



RULE INTERPRETATION DETERMINATION

Determination #: 2021-001

Title: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA)

Drafted by: Rachel Holder, PE, Land Development Division, Transportation Review Section

Rule in Question: Section 35-502(b)(2) - Trip Analysis, Section 35-502(f)(2) – Mitigation Improvements and Roughly Proportionate Determination, and Section 35-B122 “Appendix B” – Traffic Impact Analysis

Department Action: This RID is for clarification purposes and includes a suggested Unified Development Code (UDC) Amendment. The Director concurs with staff’s position regarding the Traffic Impact Analysis proposed changes.

03/15/21

Michael Shannon, PE, CBO
Development Services Director

Date

Effective Date of Determination: Immediately

Please note RIDs often result in direct or related UDC amendments to codify the clarification addressed within the RID. RIDs can also be superseded by subsequent RIDs or UDC amendments. The Development Services Department will remove RIDs from the website when they are no longer valid.

Staff Analysis:

This RID is a customer service and staff clarification on Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) reviews, which include Rough Proportionality, Grandfathering, Mitigation, and Trip Generation clarifications.

1. Shell Building Generated Trips:

Topic of Discussion	Solution
<p>Shell Building Generated Trips: Shell buildings for strip centers determine the number of peak hour trips (PHT) the proposed development generates and does a TIA study if required. After the shell building is completed, the finish-out permits may contain land uses not originally assumed when the shell building determined the generated trips. The requirement for an updated TIA then falls on the tenant applying for the interior finish-out permit.</p>	<p>Solution: To allow the use of Shopping Center 820. If the developer uses this rate, no TIA will be required at finish-out permitting UNLESS a new drive-through is proposed that was not included with the study and it has 76 PHT or more.</p>

The City has noted a change in the composition of strip centers from a majority retail use to other uses including drive-through restaurants. As such, it has been noted that the use of the ITE Trip Generation Manual land use code of 820 for shopping centers is not generally representative of the finish-out uses for these strip centers. The ITE Trip Generation Manual 10th edition describes the types of shopping centers surveyed to determine the rate for the 820 (Shopping Center) land use code:

“...Shopping centers, including neighborhood centers, community centers, regional centers, and super regional centers, were surveyed for this land use. Some of these centers contained non-merchandising facilities, such as office buildings, movie theaters, restaurants, post offices, banks, health clubs, and recreational facilities (for example, ice skating rinks or indoor miniature golf courses)...”

The City interprets that the ITE land use code 820 allows for many uses, but was not intended to capture restaurants with drive-throughs. Drive-throughs generate more incoming and outgoing trips than other uses. The current UDC only specifies that the most recent edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual be used to determine trip rates in Section 35-502(b)(2), as shown below, but has no additional guidance regarding specific land uses:

“(2) Trip Analysis. The property owner, or owner’s agent shall submit one (1) of the following three (3) types of reports listed below based on the number of peak hour trips (PHT) generated by the proposed development as determined from the most recent version of the ITE Trip Generation Manual...”

The City does note that the developer does not always know what businesses will lease the spaces within the shell buildings, and an agreement regarding land uses between the City and the development community is required to prevent excessive rework and cost.

Solution to Shell Building Generated Trips: The City shall allow the use of ITE land use code 820 for shopping centers. However, if the plans submitted include a drive-through that was not included in the approved TIA study and the drive-through generates 76 PHT or more, a TIA Update Memo may be required as determined by DSD. If multiple finish-outs are submitted

with drive-throughs that were not included in the original TIA, all drive-through trips will be considered cumulatively instead of in a stand-alone capacity.

