

**POLICY AND PROCEDURES MANUAL  
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA**

**2013 ANNUAL REVIEW**

1.	<b>Requested by RTC</b>	<b>Change Chairman/Vice-Chairman to Chair/Vice Chair throughout document</b>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee
2.	<b>Requested by CLV</b>	<b>Change all "Citizens Area Transit/CAT" to "RTC Transit" throughout document</b>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

3.	<b>Requested by RTC</b>	<b>Update current position titles/grammatical corrections</b>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee
▶	10/14/13	Media Relations <u>Manager</u> has been changed to <u>Director</u>

**1.2 COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION**

The Regional Transportation Commission is composed of eight members. These members represent the various political entities within the County and include two members appointed by the Board of County Commissioners, two members appointed by the City ~~Commission Council~~ of the City of Las Vegas and one member each appointed by the City Councils of the cities of North Las Vegas, Boulder City, Henderson, and Mesquite. The Director of the Nevada Department of Transportation shall serve as an Ex-Officio member of the Commission.

All subsequently incorporated cities within the County will be allowed one representative on the ~~Commission~~. The Commission members will select a ~~Chairman~~Chair and Vice-~~Chairman~~Chair in July of odd numbered years as provided in NRS 373.040 as amended at the 1993 Legislative Session.

The RTC General Manager, ~~Deputy General Manager and (Director of and Government Affairs & Media Relations Manager)~~ Director of Government Affairs/Media Relations & Marketing serve as primary liaisons to the Commission. Commission members and their staff shall contact the RTC General Manager, ~~Deputy General Manager, (Director of Government Affairs & Media Relations Manager)~~ Director of Government Affairs/Media Relations & Marketing or Outside General Counsel with questions or direction on RTC matters.

**1.3 RESPONSIBILITY**

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is responsible for funding a program of projects to improve the transportation facilities within Clark County in accordance with State Law. This program is funded through the special motor vehicle fuel tax which is provided by the Nevada Revised Statutes and Clark County Code. Accordingly, when projects are proposed for funding through the Regional Streets and Highway Fund, the Commission shall evaluate the project in terms of the priority established for the project, the relationship of the proposed construction in comparison with other proposed projects, the funds available, and the relative need for the project in comparison with others proposed. If the project meets the above criteria, the Commission may approve funding for the project.

**2.0 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT**

**2.2 THE MASTER PLAN OF STREETS AND HIGHWAYS AND THE RTC CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

1. The Regional Transportation Commission will maintain a Master Plan of Streets and Highways for the Las Vegas urban area. In order for a roadway project to be considered by the Regional Transportation Commission for funding under any program administered by the RTC, the roadway must be shown on this Master Plan of Streets and Highways.
2. In order to receive funding under any RTC program, the project must also be identified in the RTC Capital Improvement Program, as approved by the Regional Transportation Commission.

▶ Changed from original recommendation

Any project proposed for a roadway shown on the Master Plan of Streets and Highways may be submitted for inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program in accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 2.1 and any specific requirements of the various CIP fund sources.

<b>4.</b>	<b>Requested by RTC</b>	<b>Revise street width to street classification</b>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee
▶	10/14/13	Staff requests this revision be rescinded: Upon further review the roadway classification does not encompass all definitions used by the entities.

3. The Master Plan of Streets and Highways shall include all streets and highways that:
  - a. are included in a recognized transportation plan or transportation element adopted by one of the constituent entities of the RTC,
  - b. lie within the Las Vegas urban area, and
  - c. are identified as a street with a minimum of **80 feet planned right-of-way** (~~classification of minor arterial~~).

<b>5.</b>	<b>Requested by CLV</b>	<b>Could this policy be revised to allow for safety improvements on roads that are not on the Master Plan of Streets and Highways? Improvements such as bicycle lanes and bus turnouts/pads are a couple examples of viable RTC improvements that may not occur on currently approved roadways. ~RTC staff recommendation as follows:</b>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
▶	9/17/13	Operations Subcommittee approved with change of “case-by-case” to “by waiver”.

4. ~~The Regional Transportation Commission may approve projects not included on the Master Plan of Streets and Highways by waiver, on a case-by-case basis.~~ If approved, the Board may then authorize the distribution of appropriate funds to the entity requesting the project.

<b>6.</b>	<b>Requested by CLV</b>	<b>Should read – can predict a future location of the proposed facility (instead of system).</b>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

## 2.4 PROJECT INITIALIZATION

At such time as an entity recognizes the need for a new or improved facility and at such time as the entity can predict a future location of the proposed ~~system~~ facility, action may be initiated to request project funding for the right-of-way engineering and construction cost. This action should be taken well in advance of the required date for actual expenditures to allow the funds to be programmed in conjunction with other related projects based upon transportation needs and priorities.

A project may be initiated by the entity which has jurisdiction over the physical location of the proposed system. This shall be accomplished by the governing body of the entity requesting consideration of the proposed project by the RTC. If a project involves more than one jurisdiction, one entity will be responsible for project administration.

The RTC may then approve the project. This approval may take any of the following forms:

1. Approved Project, Proposed Appropriation: The project becomes a part of the approved project list but has no relative priority and construction is not imminent nor does an urgent need exist. The project estimates of cost will not be reflected in the financial statements as an appropriation. Since money has not been appropriated for the project, it will not be necessary to draft a formal interlocal contract; however an interlocal contract may be drafted for portions of the project.
2. Approved Project, Approved Appropriation: The project becomes a part of the approved project list and has an assigned priority for construction. Method B Interlocal Contracts must be used for all large, multiple step projects.

Method A - Interlocal Contract/Supplemental Interlocal Contract Method: It will be necessary to draft and approve an interlocal contract covering engineering design and right-of-way acquisition and all associated costs will be considered as appropriated funds for expenditure and listed in the financial statement in that category.

7.	Requested by CLV	<b>Refers to the objectives of the RTC which are not included in the policies and procedures document. It might be helpful to include a reference to the document where they can be found. ~RTC staff recommendation as follows:</b>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

The RTC may reassign priorities and adjust appropriations for projects consistent with ~~the objectives of the RTC~~ Section 1.3 Responsibility of the RTC.

The fact that a project is approved and has been given priority does constitute authority for expenditure of funds as approved by the interlocal contract, but does not preclude another project being moved to a position of precedence over a previously approved priority project.

Funds may be appropriated for construction when the project is part of the approved project list has an assigned priority, design is complete, and right-of-entry has been obtained on all right-of-way necessary for construction. Prior to the entity making any commitment for related project construction services or expenditures, it will be required that a supplemental interlocal contract is executed, all reimbursable amounts included in the contract will be considered as expenditures for purposes of the financial statement.

