

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSCRIPT MINUTES

CITY OF SPARKS
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING

Thursday, July 18, 2019
6:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers
745 4th Street
Sparks, Nevada

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

Commission Members Present:

- Scott Carey, Chair
- Shelley Read, Vice Chair
- David Blaco
- Mary Brock
- James Fewins (absent)
- Frank Petersen
- Dian VanderWell

Staff Present:

- Alyson McCormick
Assistant City Attorney

- Armando Ornelas
Assistant Community Services Director

- Jim Rundle
Planning Manager

- Jon Ericson
Transportation Manager

- Marilie Smith
Administrative Secretary
Community Services Department

Other Participants:

- Julie Masterpool, RTC

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

ITEM	PAGE
1. CALL TO ORDER	4
2. ROLL CALL	4
3. PUBLIC COMMENT	5
4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA	6
5. REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF FILING WITH THE SPARKS CITY COUNCIL A REPORT ON THE PROGRESS OF CARRYING OUT THE REGIONAL ROAD IMPACT FEE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN (For Possible Action)	7
6. REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL TO THE SPARKS CITY COUNCIL OF THE LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS, PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN, ASSOCIATED FEES, AND UPDATES TO THE REGIONAL ROAD IMPACT FEE 6TH EDITION GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL (For Possible Action)	13
7. PUBLIC COMMENT	34
8. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS	34
9. ADJOURNMENT	35

1 SPARKS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, JULY 18, 2019, 6:00 P.M.

2 -oOo-

3 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay. I'll call this meeting
4 to order.

5 Welcome, everyone. This is the Sparks Capital
6 Improvement Advisory Committee meeting of July 18th,
7 2019. I want to welcome everyone in our audience
8 tonight and watching on Sparks Centennial TV and on
9 Facebook Live, appreciate everyone tuning in.

10 Just a quick announcement. We are not
11 convening tonight as the -- turn the mic on. We're not
12 convening tonight as the Sparks Planning Commission.
13 We're meeting as the Capital Improvement Advisory
14 Committee. And this Committee's purpose, we provide
15 recommendations to the City Council on capital
16 improvement issues.

17 Tonight we'll be doing a deep dive into the
18 Regional Road Impact Fee Program from RTC. That's the
19 Regional Transportation Commission. So you might hear a
20 lot of acronyms tonight with RTC. I just wanted to
21 provide that, that explanation.

22 So welcome, everybody.

23 The first item -- second item on our agenda is
24 roll call.

25 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Carey?

1 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Present.

2 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Read?

3 COMMISSIONER READ: Here.

4 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Blaco?

5 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Here.

6 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Brock?

7 COMMISSIONER BROCK: Here.

8 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Fewins is absent.

9 Commissioner Petersen?

10 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Here.

11 MS. SMITH: Commissioner VanderWell?

12 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Here.

13 MS. SMITH: Assistant City Attorney Alyson

14 McCormick?

15 MS. MCCORMICK: Here.

16 MS. SMITH: Assistant Community Services

17 Director Armando Ornelas?

18 MR. ORNELAS: Here.

19 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Thank you very much for that.

20 The third item on our agenda tonight is public

21 comment. And this is an opportunity for the public to

22 provide comment on tonight's agenda. I will note that

23 items 5 and 6 on tonight's agenda are not public hearing

24 items. So if you wish to speak on those items, this is

25 the opportunity to do so. There will be another public

1 comment period at the end of the meeting.

2 Are there any members of the audience that wish
3 to provide public comment at this time?

4 Seeing none, we will close the public comment
5 period.

6 And we'll move on to item number 4. That's
7 approval of the agenda.

8 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Mr. Chair.

9 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Commissioner VanderWell.

10 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: I move to approve the
11 agenda for Thursday, July 18th.

12 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay. Thank you.

13 I have a motion to approve the agenda by
14 Commissioner VanderWell. Is there a second on the
15 motion?

16 COMMISSIONER READ: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Thank you.

18 I have a second by Commissioner Read. Any
19 discussion or questions concerns the concerning the
20 motion?

21 Okay. Hearing none, I'll call the vote. All
22 those in favor of the motion, please say "aye."

23 (Committee members said "aye.")

24 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Opposed, "nay."