2. TIA Reevaluation:

Topic of Discussion	Solution
<p>TIA Reevaluation: Some old TIAs contain out of date analyses and mitigations that no longer make sense. The UDC currently indicates that TIAs expire 5 years after approval, but the City has not been enforcing this requirement.</p>	<p>Solution: An approved TIA does not have an expiration date, but the City can require the TIA be reevaluated 5 years after the proposed build-out date assumed in the TIA OR 14 years after the TIA approval date, whichever is sooner, to determine the continuing validity of the assumptions under the TIA based on the changing conditions since the approval.</p> <p>If the City determines the TIA needs to be reevaluated, only the undeveloped portion will be reevaluated; however, rough proportionality will be calculated for the entire development unless the remainder of the development in question has been sold to another party. All developments and improvements already constructed will be considered existing traffic, and analysis for the undeveloped portion will be done as a standalone TIA.</p>

Traffic Impact Analyses (TIAs) are studies which analyze the adequacy of the existing and future transportation infrastructure to accommodate additional trips by a proposed development; to accomplish this, these analyses contain models with estimated future roadway conditions. These analyses are only accurate as long as the assumptions regarding future conditions remain valid. Over the course of a development, many changes may occur to the surrounding roadway network including additional developments in the area, capital improvement projects, and new traffic control devices (such as traffic signals or all-way stop control). Each of these changes affects the assumed outcome within a TIA. In accordance with the Unified Development Code (UDC), the city must limit the validity of a TIA to contend with the above while also allowing a degree of certainty along the course of a large development. Section 35-502(b)(2)C.iv. of the Unified Development Code (UDC) addresses the current standard for TIA validity as follows:

“...A traffic impact analysis (TIA) and a proportional mitigation determination report shall be required when the property is subject to master development planning, development permitting, or rezoning; and [...] (a) previously completed TIA for the subject area was completed more than five (5) years prior to the submittal date of current application...”

However, the UDC also provides for TIA phasing for up to seven (7) years. The intent of this section of code is to allow the City to request a reevaluation of the TIA after 5 years, not to indiscriminatorily expire a TIA after 5 years.

Solution to TIA Reevaluation: An approved TIA does not have an expiration date, but the City can require the TIA be reevaluated 5 years after the proposed build-out date assumed in the TIA OR 14 years after the TIA approval date, whichever is sooner, to determine the continuing validity of the assumptions under the TIA based on the changing conditions since the approval. Examples of criteria that will be used to determine if the TIA needs to be reevaluated include the following:

- Assumed external roadway network has significantly changed from that assumed in the TIA. For example, a freeway was not constructed, a roadway was widened beyond what was assumed, and/or a roadway or highway was converted to a freeway with frontage roads.
- Internal roadway network has been modified
- Land-uses or access points were modified, including changing locations of land uses and density within the development.

If the City determines the TIA needs to be reevaluated, only the undeveloped portion will be reevaluated; however, rough proportionality will be calculated for the entire development unless the remainder of the development in question has been sold to another party. All developments and improvements already constructed will be considered existing traffic, and analysis for the undeveloped portion will be done as a standalone TIA.

3. TIA Mitigation Phasing:

Topic of Discussion	Solution
<p>TIA Mitigation Phasing: In some cases, a large amount of time and effort by both the development community and the city is put into determining which mitigations are applicable to a development, especially if mitigations are not phased.</p>	<p>Solution: Implement two additional memo types to expedite review: Rough Proportionality Memo and PHT Comparison Memo. The process is revised to allow developments to show they have exceeded the RP and no mitigations will be required in the future (Rough Proportionality memo). If the development is proceeding according to the approved TIA, a PHT comparison is not required, thus saving time for the developer and staff. During determination of mitigations required, if the mitigations were not phased in the approval letter, the developer may submit a mitigation phasing memo or construct all required mitigation improvements adjacent to the development for TIAs completed prior to March 2010 or within 1.5 miles of the site up to their RP amount for TIAs completed during or after March 2010.</p>

TIAs result in a list of required mitigations in the approval letter based on the number of PHTs anticipated for the development. It is at the developer's or developer's agent's discretion as to how many mitigation phases occur; multiple phases allow the developer to distribute the mitigations throughout the construction timeline of the development. This RID intends to clarify how required mitigations are determined based on the approved TIA, and what will be expected when the allotted PHTs from the approved TIA have been exceeded for the area encompassed by the TIA. UDC Section 35-502(f)(2) is the only location where enforcement of mitigations is described:

“(2) For all phased development projects, implementation of the mitigation improvements must be completed no later than the completion of the project phase for which the traffic impact analysis show that they are required. Plats for project phases subsequent to a phase for which a mitigation improvement is required may be approved only if the mitigation improvements are completed or bonded by the developer.”