8.	Requested by RTC	<b>Remove "commencing"</b>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

### INCENTIVE CLAUSE

In order to expedite projects, revenue not committed to prepayment of bonds may be available for construction of projects on a first come, first served basis. At the time that Authorization to Proceed for construction is requested, the requesting agency must demonstrate that the project is included in the first five years of the Capital Improvement Program, have the 90% design plans complete, have right-of-way for construction purposes obtained or demonstrate to the Commission that it is in the process of ~~commencing~~ condemnation, and confirm that all supplemental funding including Special Improvement District funding will be in place at the time the bid is awarded. At the time Authorization to Proceed is requested, a separate agenda item must be submitted to amend the Capital Improvement Program, if necessary, or to request the project be moved ahead of another project on the approved construction list. If the project has not been advertised for bids within a period of three months after the signed Authorization to Proceed has been received from the RTC, the Authorization to Proceed shall automatically be considered revoked. An agenda item must be resubmitted to request approval of the Authorization to Proceed for construction. The RTC staff shall maintain a perpetual approved construction list showing the order of projects approved for construction, the date the Authorization to Proceed was sent to the agency, and the status of the project. A current copy of the list shall be included under the Status Reports item, and updates shall be immediately e-mailed to each Public Works Director and their designees.

It is also desirable to accelerate the design of projects. Authorizations to Proceed for design should be submitted in the fiscal year that funding is provided in the Capital Improvement Program. Prior to accelerating project design schedules, the responsible entity should consider the number of projects already under design and be able to complete those designs as scheduled.

### 3.2 DESIGN CRITERIA

All projects shall be designed for future traffic to local standards, to standards adopted by the RTC as enumerated in the appendix of this document, the standards contained in the adopted Bicycle/Pedestrian Element of the Regional Transportation Plan, the State standards, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards, the Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems Architecture adopted by the RTC, and generally accepted engineering practices. The Uniform Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction of Off-Site Improvements, Clark County Area, Nevada, hereinafter referred to as "Standard Specifications," most recent edition shall be used on all

► Changed from original recommendation

contracts. No streets shall be constructed with less than a 3" asphalt concrete pavement, or the equivalent if other paving materials are used. The base course requirements on each street shall be determined by an acceptable method based on the types of soils encountered as sub-base material.

The installation of raised medians to reduce left turn conflicts and provide for pedestrian refuge areas shall be addressed during the project design.

9.	Requested by CLV	Has a baseline policy of “Median islands or continuous left turn lanes shall be built on all jobs where feasible”. We would like to see that revised to read “Median islands or continuous left turn lanes shall be built on all jobs where feasible. Landscaped or raised medians are preferred.”
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

Median islands or continuous left turn lanes shall be built on all jobs where feasible. Landscaped or raised medians are preferred. Where traffic signals are anticipated to be installed at a later date, conduit shall be included during the construction of the project. Additional traffic signal infrastructure as specified in subsection 6.1.3H may be reimbursable.

Before beginning design of any drainage facility, data relating to existing flows, ultimate flows as shown in the Clark County Regional Flood Control Master Plan, and the construction schedule of future Flood Control District projects shall be collected and considered. Drainage studies and the design of drainage facilities constructed on RTC projects shall be in accordance with the Clark County Regional Flood Control District's Hydrologic Criteria and Drainage Design Manual.

Projects shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title II, and all projects shall be in accordance with the RTC policy on sidewalk.

### 3.3 PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS REVIEW

During the design and construction phases of project development, the administering entity will be required to prepare and present monthly status reports to the RTC. Project status reports must be submitted to the RTC within 60 calendar days after the interlocal contract has been approved by the RTC. These reports will be for purposes of keeping the RTC informed of the project progress.

10.	Requested by CLV	Refers to the General Manager’s attendance at the pre-design conference. Perhaps this should be revised to ‘General Manager or designee.
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

A pre-design conference shall be held with representatives of each entity in which the project is located with the General Manager or designee and the design engineer present. Design conferences to be held at least monthly to review the progress.

11.	Requested by CLV	Project signs requires ‘an appropriate number of RTC Construction Signs’ but does not define appropriate. Perhaps a standard should be referenced or the definition provided. ~RTC Staff recommendation as follows:
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

### 4.5 PROJECT SIGNS

An appropriate number of RTC Construction Signs (a minimum of one per major approach) shall be placed on all RTC Construction Projects, except that no signs are required on traffic signal projects.

On projects where the RTC has reimbursed a substantial amount, such as for the design and right-of-way acquisition, and the construction of the project is funded with other than RTC funds, the RTC should be listed as a participating funding agency on the construction sign used by the agency funding the construction.

## **6.0 REIMBURSEMENTS**

Relocation and modification of existing school flashers to comply with the requirements of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, that meet the warrants adopted by the RTC, will be reimbursed.

<b>12.</b>	<b>Requested by CLV</b>	<b>Construction flashers should read “The construction of the school flasher is the least cost <u>method</u> of ...”</b>
	<b>8/29/13</b>	<b>EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee</b>
	<b>9/17/13</b>	<b>Approved by Operations Subcommittee</b>

Construction of new school flashers are reimbursable when:

1. The proposed flasher satisfies the criteria set forth in the appendix for the installation and operation of speed limit sign beacons.
  2. The construction of the school flasher is the least cost method of providing safety for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic.
- A. Traffic lane delineation and special traffic markings will be reimbursed. Traffic control signs which are placed in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, and which are necessitated by the construction of the project, and which are listed below will be reimbursed.
1. Regulatory Signs
    - a. Right-of-way Series
    - b. Speed Series
    - c. Movement series limited to turn prohibition signs, lane use control signs, two-way left turn only signs, keep right signs of raised medians at signalized intersections, one-way signs, divided highway crossing signs, and traffic signal signs.
    - d. Parking regulation signs in the following cases:
      1. To regulate or prohibit parking in a travel lane which was converted from a parking lane.
      2. To regulate or prohibit parking in a travel lane on a new street in a residential area where parking had previously been permitted within the right-of-way.
      3. Warning Signs
      4. Street Names Signs
  - B. Off site improvements.....
  - C. Reimbursements for landscaping and structural aesthetics may be reimbursed in accordance with the following criteria:
    1. Replacement landscaping and related items of construction on properties adjacent to the right-of-way may be reimbursed. Sleeves for irrigation systems for future median landscaping may also be reimbursed.
    2. Aesthetic enhancement of structures may be reimbursable in an amount not to exceed 3% of the structure cost. Enhancements shall be an integral part of the structure. Free-standing decorations are not reimbursable. The enhancement of various functional elements such as beams, walls or columns by utilizing colors, texture or other amenities is encouraged. The enhancements should be in accordance with an approved landscaping and/or aesthetics master plan or should be finalized after public participation. A presentation on the proposed aesthetic enhancement of structures on any project shall be made to the RTC upon request.

13.	Requested by CLV	In light of the focus on complete streets is this limit still appropriate?  <i>*RTC Staff recommends that this be referred to a working group for discussion/revision.</i>
	9/26/13	Executive Advisory Committee referred to working group

3. Installation of new landscaping may be reimbursable in an amount not to exceed 3% of the RTC funded construction cost, excluding construction conflict.