25 The ayes have it. The motion is carried.

1 The next item on our agenda is item number 5,
2 and that's review, discussion and possible approval of
3 filing with the Sparks City Council a report on the
4 progress of carrying out the Regional Road Impact Fee
5 Capital Improvements Plan, CIP.

6 Mr. Ericksen.

7 MR. ERICKSEN: Thank you, Chairman and
8 Commission. I'm Jon Ericksen, City Engineer.

9 Before we get started, I would like to
10 introduce the team that represents the City of Sparks at
11 the RRIFTAC. I'd like to thank Chairman Carey for
12 participating from the Planning Commission; Mr. Rundle
13 for the Planning Department; and then I represent the
14 Public Works Department.

15 The most important person that we deal with on
16 the TAC is to my right. This is Julie Masterpool with
17 the RTC. And so she kind of keeps everybody in line
18 with regards to our meetings and making sure that we use
19 our time efficiently during the process of the RRIF
20 updates.

21 So with that, I will hand it off to Julie to do
22 a 5th edition update.

23 MS. MASTERPOOL: Well, thank you.

24 And, again, this is -- my name is Julie
25 Masterpool. Oh, am I on?

1 MR. ERICKSEN: Push.

2 MS. MASTERPOOL: Oh, it's green. Okay. Thank
3 you.

4 Again, my name is Julie Masterpool, Engineering
5 Manager with the Regional Transportation Commission,
6 kind of the overseer, as Jon mentioned, of the Regional
7 Road Impact Fee Program.

8 NRS 278B outlines the requirements and the
9 responsibilities for the impact fee programs. One
10 requirement includes that the Capital Improvements
11 Advisory Committee is established to assist in the
12 review of the program. And since this is a regional
13 program, each one of the Washoe County, City of Sparks
14 and City of Reno, their planning commissions operate as
15 the CIAC for each of those agencies on behalf of their
16 agencies.

17 Again, one of the requirements listed in the
18 impact fee statute is to review the progress of carrying
19 out the Capitol Improvement Plan that's in the RRIF
20 program.

21 Okay. There we go. Currently, we are in the
22 5th edition of the Capitol Improvement Plan for the RRIF
23 program, which was adopted in 2015. The projects
24 included in the CIP were based on the first 10 years of
25 the Regional Transportation Plan, the 2035 version of

1 the Regional Transportation Plan. And we divide those
2 projects by service area, which I'll describe a little
3 bit later, for the RRIF program.

4 And this is kind of a map that shows the
5 projects that are listed in that Capital Improvement
6 Plan and with a blow-up of the ones that are actually in
7 the Sparks area.

8 In your packet, you'll see a map of the two
9 separate services areas and a full listing of those
10 projects by service area.

11 The status of the projects are listed as either
12 complete, under design, under construction, or still
13 planned for the future. Because this is a 10-year list
14 of projects, so, obviously, there's going to be some
15 that are still, still yet to be done.

16 This slide is the Sparks area projects. And as
17 you can see, we've got quite a few that have been
18 completed or are underway. I say there's nine projects,
19 even though there's like 12 listings, just because,
20 since we do have the two separate service areas, some
21 projects fall over, over the boundary between the north
22 and the south, so they're listed twice but with limits
23 that are just identified by the particular service area.

24 Overall, we've completed five projects,
25 including the first, the 4th and Prater bus rapid

1 transit. The Southeast Connector, which, of course,
2 falls into Sparks just a little bit. The southeast
3 McCarran project was completed a few years ago. And, of
4 course, the Pyramid and McCarran intersection, I'm sure
5 everybody's glad that one is done. Along with some
6 intersection projects, including the Prater-Lillard
7 traffic signal.

8 We have one project that's under construction,
9 and that's the Kietzke Lane project, and that's actually
10 being completed by NDOT.

11 And then there are two that are under design,
12 one the La Posada-Cordoba roundabout. Sparks is
13 handling that particular project. And the Oddie-Wells
14 multimodal project, we're kind of in the first phase of
15 that. It's currently under design.

16 And we have one project, the Sparks Boulevard
17 widening project, that's in the scoping phase. We
18 anticipate that we're going to enter into the design
19 contract here in the next couple of months.

