

**TAC Members**

**MINUTES**

**2007 REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, November 18, 2005**

Nevada System of Higher Education

Palomino Valley General Improvement District

Regional Transportation Commission

Regional Water Planning Commission

City of Reno

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

The meeting was called to order by Dave Ziegler, Director of Regional Planning, at 9:38 a.m.

**1. ROLL CALL**

The clerk called the roll, and TAC Members in attendance were: Harold Shotwell, Palomino Valley GID; Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Greg Dennis, Regional Water Planning Commission; Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment Agency and HOME Consortium; Scott Nebesky, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; Dean Schultz, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power; Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; Robert Lichtenstein, UNR/TMCC; Adrian Freund, Washoe County; Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department (Air Quality); and Mike Boster for Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District. Dave Ziegler, Truckee Meadows Regional Planning.

Member Rob Joiner, City of Sparks & Sparks Redevelopment Agency, arrived at 9:55 a.m. Member John Hester, City of Reno, arrived at 10:15 a.m.

Members absent were: Margaret Powell, City of Sparks and Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID; John Erwin, Truckee Meadows Water Authority; Jeanne Rucker, Washoe County District Health Dept. (Solid Waste); and Greg Martinelli, Waste Management

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) staff present were: Randy Baxley, Rosanna Coombes, Patricia Rogers, Lora Richards, and Paige Menicucci, and.

Also present were: Stacy Crowley, Growth Task Force; Trent Averett, President of Peavine Pines; Chris Lipman, Bayfish LLC; David Anderson, Development Director for Reno Sparks Indian Colony; Elizabeth and John Howe, Silver Knolls; A representative from the Nevada Division of Water Resources; Robin Palmer; Cline Harts, High Ranch Homeowners; Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions.

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MEMBER SHOTWELL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 18, 2005, TAC AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER FREUND. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH FOURTEEN (14) MEMBERS PRESENT.**

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.

### **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MEMBER FREUND MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 20, 2005, TAC MEETING MINUTES, SECONDED BY MEMBER SULLIVAN. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH TWELVE (12) MEMBERS IN FAVOR AND TWO (2) ABSTENTIONS BY MEMBERS DENNIS AND SCHULTZ.**

### **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

A. Trent Averett, President of Peavine Pines reported that his company currently owns about 1,300 acres off of Peavine Mountain, contiguous with Somerset. They are discussing trying to work with the county staff to create a specific plan on the property on Peavine Mountain. In order to do this, they would like to be included in the Truckee Meadows Service Area.

B. Chris Lipman represented himself as another property owner who shares the northern boundary of Somerset and would also like to be a part of the TMSA.

C. Robin Palmer commented on the previous meeting and asked that the TAC keep in mind that the audience is at their backs and that it is difficult to read the flipcharts and to hear the members' discussions.

D. Cline Harts stated that he was representing himself today and was not representing Highland Ranch.

E. John Howe, Silver Knolls, requested the TAC to please consider the areas that are included in the Sphere of Influence on the map.

Mr. Ziegler addressed the stakeholders and encouraged them to feel free to participate in the process and if anyone wished to be recongnized during the discussions, to please raise his/her hand and the facilitator will call on him/her. He stated that the TAC would be breaking up into small groups and the stakeholders were welcome to be a part of the groups. He also asked that everyone continue to be respectful and mindful of the overall process.

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

- A. **Presentation by and discussion with representatives of the Truckee Meadows Growth Task Force regarding the Regional Plan update**
- B. **Consideration of and possible conceptual agreements on Module 1 of the Regional Plan, Issue #1, boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA)**
- C. **Review of priority list of issues for 2007 Regional Plan update, including possible identification of additional issues or qualifiers**

Agenda items 5A-C were discussed together.

Stacey Crowley, co-chair of the Truckee Meadows Growth Task Force, along with Phil Satre, began the discussion with an introduction. The Growth Task Force was developed in response to a possible ballot initiative about one- to one-and-a-half years ago, about “smart growth” in the Truckee Meadows. The Task Force is a citizen-led, volunteer group made up of community leaders from all areas of practice, including environmentalists, the gaming industry, business development design, all working at looking at issues of growth. Throughout the past few months, the development communities have looked at five priorities: (1) affordable housing, (2) transportation, (3) accessibility to open space, (4) natural resource constraints, and (5) downtown revitalization to include a study of reinvestment funds. The study conducted by other cities looks at reinvestment from foundations, banks, other private entities to help spur growth in downtown or smart growth issues.

Ms. Crowley stated that they have the approval and support of the City of Reno, City of Sparks and Washoe County, along with the Regional Planning Agency with Dave Ziegler. They created the work plans that discuss committees, what they are working on and recently requested a small amount of funds from each the City of Sparks, the City of Reno and Washoe County to help look further into the issues. They have asked for funding for affordable housing and the reinvestment fund. Discussions concerning the open space and natural resource constraints have been held with Desert Research (DRI) and several environmental groups as a discovery process relating to growth. The Task Force is participating with the City of Reno’s and Washoe County’s open space and greenways plans updates. She stated that today’s intent is to introduce the Task Force, provide an update, and participate in the Regional Plan Update.

