



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

The Planning Commission will convene as the NRS 278B.150 "Impact Fee" Capital Improvements Advisory Committee for a portion of the meeting

Planning Commission Members

Larry Chesney, Chair
Francine Donshick, Vice Chair
James Barnes
Thomas B. Bruce
Sarah Chvilicek
Philip Horan
Kenneth Krater - CIAC
Kate S. Nelson
Trevor Lloyd, Secretary

Tuesday, September 3, 2019
6:30 p.m.

Washoe County Administration Complex
Commission Chambers
1001 East Ninth Street
Reno, NV

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in a scheduled session on **Tuesday, September 3, 2019**, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

1. *Determination of Quorum

Chair Chesney called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Larry Chesney, Chair
Francine Donshick, Vice Chair
James Barnes
Thomas B. Bruce
Sarah Chvilicek
Philip Horan
Kenneth Krater – CIAC
Kate S. Nelson

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Julee Olander, Planner, Planning and Building
Dwayne Smith, Director, Engineering and Capital Projects
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office
Katy Stark, Recording Secretary, Planning and Building
Donna Fagan, Office Support Specialist, Planning and Building

2. *Pledge of Allegiance

Vice Chair Donshick led the pledge to the flag.

3. *Ethics Law Announcement

Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney, provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

4. *Appeal Procedure

Secretary Trevor Lloyd recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission.

5. *General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

With no requests for public comment, Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

6. Approval of Agenda

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Vice Chair Donshick moved to approve the agenda for the September 3, 2019 meeting. Commissioner Horan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

Trevor Lloyd announced Item 9.B., Bennington Court, was continued.

7. Possible Action to Approve August 6, 2019 Draft Minutes

Commissioner Chvilicek moved to approve the minutes for the August 6, 2019, Planning Commission meeting as written. Vice Chair Donshick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

9. Public Hearings

The following item (Agenda Item 9.A.) was heard by the Washoe County Planning Commission who also simultaneously convened as the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee, including CIAC member Kenneth Crater, for this item only.

A. For possible action, pursuant to NRS 278B.150 and Washoe County Code (WCC) 110.706.05, to recommend approval to the Washoe County Board of Commissioners of amendments to the Regional Road Impact Fee (RRIF) General Administrative Manual (GAM) and the RRIF Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) with revised fees. The RRIF is an NRS chapter 278B impact fee designed to generate revenue for the construction of regional roads and associated improvements in the community that was first passed in 1996 and has since been periodically amended upon the adoption by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of updated versions of the GAM, CIP, and fees. Changes to the dollars per vehicle mile traveled (\$/VMT) and updates to the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for the land use categories results in revised fees in both the North and South Service Areas. The North Service Area generally covers areas in the county to the north of Interstate 80, east of the California/Nevada state line to the eastern boundaries of the Warm Springs and Spanish Springs Planning Areas. The South Service Area generally covers areas in the county to the south of Interstate 80, east of the California/Nevada state line, to the South Valleys Planning Area Boundary and south to the Forest Area Plan Boundary. The revised fees range from a 43% decrease in some categories to a 47% increase in some categories in the North Service Area and a 53% decrease in some categories to a 22% increase in some categories in the South Service Area. The amount of the fees is based on the most recent version of the CIP in effect and is calculated according to the formula set forth in the GAM. The current amendments to the GAM consist of the 6th Edition RRIF GAM that has been approved by RTC for recommendation to governing bodies of the county and cities, as well as associated updates to the CIP and fees. In order to act on this item, the Planning Commission will convene as the NRS 278B.150 Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC), and will hear a presentation by RTC staff to provide further information and answer questions concerning the amendments. If approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution (WCC 110.706.05(d)) to that effect that also

recommends the adoption of necessary ordinances to implement these amendments (WCC 110.706.05(e)). See Exhibits A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H.

- Prepared by: Mitchell Fink, RRIF Administrator
Washoe County Community Services Department
Engineering and Capital Projects Division
- Phone: 775.328.2050
- E-Mail: mfink@washoecounty.us

Julie Masterpool, Engineering Manager with RTC, provided a PowerPoint slideshow.

Ken Krater had some housekeeping items. He spoke about guidelines for traffic reports, the street cross sections, and access management standards. He said he would love to see RTC coordinate with the three agencies and get all of the agencies to adopt similar standards for all those items. It would reduce development costs for the community.

Mr. Krater said he liked the introduction to the calculation of the fees based on trip length. He believes it's important for the RRIF and Regional Planning that we are finding, in areas where we create a job/housing balance, people want to live close to work and don't want to drive far from home. He said he noticed a better job of planning. We are starting to put more employment out in those areas. He said we are seeing significant drops in trips. He read in the meeting minutes from the RTC meeting that the trip generation manual typically shows 10 trips per single family residential dwelling unit. He said they were using 8.5, and he presumed they were using a lot of local data. Ms. Masterpool said for the residential, they use local Washoe County data, which falls within the general wide range of what is in the trip generation manual, but it is on the lower end.

