

TAC Members

**MINUTES
2007 REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, August 4, 2006**

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 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 8:45 a.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll, and TAC members in attendance were: Jim Rundle filling in for Margaret Powell, City of Sparks & Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Harold Shotwell, Palomino Valley GID; Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Greg Dennis, Regional Water Planning Commission; Scott Nebesky, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; Dean Schultz, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Company; Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID; Hilary Lopez filling in for John Erwin, Truckee Meadows Water Authority; Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department (Air Quality); and, Mike Boster filling in for Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District.

Adrian Freund, Washoe County, arrived at 8:02 a.m. John Hester, City of Reno, arrived at 8:02 a.m. Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment and HOME Consortium, arrived at 8:50 a.m. Dean Schultz left the meeting at 10:10 a.m. Jerry Schumacher left the meeting at 10:10 a.m.

Members absent were: Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; Robert Lichtenstein, Nevada System of Higher Education; Jeanne Rucker, Washoe County District Health Dept. (Solid Waste); Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District; and, Greg Martinelli, Waste Management.

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

Also present were: Dee Schafer from Corporate Solutions, Inc. who was the facilitator for the meeting. Bill Von Phau, Washoe County Parks Commission; Arlo Stockham, CFA, Inc.; Ginger Pierce, Pleasant Valley CAB; Sonya Him, Nevada Land Conservancy; Niki Linn, Eagle Logic Engineering; Lynda Nelson, Washoe County; Trevor Lloyd, Wood Rogers; and Melody Hefna, UNCE and UNR. Marilyn Gross was also present to take the Minutes.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEMBER SHOTWELL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 4, 2006, TAC AGENDA. SECONDED BY MEMBER SIKORSKI. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH TWELVE (12) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment presented at this time.

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, Inc., reviewed today's meeting objectives, which are to finalize the natural resource area, move into the recommendations by the Infill Subcommittee, and look at the issues in Module 3.

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.**

Ms. Schafer asked that the members focus on page 3 of the handout under the notes and comments or draft text changes. Ms. Schafer requested the members' comments.

At this point in the meeting (at approximately 8:02 a.m.), Members Freund and Hester arrived.

Member Dennis requested if the conceptual agreements are inclusive. Ms. Coombes replied that the master plan can address other things if it is relevant. Member Dennis expressed concern that it is qualitative. A brief discussion followed.

Ms. Schafer requested if the members are comfortable with the language on the right side of the handout. The following comment was noted: "public safety service provision" is mentioned twice.

Ms. Schafer requested that the members review the middle and last columns on page 6, 2.2 to 221.4. The following comments were noted: look to the top in terms of the goal to require the master plan to answer those types of questions and preserving the recharge is the key and it is addressed in the master plan.

Ms. Schafer requested that the members review the middle and last columns on page 7 and 8.

Ms. Coombes stated that notes were taken at the last meeting and put in the middle column and then took approaches in the last column. Ms. Coombes stated that it is a very soft dialogue.

The following comments were made: it is typical to fall short on public facilities so utility providers should encompass public facilities more; under 2.3 and 2.3.1 add “where funding is used”; include local tribes in 2.3.1; is connectivity adequately used; and, connectivity is covered on page 8.

Member Hester suggested that the 8 foot buffer and 5 foot sidewalk be part of the Open Space Greenway Plan. Member Sikorski stated that he is unsure if it should be considered in the Open Space Plan as it is more of a design streetscape. A member stated that it uses streetscapes as connectivity to open space. A brief discussion followed regarding connectivity, the Open Space Plan, and affordable quality of life in urban areas. Member Hester suggested considering a plaza as open space. Member Hester cited examples of other cities that use plazas and landscaped streets as part of their open space.

Ms. Schafer requested how this can be addressed in the Master Plan. Member Hester replied by interconnecting it amongst itself and to what is traditionally known as open space.

Member Freund suggested developing wording to state that connectivity is wanted from the corridors out to the urban interface to the rural open space network.

Member Sikorski questioned the ability to distinguish open space from streets if streetscape is included.

Arlo Stockham, CFA, Inc., stated that the concept of open space has been overlooked in the past plans. He cautioned against getting too specific at the level for sidewalks and keep it at a conceptual level.

Ms. Coombes suggested that this section in the plan calls for a plan for traditional open space, emphasis on the need for similar forms of open space in the core, and the need to connect everything.

Member Dennis asked if it will be connected to the Open Space Plan for funding. Member Sikorski expressed concern that money is spent on the interior. Ms. Schafer summarized by stating that funding should tie into the Regional Plan.

Member Freund stated that connectivity is critical. Member Schultz cautioned against getting too specific. A brief discussion followed regarding connectivity.

Ms. Coombes referred to a previous discussion regarding severing (page 7). Ms. Coombes questioned if Policy 2.3.2 should be deleted. Ms. Coombes stated that the Open Space Plan has not been updated in a long time and deleting Policy 2.3.2 might cause problems.