The UDC does not indicate how PHTs will be tracked through multiple submittals for plats and building permits throughout the life of the TIA. The City recognizes that there are some cases in which the UDC requires a new TIA, but the circumstances indicate that no value would be provided in requiring a new TIA. The City aims to provide guidance in what the next steps would be when a development exceeds the PHTs by both 76 trips and 10% of the PHT from the approved TIA, currently requiring a new TIA per 35-502(b)(2)C.ii.-iii. below:

“C. Traffic Impact Analysis and Proportionality Mitigation Determination Report. A traffic impact analysis (TIA) and a proportional mitigation determination report shall be required when the property is subject to master development planning, development permitting, or rezoning; and

- i. The proposed development generates seventy-six (76) PHT or more;*
- ii. The change to an existing TIA or existing zoning results in an increase of at least seventy-six (76) PHT or ten (10) percent of the total PHT for the proposed development, whichever is greater;*
- iii. When a building permit submitted for the development is of an intensity at least (10) percent greater (in the number of PHT) than assumed in the previously completed TIA...”*

Solution for TIA Mitigation Phasing: It is the staff's position to amend the UDC to include clarifying statements regarding the enforcement and phasing of TIA mitigations. When a plat or building permit has been submitted that has an associated TIA, the following steps shall be taken to determine the required mitigations:

Step 1: Verify TIA validity in accordance with previous sections of this RID. If the TIA is valid, continue to step 2. If the TIA is not valid, a new TIA or TIA update memo shall be required.

Step 2: Have the constructed mitigations exceeded the total rough proportionality for the entirety of the development? If so, a Rough Proportionality Memo may be submitted to document this, and no further action will be required. If not, continue to step 3. The Rough Proportionality Memo will compare the cost of the constructed mitigations with the

development’s rough proportionality demand to show they have exceeded their rough proportionality for the development.

Step 3: Are the land uses and PHTs for the current development to date consistent with the approved TIA? If so, continue to step 5. If not, provide a PHT Comparison Memo and continue to step 4. A PHT Comparison Memo contains a comparison between the PHTs and mitigations in the approved TIA for the development with the PHTs and constructed mitigations to-date to determine if the development is proceeding within the confines of the approved TIA.

Step 4: Have the PHTs for the entire approved TIA been exceeded by both 76 PHT and 10% of the PHT from the approved TIA? If so, a TIA Update Memo or new TIA may be required as determined by DSD. If not, continue to step 5.

Step 5: Were the mitigations in the TIA approval memo phased? If so, continue with the mitigations required for this phase. If not, provide a memo phasing the mitigations OR

- For TIAs completed prior to March 2010, construct mitigations adjacent to the development up to the rough proportionality amount for this development (mitigations not adjacent to the development are not required to be constructed), or
- For TIAs completed during or after March 2010, construct mitigations within 1.5 miles of the development up to the rough proportionality amount for this development unless the mitigations are listed as “recommendations.”

4. PHT Comparisons:

Topic of Discussion	Solution
<p>PHT Comparison: PHTs can be determined using different methods or different editions of the ITE Trip Generation Manual. Clarification is needed for what is accepted.</p>	<p>Solution: If an approved TIA study uses a different edition of the ITE Manual than what is currently used by the City, the developer may use either the edition from the approved TIA study or the most recent edition. The editions may not be mixed. If the trips in the TIA study were determined using a different method, the same method may be used for the PHT comparison.</p>

A Peak Hour Trip Generation Form, also known as a TIA Threshold Worksheet, is submitted to determine the need for a TIA. If a TIA has already been approved, this worksheet compares the number of peak hour trips (PHT) for the proposed development with those approved with the TIA to determine if the TIA is still valid. Section 35-502 (b)(2)C.ii.-iii. of the UDC illustrates when a TIA is required.

