

**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, December 2, 2005**

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: Rob Joiner, City of Sparks & Sparks Redevelopment Agency; Harold Shotwell, Palomino Valley GID; Greg Dennis, Regional Water Planning Commission; Scott Nebesky, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; Dean Schultz, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority; Mark Sullivan, Sierra Pacific Power; Jerry Schumacher, South Truckee Meadows GID; Diana Langs, Sun Valley GID; Adrian Freund, Washoe County; Jim Smitherman, Washoe County Dept. of Water Resources; Robbin Rose, Washoe County District Health Dept. (Solid Waste); and Mike Boster for Mark Stanton, Washoe County School District.

Member John Hester, City of Reno, arrived at 9:45 a.m.; Member Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Reno Redevelopment Agency and HOME Consortium, arrived at 10:05 a.m.; Member Margaret Powell, City of Sparks and Sparks Redevelopment Agency, arrived at 10:47 a.m.

Members absent were: Debra Goodwin, Regional Transportation Commission; John Erwin, Truckee Meadows Water Authority; Robert Lichtenstein, UNR/TMCC; Jeanne Ruefer, Washoe County Department of Water Resources; Duane Sikorski, Washoe County District Health Department (Air Quality); 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 were: Dave Ziegler, Randy Baxley, Rosanna Coombes, Patricia Rogers, Lora Richards, and Paige Menicucci.

Also present were: Trent Averett, Peavine Pines; Joan Lambert; Robbin Palmer, Craig Knudsen; Jeff Codega, Codega Planning & Design; Lee Weston, Property Owner; Teresa, Summit Engineering; Dee Shafer, Corporate Solutions and Stacy Crowley.

## **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MEMBER DIANA LANGS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 2, 2005, TAC AGENDA, SECONDED BY MEMBER ADRIAN FREUND. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THIRTEEN (13) MEMBERS PRESENT.

## **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Trent Averet, President of Peavine Pines requested that Peavine Pines be included in the TMSA boundary. He expressed that his property is being excluded and that the the TMSA should be based on a radius from the center of the city.

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

- A. Consideration of and possible conceptual agreements on Module 1 of the Regional Plan, Issue #1, boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA)
- B. Initial consideration of Module 1 of the Regional Plan, Issue #2, providing an appropriate amount of land for all types of development and open space
- C. Review of priority list of issues for 2007 Regional Plan update, including possible identification of additional issues or qualifiers

Dee Shafer of Corporate Solutions began by stating the purpose of the day's meeting, which was to finalize the purpose of the TMSA and to work on the principles and policies of the TMSA and hopefully reach a consensus with the group on what it believed the principles and policies might be.

*(John Hester arrived at 9:45 a.m.)*

Ms. Shafer reminded the group of the purpose of the TMSA and why the TMSA exists. According to the discussions of the previous meeting, the purpose of he TMSA was “to define the area where urban and suburban development will take place and where municipal services and infrastructures will be provided subject to their availability and to restrain outward expansion of urban and suburban development and premature extension of services and infrastructure. To maintain a priority on utilization and maintenance of existing development and infill and to guide urban and suburban development away from unsuitable areas while recognizing resources. To support urban and suburban development are constrained, the TMSA and rural development area (RDA), are interconnected. The capacity of the TMSA will be absorbed over time and must be monitored.

Dave Ziegler commented on the results of the previous group session. The staff did not include on the flip chart summary, the statement “to promote fiscal equity (or just equity).” The reason this was left out was that he did not believe that this statement was one of the purposes but rather, should be discussed. Mr. Ziegler expressed that he felt that the TMSA was non-jurisdictional. He stated that there may be equity issues across the boundary but not sure what they are or if they can be analyzed. He also stated that this issue may not be central to the discussion. Currently, 1% of the population in the TMSA is rural. This should be discussed.

Adrian Freund stated that he agreed with Mr. Ziegler's statements regarding equity and that all areas of the TMSA support themselves with infrastructures and services. Mr. Freund questioned whether the issue was with fiscal equity or with other types of equity. The fiscal equity part was a derivative issue that came from ensuring that whenever a resident/property owner was a part of the TMSA, a range of services would be provided and supporting infrastructure that ensures that all areas of the TMSA "pay their own way."

