

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

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, April 26, 2018

Members Present:

Amy Cummings, Regional Transportation Commission
Clara Lawson, Washoe County Public Works
Janelle Thomas, City of Reno Community Development
Jim Rundle, City of Sparks Community Development
Jon Ericson, City of Sparks Public Works
Julie Masterpool for Brian Stewart, Regional Transportation Commission
Kraig Knudsen, Private Sector
Mike Lawson, Washoe County Planning Commission
Scott Carey, City of Sparks Planning Commission

Members Absent:

John Krmptic, Private Sector
Mojra Hauenstein, Washoe County Development Review
Peter Gower, City of Reno Planning Commission
Randy Walter, Private Sector
Steve Bunnell, City of Reno Public Works
Ted Erkan, Private Sector

Guests:

Bill Thomas

Carl Savely

Jeremy Smith

RTC Staff:

Blaine Peterson

Cole Peiffer

Lee Anne Olivas

Stephanie Haddock

Xuan Wang

The meeting was called to order at 2:04pm.

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 March 22, 2018 Meeting Minutes

The March 22, 2018 Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously.

Item 4: Presentation on the Consensus Forecast by TMRPA

Jeremy Smith from TMRPA gave a PowerPoint Presentation (see Attachment A) on the Consensus Forecast and scenario planning. Jeremy discussed how the Consensus Forecast is done as well as how the 2035 and 2040 data compare. Jeremy stated that several sources are used for the Consensus Forecast to eliminate bias. The Consensus Forecast is based on a 20-year outlook and is used by the local jurisdictions. Jeremy explained where the data comes from, i.e. the Washoe County Assessor's data is used for dwelling unit information. Comparing the different Consensus Forecasts since 2003 (slide 8) shows we had the highest population projection in the 2007 Consensus Forecast with subsequent forecasts lowering the overall future population projections. This is important in that the 2035 RTP was based on the 2012 Consensus Forecast which had a larger population projection than the 2016 Consensus Forecast used for the 2040 RTP. A comparison of the 2016 and 2018 Consensus Forecasts for the year 2036 finds only a 3,000 difference in future population.

The Consensus Forecast data is broken down into annual targets and placed onto parcels using GIS modelling to determine where growth will occur. TMRPA tracks existing and potential development using the most recent information on approved tentative maps, which lots have been

final mapped, existing dwelling units, existing jobs, existing constraints, etc. Using a Rule-based Allocation Model takes many different variables, i.e. distance from existing roads, density of existing quadrant to score parcels for suitability for development for both population and employment. The information is aggregated into groups and 5-year timeframes to be used in the RTC Travel Demand Model.

Jeremy described the types of information used to weight suitability factors for the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which also used local staff to assess the importance of the various suitability factors for their jurisdiction. For the 2040 RTP, they used fewer suitability factors, but included a logistic approach (see slide 23 for comparison) to assess their importance and sub areas to focus growth areas. Jeremy noted that they were able to model population and housing growth from 2000 to 2015 with 75% accuracy using the 2040 RTP approach. A comparison between the population growth from 2035 and 2040 RTP for the 2035 Model Year (slide 24) shows changes in projections.

He noted that modeling of employment is a bit more difficult as it is hard to predict the types of employment by parcel, however the employment categories are based on the RTC categories. Changes in employment growth between the 2035 and 2040 RTPs is shown on slide 25.

The next steps are to complete the 2018 Consensus Forecast and assign the population and employment growth by parcel/timeframe using the TMRPA model during the 2017 Regional Plan Update. The information will then be incorporated into the RTC Travel Demand Model.

Jeremy anticipates that the spatial disaggregated 2018 Consensus Forecast will be complete in June/July. Jeremy is also working to complete the full model build out in June. Jon Ericson asked if the full model build out will show 2040 numbers versus 2045 numbers. Jon stated that the City of Sparks needs to identify the fiscal impacts of projects and how it will affect zoning at the regional planning level. The 2040 and 2045 numbers would be beneficial to know.

The committee discussed which Consensus Forecast should be used to determine the RRIF calculations. Julie Masterpool proposed using the 2016 Consensus Forecast to keep moving forward since the 2018 Consensus Forecast is not complete yet. Mike Lawson made the motion to stay with the 2016 Consensus Forecast and Clara Lawson seconded the motion. Jim Rundle noted

that things begin to flatten around 2035 and he sees a future problem with incremental increases in fees. The RTC is updated every four years and the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is updated every two to three years. Jim stated the impacts could be bigger if the latest Consensus Forecast is not used. Jeremy added that the Regional Plan still needs to go through approvals.

Bill Thomas joined the meeting at 3:02 pm.

The committee agreed that updates can be done more frequently so the 2016 Consensus Forecast should be used until the 2018 version is complete. Mike Lawson withdrew his motion. The committee acknowledged receipt of the report.

Item 5: Presentation on the Travel Demand Model and Trip Lengths

Xuan Wang of the RTC Planning Department gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Travel Demand Model and Trip Lengths (see Attachment B). Xuan discussed how the average trip length was determined. She also discussed the data that is included in the Travel Demand Model such as TMRPA's Household Study, traffic counts, and the Travel Demand Survey. Xuan described the factors that are included in TAZs and discussed factors for determining regional distance. Xuan noted the average trip length on the regional road network for the North and South Service Areas used for the RRIF program went down between the 2035 RTP and 2040 RTP model runs.

There was discussion about mode share and people coming from other counties and possibly not paying their fair share. There is an 8% non-motorized mode share. Eighty-six percent is for private vehicles, 3% for public transit, 2% for school busses, and 1% for private transit (taxi, rentals, and private shuttles).

The committee acknowledged the receipt of the report.

Item 6: Discussion on RRIF Capital Improvement Plans

Julie Masterpool is working on an updated CIP list. She needs to include the number for the fuel tax portion. Tischler Bise will be hired as a consultant to assist with the 6th Edition Update. Julie asked the committee to provide her with any questions or concerns that we'd like Tischler Bise's assistance with. One question to ask is how other agencies handle long-term right-of-way needs. The full model build out should help us identify what long-term right-of-way needs we will have.

Kraig Knudsen stated sections if there are multi-modal improvements. Design standard discussions need to take place such as reducing lane widths to accommodate bike lanes and breakdown lanes. Mike Lawson discussed capacity and what developers can do to augment. Bill Thomas stated that policy choice doesn't match how the impact fees are collected. The development share should be reduced if other funding is used.

The committee agreed that more discussion is needed on this item. 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 May 24, 2018 at 2pm in the RTC's 1st Floor Conference Room located at 1105 Terminal Way, Reno. Jon Ericson stated he would like status updates on the Regional Plan Update and the fee comparison for 2016 versus 2018 Consensus Forecasts discussed at the May meeting.

Item 9: Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:50pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee Anne Olivas