When the TIA associated with the proposed development uses a previous edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual than what is currently accepted by the City, the trip comparison between approved PHTs and proposed PHTs can be done in several ways. The city aims to clarify what is considered acceptable when performing this comparison.

Solution to PHT Comparison: The developer or developer’s agent may, at the developer’s discretion, do either of the following to determine if the TIA is still valid:

- Use the edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual used in the approved TIA to determine the PHTs for the combination of development to-date and proposed development and compare this to the PHTs from the approved TIA to determine if a new TIA is required.
- Use the most recent edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual to convert the PHTs from the approved TIA using current rates and compare them to the PHTs from the current development to-date and proposed development to determine if a new TIA is required.
- If non-ITE trip generation methodology was used in the approved TIA, then that same methodology shall be allowed to be used for the PHT comparison.

Both the approved land uses and the proposed land uses shall use the same edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual in the comparison (if this was used in the approved TIA). The edition used shall be indicated on the TIA Threshold Worksheet.

5. Approved TIA with Minor Modifications:

Topic of Discussion	Solution
<p>Approved TIA with Minor Modifications: The UDC currently requires a new TIA for changes to the approved TIA if it exceeds both 10% of the total PHT and 76 PHT, even if the modification is minor.</p>	<p>Solution: Allow the submission of TIA Update Memos. A previous edition of the ITE Manual may be used for the analysis if it was used in the original TIA.</p>

There are cases where an approved TIA is on file and minor modifications need to be made to account for changes in proposed development such as the removal or phasing of mitigations or adjustments in proposed land uses. As the UDC stands today, a new TIA would be required to be submitted to account for these changes in accordance with UDC 35-502(b)(2). It has been determined that the reissuance of an entire report to address minor changes presents undue burden to the development community with no significant benefit to the City or public.

Solution for Approved TIA with Minor Modifications: In lieu of the requirement for a full TIA for any changes in the development, a TIA update memo may be allowed for minor changes at the discretion of DSD staff and agreed upon by the developer. The following is a non-comprehensive list of items that may be eligible for a TIA update memo in lieu of a full TIA:

- Changes in land use with the same or fewer PHTs
- Changes in access points
- Phasing of mitigations
- Removal of mitigations

- Reduction in intersections/nodes to be analyzed

The TIA update memo may use the same edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual as was used in the original TIA. For TIA update memos only, the ITE Trip Generation Manual edition used in the approved TIA may be permissible for any analysis required to be updated.

6. Major Amendments to MDPs with Approved TIAs:

Topic of Discussion	Solution
<p>Major Amendments to MDPs with Approved TIAs: If a portion of an MDP is sold to another developer and this developer submits for a major MDP amendment, the developer is currently required to revise the TIA for the entire MDP.</p>	<p>Solution: If the developer only owns a portion of the MDP and submits for a major MDP amendment, the developer is only required to submit a TIA for the portion they own with the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The entire portion they own is to be included in the TIA, 2) The developer is required to construct mitigations specifically identified/ required of their portion from the original TIA plus all improvements identified in the new TIA up to the Rough Proportionality dollar amount of the portion they own. If no improvements were specifically required/identified for their portion of the development in the original TIA, they are only required to construct the improvements from the original TIA adjacent to their portion of the development (internally or externally) and at their proposed access points for their portion of the development plus any improvements identified in the new TIA up to the Rough Proportionality dollar amount of the portion they own. 3) The new TIA shall be done using the most current version of the ITE Trip Generation Manual and Rough Proportionality Worksheet. <p>The developer has the option of reanalyzing the original TIA assumptions and improvements if they have changed land-uses, reduced density, and/or changed access and some of the original improvements identified/required for their portion of the development may no longer be necessary.</p>

Both planning level and detailed TIAs are allowed for MDPs per the UDC. In many cases, after approval, pieces of the MDP are sold to another developer who may require a major MDP amendment. The UDC does not allow for a TIA to be conducted for a partial MDP; however,

the City realizes that the new developer may not have all the information required for a new TIA . A solution is required to allow for a developer owning property that does not make up a full MDP to obtain approval.

