

MINUTES
2007 REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Friday, September 1, 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 in the Sparks Police Department – Training Room, 1701 Prater Way, Sparks, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Rosanna Coombes, Interim 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, City of Sparks; Jim Rundle, Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment and HOME Consortium; Scott Nebesky, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; Dean Schultz, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power Company; Hilary Lopez filling in for John Erwin, Truckee Meadows Water Authority; Adrian Freund, Washoe County; Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Department of Water Resources; and, Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department (Air Quality).

Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID, arrived at 8:41 a.m. and Mike Boster, filling in for Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District, arrived at 8:45 a.m.

Members absent were: Harold Shotwell, Palomino Valley GID; Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; Greg Dennis, Regional Water Planning Commission; 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. Ernie Nielsen, Senior Law Project; Nancy Muniz, Charles Schwabb; Phil Reyes, City of Sparks; April Hill, Tanamera Commercial Development; Don Francis, St. Mary's; Wes Harris, Associated General Contractors; Jeff Codega, Jeff Codega Planning and Design; and, Arlo Stockham, CFA.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A MEMBER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2006, TAC AGENDA. SECONDED BY A MEMBER. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH TWELVE (12) MEMBERS PRESENT.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Cathy Brandhorst, introduced herself as Lisa Marie Presley, John Benet Ramsey, John Steele, and the United States President. Ms. Brandhorst expressed concern with problems on Forest Street, immigration and gun issues.

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

Dee Schafer, Corporate Solutions, Inc., reviewed today's meeting objectives, which are to finalize Module 2 and then move onto some education into Module 3. Ms. Schafer thanked all those who responded to Regional Planning concerning the issues of infill, natural resources, and affordable housing.

- A. Status report and discussion on the actions and agendas of the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) and the RPC's Regional Plan Update Oversight Committee including modifications to the public involvement process and TAC membership.**

Lora Richards, TMPRA, reported on the suggested changes to the Staff Report of the August 18, 2006, TAC Meeting.

- B. Discussion and possible acceptance of:**

- 1. Conceptual agreements regarding Module #1 – Issue #3.2 – Adequate affordable housing. Should the Plan call for inclusionary housing practices?**

Ms. Schafer reviewed the agreement of the goal at the last meeting regarding affordable housing. Ms. Schafer reviewed the options, which are: (1) utilize the "musts" of the white paper as policy; (2) utilize the statutory requirements already in existence; and, (3) combine option (1) and (2).

Ms. Coombes passed out a handout regarding the comments and gave a brief overview of the handouts. Referring to pages 21 and 22 of the new handout, Ms. Coombes explained that deletions to the existing goal of affordable housing is noted and on page 45 a new goal was established. Ms. Coombes stated that policies are needed to work with the new goal and questioned what policies would work. Ms. Coombes passed out the hardcopies of comments from the City of Sparks, City of Reno, and Washoe County. Ms. Coombes also referred to a letter from Ernie Nielsen regarding affordable housing.

Ms. Coombes summarized Member Freund's comments that the secondary elements from the white papers could be used with slight changes to the laundry list. On page 2 of Member Freund's e-mail, Ms. Coombes reviewed the suggestions to the wording under the secondary components category. Ms. Coombes reviewed Mr. Nielsen's correspondence about Goal B in the white paper in terms of NRS 278.160. Ms. Coombes summarized Member Hester's comments regarding the laundry list.

Member Powell summarized the City of Sparks comments, which proposes that to accomplish the regional housing goal; it already coordinates with the statutes in the state law and the 21 items in the white paper. Member Powell expressed concern that the laundry list is not defined and does not promote conformity.

Ms. Schafer asked for comments on Ms. Powell's draft. The following comments were noted: add wording to include all nationalities and does it present a problem if an item does not fall under one of the five categories.

Ms. Coombes stated that the 5 components of the sub-list and the elements of statute line up pretty well. Ms. Coombes stated that the Regional Plan does not supplant other requirements that other local governments have; it would be additive or complementary to those other requirements. Ms. Coombes observed that there is merit to not be redundant.