Member Freund stated that the adoption by reference is useful and stated that he would like to see municipalities' plans. A discussion followed regarding adopting by reference. Mr. Stockham stated that adoption by reference works well for the Open Space Plan as it is now as it is a separate document, not a master plan document. Mr. Stockham questioned whether the master plan conformance review framework would be better than adoption by reference.

Ms. Schafer requested comments. Member Freund stated that he is in support of what Mr. Stockham just said. Ms. Coombes summarized the discussion regarding adoption by reference and stated that severing the relationship here in terms of adoptive by reference but then have conformance review requirement that any conformance review coming in must be consistent with the Regional Open Space Plan. Ms. Schafer asked if the members were in agreeance with the summarization.

Mr. Stockham further suggested that the plans be in conformance at the local government level.

Member Hester clarified the discussion and stated that the county should continue with the Open Space Plan and that all the entities should be in conformance with the set of policies in the Regional Plan, and then they will be reflected in all the codes.

Ms. Schafer summarized by stating that all open space plans should be in conformance with the policies of the regional plan. Ms. Schafer suggested that what is being said is that Policy 2.3.2 needs to be reworked, not deleted.

Ms. Schafer continued the review of the worksheet and requested the members to review page 13. Ms. Schafer requested comments or questions. Member Dennis questioned if it is the Planning Commission's responsibility regarding 2.6.2.

Member Ruefer stated that there is a data base created between District Health and Water Resources. Member Ruefer stated that the water portion is supported through the Department of Water Resources; however, there is an abundant of other information and stated that it is a huge task that cannot be put upon the Regional Plan.

Lynda Nelson, Washoe County, stated that the natural resources plan process will be folded into the Regional Open Space Plan. Ms. Nelson stated that there is a huge warehouse of data at the county level that will role into another public landfill.

Member Sikorski questioned the inventory of the region as where to go to get information. Ms. Coombes reviewed the sensitive nature of some information. Ms. Schafer suggested that the regional plan is a referral center not a data center. A brief discussion followed regarding the various types and amounts of information, maintaining and updating the information, and the quality of data.

Ms. Coombes suggested Policies 2.6.1 and 2.6.2 look at regional facilitating, the preparation of data referral center, and how it is managed to be looked at on another day.

Member Hester requested a copy of the natural resource map from Washoe County.

At this point in the meeting (approximately 9:55 a.m.), Ms. Schafer called for a break. The meeting was recalled to order.

B. Discussion and possible acceptance of recommendations of the infill subcommittee regarding infill issues, including but not limited to: specific, measurable infill goals and standards to replace the existing goals and standards set for in Goal 1.2, Policy 1.2.1, Table 1.2.1 and Policy 1.2.12, and other related planning principles, policies, and definitions contained in the 2002 Regional Plan; appropriate goals, policies and measurement tools for monitoring emerging employment centers (EECs) and related growth; and additional regional centers and extensions of existing TOD corridors.

At this point in the meeting (at approximately 10:10 a.m.), Members Schumacher and Schultz left the meeting.

Ms. Schafer commended Ms. Coombes and her Staff for obtaining and narrowing down this information. Ms. Schafer stated that the purpose of the discussion is not to reinvent what the subcommittee did. Ms. Schafer requested that the members review the large worksheet by the RPU TAC. Ms. Schafer gave a brief overview of the handout with the wording in blue and red. Ms. Schafer referred to page 5, page 9 2b and 2e, page 10 3a and 3b and requested comments. The following comments were made: add to planning principle “connectivity of TOD corridors” to page 10; how flexible is the definition of secondary corridors; secondary corridors is addressed on page 28 of the handout; referring to page 10 under centers and corridors, the whole thing works on a system.

Ms. Schafer reviewed page 16, Policies 1.1 and 1.1.2 and page 19. Ms. Coombes gave a brief overview of the conceptual agreement on page 19. There were no questions or comments on these pages.

Ms. Schafer then referred to Policy 1.2 on page 26 and requested comments or questions. Mr. Stockham requested to know if this information could be read over at a later time and then if questions arise the questions could be asked. Ms. Schafer replied yes. Ms. Coombes gave an overview of Policy 1.2 regarding the McCarran Boulevard ring. Ms. Coombes reviewed Table 1.2.1.

Member Royal-Goodwin questioned the definition of infill. Ms. Coombes reviewed the definition and the densities.

Member Hester questioned if the language could be changed from “population density” to “density” on page 26 as designated in Table 1.2.1.

Member Royal-Goodwin questioned if having the goal on page 26 that requires plans to provide for necessary resources or infrastructure to support is enough to get what is wanted or if

individuals will take advantage of the wording. A brief discussion followed. There were no other comments on the table at this point.