20 So, overall, since the beginning of the RRIF
21 program, we've seen our roadway network increase
22 significantly. We've collected about \$95 million in all
23 in impact collections from the development community,
24 which have turned around and been used for capacity
25 improvements.

1 In addition, we've had about \$204 million of
2 capacity improvements built by the development
3 community. It's like Kiley Ranch, Somerset, Damonte
4 Ranch. So quite a bit has been built by that, by the
5 developments.

6 So with that, I'm going to ask for any
7 questions or if you have any comments about my
8 presentation, and I'd be glad to answer anything
9 regarding the presentation.

10 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Great. Thanks, Julie.

11 Does the Committee have any questions for staff
12 on the report?

13 I had one, Julie.

14 MS. MASTERPOOL: Sure.

15 CHAIRMAN CAREY: What is the value of the CIP
16 projects in the 5th update that have been completed in
17 Sparks?

18 MS. MASTERPOOL: I did not bring that as a
19 total. I can definitely, that's something I can get
20 back to you, but I don't have that now.

21 CHAIRMAN CAREY: But nine total projects and
22 then 12 that kind of overlap that benefit?

23 MS. MASTERPOOL: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay.

25 MS. MASTERPOOL: Right.

1 CHAIRMAN CAREY: That's a pretty significant
2 investment, I would say.

3 MS. MASTERPOOL: It really is. We've really
4 made a lot of progress on these, on these projects,
5 especially in the Sparks area.

6 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Great. Thank you.

7 Any other questions or comments regarding the
8 presentation?

9 This is an action item. There was a
10 recommendation in the staff report on this report.
11 Commissioners care to make a motion?

12 COMMISSIONER READ: I'll go ahead and make the
13 motion.

14 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Commissioner Read.

15 COMMISSIONER READ: Is it that one?

16 CHAIRMAN CAREY: It's the last page, the motion
17 on the last page.

18 COMMISSIONER READ: Okay. I move to file with
19 City Council a report on the progress of carrying out
20 the Regional Road Impact Fee Capitol Improvement Plan as
21 outlined in the staff report.

22 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay. We have a motion by
23 Commissioner Read to file the report with the City
24 Council. Is there a second on the motion?

25 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Second.

1 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: I'll second.

2 CHAIRMAN CAREY: I think, Commissioner
3 VanderWell beat you out, Commissioner Petersen, on the
4 second by -- on the second by --

5 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: It's in number only.

6 CHAIRMAN CAREY: We hope not. We hope not.

7 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Promise?

8 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Promise.

9 CHAIRMAN CAREY: There's a motion by
10 Commissioner Read, a second by Commissioner VanderWell.
11 It just edged out Commissioner Petersen. Is there any
12 discussion or questions on the motion?

13 Okay. Hearing none, I'll call the vote. All
14 those in favor of the motion to file the report, please
15 say "aye."

16 (Committee members said "aye.")

17 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Opposed, "nay."

18 The ayes have it. The motion is carried.

19 The next item on our agenda is review,
20 discussion and possible recommendation of approval to
21 the Sparks City Council of the land use assumptions,
22 proposed Capitol Improvement Plan, associated fees, and
23 updates to the Regional Road Impact Fees 6th Edition
24 General Administrative Manual. This is kind of the meat
25 of tonight's agenda.

1 MR. ERICKSEN: That is correct, Chairman.

2 Again, Jon Erickson, the City Engineer.

3 This is the 6th edition update. And so this is
4 an update that Julie will provide a presentation, and
5 then we would be able to answer any questions that you
6 may have.

7 So with that, I'll hand it off to Julie.

8 MS. MASTERPOOL: All right. Thank you.

9 And, again, for the record, Julie Masterpool,
10 Engineering Manager with the Regional Transportation
11 Commission.

12 In addition to the responsibilities of
13 reviewing the progress of our Capitol Improvement Plan,
14 the CIAC also is to review a variety of other tasks,
15 which include the review of the land use assumptions
16 that's used in developing the RRIF Capital Improvement
17 Plan and that result in fees, the Capitol Improvement
18 Plan list of projects, and a review of the impact fees
19 that we charge new development, and the recommendation
20 of approval of the RRIF General Administrative Manual,
21 which is basically a manual that outlines the methods of
22 how and procedures for administering the program.