Diana Langs expressed support for Mr. Ziegler's and Mr. Freund's comments.

Rob Joiner stated that he wanted to be included in the Temporary Parking lot list.

Greg Dennis referred to Mr. Freund's comment that "all areas pay their own way." He requested that a study be completed on infrastructure to define "what" actually pays its own way and base the study on taxes.

Mr. Freund stated that the issue is broader than Mr. Dennis' understanding of the statement and that we need to have adequate fiscal resources to support growth and development, within the TMSA boundary.

Mr. Dennis stated that he believed that the fiscal issue will not be settled "here."

Ms. Langs agreed with Mr. Dennis that the fiscal issue could not be settled. She stated that "we cannot seek legislation to get it changed in the Plan."

John Hester stated that this is another issue that will not be solved at this level.

Mr. Ziegler stated that he would like to continue the discussion regarding fiscal equity but at a later date, during Module 3 discussions.

Mr. Freund stated that fiscal equity is taking on its own definition. He stated that he was more or less referring to fiscal "adequacy" for a full range of services. In the Settlement Agreement, it is clearly outlined that there must be provision and funding for a full range of services as an area develops, regardless of where the property is in the TMSA.

Ms. Shafer suggested that the fiscal issue be moved into Module 3.

Mr. Dennis requested that the purpose be re-read for clarification. He referred to the premature extensions of development and if there is long-range, affordable land and housing.

Ms. Shafer stated that Mr. Dennis' question should be addressed in "Principles" rather than as a part of the "purpose" and suggested moving into the small group session.

Mr. Hester referred to bullet #2, which stated "to ensure that when expansion does occur, it is accompanied by adequate services and facilities."

Mr. Dennis suggested adding the phrase "fully planned, outward expansion for urban and suburban development."

Ms. Shafer questioned if the group was comfortable with the limiting term and suggested "well planned out" term rather than a restraining term.

Mr. Hester stated that he would rather "plan" the terms and not react.

Mr. Joiner stated that there needs to be adequate provision for services prior to planning. Additionally, the language should mirror the language of the Settlement Agreement.

Mr. Ziegler stated that it seemed like the group was discussing the concept of discipline or restraint on outward expansion. He questioned if one of the purposes of the TMSA was to provide discipline or restraint on outward expansion or if the TMSA was a concept that accommodates outward expansion.

Mr. Freund stated that the purpose statement needs to also recognize dynamic tension in terms of policy between wanting to constrain growth provided for infill but also the TMSA has to be an opportunity for free-standing new towns, etc. He expressed that he was unsure if the purpose statement, as currently written, was sufficient for that type of growth. The statement needs to suggest good reasons and benefits for constraining growth and meeting some infill goals.

Ms. Shafer suggested adding the statement “as appropriate” to the purpose statement. The TMSA needs to have the flexibility but also needs to recognize the issue of outward expansion.

Mr. Hester stated that Mr. Dennis’ statement appeared to be mostly about defining areas.

Mr. Freund stated that the group should not set boundaries without planning.

Mr. Ziegler referred to bullet #2 and suggested that the thought is complete but that it should be monitored and expanded. He stated that there is a purpose of the boundary, and that is to provide some counter-balance to all existing incentives or extensions that are out there. Outward expansion is already incentivized.

Jeff Codega referred to the word area in bullet #1. He stated that the statement should be modified to read “sufficient areas.” Mr. Codega stated that the group needed to think more positively and to avoid premature expansion of services and infrastructure.

Mr. Ziegler and Mr. Hester agreed with Mr. Codega’s statements.

Ms. Langs stated that she agreed with the word discipline in the statement.

Mr. Ziegler discussed Mr. Codega’s comments regarding bullet #1 and stated that the word area should be made plural and on bullet #2, the wording changed to guide expansion of urban and suburban development and avoid the premature extension of services and infrastructure.

Mr. Codega focused back on his comments on services, infrastructure, and developers.

Ms. Shafer suggested removing the word outward.