14.	Requested by RTC	Remove Stakeholder Advisory Committee
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

## ~~12.0 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE~~

### ~~12.1 CREATION AND PURPOSE~~

~~The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) may seek public input on issues of importance to the community and the Commission. The Commission may rely on the input from a variety of stakeholders by way of a Stakeholder Advisory Committee. The Commission shall set forth the scope of the issues that the Committee will consider.~~

### ~~12.2 MEMBERSHIP~~

~~A. The membership of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee shall consist of the following:~~

~~1. Stakeholders appointed by the RTC Board of Commissioners.~~

~~B. Members are appointed for a term of one year.~~

~~C. If a Stakeholder Advisory Committee member is absent, he/she may send an alternate to the meeting. The alternate may participate in the Committee discussion.~~

### ~~12.3 MEETINGS~~

~~A. Meetings shall be held at least quarterly or more often as determined by the RTC.~~

~~B. Meetings shall be facilitated by the RTC or a designated facilitator.~~

~~C. The presence of 33 percent of the membership shall constitute a quorum.~~

~~D. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee shall follow a prepared agenda, subject to a publicly posted notice of public meeting as required by Nevada State Law.~~

~~E. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee will try to reach consensus on all items. Opposing opinions will be reflected in the Committee minutes.~~

~~F. Meetings will be recorded.~~

~~G. Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings will be open to the public.~~

~~H. Public comment will be permitted at the end of each meeting.~~

## 14.0 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

### **14.1 CREATION AND PURPOSE**

The Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee shall assist the Executive Advisory Committee in the formulation of recommendations to the RTC. The Subcommittee's areas of interest shall include planning and programming issues and other items as requested by the Regional Transportation or the Executive Advisory Committee

### **14.2 MEMBERSHIP**

A. The membership of the Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee shall consist of the following entity representatives:

15.	Requested by CLV	Refers to “The land use planning agency General Manager or other designated official, from each RTC member entity”. Perhaps should the sentence be revised to refer to the ‘Director of Planning from each RTC member entity?’  <i>*RTC Staff recommends referring this request to the MPS for consideration.</i>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee (MPS)
▶	10/8/13	MPS approved leaving General Manager and adding Director of Planning

1. The land use planning agency General Manager, **Director of Planning**, or other designated individual, from each RTC member entity (Clark County, City of Las Vegas, City of North Las Vegas, City of Henderson and City of Boulder City).
2. The Chief of the Program Development Office of the Nevada Department of Transportation, or other designated individual.
3. The land use planning agency director, or other designated individual, from the City of Mesquite and any other subsequently incorporated city that is a member of the RTC, upon written request to the RTC General Manager.

16.	Requested by MPS	Add a representative from Nellis Air Force Base (MPS Approved 7/19/13)
17.	Requested by CLV	In light of the focus on providing multi-modal transportation for all users, would it be appropriate to add another member of the committee under subsection B to represent non-motorized users?  <i>*RTC Staff recommends referring this request to the MPS for consideration.</i>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee (MPS)
	10/8/13	MPS approved

- B. The membership of the Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee shall also consist of the following community and special interests representatives:
1. A designated staff member from the Clark County Department of Air Quality Management.
  2. The Director of the Clark County Department of Aviation, or other designated individual.
  3. A representative of each firm operating public mass transit services in the Las Vegas metropolitan planning area under contractual arrangements with the RTC.
  4. One representative, selected by the RTC, from the urban goods/freight transportation industry.
  5. One representative selected by the RTC, from the taxicab or private motor carrier industry.
  6. One representative from the Clark County School District.
  7. One representative from the Bureau of Land Management.
  8. One representative from the Southern Nevada Water Authority.
  9. **One representative from Nellis Air Force Base**
  10. **One representative for non-motorized transportation users**
- C. Members of the Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee shall be selected by the entity, firm or agency they represent, unless otherwise designated under paragraph (B) above to be selected by the RTC.
- D. Members of the Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee designated under paragraph (B) above to be selected by the RTC shall have a term of appointment for two years ending on June 30 of an odd-numbered year. Members may be reappointed for successive terms. Vacancies shall be filled by the RTC.
- E. Each Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee member shall have one vote.

- F. Except as provided for in paragraph (D), the terms of the members of the Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee shall be indefinite.
- G. For each member provided for in paragraphs (A) and (B), one alternate member may be appointed. Such alternate members will exercise all functions of the member in the member's absence. All members and alternates must be designated, in writing, to the RTC General Manager.

<b>18.</b>	<b>Requested by RTC</b>	<b>Remove Regional Rapid Transit Authority Advisory Committee</b>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

## ~~19.0 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE REGIONAL RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE~~

### ~~19.1 CREATION AND PURPOSE~~

~~In 2011, the Nevada legislature approved Senate Bill 151, a bill that calls for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (Commission) to establish a Regional Rapid Transit Authority Advisory Committee (Committee). The Committee's purpose is to study the issues concerning the development of a regional rapid transit system.~~

~~The Committee shall report to the appropriate committees of the Nevada Legislature by February 1 of each year.~~

### ~~19.2 MEMBERSHIP~~

~~A. Membership is prescribed in Senate Bill 151 and includes:~~

- ~~i. The general manager of the Commission shall serve as Chairman;~~
- ~~ii. One member appointed by the Board of Clark County Commissioners;~~
- ~~iii. Three members, one from each of the three largest cities within Clark County, who are appointed by the respective governing bodies of each city;~~
- ~~iv. One member who is selected by the Nevada Resort Association;~~
- ~~v. One member who is selected by the Nevada Development Authority;~~
- ~~vi. One member selected by the Nevada Department of Transportation;~~
- ~~vii. One member selected by the Nevada Arts Council~~

~~B. Members are appointed for terms that are prescribed by the respective agencies that they represent.~~

### ~~19.3 MEETINGS~~

~~A. Meetings will be scheduled bi-monthly; however, additional meetings may be scheduled as needed. Special meetings may be called by the Committee Chair.~~

~~B. Meetings shall follow a prepared agenda and will be posted and recorded in accordance with Nevada Open Meeting Law.~~

~~C. Meetings shall be limited to two hours.~~

~~D. Meetings shall be facilitated by the RTC or a designated facilitator.~~

~~E. The Committee shall follow Robert's Rules of Order except as follows:~~

- ~~i. Seconds will not be required for any motion.~~
- ~~ii. The Chairman can make motions and can vote on any motion.~~
- ~~iii. A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum.~~
- ~~iv. Committee decisions shall be consensus based. Opposing viewpoints will be reflected in the meeting minutes.~~



