

**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, May 19, 2006**

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

The meeting was called to order by Dave Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning, at 8:40 a.m.

**1. ROLL CALL**

The clerk called the roll, and TAC members in attendance were: John Hester, City of Reno; Margaret Powell, Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Harold Shotwell, Palomino Valley GID; Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Greg Dennis, Regional Water Planning Commission; Margaret Reinhardt for Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department (Air Quality); Mike Boster for Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District; Jim Rundle, City of Sparks; Hilary Lopez for John Erwin, TMWA; and Dave Ziegler, TMRPA.

Members absent were: Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment & HOME Consortium; Scott Nebesky, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; Dean Schultz, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Company; Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID; Robert Lichtenstein, Nevada System of Higher Education; Adrian Freund, Washoe County; Jeanne Rucker, Washoe County District Health Department (Solid Waste); and, Greg Martinelli, Waste Management.

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) staff present was: Patricia Rogers and Rosanna Coombes.

Also present was Dee Schafer from Corporate Solutions, Inc. who was the facilitator for the meeting.

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MEMBER RUEFER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MAY 19, 2006, TAC AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER POWELL. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ELEVEN (11) MEMBERS PRESENT.

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY**

Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, reviewed the objectives for today's meeting.

Ms. Schafer passed out the worksheets for the members' use and explained that it is an update and requested that the members read the worksheets to see if additional comments should be included.

*[Member Reinhardt arrived.]*

Member Ziegler stated that the working paper on infill had been included as a pending agreement. It is now included as the agreement of April 28. Mr. Ziegler stated that the discussion of cumulative impacts will really impact Module 4.

Ms. Schafer asked the Members to email comments on the worksheet to Member Ziegler or Rosanna Coombes.

**A. Discussion on TAC progress and direction to staff on the following Module 1 issues:**

**1. Issue #8 - Consideration of best development practices and form-based planning and zoning.**

Ms. Schafer asked if Issue #8 should be considered as a form-based planning zone issue.

Member Hester stated that there is a lot of debate going on about whether form-based codes are good or bad. He suggested putting it on hold or letting it go.

Ms. Schafer asked the members' opinion on this. The following comments were made: code implementation is more of a local government issue and too detailed for the Regional Plan; there is potential in the form-based code area but preoccupation of uses can detract from what is desired to be accomplished in place making strategies; there are other ways to address the issues; move on to natural resources and park this issue; changing the zoning code today does not change the existing things out there; and, form-based is not a regional planning issue.

Ms. Schafer summarized the member's comments and stated that the committee will move on and put Issue #8 on hold.

**2. Issue #9 - How to make sure jobs/housing balance policies do not conflict with industrial development land need.**

Ms. Schafer asked if the members were okay with parking this issue.

Member Powell stated that the specific issue on this one is the East Truckee Canyon. It may not be an issue if we have some flexibility with where the Jobs/housing balance occurs.

Member Ziegler stated that this issue is similar to 1.2 regarding making sure there is enough land for all the land use categories. The message seems to be that if Jobs/housing balance is pushed too hard there could be conflicts with industrial land and that is the issue already addressed in 1.2. Member Ziegler agreed with Member Powell that the genesis of this is East Truckee River Canyon.

The members agreed to park this issue.

**3. Issue #10 - Recognition of additional regional center and extension of existing TOD corridors.**

Member Hester stated that the City of Reno would like the Boomtown TOD extension addressed at some point. Member Ziegler suggested addressing this issue in the subcommittee that will be looking at infill targets and standards. Ms. Schafer recommended seeing what the subgroup comes up with and then determining if it makes sense for the subgroups to handle the Boomtown issue.

Ms. Schafer stated that the TAC will be moving on to Module 2 but will still be getting updates from subcommittees working on Module 1 issues.

**B. Educational presentations and consideration of Module 1, Issue #7 -  
Appropriate incentives for regional plan implementation (e.g. smart codes).**

Ms. Schafer stated that the education piece on this item will include an update of where this issue exists within the current Regional Plan and what it says, and information from the agencies regarding what types of incentives are already in place in the planning process.