Mr. Hester suggested that rather than the word avoid, replace it with ensure timely. He also suggested removing the word extensions and adding the word provisions.

Robin Palmer made two comments. The first comment was regarding the addition of as appropriate. The second referred to the last flip chart and asked if someone could explain the statement which read “the capacity will be absorbed”.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the statement referred to the idea that we’re not making any more land and that the capacity within a boundary will eventually be all absorbed. He referred

to Mr. Hester's comment of "ensuring timely provisions" to accommodate development but not premature extension of services

Ms. Langs expressed her concern with the word timely and how it is defined. She asked whose time was being referenced.

*(Jodi Royal-Goodwin arrived at 10:05 a.m.)*

Mr. Dennis gave an example if someone wanted an interceptor on the fringe, he would include this request in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) over time. The other option was for someone else to put in the infrastructure for free or else as part of the development. It would be great if these alternatives to the CIP plan resulted in a benefit to the community.

Ms. Shafer questioned if the word premature addressed everybody's concerns.

Mr. Dennis stated that the wording should represent a positive direction and avoid the negatives.

Mr. Hester stated that he believed that the words "timely" and "problematic" are problematic. There should be a plan for services and a plan for expansion.

Ms. Langs expressed that others believe that there is "too soon, too fast" mentality and that people want discipline, a defined area in an orderly fashion. The problem has been fast-faced, reacting to developers, rather than appropriate planning for the good of the entire community. Also, she suggested that without "premature" and "timely" when the density is increased, they will be forced to do something they are not ready for and rely on resources that they do not have.

Jerry Schumacher referred to bullet #4 and questioned "what are suitable areas?"

Ms. Shafer reminded the group that the purpose of the TMSA is broad and that the purpose statement should not be too tight.

Joan Lambert suggested replacing the word premature with the word orderly.

Ms. Shafer read the revised statement. It read "to guide the expansion of urban and suburban development and ensure orderly provision of services and infrastructure".

Scott Nebesky stated that everyone has their own interpretations and that the bullets need to be looked at as a whole and not piece by piece.

Mr. Ziegler addressed Mr. Schumacher's question and stated that the word unsuitable came from the flip chart. The staff attempted to be really broad in their summaries on the flip charts.

Mr. Dennis commented that constraints are a function of economics.

Jim Smitherman stated that the word constrained could be interpreted as fixed and would never be movable.

Ms. Shafer questioned if the definition should be a part of the purpose of if it was part of the principles and policies of the TMSA.

The group discussed several options of revising the statement.

Mr. Freund stated that the entire updated Plan needs to be resource constrained.

Mr. Smitherman stated that constraints have time elements involved and sometimes economic elements, but those are not fixed.

Mr. Dennis stated that the word maybe is acceptable and believed that the statement was better the way it read before it was revised.

Mr. Nebesky stated that all resources are constrained.

Mr. Schumacher stated that the statement “are constrained” specifies the current situation and leaves room for future changes.

Mr. Hester agreed the statement recognizes existing constraints.

Mr. Dennis requested clarification on the statement existing constraints.

Mr. Hester suggested adding the word existing to imply that a change can be made.

Mr. Ziegler stated that there are other constraints, such as slope, air quality, financial, etc. and denotes the idea of discipline. He agreed with Mr. Freund that some of the elected officials agreed in October 2002 that the Regional Plan is resource constrained. He stated that we must be realistic about the water available.

Mr. Dennis stated that there is only so much “in the pot,” and that resources are constrained.

Mr. Hester stated that we need to recognize what is there but not to exclude change.

Mr. Dennis stated that he does not want the wording “resources are constrained” because it may hurt the jurisdictions economically.

Jodi Royal-Goodwin stated that everything is constrained at a given point and that the amount of constraint is always changing.

Mr. Freund stated that the group was focusing too heavily on the language and stated that adding the word existing to resources should suffice.

Jim Smitherman referred to bullet #1 and requested clarification. He stated that the statement seemed inconsistent.

Mr. Ziegler noted that the wording was a result of discussion from the last meeting.

Mr. Smitherman stated that there appears to be a timing issue and he does not like the new or current wording.

