



REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
OF WASHOE COUNTY

REGIONAL ROAD IMPACT FEE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING AGENDA

THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 2020  
8:30AM-10:00AM

**Meeting via teleconference/Zoom only pursuant to NRS 241.023 and Emergency Directive 006.**

The meeting will be streamed live via the RTC YouTube channel and can be watched by following this link:  
[bit.ly/RTCWashoeYouTube](https://bit.ly/RTCWashoeYouTube)

PUBLIC NOTICE

I. Pursuant to Section 1 of Governor Steve Sisolak's Declaration of Emergency Directive 006 ("Directive 006"), the requirement contained in NRS 241.023(1)(b) that there be a physical location designated for meetings of public bodies where members of the public are permitted to attend and participate has been suspended. Pursuant to Section 3 of Directive 006, the requirements contained in NRS 241.020(4)(a) that public notice agendas be posted at physical locations within the State of Nevada has likewise been suspended. Pursuant to Section 5 of Directive 006, the requirement contained in NRS 241.020(3)(c) that physical locations be available for the public to receive supporting material for public meetings has been suspended.

II. The Regional Road Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee (RRIF TAC) has a standing item for accepting public input on topics relevant to the jurisdiction of the RTC. Because specific items may be taken out of order to accommodate the public and/or the RRIF TAC, public input on all items will be received under Item 2. Individuals providing public input will be limited to three minutes. Members of the public may provide public comment and also comment on Agenda Items without being physically present at the meeting by submitting their comments via online Public Comment Form (<https://www.rtcwashoe.com/about/contact/contact-form/>), or by emailing their comments to: [rtcpubliccomments@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:rtcpubliccomments@rtcwashoe.com). Public commenters may also leave a voicemail at (775) 335-0018. Comments received prior to 4:00 p.m. on July 22, 2020, will be entered into the record.

III. The RRIF TAC may combine two or more agenda items for consideration and/or may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

IV. Requests for supporting documents and all other requests should be directed to RTC Engineering & Construction at 775-348-0171. Supporting documents may also be found on the RTC website: [www.rtcwashoe.com](http://www.rtcwashoe.com). In addition, a member of the public may request supporting materials electronically from Lee Anne Olivas at the following email address: [lolivas@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:lolivas@rtcwashoe.com).

V. The RTC appreciates the public's patience and understanding during these difficult and challenging circumstances.

**\*\*ROLL CALL\*\***

**ITEM 1** Approval of Agenda (*For Possible Action*)

**ITEM 2** Public Comment - *please read paragraph II near the top of this page*

**ITEM 3** Approval of the July 23, 2020 Meeting Minutes (*For Possible Action*)

**ITEM 4** 7<sup>th</sup> Edition RRIF General Administrative Manual Overview Discussion Items (*For Possible Action*)

**ITEM 5** Public Comment - *please read paragraph II near the top of this page*

**ITEM 6** Member Items

a) next RRIF TAC meeting: TBD

**ITEM 7** Adjournment (*For Possible Action*)

*The Committee may take action on any item noted for possible action*

Pursuant to Section 3 of Directive 006, the requirements contained in NRS 241.020(4)(a) that public notice agendas be posted at physical locations within the State of Nevada has likewise been suspended.

Current posting locations: RTC website: [www.rtcwashoe.com](http://www.rtcwashoe.com), State website: <https://notice.nv.gov/>



**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

*Metropolitan Planning • Public Transportation & Operations • Engineering & Construction*

Metropolitan Planning Organization of Washoe County, Nevada

August 27, 2020

**AGENDA ITEM 2**

**TO:** Regional Road Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee (RRIF TAC)

**FROM:** Dale Keller, P.E.  
Engineering Manager

**SUBJECT: Public Input**

This agenda item allows the public the opportunity to provide information on topics within the jurisdiction of the Regional Road Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee (RRIF TAC). Any person wishing to wait to provide public comment on a specific agenda item should indicate that item number on the “comment” card. The RRIF TAC reserves the right to take all public comment during Public Input. Individuals addressing the RRIF TAC during the Public Input portion of the meeting will be limited to three minutes total. However, an individual acting as a spokesperson for a group of individuals may request additional time. Individuals are expected to provide public input in a professional and constructive manner.