Member Freund questioned the utility for Regional Staff of having specific performance criteria as opposed to the prefacing statute. Ms. Coombes stated that if an item is listed as performance criteria Regional Staff would look for that, if it is not the assumption is that they are satisfying the sections of statute that need to be satisfied.

Member Powell questioned if the Regional Plan went through the statute and in essence tried to total reevaluate the water plan based on the criteria of the state law. A Member stated that in doing the conformance review the issues were based on the state law requirements. A discussion followed regarding the Regional Plan becoming the watch dog of state law, abiding by the state law, and being consistent.

Ernie Nielsen, Sr. Law Project stated that one of the primary concerns is to hammer out the issues of fair share, coordination of senior housing, and which jurisdictions are responsible for what income levels. Ms. Schafer questioned if the jurisdictions are working on the senior housing element. A brief discussion followed. Ms. Powell explained that the current statute is silent on fair share and that the regional plan cannot address fair share at this time.

An individual questioned if there is confusion in terms of jurisdiction of who interprets due to redundancy of the State Law restated in the policies and an interpretation that the intent has not been met. Member Hester replied that State Law speaks for itself. The same individual questioned if this affords the governing board to define and implement affordable regional

housing. Ms. Schafer summarized the comments that the state law has to be followed and the five items are added. A brief discussion followed.

Ms. Schafer questioned how the committee feels regarding the wording. Ms. Coombes stated that if this type of policy is put in the plan, that is the kind of conformance review that will be received although there will be a wide open span of interpretation.

Member Freund stated that he likes the Sparks B suggestions. Ms. Schafer questioned if Sparks B and Washoe County's A could be combined. A brief discussion followed regarding the need to update the housing element as they have not been updated for several years. Ms. Schafer asked again how the members felt about combining the two suggestions. At this point in the meeting, the members clarified the suggestions. The following comments were noted: leave the entire laundry list in B; Washoe County's bullet points are more objectives and Spark's A are more categorical; blend the statements together to make them stronger and more measurable; take the language that Sparks has and use 2-5 on the next list, add with the aim of, a picture of conformance review would be given; and, leave the list of five as they are not redundant. A discussion followed regarding the combination of the wording.

Mr. Nielsen stated that he would like to see more specific items in the coordination of the entities. Member Powell suggested leaving the inclusionary housing policy in and throwing out the rest.

Ms. Schafer reviewed the two ideas of combining the two suggestions and keeping what is in the policy now. Referring to the amendment worksheet starting on page 3 Policy 1.1.13, Ms. Coombes directed the members to review the wording. Comments were requested. The following comments were made: the policy specifically identifies that a regional model is established; add more meat to the Regional Plan regarding documentation as it pertains to inclusionary housing; and, add language for a mutual coordination effort. It was decided that the two sections be combined while adding more meat, not conflicting with state law, and adding a coordination effort.

Jeff Codega, Jeff Codega Planning and Design, stated that to blanket affordable housing is not a good thing. Mr. Codega stated in order to get this to work the private building communities will need to be engaged.

At this point in the meeting, a ten minute break was called. The meeting reconvened.

2. Recommendations of the infill subcommittee regarding infill issues.

Ms. Coombes directed the TAC members to the Module 1 worksheet page 36, which is referred to as the escape clause. Ms. Coombes explained the worksheet and Arlo Stockham's concern regarding the wording on CIPs and how the wording relates to the escape clause. Ms. Coombes explained that the wording could be deleted, changed, or kept as is.

Mr. Stockham stated that the policy is a regulatory barrier to infill development as it is too specific. Mr. Stockham suggested deleting the clause. Ms. Schafer summarized that number 4 under the CIP is the concern. At this point in the meeting, a lengthy discussion followed regarding infrastructure. Member Hester suggested rewording C so the interpretation could not be skewed or delete it all together. Mr. Stockham stated that the more hoops a developer has to go through, it is more likely they will go build someplace else.

Ms. Schafer summarized the comments by stating that the suggestion is to keep everything up to 4 when it says “facilities or infrastructures are not currently available” and from the “or” on crossing that and looking below, keeping A and B and cross out C. Everyone was in agreement.

Ms. Coombes explained the concerns of Member Schultz regarding the two airport center plans in terms of residential and FAR requirements as it relates to the two center plans. Ms. Coombes reviewed the available approaches and stated that she will work with Member Schultz and bring it back to the committee.