23 Impact fees. They were developed as a means to
24 collect from new development for the funds for -- excuse
25 me -- to collect funds from the new development for the

1 purpose of building capacity improvements for public
2 facilities to accommodate new growth.

3 This is kind of a basic outline of how we
4 develop the impact fee program. And there's two things
5 that we're looking for. We're looking to find out how
6 much growth and where growth is occurring and what
7 capacity projects are needed to accommodate that growth
8 and the cost of those capacity projects.

9 Land use assumptions are based on the Washoe,
10 Reno and Sparks master plan. And we use the population
11 and employment growth, growth consensus forecast. In
12 this case, we used the 2016 consensus forecast, which we
13 distribute throughout Washoe County using TMRPA's land
14 use model that assesses the likelihood of development by
15 parcel. And it's validated by reviewing development
16 handbooks, the development agreements, and vacant land
17 is based on land use categories that are included in the
18 Comprehensive Plan.

19 All this data is imported into RTC's travel
20 demand model and which we predict what the traffic
21 volumes are going to be on the various regional roads
22 throughout Washoe County in our service area.

23 And it also predicts the timing of that, of
24 that growth. We have a model that has five-year
25 increments -- so 2015, 2020, 2025 -- that determines

1 what the volumes on the various regional roads, and that
2 will trigger when we need to actually do capacity
3 improvements.

4 In addition, our travel demand model
5 anticipates what that growth is in VMTs, vehicle miles
6 traveled.

7 And here's kind of an example of the
8 information that's used by TMRPA and actually to be put
9 into their model and also our travel demand model. And
10 these land uses actually determine what that density is
11 that's uploaded into those travel demand models and land
12 use models. And by using this information, we can
13 figure out our best guess on when development's going to
14 go in the various parcels or the various PUDs, projects,
15 and which helped us determine, again, where those
16 capacity projects are developing in the regional
17 network.

18 One of the provisions in the NRS statutes
19 actually restricts an impact fee service area from
20 encompassing an entire city or county if they're over
21 15,000 population. So we had to separate, in our 5th
22 edition. We had one service area with various method
23 districts. In the 5th edition, we actually divided into
24 two service areas, the north service area, which is
25 north of I-80, and the south service area. That way, it

1 breaks up both the City of Sparks and the City of Reno.

2 With the two separate service areas, we
3 actually had to calculate two separate impact fees. So
4 there's a separate capitol improvement plan and a
5 separate amount of growth for each service area, and
6 that determines what is going to be the impact fee rate.

7 For the 6th edition, this is a sample of the
8 projects that fall within the Sparks area. In your
9 packet, I believe, you have a full listing of the
10 capacity projects that are included in the CIP for both
11 the north and the south service area.

12 And this is a map, and, again, with the list of
13 projects that are included in this upcoming project.
14 You can see there are a couple of projects that rolled
15 over, like the Oddie-Wells project. It's under design
16 right now from the 5th edition, and it's rolled over
17 into this new 6th edition because it hasn't been
18 completed yet.

19 Now, RRIF fees are based on the total cost of
20 the capacity projects that are included in the CIP.
21 Now, new development does not fund all capacity
22 projects. We also have state funding, federal funding,
23 some local funding, a fuel tax that we use to fund
24 capacity projects. So we take that full list of the
25 capacity, the Capitol Improvement Plan, the total cost

1 of those projects, and deduct out what the other funding
2 sources that we plan to use over the next 10 years. And
3 the resulting number is the RRIF share by service area.
4 In this case, it shows \$103 million that will be funded
5 by the new development for the north service area and
6 about \$72 million in the south service area.

7 The VMT growth by service area, again, is one
8 of those outputs from our travel demand model based on
9 what we anticipate is going to be built, how many new
10 houses, what types of -- or the retail, office
11 buildings, manufacturing. And that comes out to the VMT
12 growth, again, by service area.

13 When you divide the total cost of the capital
14 improvement plan, the new development share, and divide
15 it by the VMT growth by service area, that's how we come
16 up with the dollar per VMT rate. In this case, for the
17 north service area, which is most of Sparks, it'll be
18 \$320.71 cents per vehicle miles traveled.