Solution for Major Amendments to MDPs with Approved TIAs: If a major MDP amendment is submitted and the applicant only owns a portion of the property within the MDP, a TIA for only the property owned by the developer may be submitted in lieu of a TIA for the entire MDP with the following conditions:

- 1) The entire portion they own is to be included in the TIA,
- 2) The developer is required to construct mitigations specifically identified/ required of their portion from the original TIA plus all improvements identified in the new TIA up to the Rough Proportionality dollar amount of the portion they own. If no improvements were specifically required/identified for their portion of the development in the original TIA, they are only required to construct the improvements from the original TIA adjacent to their portion of the development (internally or externally) and at their proposed access points for their portion of the development plus any improvements identified in the new TIA up to the Rough Proportionality dollar amount of the portion they own.
- 3) The new TIA shall be done using the most current version of the ITE Trip Generation Manual and Rough Proportionality Worksheet.

The developer has the option of reanalyzing the original TIA assumptions and improvements if they have changed land-uses, reduced density, and/or changed access and some of the original improvements identified/required for their portion of the development may no longer be necessary.

Staff Position and Interpretation:

It is the staff's position to amend the UDC to accomplish the following:

1. To provide clarification and consistency to shell building generated trips.
2. To reevaluate the assumptions made in TIA reports after an appropriate period of time has lapsed after the analysis was completed.
3. To provide clarification and consistency in how mitigations will be assigned.
4. To provide clarification and consistency in the evaluation of a development's peak hour trips to date.
5. To allow the use of TIA Update Memos.
6. To allow developers to provide a stand-alone TIA for a development within an MDP under certain conditions.

Future UDC Amendments:

Staff recommends the following UDC updates:

Sec. 35-502 (b)(2)

Trip Analysis. The property owner, or owner’s agent, shall submit one (1) of the following ~~three (3)~~ four (4) types of reports listed below based on the number of peak hour trips (PHT) generated by the proposed development as determined from the most recent version of the *ITE Trip Generation Manual*, unless otherwise noted herein, when the property is part of a master development plan (MDP), planned unit development (PUD), plat, building permit, or is subject to an application to rezone. PHT analyzed may be the A.M., Midday, P.M., Saturday, and/or Sunday peak hours, based on the peak hour trip generation for that given day. Linear trip generation rates shall be used, except where the *ITE Trip Generation Manual* clearly indicates the use of regression equations better captures the trip generation estimates.

- A. **Peak Hour Trip Generation Form and Turn Lane Assessment.** The form shall be required for all developments; however, developments generating ~~less than~~ seventy-six (76) PHT (inbound and outbound peak hour trips) or more during its highest trip generating peak hour shall require items in B., C., or D. below.
 - i. Trip comparisons within the Peak Hour Trip Generation Form between proposed development and previously approved TIAs may use the edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual used in the approved TIA or may be updated to the most recent edition. Trip comparisons shall use the same edition of the ITE Manual throughout the worksheet and shall be noted therein. The same trip methodology used in the approved TIA may be used in the PHT comparison.
 - ii. The form shall be supplied by the property owner, or owner’s agent, identifying the trip generation information specified in Appendix “B,” subsection 35-B122(a)(6). A development may generate enough trips to require the installation of a turn lane without requiring the need for a traffic impact analysis, therefore the form supplied by the property owner, or owner’s agent, shall also address the need for turn lanes, as described in subsection 35-502(d)(2).
 - iii. Shopping centers may use the 820 land use code as defined by the ITE Trip Generation Manual. This rate shall not include drive-through facilities with seventy-six (76) trips or more. If multiple finish-outs are submitted with drive-throughs that were not included in the original TIA, all drive-through trips will be considered cumulatively instead of in a stand-alone capacity.
 - iv. Development submittals using a previously approved TIA shall provide a PHT Comparison Memo as described in Appendix “B.” subsection 35-B122(d) illustrating the PHTs and constructed mitigations to-date unless the mitigations constructed to-date exceed rough proportionality. If the mitigations to-date exceed rough proportionality, a Rough Proportionality Memo as described in Appendix “B.” subsection 35-B122(d) may be submitted in lieu of the PHT Comparison Memo.
- B. [Section not being changed.]
- C. **Traffic Impact Analysis and Proportional Mitigation Determination Report.** A traffic impact analysis (TIA) and a proportional mitigation determination report shall be required when the property is subject to master development planning, development permitting, or rezoning; and
 - i. The proposed development generates seventy-six (76) PHT or more;

