

**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (RTC)
REGIONAL ROAD IMPACT FEE (RRIF)
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 27, 2014

Members Present:

Bill Gall, City of Reno Community Development

Clara Lawson, Washoe County Public Works

Jeff Hale, Regional Transportation Commission

Jess Traver, Private Sector

Jim Rundle, City of Sparks Community Development

John Martini, City of Sparks Public Works

Kraig Knudsen, Private Sector

Paul Kelly, Washoe County Development Review

Randy Walter, Private Sector

Steve Bunnell, City of Reno Public Works

Ted Erkan, Private Sector

Members Absent:

Amy Cummings, Regional Transportation Commission

Art Sperber, City of Sparks Planning Commission

Doug Coffman, City of Reno Planning Commission

Roger Edwards, Washoe County Planning Commission

RTC Staff:

Julie Masterpool

Kristen Barnes

Lee Anne Olivas

Michael Moreno

Shawn Pearson (Woodburn & Wedge)

Xuan Wang

Guests:

Carl Savely

The meeting was called to order at 1:09pm.

Jeff Hale introduced Jess Traver as a new member to the RRIF TAC and welcomed him to the committee.

Item 1: Approval of Agenda

Julie Masterpool requested that Item 4 be pulled from the agenda and stated that the item would be presented at the April RRIF TAC meeting. The amended Agenda with Item 4 pulled was approved unanimously.

Item 2: Public Comment

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Item 3: Approval of the February 27, 2014 Meeting Minutes

The February 27, 2014 Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously.

Item 4: RRIF Capital Improvement Plan Projects

Item 4 was pulled from the agenda and will be brought back to the April meeting.

Item 5: RRIF General Administrative Manual Review

The committee agreed to go through the General Administrative Manual (GAM) by section and if more detail was needed, per page.

Definitions:

Auxiliary Use - Randy Walter stated that the language was confusing and the fee should be calculated on what is actually is, i.e. a warehouse or retail. Julie explained that the purpose of the Auxiliary Use was to identify secondary uses that are inherent to the primary use and do not

independently contribute additional traffic to the regional network . Clara Lawson commented that having fewer categories may make the definition less confusing.

Developer of Record - There was discussion about possibly issuing an interim waiver prior to completion of an eligible improvement. Julie Masterpool asked if the Cities would accept right-of-way (ROW) dedication before completion, which would allow the possibility of an interim waiver. The response was that they would.

Offset Agreements – Clara Lawson asked if the agreements would go before the RRIF TAC or other Advisory Committees. Julie Masterpool stated that a process would need to be determined, but that it would most likely follow the RTC’s current Program of Projects (POP) process. The RTC’s POP does go before the RTC Technical Advisory Committee and Citizen Advisory Committee for recommendation to the RTC Board.

RRIF Capital Improvements – Ted Erkan asked if landscaping would be eligible. John Martini stated the he feels it should be. He also commented that the RRIF Administrators will need to establish a baseline or metric for determining what is “creditable”. Julie Masterpool stated that under multimodal components, transit improvements are not eligible for impact fees per NRS. There was discussion about collector streets being removed from the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Julie Masterpool stated that there has been consideration to not give offsets for the first two lanes of a regional road. Ted Erkan stated that if something is on the CIP, then offsets should be given. The committee agreed that collector streets need to be addressed.

RTC RRIF Administrator – Julie asked if the committee wanted the RTC RRIF Administrator to Chair the RRIF TAC meetings or if it should rotate amongst the RRIF Administrators. The committee agreed that it should remain the RTC RRIF Administrator.

RRIF Waiver – Clara stated that she had a hard time with the use of the term “waiver”. The committee agreed to leave as is.

Trust Fund – Julie stated that the RRIF Trust Fund is where the RRIF collections are deposited once the local jurisdictions transfer the money to RTC.

Section III Imposition of Impact Fees:

- A. **Service Areas** - The Exhibit references need to be re-labeled. Julie stated the proposed service areas do not include the Winnemucca Ranch area and East Truckee River Canyon. If they are added back in, the fee calculations will change slightly. Julie commented that

they are some boundary changes being discussed between Washoe County and Storey County and if there are any changes made, the committee will need to re-address the boundaries of the Service Areas.