Ms. Coombes requested that the members review page 45 of the affordable housing worksheet and return comments to her at a later time. Ms. Schafer stated that it is important that infill be signed off by the next meeting, so these comments are important.

3. Conceptual agreements regarding Module #2 – Management of the Region’s Natural Resources.

Ms. Schafer directed the members to review the Module 2 Natural Resource Management worksheet and directed the members to focus on the middle and last columns of the worksheet. Referring to page 2, Ms. Coombes explained that the red wording was agreed to by the committee. Ms. Coombes reviewed the issues on pages 3 and 4 and reviewed the possible options. Ms. Schafer requested if the members were comfortable with the changes. The following comments were made: add wildlife section; concern with putting language in – do not refer to the options; wild land, fire management, and fuel reduction is part of the urban wild land interface and should not be drawn out separately, add them into the including section; under option 2, the regional open space master plan has to address things specifically and the local master plans have to address those things that pertain to them; and, concern about the inclusion of the regional open space plan with the exclusion of master plans.

Ms. Schafer summarized the comments and explained option A, no need to reference and keep as option 1 as worded or option B, keep it in there as the language is written as a coordination effort. She requested to know which option the members are comfortable with. The members were comfortable with option 1.

At this point, Ms. Schafer directed the members to page 5, Tina Nappe’s comments and policy recommendations, and requested comments. Ms. Richards and Ms. Coombes gave a brief overview of Ms. Nappe’s comments. Member Hester spoke in regards to water recharge values.

Ms. Coombes explained that Policy 2.2.1 addresses recharge. The members agreed to leave the policy as is.

Ms. Schafer directed the members to review page 6. Ms. Coombes explained the suggestions from Washoe County, which would include the list on page 4. The following comments were made: keep it in the management area not in the constrained areas; the red map has value, but the map should not be included as DCA within the Regional Plan; and, there are species that love the developed areas. The members agreed to keep it where it is. In regards to Ms. Nappe's comments, it was decided that they are just observation.

Ms. Richards referred to page 6, Policy 2.1.1 and requested the members' comments. The following comments were made: weigh it evenly with everything; go back to the enabling concept where there are not too many constraints; and, each jurisdiction can build that into their own policy.

On page 8, Ms. Richards explained the policy and comments were requested. Ms. Coombes explained that this is a subcomponent of a policy on page 7. The following comments were noted: do not specifically identify aquifers in the plan; since recharge function is already in the water management plan, it may not need to be in the regional plan. The members agreed that the first item should be kept but not the second.

Ms. Richards stated that the change on page 9 is a name update or change. Ms. Coombes requested direction regarding the two goals and the name update. The following comments were made: the name is appropriate; lean towards the shorter wording; like the first goal as it leans toward linkage and coordination. The members agreed to leave the goal the way it is. Member Powell questioned if it should be as provided by the Nevada Revised Statutes. Ms. Coombes explained that the bottom line is that the language encourages not restricts.

On page 11, Ms. Richards overviewed the County's comments. It was decided that this would be kept the way it is.

On page 15, the members reviewed 2.5.2.2 and a brief discussion followed regarding energy efficient construction. It was decided to keep this out.

Ms. Schafer directed the members to review page 16 in the right column. Ms. Schafer requested sign off of this topic. The members agreed with the new changes and Module #2 was signed off.

C. Educational presentations and consideration of Module #3, including but not limited to:

- 1. Issue #4 – Should the plan identify different priorities for the provision of public facilities (infrastructure) and services?**

It was decided that this item be focused on at the next meeting. Ms. Coombes passed out background material on this item for the members to review for the next meeting.

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

Ms. Coombes stated that the next meeting will be held on September 15, 2006, which will focus on the education and start on discussion of Module #3. A third meeting will be held on September 22, 2006. The goal is to finish up the first three Modules by the end of September.

6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

Ms. Coombes reported that the written correspondence was dealt with throughout the meeting and that there was not any new correspondence to report.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by, Christine Birmingham



Rosanna Coombes, Director

Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

FILED ON

2/22, 2008.