19 So that's how we get to the rate part of the
20 calculation.

21 And then this next slide shows we -- when you
22 actually get down to the building permit, and someone's
23 going to be charged an impact fee, it's based on their
24 specific land use. If you're building a single-family
25 home, it's based on the land use of the trips that are

1 generated by a single-family home, typical trips.

2 Retail, same thing, or office building.

3 So here is our spreadsheet that shows the
4 various development types that we used and base the
5 impact fees on.

6 As you can see in the schedule here, we have --
7 to charge a fee for the impact fee for a single-family
8 home, we base it on the average daily trips of that
9 particular land use. And it looks, say, in the case of
10 a single-family home, here we say it's 8.56 trips per
11 day. We multiply that times some trip rate and trip
12 length factors.

13 And this is to take into account that most
14 trips, let's say, for a single-family home are direct
15 trips, home to work. But if you're doing a fee for,
16 let's say, a retail use, many times that's a diverted
17 trip. You're on your way home, you're going to stop by
18 the grocery store. So these factors take into account
19 those diverted and pass-by trips.

20 Then we also multiply that number by the
21 average trip length for that you travel on a regional
22 road. It excludes the trips that you travel on the
23 freeway and also on local streets. That number is taken
24 from our travel demand model. In the case of the 6th
25 edition, we have at the very top an average trip length

1 of 2.79 miles in the north service area, and it's a
2 little bit shorter, 2.64 miles, in the south service
3 area. And over the years, it's been in that general two
4 and a half to three miles on the regional road network
5 is what we anticipate people travel.

6 We multiply those numbers to come up with the
7 amount of vehicle miles traveled per development type.
8 For a single-family home, it's 15.03 VMTs. And then
9 that number is multiplied by that trip rate, that \$320
10 per VMT, to get a fee of \$4,820 for a single-family
11 home.

12 And that money, again, is used to build
13 capacity improvements, collected and used to build
14 capacity improvements in the north service area in this
15 case.

16 So here's a comparison between the draft 6th
17 edition and the 5th edition that's currently in effect.
18 If you start looking at individual roads, you might
19 notice in many cases that the fees actually went down.
20 And one of the reasons is that we base the ADT on the
21 ITE trip generation manual for most cases. And we
22 updated those numbers based on the 10th edition. And we
23 found that that actually went down this year from the
24 9th edition of the ITE trip generation manual. That's a
25 national study that looks at the various types of land

1 uses and actually measures of the studies and comes up
2 with what the averages are. So we use that for, as our
3 calculation in the RRIF program.

4 Let's see. Some other changes that were,
5 again, between the 5th and the 6th edition is we have a
6 new list of projects and new costs associated with those
7 projects.

8 So the CIP actually went, increased just
9 slightly if you add both the north and the south
10 projects that are development-related, and it only went
11 up about \$10 million. So there is a little bit
12 difference.

13 We also saw where growth was occurring changed
14 from the 5th edition. In our previous models it looked
15 like there was more growth in the south. So there was
16 more VMTs being generated in the south service area.
17 Now we're seeing more roads anticipated in the north.
18 And, I think, we see with the North Valleys, with Sparks
19 area growing so much, that makes sense that we're going
20 to see a higher growth rate in the north service area.

21 Let's see. And with that, the other companion
22 manual that goes with this program -- there's the
23 Capitol Improvements Plan that identified what the
24 methodology is for calculating the fee. The other
25 manual is the General Administrative Manual. It's

1 basically the rules on how to actually apply the manual
2 to paying impact fees.

3 There are only two notable changes that we made
4 this time, one being that we included that the -- there
5 is an exemption for paying impact fees for state
6 buildings. That's something that's actually been in
7 effect for -- I think, for just about since the
8 beginning of the program. It wasn't documented in our
9 General Administrative Manual, but there was an Attorney
10 General --

11 MR. ERICKSEN: Opinion.

12 MS. MASTERPOOL: Opinion. Thank you. Attorney
13 General opinion that identified they were exempt from
14 paying impact fees. So we just documented that in the
15 manual.

16 The second one was to change the timing or
17 allowing impact fee offsets. Looking a little bit of it
18 this way is that one of the NRS requirements is that new
19 development is either required condition or volunteers,
20 to build an improvement that's on the Capital
21 Improvement Plan, they must be compensated for building
22 that improvement.