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

**Meeting Minutes**

**Thursday, July 23, 2020**

**Members Present:**

Amy Cummings, Regional Transportation Commission

Brian Stewart, Regional Transportation Commission

David Blaco, Sparks Planning Commission

Jim Rundle, City of Sparks

John Krmptic, Private Sector

Jon Ericson, City of Sparks

Kraig Knudsen, Private Sector

Mike Mischel, City of Reno

Mitchell Fink, Washoe County

Randy Walter, Private Sector

**Members Absent:**

Ed Hawkins, Reno Planning Commission

Kurt Dietrich, City of Reno Public Works

Larry Chesney, Washoe County Planning Commission

Mojra Hauenstein, Washoe County

Ted Erkan, Private Sector

**Guests**

Carl Savely

Claudia Hanson

Jeffrey Borchardt

Jeremy Smith

**RTC Staff:**

Amber Bowsmith

Bill Thomas

Blaine Petersen

Dale Keller

Dan Doenges

Hannah Yue

Jelena Williams

Lee Anne Olivas

Stephanie Haddock

Xuan Wang

The meeting was called to order at 8:32am. Roll call was taken to ensure there was a quorum.

**Item 1: Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved unanimously.

**Item 2: Public Comment**

None

**Item 3: Update on 2050 Regional Transportation Plan**

Dan Doenges from the RTC Planning department provided an update on the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. The development of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan is underway. The purpose of the plan is to identify the long-term guiding principles and goals for the regional transportation system and to identify the projects, programs, and services to be implemented through 2050. There is a robust community engagement process and collaboration with partner agencies. The plan will address the safety, mobility, connectivity, and traffic operations issues that are resulting from strong population and employment growth in the region. Federal regulations require that the long-range planning document be updated every four years. The current RTP approval extends through May 2021.

Staff is currently seeking input on transportation improvement projects, programs, and services to be considered for inclusion in the 2050 RTP. On June 22, 2020, the RTC launched an online survey that was available through July 20, 2020 to solicit ideas from the public on other potential projects,

and the responses will be compiled for consideration in the 2050 RTP. Approximately 170 responses were received.

Projects in the current (2040) RTP that have not been completed or initiated will be evaluated to determine if they still appropriately meet regional transportation needs. The evaluation also includes updating cost estimates. In addition, there are some new project recommendations from recently completed planning studies such as the South Meadows Area Multimodal Transportation Study, the University Area Multimodal Transportation Study, and an Advanced Mobility Study. Similarly, there are several improvement projects that have been suggested by agency representatives and members of the public in response to development and growth in population and employment throughout the region.

Dan Doenges discussed current projects under development or construction such as Sun Valley Boulevard, Center Street Cycle Track, and Oddie/Wells Multimodal Improvements. Maps of suggested projects for consideration in South Reno, the University Area, the North Valleys, and connectivity to the TRI Center were presented. Dan Doenges also discussed the upcoming update of the Short Range Transit Plan, on demand transit opportunities such as Flex Ride, joint development opportunities, service expansion requests and facility needs.

Dan Doenges asked members to submit recommendations for potential projects within the next two or three weeks. Jon Ericson asked if bicycle signal heads at signalized intersections are being considered on the Center Street Cycle Track project. Brian Stewart stated they were. Jon Ericson relayed that the City of Sparks received interim approval from FHWA to install the signal heads at McCarran Boulevard and Nichols.

Jon Ericson if anyone has talked to the officials in Virginia City regarding the South Meadows Alignment as it may relate to the connection to the TRI Center. Jon Ericson heard they might not support the alignment. Amy Cummings stated an inter-county group is helping work through the projects in the RTP and the group includes representatives from Storey County. Amy will ensure the topic is addressed with the inter-county group.