- ii. The change to an existing TIA or existing zoning results in both an increase of at least seventy-six (76) PHT and ten (10) percent of the total PHT for the proposed development, and the development is not eligible for a TIA Update Memo;
- iii. ~~When~~ When a building permit submitted for the development is both of an intensity at least 76 PHT and ten (10) percent greater (in the number of PHT) than assumed in the previously approved TIA, and the development is not eligible for a TIA Update Memo;
- iv. ~~A previously completed TIA for the subject area was completed more than five (5) years prior to the submittal date of current application~~ Five (5) years have elapsed from the full build-out year as defined within the approved TIA and DSD has determined a reevaluation is required; ~~or~~
- v. Fourteen (14) years have elapsed from the original TIA approval date and DSD has determined a reevaluation is required (note that minor updates to the approved TIA do not extend the original TIA validity); or
- vi. When the number of access points are reduced or relocated.
- vii. When a development generates less than seventy-six (76) PHT, the application shall fill out a peak hour trip generation form, and may perform a rough proportionate determination to determine potential right-of-way dedication and turn lane requirements, or may make the dedication as required by the code.
- viii. If the applicant owns a portion of a full MDP, submits for a major MDP amendment, and a new TIA, revised TIA, or TIA Update Memo is required, the owner may limit the study to encompass only the portion of the MDP owned by the applicant if:
 - a. The owner includes the entirety of the owned portion of the MDP within the study.
 - b. Any mitigations specifically assigned to the developer's portion of the MDP shall be completed in addition to the mitigations identified within the stand-alone TIA if within rough proportionality.
- ix. A traffic circulation study for renovation of existing schools (public, private) is required.

TIA Requirements. A TIA shall be performed by the property owner (or its agent) according to the scope and format established in Appendix "B." subsection 35-B122(a). Items iv. and v. above do not apply if a minor MDP amendment or amending plat is submitted or if the application has fewer than 76 PHT.

- D. **TIA Update Memo.** A TIA Update Memo may be substituted in lieu of a Traffic Impact Analysis and Proportional Mitigation Determination Report for minor revisions to the approved TIA at the discretion of DSD and agreed upon by the developer or developer's agent. The development may be eligible for a TIA Update Memo if
- i. There is an existing, valid TIA in accordance with 35-502(b)(2)C.iv. and
 - ii. The changes to the approved TIA are minor according to DSD.

A TIA update memo may use the same edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual as was used in the original TIA. The TIA Update memo shall be performed by the property

owner (or its agent) according to the scope and format established in Appendix "B." subsection 35-122(c).

Sec. 35-502(f)(2)

~~(2) For all phased development projects, implementation of the mitigation improvements must be completed no later than the completion of the project phase for which the traffic impact analysis show they are required.~~ Mitigations may be phased at the developer's discretion. If mitigations are phased, they shall be constructed at the beginning of the phase in which they are required within the rough proportionality of the submittal unless the mitigation is listed as "recommended" in the approval letter. If mitigations are not phased, mitigations shall be constructed as follows:

A. for TIAs approved prior to March 2010, required mitigations adjacent to the development shall be constructed within the rough proportionality of the development.