23 The way we came up to monitor that is entering
24 into offset agreements, or what used to be known as
25 credit agreements, where they would build them, build

1 the project instead of paying impact fees. And we would
2 monitor how much money they spent on these projects.
3 And in return, rather than giving them cash, we gave
4 them impact fee credits, and now we're giving them
5 impact fee waivers -- it's just kind of a different
6 change in terms -- and then use those waivers to pay
7 those impact fees. So they build the road up front, and
8 in return they get waivers that they can use to pay
9 their impact fees.

10 One of the challenges that we have is the time
11 that it takes to actually get this manual and the RRIF
12 program adopted takes many, many meetings, many months.
13 And there are many developers out there that are ready
14 to build. And particularly Pioneer Meadows, it is ready
15 to build, Wingfield Hills Parkway. It will be on our
16 6th edition manual, but they're ready to build now.

17 So we provided a provision that allows a
18 developer to start construction of his project prior to
19 the new Capital Improvement Plan being implemented. As
20 long as we have this adopted within a year from when he
21 starts construction, he will still be able to enter into
22 an agreement and then earn the waivers that he's due for
23 building those improvements that are on the Capital
24 Improvement Plan.

25 So those are really the only two significant

1 changes that were included in the General Administrative
2 Manual.

3 And with that, I'll be glad to answer any other
4 questions.

5 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay. A lot of technical
6 information there. We appreciate it.

7 Are there any questions from the Committee?
8 Commissioner Petersen.

9 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: May I have -- if
10 there's impact fees for public parks and schools?

11 MS. MASTERPOOL: Well, we do have one that says
12 for schools. However, public schools are exempt per NRS
13 from paying impact fees. But there are private schools,
14 charter schools, and they would pay the school rate.

15 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: I understand that. And
16 how about the public parks, collecting an impact fee for
17 this?

18 MS. MASTERPOOL: We can collect impact fees
19 from public parks, yes. And it would be based on the
20 acreage of a public park.

21 Just because we are public, like the City of
22 Reno, City of Sparks, and RTC, if we built a building,
23 we would be -- we would owe impact fees.

24 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: All right.

25 MS. MASTERPOOL: The only folks that are exempt

1 are schools, federal buildings, and --

2 MR. ERICKSEN: State.

3 MS. MASTERPOOL: -- state buildings.

4 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: And the public park,
5 who pays those impact fees?

6 MS. MASTERPOOL: It would be whoever's
7 constructing the park.

8 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Okay. I wasn't aware
9 of that. Thank you.

10 MS. MASTERPOOL: M-hm (affirmative), sure.

11 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Thank you, Commissioner
12 Petersen.

13 Commissioner VanderWell.

14 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Yes. I had a quick
15 question. This has gone out to the development
16 community. Have you received any feedback?

17 MS. MASTERPOOL: We haven't. However, the RTC,
18 or the RRIF Technical Advisory Committee is made up of
19 actually 15 members, three from each one of the local
20 governments, two from RTC, and actually four developers.
21 So they are on the committee and are part of this, this
22 review.

23 I have done some presentations to the end, the
24 association. So they are familiar with things going on.

25 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Have you gotten any

1 feedback from them one way or another?

2 MS. MASTERPOOL: No.

3 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Okay. Because I just
4 noticed that, because you mentioned everything else went
5 down except for residential. And so, I guess, what my
6 concern here is that we have residential builders out
7 there saying that they can't build affordable. And I
8 just don't want to give them another excuse.

9 MS. MASTERPOOL: M-hm (affirmative).

10 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: So. Okay. Thank
11 you.

12 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Good question. Are there any
13 other questions from the Committee?

14 I had a couple, Julie. I was wondering if you
15 might be able to dive into a little bit more the TAZ,
16 the traffic analysis zone model and how that works. And
17 I know that from the land use side of things that we do,
18 really it's pretty much a parcel by parcel, you know,
19 review, looking at land use. And then it gets inputted,
20 and then there's this really big model that comes in. I
21 was wondering if you could kind of talk about that.