# APPENDIX

19.	Requested by CLV	<p>We would like to recommend some revisions to the guidelines to move the TIA process closer to a multi-modal analysis of the transportation network and have the following suggestions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Consider, in addition to vehicle counts, also require counts of bicyclists and pedestrians at all intersections.</li> <li>b. Consider requiring the TIA to address the impacts to non-motorized users of the transportation network.</li> <li>c. Consider adding a requirement to address Bike/Ped LOS.</li> <li>d. Consider adding a definition for the minimum threshold for a study to be completed and define the area of influence. Currently most of the valley agencies require a TIA for any site generating 100 or more new trips. If this minimum is added, it should also allow for the local agency to require a TIA for special circumstances on sites that generate fewer than 100 new trips.</li> </ul>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
▶	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee with additional note to refer to entity guidelines

### TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS GUIDELINES

#### A. Responsibilities for Traffic Impact Analysis.

- (1) A Traffic Impact Analysis may be required for any project generating over 100 peak hour trips by a government agency responsible for adjacent roadways (Agency) in order to adequately assess the impact of a proposal on the existing and/or planned street system. In special cases, a Traffic Impact analysis may be required for projects proposed to generate fewer than 100 new trips. The primary responsibility for assessing the traffic impacts associated with a proposed development will rest with the developer, not with the responsible governmental agency or agencies serving in a review and approval capacity.
  - (a) Each Agency may have additional requirements for Traffic Impact Studies than those included herein, and the developer / applicant must comply with all Agency specific requirements.
- (2) A written professional traffic engineering study meeting these guidelines may be required for any development proposal.
- (3) When required, the Traffic Impact Analysis shall be the responsibility of the applicant and must be prepared and sealed by a Nevada Registered Professional Engineer with appropriate experience in transportation engineering. Upon submission of a draft traffic study, the Agency's Traffic Engineer will review the study assumptions, procedures, sources, methods, and findings, and will provide comments in written form. The developer and the developer's engineer will then have an opportunity to incorporate necessary revisions prior to submitting a final report.
- (4) Any traffic study having no regional significance will be reviewed in a timely manner. Developments that will create regional transportation impacts shall be submitted by the applicant to the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and, if applicable, other local government agencies, concurrently with submission to the Agency. Longer review periods should be anticipated if the Nevada Department of Transportation or multiple jurisdictions are involved.
- (5) All previous traffic studies relating to the development that are more than one year old at the time of the start of actual development construction may require updating, unless conditions are determined not to have changed significantly.
- (6) Traffic studies may be required for the following submittals:
  - (a) For a rezoning application.
  - (b) For a tentative subdivision map if the property has previously been zoned for the proposed use and no traffic study was required at the time of the zoning.
  - (c) Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, if the property has already been zoned or subdivided and no previous traffic study less than one year old exists.
  - (d) The applicant may be required to submit a new traffic study if, after submitting the original traffic study, the land use intensity or traffic generation is increased. Where access points are not defined or a site plan is not available at the time the traffic study is

prepared, additional traffic analysis may be required when a site plan becomes available or the access points are defined.

- (7) If insufficient information is available but the property appears to involve a sufficiently intense land use, the applicant will be informed that a traffic study is required. The applicant is urged to contact the Agency's Traffic Engineer at the preplanning stage to determine if a traffic study will be required.

#### B. Suggested Format for a Traffic Study –

Traffic Engineering consultants are required to discuss projects with the Agency's Traffic Engineer prior to commencing the study. Topics for possible discussion at such meeting might include directional distribution of traffic, definition of the study area, intersections requiring level-of-service analysis, and methods for projecting build out volume. This should provide a firm base of cooperation and communication between the Agency, owner, developer and his consultants in developing realistic traffic characteristics, which is in the best interest of the total community. Projects creating regional impacts should be discussed with Clark County, NDOT and RTC. Specific requirements will vary depending on the site location. However, all traffic studies shall contain, as a minimum, the following information:

- (1) Executive Summary. It is anticipated that this chapter will contain a brief project overview, study conclusions and recommendations as an executive summary to guide the local policy-making boards, commissions and councils.
- (2) Introduction
  - (a) Site and Study Area Boundaries

A brief description of the size of the land parcel, general terrain features, the location within the jurisdiction and the region should be included in this section. In addition, the roadways that afford access to the site, and are included in the study area, should be identified. Public facilities for bicycles and pedestrians in the project vicinity should be identified. The exact limits of the study area should be based on engineering judgment, and an understanding of existing traffic conditions at the site. In all instances, however, the study area limits shall be mutually agreed upon by the developer, his engineer and the Agency's Traffic Engineer. These limits will usually result from initial discussion with the Agency's Traffic Engineer. A vicinity map that shows the site in relation to the surrounding transportation system should be included.
  - (b) Existing and Proposed Site Uses and Densities

The existing and proposed uses and densities of the site should be identified in terms of the various zones categories of the Agency. In addition, the specific use and densities of which the request is made should be identified, if known, since a number of uses may be permitted under the existing ordinances.
  - (c) Existing and Proposed Uses in Vicinity of Site

A complete description of the existing land uses in the vicinity of the site, as well as their current zoning use, should be included. The applicant should also state the proposed uses for vacant adjacent land in order that any proposed transition in uses are identified. This latter item is especially important where large tracts of underdeveloped land are in the vicinity of the site, and within the prescribed study area.
  - (d) Existing and Proposed Roadways and Intersections

Within the study area, the applicant must describe existing roadways, including sidewalks and bicycle facilities and intersections (geometrics and traffic signal control) as well as improvements contemplated by government agencies. Sidewalk gaps or gaps in the bicycle network should be identified and addressed. This would include the nature ~~of~~ the improvement project, its extent, implementation schedule, and the agency or funding source responsible.
- (3) Trip Generation

The future motor vehicle trips generated on the developed site shall be calculated in a manner consistent with the latest edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) transferable data collection report, Trip Generation, as amended. The Agency responsible for adjacent roadways may require specific trip generation rates to be used in specific cases that differ from the ITE average values when the results of local studies differ from the national values. For land use categories for which no national or regional trip generation rates are available, the Agency will require documentation at three or more similar sites to support the rates used in the study. A study of less than three sites may be used if justification is provided and the study plan is approved by the Agency prior to the study.
- (4) Trip Distribution

The direction of approach for site generated traffic will be presented in this section. The technical analysis procedures, basic methods, and assumptions used in this work must be clearly stated.
- (5) Trip Assignment

This section will describe the utilization of study area roadways by site generated traffic. The anticipated site traffic volumes must be combined with existing and projected area traffic volumes from Section 6, to describe through and turning movement volumes for future conditions with the site developed as proposed. Internal trips in excess of ten percent (10%) will require analytical support to demonstrate how the higher figures were divided. Non-generated passerby traffic reduction in generation volumes may be considered, if applicable. Analysis techniques that will generally be acceptable are contained in the document published by the Transportation Research Board (TRB), National Research Council entitled, Quick-Response Urban Travel Estimation Techniques and Transferable Parameters, (National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report No. 197), Washington, D.C., 1978 and in the Institute of Transportation Engineers publication Traffic Access and Impact Studies for Site Development. Other network models that differ may be acceptable, if first reviewed with the Agency's Traffic Engineer. The traffic study must also take into account the current edition of the Regional Transportation Plan of Clark County, published by the RTC.

