

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

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 22, 2018

Members Present:

Amy Cummings, Regional Transportation Commission
Brian Stewart, Regional Transportation Commission
Ed Hawkins for Peter Gower, City of Reno Planning Commission
Janelle Thomas, City of Reno Community Development
Jim Rundle, City of Sparks Community Development
Jon Ericson, City of Sparks Public Works
Kraig Knudsen, Private Sector
Mike Lawson, Washoe County Planning Commission
Randy Walter, Private Sector (via conference call)
Scott Carey, City of Sparks Planning Commission
Steve Bunnell, City of Reno Public Works

Members Absent:

Clara Lawson, Washoe County Public Works
John Krmpotic, Private Sector
Mojra Hauenstein, Washoe County Development Review
Ted Erkan, Private Sector

Guests:

Carl Savely

Jeremy Smith

RTC Staff:

Blaine Peterson
Julie Masterpool

Dan Doenges
Xuan Wang

The meeting was called to order at 2:02pm.

Item 1: Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved unanimously.

Item 2: Public Comment

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Item 3: Approval of the February 22, 2018 Meeting Minutes

The February 22, 2018 Meeting Minutes were approved by majority vote. Nine members voted to approve the meeting minutes. Randy Walter joined the meeting via conference call after the vote. Ed Hawkins abstained from voting.

Item 4: Right of Way

At the February 22, 2018, RRIF TAC meeting, RTC was requested to review the option to include the 30-year right of way (ROW) needs in the RRIF CIP calculations.

RTC staff asked for legal guidance on the ability to include 30-year ROW in the impact fee and to issue impact fee waivers for the additional right of way.

While there are obvious benefits of reserving future ROW now, such as:

- Limiting development within the future roadway footprint;
- Allowing RRIF Cash to be used to purchase ROW; and
- Allowing RRIF Waivers to be issued for ROW donations by development.

There are also negatives. Reserving future ROW would:

- Remove donated ROW from the tax rolls;
- Put maintenance responsibilities on the local governments (under the old program, when we were looking at reserving ROW related to the Pyramid Hwy expansion, there was concern on who would pick up trash, handle weed abatement, etc.); and
- Future RTPs could change where capacity projects are needed.

Per a legal review, NRS limits the CIP to not exceed a 10-year timeframe. Therefore, it is legal opinion that the CIP cannot include the cost for 30-year ROW and RRIF Cash and RRIF Waivers would not be eligible for 30-year ROW.

There was discussion about how future ROW could be reserved. Possibly the local governments could require setbacks. However, that would be considered a taking. Developer agreements could be looked into as part of Master Plan Developments. Although, they are typically going to be constructed within two to three months. Julie stated she reviewed the current 2040 RTP and there aren't any projects that currently fall into the 10-year CIP that require additional widening in the outer years. Future ROW may not be an issue now, but could be in the future.

The committee acknowledged receipt of the report.

Item 5: RRIF Capital Improvement Plans by Service Area and Fee Methodology

Julie Masterpool stated the RRIF share of the proposed 6th Edition RRIF CIP has been updated with the most current information on proposed funding sources. However, RTC staff is still working on the amount of Fuel Tax funding that will be used on capacity improvements. As a part of RTC's budget process, staff is updating the long range financial plan. Once the information is available, they will be able to better anticipate the amount of fuel tax anticipated to be used on the CIP projects, which will help offset new development's share of the cost of the improvements.

Since Randy Walter was unable to attend the meeting in person, he sent questions in advance asking about the widening projects on the 6th Edition CIP such as Lemmon Drive, Military Road, and Moya. Randy asked if the roads reach 14,000 ADT. Julie Masterpool stated the projects came out

of the North Valleys Transportation Study and were included in the 2040 RTP. The RTP includes a combination of factors including not only travel demand, but community input, safety, congestion management (air quality), funding/revenue availability, and approval by government officials.

Wingfield Hills Extension from David Allen to Wingfield Hills Drive is shown for four lanes. A 4-lane facility was requested in the RTP process to connect the existing 4-lane segments. In addition, the new schools in Kiley will add volumes onto this segment and shows the need for 4-lanes.

Currently, RTC is working with TMRPA to develop a build out model of Spanish Springs and will help confirm needed improvements.

Lazy 5 from Pyramid to Sonoma Highlands was discussed. Randy Walter stated his traffic analysis does not show the need for four lanes, so we need to be more judicious on the projects listed on the CIP. Arrowcreek from Wedge to Zolezzi was also discussed. It is shown for four lanes. RTC staff looked at the model and the volumes do show it is approaching the 4-lane thresholds.

The model does look at the region at a higher level and is good at predicting volumes for the freeways and major roadways. The local network is more difficult to predict and so corridor and regional studies are used to help refine the projections.

Randy questioned (per questions submitted prior to the meeting) the Geiger Grade widening and realignment. It is show in the CIP to be RRIF funded, but the 5th Edition showed it with 0% funding. The need for improvements came out of the Geiger Grade Study. The previous 5th Edition assumed NDOT funding would be used. The 2040 RTP showed a combination of federal, state, and local funding; hence, it was included in the initial draft of the 6th Edition CIP.

Julie stated funding sources in the CIP will be re-addressed with the financial plan update. The number of new trips will be factored in as well as population and employment forecasts. Julie will provide an updated version of the CIP at a future meeting.

The committee acknowledged the receipt of the report.

Item 6: RRIF Indexing 5th Edition – Year 3

The March Board Meeting was postponed due to weather. This item is now scheduled to be heard at the April 5, 2018, RTC Board Meeting. Julie will notify the committee of the RTC Board's decision after the April 5, 2018, Board Meeting. The committee agreed that if the item is approved, it should be implemented on July 1, 2018.

The committee acknowledged the receipt of the report.

Item 7: Public Comment

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Item 8: Member Items

The next RRIF TAC meeting is scheduled for April 26, 2018 at 2pm in the RTC's 1st Floor Conference Room located at 1105 Terminal Way, Reno. Julie Masterpool stated the 2018 Consensus Forecast will be discussed at the April meeting. Preliminary results, next steps to include it in the Travel Demand Model, and determination for what is required to use for the RRIF CIP calculations will be discussed. Jeremy Smith stated he will work to have the build out model completed by the April meeting. Jeremy stated that as a sneak peak, it's looking to be just slightly higher than the model from two-years ago.

Item 9: Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:35pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee Anne Olivas