22 MS. MASTERPOOL: Absolutely.

23 What Commissioner Carey is referring to is
24 RTC's travel demand model. It is a big picture of what
25 is being developed. The TAZs are actually a combination

1 of parcels. So. And rather than representing each and
2 every parcel in our travel demand model -- it would just
3 kind of take too much time to actually generate, then
4 the programs run. So we combined a great number of
5 parcels into travel analysis zones. I think, we're up
6 to about maybe 906 TAZs. So they're big bubbles. And
7 all of those bubble areas are loaded onto the regional
8 road network, kind of representing arterials where they
9 would tie in.

10 It's not exact roadmap, but they do represent
11 the amount of traffic that is in that bubble for those
12 individual parcels, and then they're put onto the
13 regional road network.

14 Now, the travel demand model actually goes
15 through a lot of validation. There are -- oh, did you
16 want to add something?

17 MR. ERICKSEN: You're okay, Julie.

18 MS. MASTERPOOL: Okay. If you had some things
19 to add to that.

20 But on the travel demand model we actually go
21 through and do a lot of traffic counts to validate the
22 information that's coming out of the model to make sure
23 that it's predicting what existing traffic is doing.
24 And then by adding more traffic on for future growth,
25 then we can get a good idea of where that traffic is

1 growing and where the roads are collecting more ATM,
2 more vehicles.

3 MR. RUNDLE: If you want to look at that slide
4 for Pioneer Meadows.

5 MS. MASTERPOOL: Okay.

6 MR. RUNDLE: We could go to that.

7 Commissioner Carey, Jim Rundle, to add onto a
8 little bit of what was just discussed to your question.

9 Through regional planning, what we were doing
10 and was touched on in Julie's presentation was utilizing
11 land use, land uses in the city, in the planned
12 developments and development agreements and then giving
13 certain forecasts for areas like mixed-use district.

14 What we'll do for these areas is identify how
15 many units that, oh, pink area would provide for. And
16 that's easy, because it's in a hamlet, so it's very
17 fitted. Then what we utilize is as described in the
18 presentation, the consensus forecast. That consensus
19 forecast identifies how much development will occur in
20 the Truckee Meadows by a certain number of people. It's
21 called out year by year by year.

22 And we know, let's say, like in the year 2020
23 there'll be an addition of, say, 8,000 people to the
24 Truckee Meadows. We're able to then take that number
25 down and identify how many people will, should locate in

1 the city of Sparks by assuming scientific forecasts.

2 And then we utilize what we call suitability
3 factors. And some of those can be proximity to the
4 school or proximity to existing infrastructure. This
5 infrastructure may be sewer lines that are already in
6 the ground or roads that are already in proximity to the
7 project or water that's available. Those will turn on
8 those, those units to attract development before, say,
9 maybe Sonoma Highlands would, because there is no
10 infrastructure there yet, there is no arterial road
11 running up there.

12 And what that does is begin to capture those
13 units and those people, until they're turned on for the
14 year 2020 and they capture the 2,000 people that should
15 live in the city of Sparks.

16 And then, through the travel demand model, it
17 begins to turn on where those infrastructure upgrades
18 would be required. And utilization of that consensus
19 forecast is how we come up with proposing those to the
20 RTC.

21 I don't know if that helps.

22 CHAIRMAN CAREY: I think, that helps a lot.
23 And, I think, that demonstrates -- where I was going
24 with this, I think, it demonstrates as the level of
25 specificity that is put into these, into this, into this

1 program. And it kind of shows neighborhood by
2 neighborhood the impact of growth and trying to help
3 sustain our regional growth.

4 So I just kind of wanted to highlight that.
5 That was one of the eye-opening experiences I had, being
6 this Commission's rep on the TAC, is the level of detail
7 in the different zones and how it relates with land use.
8 So, I thought that was a great explanation.

9 MR. RUNDLE: I think, we have approximately, I
10 think, we have 220 TAZs, traffic analysis zones, in the
11 City of Sparks and the sphere around Sparks.

12 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Great. And the other question
13 I had is -- you know, one of the big things we're trying
14 to do, when we meet as the Planning Commission, and as a
15 region, we're trying to, you know, have good land use
16 policy and locate homes and locate jobs and in close
17 proximity together. And, I think, overall, we want to
18 have less VMTs.

19 The question I have is -- I know that the VMTs
20 are going down in both service areas, which is good.
21 From a land use perspective and, obviously, with the
22 Comprehensive Plan and this Commission's
23 responsibilities with implementing those policies, from
24 a land use perspective, as a region, are we doing well
25 and trying to reduce VMTs regionwide? Or are the -- are

1 we doing well because of our policies, or is it a matter
2 of just the ITE manual going down?