(6) Existing and Projected Traffic Volumes

- (a) Existing A.M. and P.M. peak hour traffic (in and out) including turning movements
- (b) For each development phase, the estimated A.M. and P.M. peak hour site traffic (in and out) including turning movements for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians
- (c) For each development phase, the estimated A.M. and P.M. peak hour background traffic (in and out) including turning movement
- (d) For each development phase, the estimated A.M. and P.M. peak hour site plus background traffic (in and out) including turning movements. All raw traffic count data (including hourly, ADT and peak hour turning movements for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians) and analysis worksheets shall be provided in the appendices. Computer techniques and the associated printouts may be used as part of the report. Development phasing should be determined in conjunction with the developer and the Agency. Build out projections shall include major vacant properties around the proposed development that may be identified by the Agency responsible for adjacent roadways. Volume projections for the background traffic growth may be provided by the Agency or a method for determining their volume will be recommended by the Agency responsible for adjacent roadways. All total daily traffic counts shall be actual twenty-four (24) hour machine counts and not based on factored peak hour sampling. Latest available machine counts from NDOT, Clark County, the City or other agencies may be acceptable if not more than one year old or, if older, suitable justification is provided and approved by the Agency Traffic Engineer prior to the study submittal. Where sufficient local information is available related to the traffic characteristics, traffic counts should be expanded for day-of-week and seasonal variations.

(7) Traffic Signals

The need for new traffic signals shall be determined using the warrants in the most current edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Traffic progression is of paramount importance. Generally, a spacing of one-half (½) mile for all signalized intersections should be maintained. This spacing is usually desirable to achieve good speed, capacity and optimum signal progression. To provide flexibility for existing conditions and ensure optimum two-way signal progression, the traffic engineering analysis should properly locate all proposed connecting access approaches that may require signalization. An optimum two-way progression pattern should be established for the section of the arterial or network in which the intersection is located. In areas located within the Freeway and Arterial System of Transportation (FAST), all progression and coordination calculations must be verified with the System Director of the FAST Traffic Management Center (TMC) prior to inclusion in the report. The Agency responsible for adjacent roadways will facilitate communications between the consultant and the FAST-TMC operator. Coordination sections will be configured by the Agency's Traffic Engineering Division staff based on the latest configuration established by the FAST System Director.

(8) Traffic Capacity

The capacity and level of service of each intersection and road section affected by the development project shall be determined in accordance with the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)<sup>4</sup> as amended. Where the <sup>2</sup> system does not exist or is incomplete in the vicinity of the project, the planning method of the HCM may be used for signalized intersections. Existing intersections that are signalized or will be signalized as part of any FAST section shall be analyzed using the operational method. The analysis performing and reported in the study should include:

Level of Service (LOS) "C" will be the design objective for capacity and under no circumstances will less than LOS "D" be accepted for site and non-site traffic, unless justification can be provided and approved by the Agency Traffic Engineer. Impacts to

- bicycle and pedestrian LOS due to site development should be addressed. The design year shall be twenty (20) years following construction or at build out of the area, or as approved by the Agency Traffic Engineer during the scoping meeting. Capacity and LOS determinations shall be based upon the peak hour conditions and not a daily volume projection.
- (9) Traffic Accidents  
Traffic accident data including a minimum period of three years for existing streets, shall be incorporated in the study. Estimates of increased or decreased accident potential shall be evaluated for the development and suggested mitigating measures recommended. Where historical crashes have involved bicyclists or pedestrians, those should be noted and addressed in the discussion.
  - (10) Conclusions and Recommendations  
In the event that analysis indicates unsatisfactory levels of service on study area roadways, a description of proposed improvements to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development shall be included. In general, the recommendation section should include:
    - (a) Recommended Improvements  
This section shall describe the location, nature and extent of proposed improvements to ensure sufficient roadway capacity. Accompanying this list of improvements are preliminary cost estimates (engineering, right-of-way and construction), source of funding, timing and likelihood of implementation.
    - (b) Volume/Capacity Analysis at Critical Points  
A second iteration of the volume/capacity analysis should be described, which demonstrates the anticipated results of making these improvements.
    - (c) Levels of Service at Critical Points  
As a result of the revised volume/capacity analysis presented in the previous section, levels of service for the highway system with improvements should be presented.
  - (11) Study Checklist  
The Traffic Engineer will complete the checklist for study requirements and sign the checklist. In so doing, the Traffic Engineer will be acknowledging that all of the minimum requirements of these guidelines are met.
  - (12) Revisions to Traffic Study  
Revisions to the traffic study must be provided as required by the Agency's Traffic Engineer. The need to require revisions will be based on the completeness of the traffic study, the thoroughness of the impact evaluation and the compatibility of the study with the proposed access and development plan.

<sup>1</sup>Transportation Research Board Special Report No. 209, Washington, D.C., 1985

- (a) Existing A.M. and P.M. peak hour traffic
- (b) For each development phase, the estimated A.M. and P.M. peak hour background traffic
- (c) For each development phase, the estimated A.M. and P.M. peak hour site plus background traffic

Approved 10/10/91

20.	Requested by CLV	This policy was last updated in 1992 and does not reflect the flashing yellow arrow. It should be updated.
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
▶	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee with change to leave paragraph C as-is and add paragraph D referencing 4-section flashing yellow arrow.

### LEFT TURN SIGNAL DISPLAY STANDARD

Adopted herein by the Regional ~~T~~ransportation Commission ~~of Clark County~~ is a new local area standard for traffic signalization displays relating to left turn movements. This standard would be the “normal” condition for all installations, but would leave latitude to the traffic engineering personnel of each entity to vary from the standard where unusual conditions are encountered. A desirable goal of all of the entities in this urbanized area is to promote uniformity of signal displays to the greatest degree possible.

- A. For 3-section (protected-only) left turn signal head display, all 3 sections shall use arrow indications; circular indications are not to be used. When all-arrow displays are used, the MUTCD says that there is not a need to shield or otherwise hide the display from the adjacent through movement traffic on the same approach. Therefore, the use of programmed visibility heads for all-arrow displays is not only unneeded, but also not recommended. If programmed visibility heads are used, the programming should be “opened up” so that the adjacent through movement traffic can also see the display.
- B. The use of the left red arrow indication should normally be limited to a movement with a separate left turn phase having an opposing, conflicting through movement (i.e., a typical left turn lane). It specifically should not be used for a split-phased movement where the left turn and the immediately adjacent through movement are the same phase, nor where there is no opposing, conflicting through movement (as in the case of a T-intersection, or in the case of a freeway off-ramp terminal). In such cases, a circular red should always be used.
- ~~C. For 5-section, protected-permissive flashing yellow arrow signal head displays, the LEFT TURN YIELD OR GREEN ON FLASHING YELLOW ARROW (symbolic green ball) sign, R10-12E, may be employed.~~
- C. For 5-section, protected-permissive signal head displays, the LEFT TURN YIELD OR GREEN (symbolic green ball) sign, R10-12, may be employed.
- D. For 4-section, protected-permissive flashing yellow arrow signal head displays, the LEFT TURN YIELD ON FLASHING YELLOW ARROW sign, R10-12F, may be employed.