Member Ziegler stated that the Clarion report is in draft form. There is also a report from Hansford and Eaglenest on infrastructure capacity which has some insights into infill. The RPA prepared a short report last year on infill barriers and incentives which is available on-line. Member Ziegler stated that all of the reports will be posted on-line once they are out to the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) and the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB).

Member Ziegler stated that Policy 1.2.11 in the current Regional Plan addresses incentives. Mr. Ziegler reviewed the policy and a list of what incentive strategies, programs, or policies might include.

Ms. Schafer asked for an update from the local entities on incentives in place now.

Member Hester stated that the City of Reno has adopted seven of their eight Regional Center Plans. They are projects of regional significance and most have more uses allowed by rite. Because they don't have to go through the review process, that takes care of the permit fees. Member Hester reviewed the concept of relaxing the concurrency standard in infill areas. Member Hester referred to projects on Virginia Street and stated that infrastructure is a barrier to infill development. There is an issue regarding the RTC's commitment to transit and whether development or transit should come first. The City of Reno does use subsidies. Reno Planning staff is working with their redevelopment agency. Home and CDBG funds have been used in those areas. Parking development standards have been changed significantly.

Member Ziegler asked Member Hester to talk about Washoe Medical. Member Hester reviewed the Washoe Medical Center project and stated that the intensity has been significantly increased on the site.

Member Ziegler asked about the number of Special Use Permits (SUP) being cut down. Hester responded that they did away with almost all of the SUPs.

Member Powell reported that the City of Sparks has increased the thresholds for SUP review. The City of Sparks is in the process of doing interim TOD standards. Clarion is working on an implementing ordinance that is missing from the TOD area plan. Member Powell stated that Clarion is also working to address the intensification of the industrial area. Member Powell reported that the Sparks Planning Commission approved the first phase of their redevelopment

area number one plan. The City of Sparks is redesigning Prater Way west of Rock Blvd. to address concerns. Sparks has focused the last few years on increasing the density and intensity of housing in the redevelopment area. When the TOD standard ordinance is developed they will have additional parking reductions. Member Powell stated that all three of the local jurisdictions have gone to an enterprise fund for building permits. Member Powell expressed concern regarding waiving fees and stated that the fees have to be made up sometime.

Member Hester stated that several California jurisdictions have recently been sued because they used building fees out of a code that were not related to the actual time and cost. The City of Reno charges their own redevelopment agency and City Council. Only the school is not charged. Member Hester stated that they would probably need state legislation to change their fees.

Member Ziegler gave an update on the Clarion Infill Report. The report includes the following points: (1) removing barriers will take a team approach from all entities; (2) undertake efforts to expedite transit improvements and priority infill areas and consider the timing of those improvements; (3) establish more targeted areas for intensification; (4) treat pedestrian and bike improvements as meaningful enhancements not as secondary design features; (5) more even distribution of special service costs (6) emphasis on infill areas in the CIPs; (7) exploring new school funding possibilities; (8) funding of park and recreation amenities; (9) multi-family residential development within certain size ranges should be allowed in infill areas; (10) continue to fine tune zoning; (11) implement infill supportive zoning; (12) pursue public private partnerships; (13) infill project review teams; (14) better coordination between TMRPA, local government, service providers; (15) consistent local and regional development and infrastructure priorities; (16) clarified information on infill projects; (17) evaluate all applicable fee structures that may create incentives and explore changes; and, (18) comprehensive infrastructure inventory and alternative funding sources for infrastructure upgrade.

Member Ziegler reviewed the survey of infrastructure capacity restraints done by Katherine Hansford and Lisa Haldane. The following findings in the report relate to infill: (1) need to do a better job of engaging local government and service provider staff in creation of common development scenarios; (2) service provider involvement and development of common vision for local Master Plans; (3) clarify the concurrency provisions of August 2005 settlement agreement; and, (4) identify potential infrastructure demand, analyze existing facility capacity with an emphasis on TODs, regional centers, and infill areas.

Member Ziegler reviewed the TMRPA report on infill incentives and listed each category, which included: (1) education; (2) regional tax base sharing; (3) finance, infrastructure, and regulatory incentives; (4) land assembly; (5) brown fields; (6) reduce perceived conflicts around infill projects; and, (7) a need for political leadership. A discussion followed regarding these categories.