Jon Ericson asked if the multimodal projects in the industrial area in Sparks are still being considered. Dan Doenges stated they were. Jon Ericson asked if a Flex Ride service would come down from Incline Village to Reno. Dan Doenges stated there are a couple options being considered such as a service within Incline Village and a fixed route regional connection from Reno to Incline Village to Carson City. Jon Ericson suggested looking into the maintenance of the vehicles when coming down Mt. Rose Highway. Bill Thomas clarified the potential fixed route would be an on-demand service not a traditional fixed route.

**Item 4: 7<sup>th</sup> Edition RRIF General Administrative Manual Potential Discussion Items**

During the process of updating the 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, some questions and concerns were raised. Prior to her retirement from the RTC, Julie Masterpool summarized the questions and concerns. Approximately nine items came up. Brian Stewart asked members to provide recommendations for how to address the items.

Item 1 regarding redefining the service areas/benefit districts will require legal involvement. There was discussion on the pros and cons of addressing the item. Several members are not in favor of addressing the item because of extensive past discussions that showed no benefit to redefining the areas. Brian Stewart stated he wanted to do a review of the 5<sup>th</sup> Edition to better understand the history.

Item 2 regarding the TMRPA Development Model requires TMRPA to use the same methodology for suitability factors and ranking to be consistent within the region. Jeremy Smith from TMRPA is willing to work with the RRIF TAC to determine the factors and rankings. RTC staff will also work closely with TMRPA on the Consensus Forecast Model update as part of the RTP Update. Randy Walter stated build out scenario factors need to be reviewed and he volunteered to assist with that effort. Xuan Wang stated Jeremy Smith is currently working on the RTP TAZ input and build out scenarios.

Bill Thomas discussed the need to clarify how exactions on developments that may not be included in the Capital Improvement Plan are addressed. Brian Stewart stated that would be discussed as part of Item 5 regarding RRIF Eligible Improvements.

Randy Walter stated what is applicable and eligible in the waiver program needs to be addressed in more detail. Timing of when the waivers are available should also be discussed. He suggested a list of current projects approved through the waiver process be provided to the RRIF TAC, including how the process went on each project and any issues that came up. Jon Ericson stated only a few projects have come through so far. The City of Sparks is addressing some right-of-way challenges on the Wingfield Springs project. Brian Stewart stated the items Randy commented on would be addressed as part of discussion on Item 9 regarding RRIF Waivers.

Jon Ericson asked how the group would tackle the list of items. Brian Stewart stated some items could be grouped together, but others will be addressed individually over the next few months at the RRIF TAC meetings. There was agreement that the “low hanging fruit” or items that could be addressed quickly should be discussed first.

A motion to acknowledge receipt of potential changes raised during the approval of the 6<sup>th</sup> Edition RRIF Capital Improvement Plan and General Administrative Manual was approved unanimously.

**Item 5: Impact Fees for Affordable Housing**

Claudia Hanson from the City of Reno provided a presentation on the potential reduction of fees for affordable housing. In 2019, the Nevada Legislature passed Senate Bill No. 103 that enables a local government to reduce or subsidize in whole or in part impact fees, fees for the issuance of building permits collected pursuant to NRS 278.580, and fees imposed for the purpose for which an enterprise fund was created to assist in maintaining or developing a project for affordable housing. In order to allow the reduction or subsidization per SB 103, the local government is required to adopt an ordinance establishing the criteria that a project for affordable housing must satisfy to receive assistance in maintaining or developing the project for affordable housing.

Claudia Hanson discussed the City of Reno’s ordinance and breakdown of fees associated with the Enterprise Fund. There was discussion on how the reduction of fees affects the community. It is a relatively low impact; maybe one or two projects a year. It is only about \$1 million to \$3 million per year. Every project is reviewed to ensure it meets the 60% AMI criteria.

John Krmptic stated it appears the process is largely self-regulated, but wonders if it will become a large profit center for affordable housing developers. Claudia Hanson believes there will be a balance. The subsidy only goes to those units that meet the criteria. Units at market rate will still pay impact fees. All units would have to under 30% AMI to get the 100% reduction in fees. Trip rates are factored in. Claudia Hanson stated she has only seen one development that meets the threshold and it is only about 10 units.