3 MR. RUNDLE: Well, and, Commissioner Carey, it
4 may not be a question for Julie, who takes what the
5 traffic analysis zones essentially tell the RTP of where
6 road improvements need to be done. It may be a more
7 appropriate discussion for the representatives at the
8 Regional Planning Commission when they identify what
9 types of land uses and where we want those residential
10 and employment opportunities to occur.

11 This, to an extent, is a result of what is
12 being done and what that consensus forecast shows where
13 the traffic will go, where the trips will go based on
14 that, those inputs.

15 But I appreciate the question on, if it's a
16 goal of the region to reduce the number of vehicle miles
17 traveled, then what standards need to be in the Regional
18 Plan to ensure that employment's in proximity to the
19 residential.

20 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Thank you. Just thought we'd
21 explore that, that a little bit while we had the
22 opportunity.

23 Okay. Are there any other questions concerning
24 the 6th edition and all the proposed changes?

25 I believe, the staff does have a

1 recommendation. They are looking for action to the City
2 Council on this item, if anyone wants to take a stab at
3 it.

4 COMMISSIONER READ: I'll make a -- go ahead and
5 make a motion.

6 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Commissioner Read, thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER READ: I move to recommend that
8 the City Council approve the land use assumptions,
9 proposed Capital Improvement Plan, associated fees, and
10 updates to the Regional Road Impact Fee 6th Edition
11 General Administrative Manual.

12 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Thank you.

13 We have a motion to approve the 6th edition
14 changes by Commissioner Read. Is there a second on the
15 motion?

16 COMMISSIONER BROCK: I second.

17 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Second by Commissioner Brock.
18 Is there any questions or further discussion concerning
19 the motion?

20 I just had a quick one. I wanted to take this,
21 take this opportunity to thank this Commission for
22 allowing me to be its representative on the TAC. It's
23 been a real eye-opening experience. And I very much
24 appreciate the opportunity to work with Julie and Brian
25 and the engineering staff at the RTC. I want to extend

1 my appreciation to those folks, as well as Shwen, for
2 all the modeling that she does.

3 I want to extend a thank-you to Jeremy over at
4 Regional Planning for his work and the really detailed
5 analysis with the consensus forecast and the land use
6 assumptions. And it's been great working with Jon and
7 Jim and the rest of the TAC on this update.

8 I think, a lot of really good technical work
9 has gone into this update. The fees are increasing.
10 But, I believe, we've gone round and round on the TAC.
11 And, I believe, they are justified. I think, they will
12 help meet the regional road impact, the regional road
13 infrastructure needs that we have to accommodate future
14 growth.

15 And I appreciate the staff and the Committee
16 for taking the time on Tuesday and tonight to kind of
17 dive into this, this program. Because really the
18 decisions that we make as the Planning Commission on
19 land use, or we're adding units in the handbook, or when
20 we review tentative maps, each one of those uses that we
21 approve, eventually they're going to show up at the
22 Building Department and paying these fees.

23 And this program has program has generated
24 \$294 million, as you've seen. That's a substantial
25 impact for our transportation. So I really appreciate

1 us jumping into this. The last update was 2015. So I
2 encourage us to keep that in mind when we're meeting as
3 the Planning Commission.

4 Are there any other -- I'll get off my soapbox.
5 Is there any other discussion on the motion to approve?

6 Okay. Hearing none, we'll call the vote. All
7 those in favor of the motion, please say "aye."

8 (Committee members said "aye.")

9 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Opposed, "nay."

10 The ayes have it. The motion is carried
11 unanimously.

12 Thank you, Julie. Good luck with the county
13 and the city and their board.

14 MS. MASTERPOOL: All right. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN CAREY: The next item on our agenda is
16 public comment.

17 Is there any members of the public that would
18 like to provide comment at this time?

19 Seeing none, I'll close the public comment
20 portion of our agenda.

21 We'll move on to item number 8. That's
22 comments from the Commissioners.

23 Do we have any comments from the Commission?

24 I had just a quick one. I wanted to extend my
25 appreciation for Commissioner Brock.