B. Benefit Districts - The Exhibit references need to be re-labeled. Benefit Districts will not apply to the new offset program. Julie asked if fee collections should be associated with the CCFEA Credit Benefit Districts or the new North and South Service Areas. The Northeast and Northwest Benefit Districts are combined into the North Service Area. The committee agreed to associate fee collections with the North/South Service Areas. Since collections and offsets will reference only the North/South Service Areas, the committee asked if the NE and NW “credits” will be combined into the North category and be used anywhere in the North service area. (Note: Any changes to CCFEA Credit usage will require legal counsel review.)

C. Feepayer – No changes.

D. Payment Due

1. **General** - Fees will be locked in at time of the permit issuance. The fee shall be paid prior to the C of O, as approved by the local jurisdiction.
2. **Invalid Payment** – No changes.
3. **Underpayment of Fee Based on Error of Misrepresentation** – Change the “application” to “issuance”.
4. **Overpayment of Fee Based on Error** – Leave as is.

E. Determination of Fee

1. **General** - No changes.
2. **Offsets** – Separate into two sections, i.e. 2A Offsets and 2B CCFEA Credits. There was discussion about how to handle offsets. Julie suggested using vouchers with dollar amounts, similar to the current credit voucher program. There was discussion on how offsets were measured; in dollars or in VMTs. Julie stated that her vision is that a voucher would be received in dollar amounts instead of credits.

IV. Determination of Fee Based on Fee Schedule:

A. Land Use Classification

1. **Land Use Definitions** – remove “Land”. The committee discussed the various categories and agreed to reduce the number of categories. The committee agreed that we need to keep both “Medical-Dental Office” and “General Office”, but redefine what goes under “Medical-Dental Office” because there are some physicians/dentists that generate more trips than say a psychologist or physical therapist. Examples of a practice with higher volumes of patients are dentists, chiropractors and ophthalmologists. The committee agreed that “Drive-in Bank” and “Fast Food Restaurant” would go under the General Commercial category. “Warehouse” and “Regional Warehouse” will be collapsed into one category. Julie Masterpool stated that she would look at the ITE rates for warehouses. “Day Care Centers” will be moved to the “General Commercial” category.
- J. **Recreational Vehicles (RVs)** – Julie asked if the category was still needed and the committee agreed that it is.
- K. **Shopping Centers (Existing)** – There was discussion about changing the project term from two years to five years and tying it to the Special Use Permit. The committee also discussed reducing the number of thresholds for shopping centers.

Section X. Impact Fee Offsets Requested after the 2013 RRIF Program Update:

A. Generally.

- a. **Waivers** – the word “lots” will be changed to “uses”. Instead of saying “waivers may be approved for Offset-Eligible Costs...,” it will be changed to “waivers are Offset-Eligible Costs...” under section (1).
- b. **Reimbursements** – Language will be changed from “Reimbursements requested by a Developer of Record may be accepted for Excess Offset-Eligible Costs if the RTC and the affected Participating Local Governments determine...” to “Reimbursements *are* Excess Offset-Eligible Costs *as approved by* the RTC and the affected Participating Local Governments...” Julie discussed projects that RTC or the local agencies may want under “Reimbursements”. There was discussion on time constraints and the developer not being mandated to build

more than their developments. The committee discussed waivers having no expirations and the basis for the waivers being set at day one or locked in at the time of the waiver agreement. A template for a waiver agreement will be created and included as an exhibit in the GAM.

- G. Excess Offset-Eligibility Costs Reimbursements; Available Funds and Timing –**
The committee agreed that this section can be removed from the GAM. Reimbursements will be handled outside of the GAM with outside agreements.

Section XI. Unexpired Credits Approved Prior to the 2013 RRIF Program Update:

Evaluation on the options for extending the expiration dates for impact fee credits is currently under legal review with local jurisdiction general counsels.

Section XIII. Amendments CIP:

A formal process for adding projects to the CIP will need to be created. Changes to the CIP will require a recalculation of the fees. (Note: We will need to check the numbering of the sections.)

Item 6: Public Comment

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Item 7: Member Items

The next RRIF TAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 24, 2014 at 2:00pm in the RTC Engineering Conference Room located at 1105 Terminal Way, Suite 108. Agenda items include the RRIF Capital Improvement Plan Projects and continued discussions on the RRIF General Administrative Manual.

Item 8: Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:36pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Lee Anne Olivas