Member Langs questioned if the group was going to do any type of cost analysis for the current citizens living here.

Ms. Crowley stated that they have not yet looked at that study. They have completed research in different ways in terms of vehicle miles traveled and gas prices, and studies with infrastructure which involved basic numbers that show the new infrastructure costs for the communities and how the older neighborhoods are somewhat neglected in terms of their infrastructure updates. Currently, no dollar figures are attached at this time.

Member Langs requested to know if analysis regarding new development versus paying for repairs to old infrastructure had been completed. Ms. Crowley replied that the impact fees from new development helps to support the whole system. Cities are supposed to look at how it affects the entire system. Member Langs clarified her thoughts of a monthly fee that could be included in water, sewer, or garbage billings.

Ms. Schafer commented that the Growth Task Force is a solid stakeholder that will participate in discussions.

Ms. Crowley explained that they are finding that resources in communities and a lot of the resources are here are being used. It is a discovery process and they would like to make

recommendations to the cities and to the county. Ms. Schafer recommended that the stakeholders come to as many of these sessions as possible.

Member Sullivan expressed concern and his desire to see the Task Force address the source of funding needed for older areas, as opposed to new impact fees paying for repairs to older neighborhoods.

Dee Schafer reviewed the session objectives for the day. The purpose of the meeting was to define the purpose, principles, and policies for administering and implementing the TMSA. She referred to the sheets and stated that they covered the issue, education and scope and identifying member issues and needs and will go through "D, E, and F" under Issue 1, Module 1. She reviewed the "homework assignments" and asked that if there were additional issues, they need to be "out of the process" to flow into the small group process.

At this time (at approximately 9:55 a.m.), Member Joiner arrived.

Member Langs stated that there is a need for definite criteria for the job-housing balance. She requested that the issues addressed stay within the regional and county boundaries.

Adrian Freund questioned how the TAC should move forward since the Settlement Agreement already dictates what the TAC is to accomplish.

Member Sullivan agreed with Member Freund in that the TAC should understand the Settlement Agreement. They need to be sure that they are not making decisions that are contrary to any legal decisions.

Ms. Schafer stated that there was a presentation of the Settlement Agreement with questions and discussions before moving forward.

Member Ruefer stated that in regards to the Settlement Agreement, as time goes on, the group should discuss the nuances and concerns of the Settlement Agreement that are going to constrain them in their definitions.

Mr. Ziegler commented that the Regional Plan needs a level of understanding that the Settlement Agreement put some baselines into place. He stated that there is a formula that establishes the size of the TMSA based on population data and the coefficient of four persons per acre. The cities of Reno and Sparks and Washoe County must submit a map to the Regional Planning Commission as a Regional Plan amendment. The TAC must think of items that are "givens" still in play, how to administer the TMSA in the future and continued updates.

Member Shotwell requested to know when the maps for the RPC were due.

Member Freund stated that he anticipated each jurisdiction taking action on a common map on December 12, 13, and 14 for Sparks City Council, Washoe County Commissioners, and the City of Reno Council. The current plans are for a joint meeting when in January to agree on recommendations to submit to the Regional Planning Commission.

Ms. Schafer stated the TAC will work to define the purposes and principles for administering the TMSA.

Member Ziegler stated that the amendment is a public process, with public hearings. The RPC might look to the TAC for advice.

Member Langs questioned the mapping process. Member Freund stated the maps are a recommendation to the Regional Planning. The Settlement Agreement terminates when the Regional Plan update is complete. The map is based on projected population forecasts to 2030 and accommodates anticipated growth in each of the jurisdictions.

Member Langs requested to know that since the agreement states it, do the elected officials sitting on the Regional Planning Governing Board have to support what comes out of the Settlement Agreement. Member Freund affirmed Ms. Langs comment stating it is identical to the terminologies in the Regional Plan settlement, and parties are bound to support the Settlement Agreement.

Ms. Schafer commented that the work completed by the TAC along with the Settlement Agreement dovetails together appropriately for the Regional Plan.

Member Freund stated that the Regional Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Governing Board will be looking to the TAC for advice as to whether the proposal is in conformance, not in conformance, and/or does it represent good growth policy.

Member Sullivan stated the importance of the economy. The TAC needs to be sure that growth is completed economically, discourage “leapfrog” development, and certain types of growth patterns.

At this point in the meeting (approximately 10:15 a.m.), Member Hester arrived.