Jon Ericson asked how it affects the overall benefit district. Claudia Hanson stated it has not been looked at yet, but further analysis will take place. Claudia Hanson added recommendations or thoughts from the RRIF TAC is needed. Jim Rundle recommended the process should have the City of Reno sponsor and provide direction to the RRIF TAC first. Then if the RRIF TAC wants to take it on, it would need to go to the RTC Board and then the local jurisdictions would need to adopt a new ordinance. Bill Thomas stated clarity and sponsorship of a regional approach to affordable housing is desired.

Randy Walter asked if anyone has looked at TMWA fees because they are a big fee generator for new housing. Claudia Hanson does not believe the TMWA fees qualify because they are not associated with Enterprise Funds. Claudia Hanson stated Enterprise Funds include building permits, sewer, and RTC impact fees. Stephanie Haddock stated RTC impact fees are not Enterprise Funds; they are Special Revenue because they are restricted. Bill Thomas stated the local jurisdictions have the ordinance that creates the fee, but RTC administers the money.

Theoretically, the jurisdictions could have different ordinances that have different rates regarding affordable housing and the RTC would have to make sense of it. Claudia Hanson will look into whether impact fees apply. Her understanding from their attorney is impact fees would apply.

Randy Walter asked if the impact to the RRIF program with the reduction in fees from affordable housing could be explained in dollars instead of units. Claudia Hanson stated the City of Reno ordinance for sewer fees and building permits are already in place. Claudia will work with the RTC to get the impact fee numbers. Brian Stewart noted if basing on a multi-family unit, it would be about \$3,000 divided by the ADT. Randy asked if Claudia Hanson could provide a hypothetical on

how many projects there are each year. Claudia Hanson stated only about eight to ten units, not projects are eligible each year.

Jon Ericson asked if there was a sunset on the affordable housing component. Claudia Hanson stated the City of Reno's ordinance requires projects to maintain the income restriction for 20 years.

A motion to receive a report by Claudia Hanson of the City of Reno regarding potential reduction of fees for affordable housing was approved unanimously.

**Item 6: Public Comment**

None

**Item 7: Member Items**

- The next RRIF TAC meeting is scheduled for August 27, 2020 at 8:30am via teleconference.
- Kraig Knudsen and Randy Walter shared their appreciation for the speed limit increase on Veterans Parkway.

**Item 8: Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:43am.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee Anne Olivas



## REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Metropolitan Planning • Public Transportation & Operations • Engineering & Construction

Metropolitan Planning Organization of Washoe County, Nevada

August 27, 2020

### AGENDA ITEM 4

**TO:** Regional Road Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee (RRIF TAC)

**FROM:** Dale Keller, P.E.  
Engineering Manager

**SUBJECT:** 7<sup>th</sup> Edition RRIF General Administrative Manual Overview Discussion Items

### RECOMMENDATION

Acknowledge receipt of potential changes raised during the approval of the 6<sup>th</sup> Edition RRIF Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)/General Administrative Manual (GAM) and provide direction.

### SUMMARY

During the process of adopting the 6<sup>th</sup> Edition RRIF CIP/GAM, a variety of questions were raised regarding the impact fee program. The issues raised are summarized in Attachment 1.

At the RRIF TAC meeting on July 23, 2020, the TAC directed RTC staff to tackle the list of potential changes and provide recommendations for possible action. Staff reviewed the various issues and prepared recommendations for Item 1, Item 6, Item 7, and Item 8. Staff recommends the following:

1. Redefine Service Areas / Benefit Districts – **No Change**. RRIF fees are intended as a regional program to address the new trips on the regional road network. Redefining the Service Areas to inside/outside McCarran Boulevard would distribute the cost of the capacity improvements within the Service Area over a smaller number of new developments. This could result in a single project causing a higher impact fee or no impact fee if no capacity projects are programmed within a smaller Service Area. With the two current service areas and separate fees calculated per service area, the current structure's approach balances the needs of capacity improvements.
  