Approved 07/09/92

21.	Requested by RTC	Revise street width to street classification
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
▶	9/17/13	Operations Subcommittee moved to change requirement to 4 inch conduit on all streets

## POLICY FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRAFFIC MONITORING CAMERAS

This policy establishes criteria for the reimbursement of costs by the RTC for the installation of communications infrastructure and traffic monitoring cameras. With the upgrade of the Freeway and Arterial System of Transportation (FAST), the methods of communication and signal coordination have changed including the addition of traffic monitoring cameras. The following criteria shall be met in order for expenses to be considered reimbursable by the RTC:

- 1.) Traffic monitoring camera locations shall be as established on FAST Communication Master Plan as developed by Parsons Transportation Group. Any supplemental locations must be submitted to FAST Operations Management Committee (OMC) for review and approval and then to the RTC for review and approval with justifications for the camera location including the benefits to the functioning of the roadway.
- 2.) Communications infrastructure including conduit, wiring, cabinet equipment, microwave, data radio, fiberoptic facilities and other appurtenances necessary to communicate with FAST may be provided for all traffic signal installations to be included as part of FAST network. Communications infrastructure, including conduit and pull boxes, should be included on RTC projects. Communications conduit shall be single duct and ~~four -inch diameter on all streets for streets with right-of-way widths of one hundred (100) feet or greater major arterial roadways or greater, and - or three -inch diameter for streets with right-of-way widths of less than one hundred (100) feet smaller roadways.~~ **four -inch diameter on all streets**. In those areas where curb, gutter and sidewalk are proposed to be constructed, conduit may be placed on both sides of the roadway and shall be considered eligible for reimbursement by the RTC. In areas of existing off-site improvements, RTC reimbursement of conduit expenses shall normally be limited to one conduit placed on either side of the street. RTC reimbursement shall be limited to the cost of a conduit(s) and pull boxes that may be necessary for traffic purposes, including traffic signal coordination and ITS facilities. Fiber optic cable shall be sized to handle multimodal transportation purposes, including a fiber connection for the RTC.
- 3.) Priority for traffic monitoring cameras shall be given to those major arterials which intersect with highway/freeway facilities (U.S. 95, I-15, etc.) or provide an alternate route to the highway facilities (i.e. coordinate with FAST system diversion routes). Priorities may also be established based on high accident rates, special events, high traffic generation areas, highly congested intersections as well as providing integral links along corridors established in the FAST Communication Master Plan.
- 4.) Cameras shall not be placed in remote locations unless other traffic monitoring cameras exist along the same corridor, however communications infrastructure may be provided as established in Note 2. The cost of cameras shall not be reimbursed unless the communications infrastructure will be in place to view images at the completion of the project or a plan has been developed to integrate these cameras to FAST.
- 5.) Video surveillance cameras installed for traffic monitoring purposes may not be used for law enforcement or any other surveillance purposes. Traffic monitoring purposes shall include monitoring of Citizens Area Transit (CAT) bus operations, incident management, special events or other purposes related to traffic as determined by the appropriate Traffic Engineer and FAST operations. Emergency uses for monitoring the effects of natural disasters, such as flooding, or any other incidents such as fires, explosions, etc., shall require approval by FAST System Director or his designee and the appropriate Traffic Engineer on a case by case basis. Monitoring for FAST shall be the primary function of the cameras, with CAT operations as secondary.
- 6.) RTC shall have access to and use of all images processed by the network of traffic monitoring cameras subject to capital costs of equipment necessary to receive images and all conditions and policies placed on camera image users of FAST.
- 7.) Communications resource-sharing may be considered on a case by case basis.

Approved 05/16/02

22.	Requested by CLV	Given the complete streets policy that was adopted, should the policy on sidewalk be revised to require sidewalk on all RTC funded projects?
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee
23.	Requested by CLV	There are a couple of references to “developed privately owned parcels”. Would further clarity be provided by adding a comma – “developed, privately owned parcels”?
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

### REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION POLICY ON SIDEWALK

The intent of this policy is to ensure that sidewalk or accessible pedestrian facilities are constructed on all REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION projects where practical. The need for sidewalk should be evaluated during the design. During evaluation, consideration should be given to:

1. Continuity of existing sidewalk fill-in
2. Bus route
3. Provide alternative to paratransit
4. Serves as a pedestrian route to school, employment or commercial developments
5. Demonstrated pedestrian safety benefits
6. Extension of existing pedestrian route and school walking route
7. Availability of right-of-way
8. Complete Streets concepts for pedestrian access

To provide for sidewalk, Special Improvement Districts are encouraged on all REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION projects where curb and gutter, street lighting, sidewalk, and parking or emergency stopping lanes do not exist.

If a Special Improvement District is formed within an entity, but developed, privately owned parcels are determined by a special benefits appraisal or a written opinion from a bonding attorney to be fully or partially non-accessible, reimbursement by REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION may be made for those off-site improvements, and for off-site improvements adjacent to vacant parcels owned by the federal government or a member entity, or non-accessible parcels. Providing that a property can be included in a Special Improvement District, off-site improvements adjacent to developed, privately owned properties on which full or partial off-site improvement requirements have been waived by the entity, or government owned leased to a private for-profit entity are not reimbursable.

In areas where sidewalk is necessary and standard curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements are not being constructed with the REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION project, a temporary asphalt sidewalk will be provided as a REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION reimbursable expense.