Member Dennis requested to know if there was a way to create an incentive to make a specific area have a specific type of infrastructure

At this time (approximately 10:20 a.m.), the TAC broke off into small discussion groups. The groups were created as follows:

- Group 1: Dave Zielger, Rob Joiner, Greg Dennis, and Mark Sullivan
- Group 2: Robert Lichtenstein, Jeanne Ruefer, Mike Boster, and Debra Goodwin
- Group 3: Adrian Freund, Duane Sikorski, Harold Shotwell, and Jodi Royal-Goodwin
- Group 4: Scott Nebesky, David Anderson – RSIC, Diana Langs, John Hester, and Dean Schultz

Ms. Schafer instructed the group discussions to define the purpose of the TMSA.

Mr. Ziegler made the presentation on the discussions of Group 1. The purpose of the TMSA is to create a dividing line for different expectations and growth expectations. The TMSA assists

with broad infrastructure planning to include infrastructure in service areas. The TMSA can be used to protect large natural tracks of land or assets, have a role in promoting fiscal equity, and provide reasonable expectations for growth. The TMSA should provide an optimal amount of land for development without services. There is an optimal amount of land that should be in the TMSA to provide some description or restraint from outward expansion because of incentives. The TMSA helps provide restraint or some discipline.

Member Boster made the presentation on the discussions of Group 2. The group suggested the idea of utilizing existing constraints, the topography and natural resources to provide services within the boundary. This will provide efficient, sustainable and compact urban form expansion within. Development is subject to the availability of resources.

Member Jodi Royal-Goodwin made the presentation on the discussions of Group 3. The group discussed an overall description of the common boundaries for early growth development in areas and the idea of discouraging unsuitable development by not allowing that specific area into the TMSA. The group also discussed resource constraints, discouraging premature development and the need for realistic containment. The group looked at the region as a whole the interconnectedness that needs to be addressed in terms of the TMSA and the RDA (Rural Development Area).

Member John Hester made the presentation on the discussions of Group 4. The group discussed the current definitions of the areas and stated that they need an analysis of the available capacity of the TMSA. There should be a priority on maintenance of existing areas and "infill." The group was opposed to municipal services and infrastructure in expensive areas. The group also discussed the phase-in process for the areas beyond twenty years and how to determine future needs. The group recommended clarification regarding low-density development and municipal services outside the TMSA.

Member Ruefer agreed an analysis of available capacity and absorption was necessary.

Member Langs suggested an inventory of the current property built, vacant and a list of what needs to be built. She stated it was important that people are aware of the set boundaries.

Member Dennis stated the need for adequate infrastructures is for schools and infill.

Member Ziegler observed that three groups, if not all, recognized that change over time is one of the factors. It is not necessarily the same boundary that we will have five, ten or fifteen years down the road. The change over time is dynamic.

Member Ruefer stated that one of the purposes of the TMSA is that it reflects an urban-type of development, an area within which urban type of development is going to take place.

At this point, a short recess was declared. The meeting was re-called to order at 11:17 a.m. At this time, Member Hester left the meeting. It was requested that Public Comment be re-opened. There was no objection.

## **6. PUBLIC COMMENT (Re-opened)**

A. Cline Harts, who is involved in economics, stated that resources rule and this should not be underestimated. He requested to know: a) what the rules were; and, b) if the rules were practical. He commented that understanding is important.

## **7. BUSINESS OF THE DAY (Continued)**

Ms. Schafer reviewed the common themes and purposes as follows:

1. Establish rational growth
2. Be mindful of resource constraints
3. Provides discipline for expansion
4. Promotes equity
5. Provides broad infrastructure for service area
6. Recognize time constraints and flexibility
7. Allows for appropriate growth

Ms. Schafer asked if the TAC members felt comfortable that a consensus could be reached for the areas of the purpose of the TMSA.

Member Sikorski questioned #6 and suggested replacing “recognize time constraints” with “criteria constraints.” There were no objections.

Member Dennis question #6 as truly a constraint and members agreed to change the language to read “recognizes changes over time”.

At this point (approximately 11:25 a.m.), Member Lichtenstein left the meeting.

Ms. Schafer instructed members to form small groups. Ms. Schafer suggested moving into small groups.

The groups were created as follows:

- Group 1: Mark Sullivan, Jodi Royal-Goodwin, and Mike Boster
- Group 2: Dave Ziegler, Greg Dennis, Debra Goodwin, and Harold Shotwell
- Group 3: Adrian Freund, Diana Langs and Dean Schultz
- Group 4: Rob Joiner, Scott Nebesky, Jeanne Ruefer, and Duane Sikorski

Ms. Schafer stated that the purpose of the small group discussions was to define the principles and policies for administering the TMSA.

Mr. Ziegler thanked everyone for their attendance and participation and asked if anyone had any other issues.

**8. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

A request was made to have discussions of the TMSA map is on the following meeting's agenda.

**9. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

Mr. Ziegler stated that the next TAC meeting would be at the same place in two weeks, on December 2, 2005.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Joy Randall

REVIEWED BY:

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

**FILED ON**

\_\_\_\_\_, 2007.