners was that there was not enough detail or direction in Policy 1.4.1, but she did not hear him state any particular item that he felt needed to be included. That is why staff developed the comparison of the current and proposed language. Member Jodi Royal-Goodwin stated that she believes that inclusionary housing is one item that the one member of the RPC would like to see in the policy, but the member does concede that this may not be possible to do. It was noted that this is an issue the Task Force is addressing.

Member Adrian Freund stated that the language of Goal 1.4 addresses new issues, such as workforce housing, is more substantive than Policy 1.1.13, and he is in support of it. Once the Needs Assessments are completed, this language could be more refined in the future.

Mike Boster arrived at the meeting.

Member Margaret Powell stated that Policy 1.1.13 pretty much focuses on one type of solution, whereas Policy 1.4.1 still leaves the work done by the Task Force available to use and the myriad of techniques, tools and programs that may achieve the same end but may or may not include inclusionary housing. Therefore, she doesn’t believe that morphing Policy 1.1.13 will work as it’s too specific. Also, the policy hasn’t been presented to the public for their input and support. Rosanna Coombes stated that since Policy 1.1.13 does state “inclusionary housing or other

mechanisms” other reasons should be presented to RPC for not using this policy as they may not agree with this point of view.

Member John Hester stated that he thinks that the proposed language in Goal 1.4 and Policy 1.4.1 should be kept, and the reasons for this proposal should be presented to RPC at their next meeting. He commented that he would be willing to attend the meeting to make this request.

Member Adrian Freund pointed out that there is support from elected officials for this proposed new language. It was noted that this proposed new language has been supported by the Housing Task Force and want it kept as it is.

Rosanna Coombes stated that she agrees with the approach as outlined by Member Hester. She suggested that Member Sullivan as chair of the Task Force also be in attendance at the RPC meeting, as well as Stacey Crowley.

It was agreed to keep the language as proposed in Goal 1.4 and Policy 1.4.1 and take this recommendation back to the Regional Planning Commission. Various TAC members and Stacey Crowley will be invited to attend the RPC meeting.

A five-minute break was taken, and the meeting reconvened at 9:35 a.m.

A discussion on concurrency was held. Dee Schafer stated that she feels that the RPC is looking for something in the Plan that specifically outlines a clear definition of concurrency, not just a glossary term.

Lora Richards reported that the RPC has set the date of the first public hearing on the Plan on January 24<sup>th</sup>, so the TAC has only about two weeks to tackle the items given them from RPC, and concurrency is the most daunting task. RPC will be meeting on January 10<sup>th</sup>, but they have not directed the TAC to bring anything back to them at this meeting. Ms. Richards commented that it might be good to give them a status report at that time even if not all of the work is done.

Dee Schafer reviewed the documentation included in the agenda packet dealing with the concurrency issue.

For the record, a Sample Concurrency (Concurrency Management) Definitions document was distributed that had been developed by the sub-group. It reads:

- “1. The necessary public services and facilities are available concurrent with the impacts from new development.
  2. Concurrency is a land use planning and implementation tool that is designed to ‘ensure that necessary public facilities and services to support new development are available and adequate, based on adopted level of services (LOS) standards, at the time the impacts of new development occur’.
3. Definition of Concurrency Standards:
- New development must demonstrate that facilities and services will be available to serve project at the time it come on-line.

- Local government sets standards then approves projects based on adequacy of public facilities.”

Member John Hester stated that during the negotiations for the Settlement Agreement, one of the proposals was that a ring be drawn that states what the growth boundary is every year and this is the percentage growth rate. In the discussions, the people negotiating came to an alternative that said it doesn't matter what the growth rate is as long as the public services and facilities are in place as the development happens. This is called “Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances” or “Concurrency Management” in different places throughout the country. This concept was built into the Settlement Agreement and states that you can't intensify the land use through zoning unless public service and facility plans in place, and when development happens, these plans will be implemented. This basically is what the flow chart (Appendix 7) outlines.

Member Hester stated that one of our problems locally is that there are not good public service and facility plans in place across the board. The sub-group has been meeting with all of the stakeholders to develop principles and then ordinances will be developed based on those principles. The sub-group had its fourth meeting yesterday, and agreement has been pretty much reached on the principles. Ms. Schafer asked if what the sub-group develops would be the recommendation for the Regional Plan. Mr. Hester stated that this work will be taken back to the governing board in January per the recommendation of Mayor Cashell that a report be made every three months. Ms. Schafer asked if there was a possibility that these principles that are being developed could be fit into the Regional Plan to address the request by the Regional Planning Commission regarding concurrency. Member Hester responded that he did not think this would be feasible.

Member Adrian Freund stated that perhaps what the sub-group had done could be summarized as an appendix, but he was not comfortable with putting it in the Regional Plan as it is too detailed for one thing.

Rosanna Coombes stated that she has heard anxiety expressed by both the governing board and the Planning Commission. She has been asked by both entities as Interim Director of Regional Planning how she intends to implement the language that is currently in Goal 3.5 and Policies 3.5.1 and 3.5.2. She stated that she has tried to address their questions. She noted that the only implementation tool that Regional has available to them is conformance review. The language that is currently in Goal 3.5 presents problems to her operationally. The first is that it is not conformance language. The second issue is that the requirement in the Goal is at the Zoning Code level which Regional never sees. Ms. Coombes stated that this makes it impossible for her to answer to the board and commission regarding her ability to address concurrency as this policy does not give her any authority to do anything.

Member Adrian Freund stated that Policies 3.5.1 and 3.5.2 state that “...all applicable services and facilities plans that have been found in conformance with the Regional Plan...” and that is the conformance review – the facilities plans. Ms. Coombes noted that the facilities plans are not guided by this policy, but rather by other policies in the Regional Plan.