Member Sikorski asked if a Regional Plan called for increased public access to the river, who would oversee something like that and who would review a project to make sure that it conforms to Regional Plan issues or designs. Member Hester responded that the City of Reno plan shows bike paths.

Member Powell stated that when they are doing the East Truckee Canyon area plan there is a set of policies related to public access to the river. When plans come in for property that will be along the river, we will make the plans conform to policy.

Arlo Stockham stated that the two cities have come a long way since 2002 and suggested that the Regional Plan not upset what is already in place and let the local governments finish their planning. Mr. Stockham stated that the less the Regional Plan mandates in terms of infill the better off it is. Regional Plan mandates can be a disincentive themselves. Each added piece of regulation is an added cost and added reason to develop somewhere else. Mr. Stockham stated that there is a big disconnect right now between the Regional Plan vision and transportation, water, and sewer. The Regional Plan says to go huge with minimum densities and the RTC says the streets are going to blow up if you do. A project may not be able to absorb the cost of repairing underground pipes that are found to be too small.

Jeff Codega stated that the key to success for a lot of these things really has to do with qualitative kinds of issues. Mr. Codega expressed concern regarding reducing discretionary review things like SUPs.

Member Ziegler stated that one issue that came from one of the consultant reports is underground utility congestion. The RTC has certain rules about where they allow underground infrastructure. Member Ziegler stated that the RTC 2030 Plan does not conflict with the Regional Plan but it has been found to fall short of promoting the Regional Plan vision. Member Ziegler suggested that the RTC infuse some of its planning money into some of the stationeries.

*[Members Powell and Ruefer left.]*

*[Ms. Schafer called for a 10-minute break.]*

Ms. Schafer asked for input on the scope of Module 1 Issue #7. Ms. Schafer asked that the discussion stay focused on incentives. The following items were mentioned: there is only so much that local governments can do acting on their own; the incentives need to jump to a wider audience; the Regional Plan can articulate regional standards for master plans for service providers; originally the Regional Plan was a general framework; to be found in conformance the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) has to show a transit system that is consistent with TOD corridors; there may not be a need to create new policy language; have more discussion with all agencies regarding potential development; focus attention on bringing infrastructure level up to the level of the Regional Plan; have the RPA look at the conformance review process and create an incentive for infill regarding timing.

Ms. Schafer stated that she would like the members to refer back to the worksheet to look at the incentives.

Ms. Coombes stated that the intent behind Policy 1.2.2 is to say we need to line up the public facilities and service provision with the areas that the Regional Plan says are priority for development.

Member Hester stated that some level of certainty in your incentive and having infrastructure provided is probably the best incentive package you could come up with.

Member Ziegler expressed concern that all the service providers and local governments have interlocking boards with some of the same officials running the agencies.

Ms. Schafer summarized the member's comments by stating that the language regarding the list of priorities should be reviewed and possibly tweaked instead of revamping everything.

Mr. Ziegler stated that he is reluctant to jump too quickly to solutions when the entities' interests have not yet been articulated.

Member Powell stated that the incentives listed in Policy 1.2.1 are all local jurisdiction and suggested that if it is going to be tweaked, we need to broaden the incentive providers. Member Powell also suggested having a policy that asks what an agency is doing to provide incentives.

Member Sikorski stated that rather than focusing on incentives right now we need to fix the first part which is staying true to the Regional Plan and making sure the infrastructure and services are there.

Mr. Codega stated that part of the problem is that the developers are providing the infrastructure. Ms. Coombes clarified Mr. Codega's comments stating that from a developer's perspective two things that would be helpful are information on what they are dealing with going into a project and some way of sharing the financing option.

[TAPE ONE ENDS - NO TAPE TWO]

A discussion followed regarding the problems developers are facing and setting up a program to make it work.

Member Ziegler suggested coming up with a plan for infill incentives to incorporate in the local plans. He questioned if the new plan has an action item list as the past plans had.

Mr. Codega stated that the Regional Plan has helped with elected officials to encourage higher densities. He stated that the plan has helped the community look at things from a long term perspective.

Ms. Schafer asked what role and standards would the Regional Plan have to assist in the effort for the local governments and service providers. Member Ziegler replied not in the area of policy but in the area of other things that the agency can do, such as articulating and communicating a vision.