Ms. Jodi Royal-Goodwin stated that municipalities have limited funds for the extension of infrastructure, but doesn't have any answers.

The group discussed different verbiage regarding bullet #1 – could vs. will vs. allow.

Mr. Hester stated that most of the infrastructure, if not all, is provided by the developers, with the exception of schools. He suggested that the statement should be changed to “where the infrastructure is planned to be provided” and remove “subject to availability.”

Trent Averett questioned how the plan will implement TMSA to guide urban and suburban development away from unsuitable areas – by inclusion or exclusion in the TMSA.

Ms. Langs supported Trent's comments.

Mr. Ziegler stated that there is no such thing as "free" infrastructure and to state that the developer pays is not always true.

Joan Lambert stated that the homeowners pay for the infrastructure in their mortgage payments but not with taxes.

Ms. Langs stated that it is better that a united group be online, on time with the appropriate sizing.

Ms. Shafer read bullet #1 for the group.

Ms. Langs suggested adding the following statement: subject to availability and timing.

Mr. Freund commented that there are no guarantees on getting services or infrastructure.

Mr. Hester stated that Reno does not have infrastructure plans for the whole TMSA area.

Mike Boster asked who would provide the resource in the statement "planned to be provided."

Ms. Shafer stated that Mr. Boster's question should be addressed in the goals and policies rather than in the purpose statement.

Mr. Ziegler thanked the group for its discussion.

Mr. Schumacher commented that a free lunch is not a free lunch.

Mr. Schultz commented on the issue of constrained resources.

Ms. Shafer asked if the group was in consensus with the changes.

*(Margaret Powell arrived at 10:47 a.m.).*

*Recess from 10:42 a.m. to 10:55 a.m.*

Ms. Shafer moving into small groups to work on bullet #1. Bullet #1 read as follows:

To define sufficient areas where urban and suburban development will take place and where municipal services and infrastructure are planned to be provided

The groups were created as follows:

Group 1: Jerry Schumacher, Jodi Royal-Goodwin, and Mike Boster

Group 2: Margaret Powell, Dave Ziegler, and Harold Shotwell

Group 3: Adrian Freund, Diana Langs, and Dean Schultz

Group 4: Rob Joiner, Scott Nebesky, and Jim Smitherman

*[The TAC reconvened out of small groups at 11:25 a.m.]*

Rob Joiner, Group 4, reported out the results of his group in three main points:

1. Identify areas of high-density development

2. All service provisions should be coordinated. Once in place, expansion of the TMSA should not take place until we have consumption of capacity before we go forward.
3. TMRPA staff should take a more proactive role to guide this.

Adrian Freund, Group 3, reported out the group's points as follows:

- Look at needs and capacity analysis
- Criteria for expansion where needed or warranted
- Should have logical phasing and staging
- Lifestyle choices – service standards might vary based on community character and lifestyle
- Should be priority on maintenance on existing infrastructure
- Concern that updates are being too short for Regional Planning or TMSA
- Keep in mind, benefits, jobs/housing balance
- Redefine infill area
- TMSA is non-jurisdictional. Growth should be looked at from the regional perspective
- Consider availability of resources and resource constraints
- Suitability of the name (Truckee Meadows Services Area) as we grow outward
- Emphasize revitalization of core areas
- Need criteria for free-standing service areas
- TMSA time frame is approximate
- TMSA amendments should occur once a year
- Land constraints and development constraints should be considered
- TMSA service standards may vary based on community character

Dave Ziegler, Group 2, reported out the group's points as follows:

- Allow service area to grow. Expect and plan with the population
- Meet thresholds and triggers
- Identify long-term future growth area
- TMS should be population based
- Long-term should be based on topography and not so much population driven

Mr. Freund commented on the densification and maintenance of a healthy core. There is a strong relationship between infill objectives and densification.

Mr. Hester made two points. The first point was at a state planning conference two years ago, there was a chart showing a 45 degree growth angle which indicated growth at the same density. He said this was a good concept to keep track of. The second point was that concepts trigger moves from long-term to short-term statements; however, this concept needed to be looked at as a whole.