Ms. Schafer reviewed page 28, 29, and 31 and requested comments. Member Hester suggested changing the Convention Regional Center and the Medical Regional Center to Convention Center and Medical Center. Ms. Coombes explained that the purpose of including “regional” is for place holder purposes. A brief discussion followed regarding the names of the regional centers.

Member Freund questioned the intent of notifying the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority regarding #4 on page 29. Ms. Coombes explained the intent and a brief discussion followed regarding adding “other”.

Continuing on with page 32, Ms. Schafer requested comments and questions. Ms. Coombes stated that the language will read as it says in the third column. Member Hester stated that the wording is not acceptable to Verdi.

On page 33, Ms. Schafer requested comments and questions. The “station area” was defined. It was suggested that “station area” should be changed to “transit station” for clarifying purposes and a discussion followed regarding the change. The members were in agreement to leave “station areas” alone.

Ms. Schafer asked for questions and comments on page 34. The following comments were noted: on #4 add “a range of uses” or “a variety of uses” as there has been confusion in the past; possibly use the word “codes” for “zoning code” on #4; and, on #10 define “feathering.”

The members reviewed pages 35, 36, and 37. Ms. Schafer requested comments and questions and the following comments were made: on page 37, under Policy 1.2.12, recognize the lack of public services to support density; and under Policy 1.2.12 do not use permanent wording and possibly add “when those services are not available.”

A brief discussion followed regarding Policy 1.2.12. Ms. Coombes stated one underlying issue is to have a mechanism that allows something less than the required overall density in the corridor and that overtime it moves toward that. Ms. Coombes questioned if an intensification plan should be completed regardless of the natural resource constraints and the lack of public services. Ms. Coombes cited scenarios to illustrate the point.

Continuing with pages 38, 39, and 40 Ms. Schafer reviewed the changes and requested comments and questions. The members were in agreeance with the changes. Ms. Schafer urged the members to go through the handout again and to pass comments onto Ms. Coombes for further discussion if needed. Ms. Schafer stated if there are no comments then the changes will be transitioned to the conceptual language.

Moving on to Module 4, Ms. Schafer asked the members to review the handout and requested changes or comments. It was suggested to add the densities defined in Table 1.2.4 to Policy 4.1.3.1. There were no other comments regarding Module 4.

C. Review and discussion regarding the technical advisory committee’s work program on the priority list of issues for Module 3 – Public Services and Facilities

Ms. Schafer passed out the handout regarding Module #3, Issues Recommendation Review for the members to review. Ms. Schafer and Ms. Coombes explained the issues and then a discussion of each issue followed.

Regarding Issue #1, Member Ruefer stated that she needs an understanding of the expectations. A brief discussion followed regarding this issue including an upcoming public facilities conference, public facilities plans, and whether the Technical Advisory Committee can address the issue or not.

The following comments were made regarding Issue #2: this issue is adopted by reference; regional utilities corridors mainly deal with power; it is important to understand the growth of the regional utilities corridors; and, it is important to see plans updated by the stakeholders. Ms. Coombes provided two options: take the issue offline and out of the TAC process or form a TAC subcommittee to work on the details to bring before the TAC. Mr. Stockham expressed concern about delaying the update as it costs more money for the land owners. Ms. Coombes reviewed the pros and cons of using a subcommittee or taking the issue offline. After discussion, it was decided that an offline stakeholders group would determine the recommendations in a timely manner.

Regarding Issue #3, the following comments were made: concern that any plan included by reference, often times the plans do not get referenced; suggested that specific policies related to facilities might be worth discussion; policies within the Regional Plan should be repeated; facility planning has been laid out very well; Regional Plan policies could be adopted by facilities in the future if not determined in the Regional Plan; the Regional Water plan cannot blanket the policies across the table amongst each entity as it will not work; and, the conformance review framework works well.

Ms. Coombes explained that Module #4 calls for input as opposed to relocating policies. Member Ruefer stated that the plans need to be in concert as much as possible.

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

Ms. Schafer reviewed the scope for the next meeting which will include discussion of Issue #4. Ms. Schafer stated that Issue #5 will be moved off the table. Ms. Schafer requested that the members review the infill handouts to bring comments and questions to the next meeting. Ms. Schafer requested that the members review Module #4 for the next meeting’s discussion also.

5. DISCUSSION ON TAC MEETING SCHEDULE, INCLUDING REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. Coombes recommended that the next meeting date be shifted to September 8, 2006 and the following meeting would be held on September 22, 2006. Ms. Coombes also recommended that Friday, September 15, 2006 be a reserve date for completion. After discussion, it was determined that the next meeting will be held on September 1, 2006.

Ms. Coombes stated that the affordable housing issue will be presented at the next meeting. Ms. Coombes requested changes on affordable housing now in order for discussion at the next meeting.

Another future agenda item includes discussion about the process and distribution of information to the community.

6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

Ms. Coombes reported that a letter from Tina Nappe was sent to the committee for the members' review.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Christine Birmingham

Reviewed by:

Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

Filed on: _____