Member Sikorski asked if the plan is enforceable. Member Ziegler replied that it is enforceable to the degree that there is political commitment to enforce it. Member Hester explained the state laws and stated that from top down there is no penalty to do it, but there is a structure.

Ms. Schafer asked what the members want to see differently in regards to the infrastructure within the individual plans. Member Ziegler suggested that it might be to just catch up as was mentioned previously.

Ms. Rogers suggested that the Regional Governing Board hold a joint meeting with RTC, the school district, or each of the individual service provider boards to bring in a shared vision.

Member Ziegler referred the statement that the best plan might be certainty plus infrastructure and cited an example of a level of certainty where the stationeries were identified in the South Virginia Corridor. Member Ziegler suggested that exploring the area of targeting specific spots could be good rather than passively hoping for infill to happen.

Mr. Codega stated that standards cannot be put in writing to make everything work and suggested that stationary locations should be incorporated in the transportation and other service plans. A brief discussion followed regarding certainty and the stations.

Ms. Schafer asked if there has been enough discussion on this to allow the members to break into smaller groups to discuss the bullet points with information. Member Powell replied that the comments have been consistent.

Ms. Coombes suggested that there is a lagging effect and the model is breaking down when everyone is waiting for things to happen, such as RTC not providing transportation in an undeveloped area. Ms. Coombes requested to know how to get past the barriers when everybody wants the same thing. She requested to know if there are structural things that act as barriers for what actually wants to be done. A brief discussion followed.

Member Powell explained the City of Sparks land use pattern and stated that they cannot get to the point of planning that is needed due to limitations of staff, money, etc. Member Powell stated that it is a lag issue, and it is in the process of being done.

Ms. Schafer summarized Members Powell's comments by stating that the role of the Regional Plan is to concur with master plans of the individual jurisdictions.

Mr. Codega suggested taking the approach of asking what can be invested to take care of existing problems.

Member Lopez suggested that the utilities report at a future meeting on what is needed. Member Lopez stated that it is a battle in meeting the needs of future development, the vision of what the utilities see, and selling it to the customers.

Member Boster agreed that the school district is not entwined with the other boards. Member Boster suggested that the school district is not needed to lead out, but to be at the end.

Member Hester explained the term existing deficiency and cited the example of building the police substations. Member Hester stated that the small groups are not necessary for discussing the bullet points.

Member Ziegler suggested brainstorming as one group. Member Ziegler stated that the result of updating all the plans is like walking a tight rope where the result is a 6 or 7 year cycle or lag. Member Ziegler questioned if there is a utility coordinating facility. Member Ziegler suggested that the idea of a shared vision should be more active.

*[Member Boster left at 11:05 a.m.]*

Ms. Schafer asked for more opportunities regarding the discussion for the regional planning to play a part in. The following comments were made: inventory of existing facilities; identify with the impact framework; change the 20-year time line and the county boundaries; have private party partnerships back off to allow redevelopment and revitalization; look at models of other cities for the coordination process; bring public and private financing together to cover incentives.

A discussion followed regarding using redevelopment as a tool. Member Ziegler stated that investigation of other cities' models and exploring the issue of incentives in another way is what he was trying to get at in this discussion.

Member Hester stated that he does not want to spend time on marginal things even though he is open to new ideas.

Member Powell questioned whether plans from other large cities will work in the Reno area.

Ms. Schafer questioned how the coordination could be improved using models.

Member Powell stated that it would be a good effort to see if there are successful communities that do a good job of coordinating the utilities and infrastructures. Member Powell questioned the incentive implementation of the Regional Plan or redevelopment and infill.

Member Ziegler summarized the member's comments by stating that more real time or more immediate infrastructure coordination efforts are the key. Ms. Schafer asked if the members agreed with this summarization. Member Hester stated that the RPA is complimentary to judge conformity.

Mr. Stockham stated that all the TAC groups need to come together.

Member Ziegler stated that he would like to reserve the right to come back to this issue for more input for Module 1.

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

This item was not discussed.

**5. REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Ms. Schafer stated that the discussion will move to Module 2 at the next meeting.

**6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

None

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Reviewed by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director  
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

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