Mr. Krater asked about the north and south CIP plans. He referenced two columns in the exhibits: there is a column showing RTP dollars and a column that shows 2019 dollars for north or south. He asked for an explanation of the difference between those two. Ms. Masterpool said in the RTP, they use the mid-point of those timeframes to assume the costs of those individual projects. At the level of the RTP, they don't know when a project is actually going to be constructed. If it is the first five years, they use the 2.5 year mid mark. It is the same thing for the next five years. They bring those costs back to the current-day 2019 cost in order to develop the impact fee.

Mr. Krater said a lot of the items in the RTP that then make it into the north and south capital improvement plan have to do with sidewalks, multimodal improvements that don't add additional traffic-carrying capacity, which is why the regional road impact fee program was originally intended. Mr. Krater said that last year when he was at the Planning Commission, they talked about the Keystone bridge and Ms. Masterpool said that RTC does account for those cost differentials between traffic capacity and improvements that might be maintenance related or pedestrian improvements. Mr. Krater asked Ms. Masterpool to explain how that works. Ms. Masterpool said the RTP includes all of the projects they anticipate will be built, including ADA, bridge replacements, and the pavement maintenance program. However impact fees are limited to just capacity projects. All of those other projects, which are maintenance, safety-related, and ADA-related cannot use impact fee revenue, so they back those projects out of the CIP. Multi-modal projects do provide a benefit to both new development and to existing development. So for the multi-modal projects, they developed a percentage of that value of those costs for multi-modal projects that would be a benefit to new development. So a small portion of those projects are included in the cost of the CIP. It's 14-18%, depending on if you are in the north or the south. Mr. Krater said he would love to see additional data moving forward in subsequent years to explain that better. He thinks it's important to include that

background so it's clearly understood by the reader that they do account for those differences in cost. Ms. Masterpool said that usually in the CIP they do try to describe to describe that, but she will review again to do a better job of showing that they exclude those expenses in the RTP that aren't eligible for RRIF program. Mr. Krater thinks it's especially important from the standpoint of Washoe County because if someone was reading this and didn't understand, they might think that this favors the City of Reno.

Mr. Krater said we have reduced the categories with land use types over the years. He said student apartments have different trip generation characteristics than multifamily. That difference is exacerbated if you are either very close to campus within walking distance or if you are way off campus and more likely to have to take some sort of transit or vehicle trip to get there. He would like to see that analysis in the upcoming year. He said there may be some other categories that should be brought back in; if you want to promote urban infill, then it's helpful to show that development in an urban area has fewer traffic impacts because it's very walkable and your fees are lower. Ms. Masterpool said they have the ability to do an administrative or an independent fee calculation for new uses that hadn't been identified before, so that's something that can be incorporated. Mr. Krater asked about the time frame for implementation. Ms. Masterpool said she has to present to the BCC and to Reno City Council. She said they like to give a 30-day notice to all of the development community that the fees are changing. She thinks the new fees will go into effect in November or early December.

Vice Chair Donshick said there are typographical errors in the report. On page 48, there is a number 6, but nothing is written. Ms. Masterpool said they will go through it one more time for typos. Vice Chair Donshick said Table 8 is for the north service area, but it references the south service area. Vice Chair Donshick thanked her for the hard work.

No Public Comment was requested. Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

MOTION: Ken Krater moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Capital Improvement Advisory Committee (CIAC) recommend approval to adopt the 6th Edition of the Regional Road Impact Fee (RRIF) General Administrative Manual (GAM), Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and revised fees for unincorporated Washoe County to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners and authorize the chair to sign the resolution on behalf of the CIAC. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Chvilicek. The motion carried unanimously, with a vote of eight for, none against.

Ken Krater left the dais, and the Washoe County Planning Commission reconvened solely as the Planning Commission for the remainder of the meeting.

10. Chair and Commission Items

***A.** Future agenda items - None

***B.** Requests for information from staff - None

11. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items

***A.** Report on previous Planning Commission items - None

***B.** Legal information and updates – DDA Edwards said the subdivision Lakes on Lemmon Valley was denied by this Commission and upheld by the Board of County Commissioners. It's currently on appeal at NV Supreme Court. DDA Edwards answered Commissioner

Horan's question regarding the Supreme Courts on appeals and case law to support decision on access.

12. *General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

There were no requests for public comment. Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

13. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Misty Moga, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on October 1, 2019.

Trevor Lloyd, Secretary to the Planning Commission