Mr. Codega stated that a Master Plan community can take 10-20 years to implement. This is market driven and central city centers are losing jobs. We need to consider that there are other dynamics that we need to be cognizant of and provide a balance.

Ms. Langs stated that if we do not utilize the land in its best form and go out too fast with projects, we have to come back and create infill. We have to be careful for intensities and be sure that we are appropriate for future growth. We do not want to have to do “re-dos.”

*(Adrian Freund left at 11:48 a.m.)*

Mike Boster, Group 1, presented points as follows:

1. Establish when and how the TMSA boundaries may be changed and expanded
2. Create a regional infrastructure plan, which includes when, where, what the infrastructure is
3. Identify general landings, pattern for areas within the TMSA
4. Identify and define suitable and unsuitable areas
5. Recognize potential for change and new technology
6. Identify and define constraints

Ms. Shafer stated that all things were brought up among the group. These issues were defined and solidified.

Rob Joiner commented on infill. He stated that Justice Hardesty said “do not be constrained by NRS 278.” If need be, it can be rewritten.

Mr. Ziegler commented on the number of times that the infill program was mentioned in context of how to manage the TMSA. He said both a couple of meetings ago and in planning literature that any strategy, like the TMSA, has to be combined with infill strategy. He stated that the group should work on this issue together. He suggested that we take the flip charts and convert what was said into a summary.

*(Dean Schultz left at 11:57 a.m.)*

Ms. Shafer agreed that taking everyone’s ideas and definitions and putting a structure around it would be a good idea.

Mr. Ziegler stated that another way to address everything is to wait until the next meeting and synthesize the ideas as a group but that it would save time if the summary was done prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Shafer asked if any group would volunteer to do the summary.

After brief discussion, Mr. Ziegler stated that Regional would take care of the summary.

Ms. Shafer referred to Module 1, Issue 2 and asked the group if it had sufficient information to start working on the appropriate land for development issue.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the issue is how to ensure that there is adequate land supply for all of our needed types of development. He stated, not just adequate but appropriate as to the location as well. He suggested looking at land absorption and utilization rates.

Mr. Hester stated that EDawn was looking at target industries.

Mr. Ziegler questioned if EDawn's studies would have a bearing on land needs.

A brief discussion took place regarding land use, resources, and at business-to-business issues.

Ms. Shafer stated that in the packet on the last page, it states "...ensure appropriate land use for all types of development."

Mr. Hester stated that statistics on land utilization and land absorption could be brought in for further review.

Ms. Shafer stated that a review of statistics would be a good starting point.

Mr. Ziegler stated that we can look back at what has already occurred up until now. However, he does not know if anyone knows what is anticipated. He asked if someone would be able to report on what Collier stated.

Mr. Hester stated that he would be able to report on Collier.

Mr. Ziegler stated that they will see if they can get EDawn's statistics.

Ms. Shafer stated that at the next meeting, Issue 1 should be completed and the group should get through Issue 2.

Ms. Coombes stated that the room was not available for the 9:30 a.m. start time. Staff would find a new location for the next meeting.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the next meeting was scheduled for the 16<sup>th</sup> of December and that the January and February meeting dates would have to be determined.

Ms. Coombes stated that the Spanish Springs Library was available at 10:00 a.m. She questioned if the group wanted to start at 10:00 a.m. or if it wanted to pick a new meeting venue for the original 9:30 a.m. time slot.

Mr. Joiner stated that he preferred to start earlier.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the location would be determined and everyone would be notified.

Ms. Powell asked about land use categories in the appropriate lands or development of open spaces sections. She asked if the local jurisdictions dealt with it or if it was regional centers, employment centers, and TOD Corridors, etc., which is what the Regional Plan is. She questioned how this related to the issue.

Mr. Ziegler commented on industrial land and asked if we have enough. He believed that what is being discussed are broad use categories.

Ms. Shafer stated that the group needed to be educated so that a decision can be made.

Mr. Ziegler stated that an infill area might lend itself to certain uses but not others.

**5. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

None

**6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

None

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

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

Respectfully submitted by Joy Randall

---

David S. Ziegler, Director  
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

**APPROVED BY THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN SESSION ON  
\_\_\_\_\_, 2006**