6. Impact Fee Rates – **No Change**. Impact fee rates shall be assessed with the land use type in the fee schedule adopted in the GAM at the time of impact fee payment. Fees are to measure the impact of a development on the RRIF Capital Improvements included in the CIP. Four (4) specific land uses were considered for change:
  - i. Warehousing - **No Change**. Trips due to warehousing are incorporated into the Traffic Demand Model (TDM) and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) calculations. Impact fees pay for capacity improvements and cannot be used for maintenance of existing roadways.

- ii. Residential Housing – No Change. Impacts fees are based on average trip generation and trip lengths. Arbitrarily adjusting the factors used in calculating the fees for one use over another, could unfairly shift the burden of funding capacity improvements.
- iii. Student Housing – No Change. Student housing has been added to the 10<sup>th</sup> Edition ITE Trip Generation Manual. Further analysis is needed and could be considered at a future edition.
- iv. Walkable Communities – No Change. Impact Fees support the Regional and local Master Plans, through the densities and land use approval by local government.

Note: Affordable Housing impact fees are under agency review and still open for possible action.

- 7. RRIF Payments with Credit Cards – **No Change**. Per Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), impact fee revenues cannot be used to reimburse the local agency for said fees.
- 8. RRIF Revenue – **No Change**. Restrictions on where funds were spent would limit available RRIF funding per project within the Service Area and could delay needed improvements or cause supplemental funds to be used to complete.

Attachment

Below is a list of discussion items brought up during the 6<sup>th</sup> Edition RRIF GAM/CIP approval process, along with RTC responses and other items that could be incorporated into the 7<sup>th</sup> Ed RRIF GAM/CIP.

### **1. Redefine Service Areas/Benefit Districts**

- Exclusion of Urban Core/Walkable Communities to encourage redevelopment.
- Change Service Areas to Inside/Outside McCarran.
  - RRIF fees are intended as a regional program to address the new trips on the regional road network. Due to the size of our community, trips typically cross over all boundaries, ie, between service areas, downtown to urban/suburban areas. Trips from the core vs suburb/rural areas affect the entire regional network.
  - If impact fees are waived/reduced, other impact fee areas would be required to pick up the cost for the needed improvements or other funding sources used to supplement the program.
  - Smaller Service Areas would distribute the cost of the capacity improvements within the Service Area over a smaller number of new developments. This could result in a single project causing a higher impact fee or no impact fee if no capacity projects are programmed within a smaller Service Area.

### **2. TMRPA Development Model**

- Adjust Population/Employment assignments to include opinions from local jurisdictions, ie, if they are seeing a development that is moving faster than that shown in the TMRPA model.
  - RTC will discuss with TMRPA staff as part of the 2018 Consensus Forecast & 2050 RTP Update.
- Review factors used to determine the amount of potential development shown in the TMRPA Development Model, ie, adjust to account for land required for basin retentions, roadways, etc. (similar to terrain adjustments). Establishing a Build Out Model for both the TMRPA Development Model and RTC's Travel Demand Model.
- Use the RTC's Travel Demand Model output for VMT Growth by RRIF Service Areas, in lieu of separate calculations using population/employment information from TMRPA for the RRIF fee calculations.

### **3. Regional Transportation Plan**

- The RTP/RRIF CIP should encourage walkability over congestion relief.
- The RTP/RRIF CIP should be based on the newly adopted Regional Plan.
  - The 2040 RTP was based on the 2012 Regional Plan, in effect at the time of adoption of the RTP. The aims of the 2012 Regional Plan included goals to minimize sprawl by directing growth to the core, promoting infill, and transit

oriented development are similar to those expressed in the 2019 Regional Plan.