B. for TIAs approved during or after March 2010, mitigations shall be constructed within 1.5 miles up to the rough proportionality of the submitted development unless the mitigation is listed as "recommended" in the approval letter.

Mitigations shall be postponed until the street on which they are required is constructed. Plats for project phases subsequent to a phase for which a mitigation improvement is required may be approved only if the mitigation improvements are completed or bonded by the developer.

Sec. 35-B122

(c) TIA Update Memos shall consist of the following at a minimum:

(1) Introduction

- A. Site location.
- B. Development description.
- C. Reason for revision.
- D. Original TIA number and name.

(2) Previous Conditions

- A. Original PHT breakdown.
- B. Original assigned mitigations.

(3) Revised Conditions

- A. PHT breakdown and comparison.
- B. Revised mitigations.

(4) Conclusions and Recommendations

- A. Mitigation phasing plan if project has planned phasing.

(5) Appendices.

- A. TIA threshold worksheet
- B. Rough proportionality worksheet
- C. Estimate of required mitigations

TIA Update Memos may require additional information if an analysis is performed.

(d) Memos allowed within 35-502 shall consist of the following at a minimum:

<u>Types of memos (Note: These are not TIA update memos, these are memos comparing current conditions to approved TIA)</u>				
	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>
	<u>Material/Information</u>	<u>Rough Proportionality Memo</u>	<u>Full Buildout Memo</u>	<u>PHT Comparison Memo</u>
A. Project & Approved TIA information				
(1)	<u>Date of memo preparation</u>	*	*	*
(2)	<u>Project name</u>	*	*	*
(3)	<u>Project Location</u>	*	*	*
(4)	<u>Approved TIA report TIA #</u>	*	*	*
(5)	<u>Approved TIA report TIA name</u>	*	*	*
(6)	<u>Buildout year assumed in approved TIA (analysis)</u>	*	*	*
(7)	<u>Proposed development (plat or building permit # AND name)</u>	*	*	*
(8)	<u>Proposed development (land uses, density & PHTs) for current application (plat or building permit)</u>	*	*	*
B. Mitigations status (required per approved TIA on file)				
(9)	<u>List of completed/constructed mitigations (provide project name/plat #/building permit # it was completed with)</u>	*	*	*
(10)	<u>Rough proportionality (RP) for all completed/constructed mitigations</u>	*	*	
(11)	<u>List of mitigations yet to be completed/constructed (with cost to complete/construct)</u>	*	*	
(12)	<u>Exhibit showing mitigations yet to be completed along with proposed development location</u>	*	*	*
C. Rough Proportionality (RP) determination for proposed development (to determine mitigations responsibility)				
(13)	<u>RP associated with all mitigations yet to be completed</u>		*	*
(14)	<u>RP comparison: land uses, density approved with TIA vs completed/constructed mitigations</u>		*	
(15)	<u>Analysis to demonstrate the following:</u>			
(16)	<u>a) Intersections within 1.5 miles of development operate satisfactorily in accordance with UDC 35-502(d)(3)</u>		*	
(17)	<u>b) Intersections within 1.5 miles of development does not meet UDC 35-502(d)(3) but improvements would exceed RP of proposed development</u>		*	
(18)	<u>c) Improvements within 1.5 miles of development are within scope of fully funded public agency construction project (to be completed within next 1 year)</u>		*	
D. PHTs comparison (using either ITE trip generation manual version in TIA or most recent version)				
Note: Same version of the ITE trip generation manual shall be used to compare approved TIA PHTs and PHTs based on development to-date				
(19)	<u>PHTs within approved TIA (state version of ITE trip generation manual used to determine PHTs)</u>	* — (if RP not exceeded as determined in section A.(10))		* —
(20)	<u>PHTs within the approved TIA limits based on development to-date (broken down by land use & associated density)</u>	* — (if RP not exceeded as determined in section A.(10))		* —
(21)	<u>Summarize outcome</u>	*	*	*
(22)	<u>Signature and Engineer's Seal</u>	*	*	*