

**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
CITIZENS MULTIMODAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY APRIL 9, 2025**

CMAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Sue-Ting Chene, Chair
Kathie Stanfield
Ryan Bernadette, Vice Chair
Michael Gawthrop-Hutchins

Amanda Nelson
Juan Martinez
Kelly Orr
Damien Cole

CMAC MEMBERS ABSENT

David Giacomini
Panah Stauffer

Paul Hewen
Richard Landon

RTC STAFF

Marquis Williams
Shay League
Lolita Davis

Graham Dollarhide
Vanessa Lacer

CMAC GUESTS

1. ROLL CALL/CALL TO ORDER

The Citizens Multimodal Advisory Committee (CMAC) meeting was conducted as a Zoom Meeting. The meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m. by Marquis Williams.

2. VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS REQUIRED BY ASSEMBLY BILL 219 (2023)

RTC staff read the instructions required for participating via Zoom and participating via telephone.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

4. APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 5, 2025, MEETING MINUTES

The CMAC February 5, 2025, meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

5. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS.

ITEM 1: PROVIDE INFORMATION, ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE DRAFT FY 2026-2027 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP).

Vanessa Lacer, RTC Planning Director, gave a presentation on the draft FY 2026-2027 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

Damien asked the meaning of multimodal to which Vanessa explained multimodal refers to all transportation modes available in each region, though the specific modes can vary based on local context. Public transportation, including buses and rail, fits into this broader category, but because it has dedicated funding from the Federal Transit Administration, it is often tracked separately for planning purposes. Vanessa also explained the Transit Asset Management Plan (TAM), which focuses on inventory and budgeting for transit assets and the Transit Optimization Plan and Strategies (TOPS), which relate to short-range transit planning.

Sue-Ting asked if there is any danger of not receiving funding in July. Vanessa stated no funding has been pulled, and there are no indications of financial threats to ongoing projects. Vanessa explained that while past surface transportation bills were generous for bike projects, future funding levels may decrease. However, no current bike-related funding has been withdrawn and RTC has processes to redistribute, replan, or reprioritize projects to ensure progress if needed.

A discussion was held regarding the complexities of transportation funding, the challenges in implementing desired safety measures, and the ongoing need to continue effective planning and community engagement.

ITEM 2: PROVIDE INFORMATION, ADVICE, AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE (TA) SET-ASIDE PROGRAM AND ASSOCIATED CALL FOR PROJECTS.

Shay League, RTC Senior Technical Planner, gave a presentation on the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside Program and associated call for projects.

Sue-Ting asked for clarification on the meaning of “non-motorized” specifically regarding e-bikes, gas powered dirt bikes and ATVs. Graham Dollarhide, RTC Planning Manager, stated that it is not explicitly defined in the federal regulations; however, it is safe to assume that these modes are not eligible. Graham emphasized that while off-road trails can be funded, facilities specifically for these vehicles would not be built under the current program.

Sue-Ting asked if previous applications can be viewed to help first-time applicants. Shay responded application materials are generally available through a records request and offer guidance for those looking for references. Sue-Ting expressed concern about the ability to create a strong application and the requirements. Graham stated that their call for proposals is on their website, along with program guidance and the application form. While Graham

encourages everyone to apply, he confirmed that eligible applicants include nonprofit organizations and individuals alone cannot apply.

Damien expressed frustration about current projects being underfunded while seeking more funds from federal grants. Vanessa Lacer, RTC Planning Director, acknowledged his frustration and pointed out that plans are not the same as projects and reassured that RTC is committed to continuing planning and problem-solving despite difficulties.

ITEM 3: PROVIDE INFORMATION, ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE STATUS OF THE CENTRAL RENO AND CENTRAL SPARKS NEIGHBORHOOD NETWORK PLANS.

Marquis Williams, RTC Senior Planner, gave a presentation on the Central Reno and Central Sparks Neighborhood Network Plans.

Damien asked for clarification on the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) approved in September of last year, which includes Neighborhood Network Plans. Marquis confirmed that the program aims to enact recommended changes and mentioned a typology guide created to categorize roads and propose tailored treatments for each type, which is used by the Engineering team to implement low-stress facilities in various projects, including those outside the Active Transportation Program. Marquis reassured that while Neighborhood Network Plans are shorter projects with simpler improvements, they do not prevent more extensive enhancements from taking place later and acknowledged that the ATP will positively impact future projects, though it may take time to see significant changes in existing road designs.

A discussion was held about the potential for future neighborhood projects and the timeline for project designs already in progress and the possibility for a new shared use bike path network.

6. RTC STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no staff announcements.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Damien expressed dissatisfaction with the current format of the CMAC meetings. He stated that committee members should engage in discussions among themselves rather than only asking questions to RTC. He stated that he feels many opinions are not being shared and discussed openly within the group. He expressed frustration with RTC and how commitments are handled, saying expectations are not being met.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.