- The 6<sup>th</sup> Ed RRIF update started after the 2040 RTP was adopted in 2017 and was based on the plans and development approvals in effect at the time of the 2040 RTP.
- The Regional Plan is just the first step in a long process to develop the impact fee, ie,
  - Update to TMRPA Development Model based on Regional Plan and new development approvals.
  - Distribution of Consensus Forecast population and employment in the Development Model.
  - Analysis of the Travel Demand Model to determine new capacity needs on the regional road network.
  - Development of the Regional Transportation Plan which includes a fiscal analysis of anticipated funds.
  - Development of the cost estimates for the projects listed in the RTP/RRIF CIP.
  - Determination of 10 year growth for the RRIF CIP.
- The process to develop the fees involves technical analyses, which take time and are reviewed by the RRIF TAC, RTC TAC, RTC CMAC, and RTC Board before being brought to the local jurisdictions for approval.
- The 2050 RTP will use the new Regional Plan to develop a new list of road improvement projects to meet the intent of the Plan. The RTP process typically takes 1 ½ years to complete. Once road improvement projects are identified, the RRIF TAC would begin the update for the 7<sup>th</sup> Ed of the RRIF Program.

#### **4. RRIF Capital Improvement Plan and Methodology**

- Review validation of the RTC Travel Demand Model.
  - The TDM is validated using actual traffic counts (NDOT TRINA data).
- Should multimodal projects be included in the RRIF Capital Improvement Plan?
  - Since both existing and new development benefit from multimodal projects, the cost of multimodal projects assessed to the RRIF CIP is based on the percent VMT growth within the Service Area.
- Using Average Daily Traffic (ADTs) and VMTs for charging RRIF fees, regardless of location, causes the urban area to subsidize developments in the suburb/rural areas.
  - RRIF fees are intended as a regional program and to address the new trips on the regional road network as a whole. Due to the size of our community, trips

typically cross over all boundaries, ie, between service areas, downtown to urban/suburban areas. Trips from the core vs suburb/rural areas affect the entire regional network.

## 5. RRIF Eligible Improvements

- Interchange improvements – Review the eligibility of interchange improvements with the RRIF CIP. Verify other funding sources used to offset new development’s share of the capacity improvements, ie, Fuel Tax used to supplement funds for capacity improvements.
- Intersection improvements - Currently, the RRIF GAM limits RRIF funding/Waivers to the intersection of two regional roadways.
  - New signals and related turn lanes at the intersection of a regional roadway and a non-regional road are not eligible for RRIF funding.
  - The RRIF Program is calculated based on the addition of other funding sources, ie, fuel tax, to help fund projects in the RRIF CIP. RTC anticipates using fuel tax to fund currently non-RRIF eligible improvements.
  - If non-regional road improvements are funded with RRIF revenue/waivers, the RRIF CIP and resulting fee calculation would need to be adjusted to add the cost of these types of intersection improvements.
- Right of way values – Values are based on date/land use as of the date the roadway improvement was identified in the development application. When a project has numerous approvals, ie, zoning change, Master Plan, Tentative/Final Map, Handbook, more clarification is required to establish which approval establishes the date of value.
- Amendments to the RRIF CIP – Recommend clarification on the process to amend the CIP, ie, timeframes to allow changes, amendment to the RTP, and the approval process for adoption of new fees.

## 6. Impact Fee Rates

- Warehousing – Received a comment that warehousing should have a higher impact fee rate due to the impact of trucks on the road network.
  - Trips due to warehousing are incorporated into the TDM and VMT calculations. Impact fees pay for capacity improvements and cannot be used for maintenance of existing roadways.
- Residential Housing – Concerns were expressed regarding the increase in residential impact fees and the cost of housing overall in the community.
  - Single Family and Multifamily Housing impact fees are based on the trip generation for Washoe County, which is slightly lower than ITE Trip Generation Rates.