Approved 06/19/01



24.	Requested by CLV	Is this process still used? It is our understanding that the program is no longer allowed so perhaps this section can be removed.
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

### ~~DEFINITION FOR AREA-WIDE MAJOR PROJECT~~

~~Area-wide Major Projects are hereby defined as those that have an existing annual average daily traffic (AADT) volume of at least 40,000 and a 10-year projected AADT volume of at least 60,000, or are part of I-15, US-95, I-515, Summerlin Parkway, Super Arterials and the Las Vegas Bypass/I-215 including interchanges and grade separations on roadways with at least 100' right-of-way, or as otherwise determined by the RTC Board. Area-wide significance for grade separations on roadway with less than 100' right-of-way will be determined on a case-by-case basis. The extent of grade separations and interchanges shall be limited to touchdown points based on AASHTO or other applicable standards.~~

~~Approved 02/14/02~~

25.	Requested by CLV	Is this process still used? It is our understanding that the program is no longer allowed so perhaps this section can be removed.
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

### ~~AREA-WIDE MAJOR PROJECTS PRIORITIZATION PROCESS~~

~~Following is the recommended process for prioritizing area-wide major projects:~~

~~Area-wide major projects be prioritized using a 2-step process. The first step screens proposed projects to determine the overall regional benefit in terms of air quality and congestion. The second step prioritizes the projects. Projects may be submitted for screening at any time throughout the year, but projects are screened and prioritized annually. The process is documented.~~

#### ~~Step 1: Screen Proposed Projects~~

~~Projects that meet the definition of an area-wide major project are screened to determine if they have an overall positive benefit on a regional basis. RTC staff does the initial screening based on the following pass/fail factors; projects that pass a majority of the factors proceed to Step 2.~~

- ~~1. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) — The regional model output is used to compare the change in VMT when the project is added. Given the very large VMT (over 27,000,000), a change of  $\pm 10,000$  is considered significant for a single project. No significant change or a reduction in VMT is considered passing.~~
- ~~2. CO/NOX — The change in CO would be based on the regional model output by comparing the change in CO production when the project is added. No change or a reduction in CO would be considered passing.~~
- ~~3. Level of Service (LOS) in the Area of Potential Effect — The change in the level of service would be calculated with and without the project to determine the overall effect. LOS would be an indicator of conditions in an area, and would allow a wider range of measures, such as delay or volume/capacity. No change or an improvement in LOS would be considered passing.~~
- ~~4. 5-Year Forecast Volume/Capacity (V/C) — The V/C in the near term (5-year) would be calculated with and without the project. No change or reduction in V/C on the affected facility would be considered passing.~~
- ~~5. 10-Year Forecast V/C — The 10-year forecast V/C would be calculated with and without the project. No change or in V/C on the affected facility would be considered positive.~~

~~Speed or Travel Time — Speed and travel time are essentially the same. The speed would compare the difference between the free-flow speed and the congested speed in the 5-year horizon. A congested speed within 10% of the free-flow speed would be considered passing. Travel time would compare the difference between free-flow and congested travel times in the 5-year horizon. A congested travel time within 20% of the free-flow condition would be considered acceptable.~~

~~Approved 07/11/02~~

► Changed from original recommendation

**GUIDELINES FOR THE PROVISION OF BUS TURNOUTS AND PASSENGER LOADING AREAS FOR THE ~~CITIZENS AREA TRANSIT (CAT)~~RTC TRANSIT BUS**

The following guidelines supplement the ~~Citizens Area Transit (CAT)~~RTC Transit Bus Stop Guidelines as revised and approved by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) which contain criteria used to determine the locations of bus stops and the need for the installation of bus turnouts. The guidelines below are intended to assist the Engineer in the application of the Bus Stop Guidelines to particular projects. Although these guidelines provide clear direction for the location of bus facilities, final approval of these facilities and their locations shall be required from the designated members of the RTC staff.

<b>26.</b>	<b>Requested by RTC</b>	<b>Revise street width to street classification</b>
	8/29/13	<b>EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee</b>
	9/17/13	<b>Approved by Operations Subcommittee</b>
▶	10/14/13	<b>Staff requests this revision be rescinded: Upon further review the roadway classification does not encompass all definitions used by the entities.</b>

For roadways along a development project having **right-of-way widths equal to or greater than one hundred (100) feet** ~~(right-of-way widths a roadway functional classification equal to of major arterial or greater than one hundred (100) feet)~~ where no bus route has been designated, whether future or existing, at the time the project is proposed to be constructed, right-of-way or easement shall be established in accordance with Standard Drawing No. 234.1 or 234.3. Locations shall be as previously defined in this Section.

Revised 11/13/08

27.	Requested by CLV	<p><b>Is there still a need/desire to focus on high-speed lane miles in light of the movement towards complete streets policies and the 'Towards Zero Fatalities' efforts? Perhaps the references and associated policies should be revised to remove the references to 'high speed lane miles'. If the focus on high-speed is removed, the current criteria for project prioritization of these funds should also be evaluated and revised accordingly.</b></p> <p><i>*RTC Staff recommends that this be referred to a working group for discussion/revision.</i></p>
	9/26/13	Executive Advisory Committee referred to working group

## PROJECT PRIORITIZATION OF QUESTION 10 HIGH SPEED LANE MILES

The following is intended to provide direction to the process of assigning prioritization points to proposed Question 10 (Q10) high speed lane mile projects. The information represents criteria agreed to at the 8/18/2004 Working Group meeting.

### Q10 High Speed Lane Mile Criteria (Roadways 100' wide or greater)

1. Project Readiness	Points Available
Design/NEPA	.30 x (50y <sup>1</sup> 25y <sup>2</sup> 10y <sup>3</sup> )
Right-of-Way Acquisition	.30 x (50y <sup>1</sup> 25y <sup>2</sup> 10y <sup>3</sup> )
Construction	.90 x (50y <sup>1</sup> 25y <sup>2</sup> 10y <sup>3</sup> )

Application: Readiness refers to projects that can feasibly be advanced within the next 3-5 year period. The rating system scores proposed projects on the three distinct phases normally associated with project development. In the event Design and ROW are complete at the time of ranking (project actually ready for construction), the project will assigned the maximum points available for Design, ROW and Construction. Note that each category has a different weight used to multiply the appropriate year/point assignment identified within the parenthesis.

### 2. Multiple Funding 15 Maximum Points

Application: The concept is to reward projects that leverage non-Q10 high speed lane mile funds to maximize the availability of Q10 funds for other projects. The maximum points that can be assigned for this criterion are 15. The assignment is calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Non Q10 Dollars pledged to project}}{\text{Total Project Cost}} \times 15 = \text{Points}$$

### 3. Congestion / Demand Accommodation 100 Points

Application: The maximum points available for this criterion are 100. The concept is to reward high speed lanes mile projects that directly assist in congestion mitigation. A v/c ratio of .75 or greater signifies that the project is suitable for Question 10 funds. When modeling a project, a change in projected volume typically reflects the geographic need for the proposed facility. This need is demonstrated by a growth in volume after the completion of the project. The criteria is as follows:

If the v/c ratio is greater than or equal to .75 **OR** projected volumes increase greater than 10%, 100 points are assigned to the project.

### 4. High Speed Lane Mile Construction 15 Points per Mile

Application: The concept is to reward projects that increase the supply of high speed lane miles. The group agreed to assign 15 points for each mile of roadway constructed within the project. The assignment does not account for multiple lanes within the proposed project as was identified in previous scoring assessments.

### 5. Interchange 20 Points

Application: The concept is to reward points to the construction of new interchanges since they facilitate rapid distribution of traffic. The group agreed that points should not be assigned to enhance existing interchange facilities.