- Impact fees are based on average trip generation and trip lengths. Arbitrarily adjusting the factors used in calculating the fees for one use over another, could unfairly shift the burden of funding capacity improvements.
- Affordable Housing (SB 103) - Reno is pursuing an Ordinance that will allow a reduction in development fees paid for qualified affordable housing.
  - What is the impact of a reduced fee to the RRIF Program?
  - Are other jurisdictions pursuing an Affordable Housing Ordinance?
  - Other options, ie, special impact fee rate for designated affordable housing projects?
- Student Housing – Request to add Off Campus Student Housing Land Use impact fee rate.
  - Student housing has been added to the 10th Ed ITE Trip Generation Manual and therefore trip rates in ITE could be used to develop a new impact fee rate.
- Walkable Communities – Concerns were expressed that impact fees should be used to incentivize development and encourage more live/work areas by the elimination or reduction in impact fees charged.
  - Impact Fees support the Regional and local Master Plans, through the densities and land uses approved by local government. Therefore, it is a result and output of decisions made by the Reno & Sparks Councils & the County Commission.
  - When live/work developments are implemented, it would likely result in the reduction of average trip lengths anticipated throughout the regional network, thereby reducing the need for capacity improvements and the associated impact fee to support the capacity improvements.
  - RRIF fees are intended as a regional program to address the new trips on the regional road network. Due to the size of our community, trips typically cross over all boundaries, ie, between service areas, downtown to urban/suburban areas. Trips from the core vs suburb/rural areas affect the entire regional network.
  - If impact fees are waived/reduced, other impact fee areas would be required to pick up the cost for the needed improvements or are other funding sources used to supplement the program.
  - To create a special impact fee rate for walkable communities, qualifications would need to be identified to determine what projects/areas would be eligible as a walkable community, in addition the associated trip generation.

## 7. RRIF Payments with Credit Cards

- Some local jurisdictions allow development fee payments with credit cards, which require the payment of credit card convenience fees by the jurisdiction. Per NRS, impact fee revenues cannot be used to reimburse the local agency for said fees. Should all credit card convenience fees be charged back to the fee payer? Would new legislation be required?

## 8. RRIF Revenue

- Concerns were expressed to limit where RRIF Revenue can be spent, ie, closer to where the fees were paid.
  - RRIF fees are intended as a regional program to address the new trips on the regional road network. Due to the size of our community, trips typically cross over all boundaries, ie, between service areas, downtown to urban/suburban areas. Trips from the core vs suburb/rural areas affect the entire regional network.
  - Restrictions on where funds were spent would limit available RRIF funding per project within the Service Area and could delay needed improvements or cause supplemental funds to be used to complete.
  - RRIF collections would need to be tracked by location by the local permitting agency and then used to determine project selection.
- Request was expressed to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the State to collect impact fees for state facilities.
  - NRS specifically excludes the payment of impact fees on State Facilities to a local jurisdiction.
  - MOUs with multiple state agencies would likely be required. Request will be forwarded to legal counsel.

## 9. RRIF Waivers

- Offset agreements lock in the RRIF Schedule to be used and the land uses approved within the Development of Record. If the Land Uses change more than 10 percent, ALL waivers are to be redeemed at the current rate, hence forth.
- If waivers are sold to a 3rd party, how are land uses transferred to the new account?
- If Land Uses change more than 10 percent, do all account holders lose their original fee rate, even if their Land Uses did not change?
- Can the Development of Record include property owned by someone else other than the Offset Agreement Developer? How would this affect the eligible land uses?
- Should the RRIF Automation program track Land Uses used on the waivers and deduct from the Land Uses identified in the Offset agreements?
- Currently, the waivers use the Land Use and units to establish the dollars on the waiver. Should we change the system to only enter the dollar amount or start with the Land Use and Units, but allow the dollars to be edited, if needed, ie, to pay a reduced rate due to a previous use on the property, partial payment of fees with remaining

balance of waivers, or for a new Land Use not currently identified in the fee schedule?

- Should we change from dollars back to VMTs?



**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

*Metropolitan Planning • Public Transportation & Operations • Engineering & Construction*

Metropolitan Planning Organization of Washoe County, Nevada

August 27, 2020

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**TO:** Regional Road Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee (RRIF TAC)

**FROM:** Dale Keller, P.E.  
Engineering Manager

**SUBJECT: Public Input**

This agenda item allows the public the opportunity to provide information on topics within the jurisdiction of the Regional Road Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee (RRIF TAC). Any person wishing to wait to provide public comment on a specific agenda item should indicate that item number on the “comment” card. The RRIF TAC reserves the right to take all public comment during Public Input. Individuals addressing the RRIF TAC during the Public Input portion of the meeting will be limited to three minutes total. However, an individual acting as a spokesperson for a group of individuals may request additional time. Individuals are expected to provide public input in a professional and constructive manner.