## POLICY FOR COMPLETE STREETS

### Vision

As the transit agency and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the region, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) is committed to fully integrating modal options. This includes supporting projects that enhance walking and bicycling infrastructure. Additionally, the RTC will improve access to public transportation facilities and services. This includes supporting urban development patterns and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) infrastructure that allow for greater accessibility to transit stops and stations. Finally, the RTC continues to improve safety for all travelers. This is particularly important for those who rely on transportation infrastructure to be physically active and for students who walk or bike to school.

28.	<b>Requested by CLV</b>	<b>Revise the sentence to read “The typical roadway transportation project that just adds <u>vehicular</u> capacity... “</b>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

The recent growth period in Southern Nevada directly impacted transportation needs. Many of the RTC’s federal, state, and local funding sources were used to develop better traffic signals and more travel lanes. Today, these funding sources are running well short of what is needed. Plus, urban growth in the region has slowed down. The typical roadway transportation project that just adds vehicular capacity and infrastructure is insufficient given these conditions. The RTC must adhere to its vision, which is to “provide a safe, convenient and effective regional transportation system that enhances mobility and air quality for citizens and visitors.”

Recent RTC and RTC-supported projects have already fulfilled some of these desires. There are already bus rapid transit routes existing in the region and more are being constructed for implementation in the near future. New transit shelters are being placed throughout the metropolitan area, while the recently built transit station in Downtown Las Vegas provides greater mobility and accessibility. Efforts are underway to add more bicycle lanes and routes. Recent planning studies are looking to improve roadway safety, pedestrian safety, and access management between roadways and building developments. Jurisdictions and the RTC are working together on projects that improve landscaping, sidewalks, and the interface with building developments.

29.	<b>Requested by CLV</b>	<b>Consider adding “move more people given constrained resources, and” to the first sentence.</b>
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

Promoting Complete Streets projects can offer Southern Nevada the ability to move more people given constrained resources, and ~~to~~ reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality, and increase the quality of life of residents by providing safe, convenient, and comfortable routes for walking, bicycling, and public transportation. Integration of Complete Streets into the RTC’s existing policies allows the potential to prevent chronic diseases, reduce motor vehicle related injury and deaths, improve environmental health, stimulate economic development, and ensure access of transportation options for all people in Southern Nevada.

### Complete Streets Definition

Complete Streets are roadways designed to safely and comfortably accommodate all users, regardless of age, ability or mode of transportation. Users include motorists, cyclists, pedestrians and all vehicle types, including public transportation, emergency responders, and freight and delivery trucks among others.

In addition to providing safety and access for all users, Complete Street design treatments take into account accommodations for disabled persons as required by the ADA. Design considerations for connectivity and access management are also taken into account for non-motorized users of the facility.

30.	Requested by CLV	Sentence ends with “where appropriate” but does not further clarify what would/would not be considered appropriate. Perhaps the phrase should be deleted. In the most recent version of the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, they state that “All roads, streets and highways, except those where bicyclists are legally prohibited, should be designed and constructed under the assumption that they will be used by bicyclists”. ~RTC Staff Recommendation as follows:
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

Implementation of Complete Street design treatments will be based on whether it connects the networks for all modes, whether it improves the functionality for all users, and whether it is appropriate given the surrounding context of the community. The final elements of a Complete Street roadway will be largely based on these factors. At a minimum, a Complete Street roadway includes sidewalks and sidewalk amenities, and transit shelters and amenities whenever there is a transit route along the corridor, ~~and provisions for bicycle facilities where appropriate.~~ Additionally, all roadways, except those where bicyclists are legally prohibited, should be designed and constructed under the assumption that they will be used by bicyclists.

### Complete Streets Attributes

While every street cannot be designed to serve all users equally, there are opportunities to enhance service for all users while maintaining its principal transportation function. Complete Streets incorporate community values and support adjacent land uses while ensuring safety and mobility. Proper applications of Complete Streets concepts support sustainable growth and preservation of scenic, aesthetic and historic resources.

### Goals

The purpose of this RTC Complete Streets Policy is to create a comprehensive and uniform Complete Streets vision and policy for the region. This will allow the implementing entities to incorporate Complete Streets guidelines and standards into both development and redevelopment actions. The regional goals are:

- Southern Nevada’s transportation network will be supported through a variety of feasible transportation choices, which allows for sustainable growth.
- The livability of neighborhoods and commercial centers located along the region’s transportation corridors will be enhanced by a safe and inviting pedestrian environment.
- The design of multimodal roadway facilities will not compromise the needs of larger vehicles such as transit vehicles, fire trucks, and freight delivery trucks.
- Inclusion of Complete Streets design elements will allow for design flexibility on different street functions and neighborhood contexts.
- Inclusion of Complete Streets design elements will improve the integration of land use and transportation, while encouraging economic revitalization through infrastructure improvements.

### Objectives

- To create an integrated and connected transportation network that supports transportation choices and sustainable growth.
- To ensure that all transportation modes are accommodated to the extent possible in all public roadway facilities in the region.
- To develop and use the latest design standards and guidelines in the design of Complete Streets.
- To provide flexibility in the implementation of this policy so that streets chosen for implementation of Complete Streets elements can be developed to fit within the context of their principal purpose and surroundings without compromising the safety of users and needs of larger vehicles.

### Complete Streets Policies

1. RTC promotes the incorporation of Complete Streets concepts and design standards in all appropriate public streets (except freeways) throughout the region.
2. RTC will seek every opportunity to provide guidance and funding for the planning, design, and implementation of Complete Streets.

► Changed from original recommendation

3. RTC will provide policy and technical support to local entities in the incorporation of Complete Streets elements into their development codes and comprehensive plans.
4. RTC will provide technical support to local entities in the development of a process for evaluating, ranking, and prioritizing Complete Streets projects in their area.
5. RTC will encourage local entities to consider Complete Streets elements as an integral part of the planning and design of roadway projects, whether new construction, reconstruction, or rehabilitation.
6. RTC will consider modifications to the Master Plan of Streets and Highways or the Roadway Functional Classification that may be necessary to configure a particular street as a Complete Street.
7. Public streets excluded from this policy include those where:
  - a. Complete streets concepts is in conflict with existing laws, codes, or ordinances, or
  - b. Compliance with this policy would conflict with goals or physical conditions related to the unique aspects of the location.

31.	Requested by RTC	Clarification of reimbursements with SIDs.
	8/29/13	EAC referred item to Operations Subcommittee
	9/17/13	Approved by Operations Subcommittee

### Reimbursement of Costs

Whenever a Special Improvement District is not formed as part of a project, Construction of curb, gutter, sidewalk, landscaping, street lights, and parking lanes (defined as the eight feet of pavement to the curb) included in an approved, entity-sponsored Complete Streets project will be eligible for reimbursement by the RTC on a case by case basis.

Approved 06/14/12