

## **CARSON CITY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of the September 15, 1998 Meeting**

**Page 1**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Transportation Advisory Committee was held on Tuesday, September 15, 1998, at the Capitol Conference Room, 201 North Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada beginning at 2:00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Frank Page, Vice Chairperson Kelly Garcia, and Members Tom Abbott, Bill Hoffman, John Bullis, Vern Krahn, Juan Guzman, and Dennis Ritchie

**STAFF PRESENT:** Deputy Public Works Director Tim Homann, RTC Engineer Harvey Brotzman, Recording Secretary Andrea Burnell (T.A.C. 9/15/98  
Tape 1-0042)

**A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM** - Chairperson Page convened the meeting at 2:03 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Members Mather and Robertson had not yet arrived and Member Fronapfel was absent.

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - Member Guzman moved to approve the Minutes for the August 25, 1998 meeting. Member Bullis seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**C. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA** - None.

**D. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**1. ANNE MACQUAIRE - DISCUSSION ON PEDESTRIAN ISSUES** - Following Chairperson Page's introduction, Mrs. Macquarie explained her attendance last November at a public meeting regarding the pedestrian element. As a result she and two other individuals who had also attended that meeting decided to form an informal citizens group to track bicycling and pedestrian issues in Carson City. Due to her concern about the pedestrian issues in Carson City, she thought that the Committee might like to hear from other community members. Letters and E-mail from several people were presented. (Copies are in the file.) Her listed concerns included the lack of safe pedestrian access to schools and recreational areas, discontinuous or nonexistence of sidewalks, bad or nonexistent sidewalk maintenance, obstructions in sidewalks, dangerous crosswalks, and specific problem areas/locations. She was disappointed that an inventory had not been done as part of the Committee's efforts but understood that it is too late to do one now. She wanted to ensure a more detailed plan is called for in this Pedestrian Element and that it is done in a timely manner. Pedestrians are an important part of the transportation mix and are neglected in Carson City. She requested that her letters and E-mail be forwarded to the RTC as well as the Board of Supervisors, and eventually to the consultant who prepares the Plan. She looked forward to working with the City on a pedestrian plan.

Chairperson Page thanked her for coming to the meeting and asked Mr. Brotzman to address her issues. Mr. Brotzman felt that the goals and objectives of the Pedestrian Element had addressed most of Mrs. Macquarie's concerns. Some people want to preserve the historic aspect of certain sidewalks or the lack thereof. He expressed concern about mandating sidewalks in certain areas and explained the differences between urban and rural areas.

Mr. Homann acknowledged the need to do work in the pedestrian area. The difference between the pedestrian and bicycle element, as far as this plan is concerned, is that there are already bicycle projects in place. He hoped to establish a citizen's committee to create a system plan and would use her suggestions in doing so. Zoning and Code requirements mandate sidewalks in certain areas and not in others. Other issues which should be addressed were also explained.

Mrs. Macquarie volunteered to assist and indicated that there are a number of others who are also willing to help with this endeavor. Mr. Homann appreciated the offer and the sense of direction which the letters would provide. Conflict areas, rights-of-way issues, liability concerns, and easement issues were discussed. Mrs. Macquarie suggested the City participate in the constructing and maintaining sidewalks in certain areas. Member Abbott supported Mrs. Macquarie's suggestions.

## **CARSON CITY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of the September 15, 1998 Meeting**

#### **Page 2**

Mr. Homann described an incentive program, that may be implemented soon, for helping residents repair the sidewalks. Funding for these projects needs to be pursued. Member Guzman indicated his intent to relay her comments on to the RTC and Board of Supervisors. He also felt that certain problems are being addressed for the betterment of the community. Mr. Long stated the need for a prioritized financial component in the full pedestrian plan. Chairperson Page again thanked Mrs. Macquarie for coming.

#### **2. FINANCIAL ELEMENT - DISCUSSION ON POSSIBLE FUNDING SOURCES** - Carson City

Chamber of Commerce Executive Vice President Larry Osborne stated his appreciation of the time that the Committee had put into the element and thanked them for the opportunity to address concerns over some of the suggested funding sources. The City's roadways and streets are becoming extremely congested. There is a difference in opinion about how to solve this problem. The Chamber of Commerce is not opposed to taxation as long as it is as broad based as possible. Impact fees are felt to be neither broad based nor fair. A trend in communities with impact fees is to increase or escalate the fees. There is also concern about impact fees which are used only to create new infrastructure for new capital projects that benefit the new incoming development. Impact fees cannot be used for planned projects which are created by the current residents/industries. Additional new business costs are also a concern. Douglas County is becoming very aggressive in attracting and developing new commercial growth. Although Carson City's impact fees would be less than Washoe County's, Washoe County is not Carson City's competitor for commercial growth. Impact fees are not a stable source of income. The pros and cons to impact fees and other taxation methods were described. Chairperson Page asked that the Chamber's comments/suggestions be put into writing. The gas tax was discussed.

Deputy City Manager Dan St. John explained that the report did not state that the City must use impact fees. It only provides potential funding options. He questioned whether any businesses had shied away from Carson City due to the existing fees. Mr. Osborne did not recall losing any businesses due to existing fees, however, potential businesses have stated that Carson City is not as cheap as it used to be. Impact fees will add another layer to the fees that the developer pays and may make the difference in the choices between Carson City and Douglas County.

Thomas Metcalf of Metcalf Builders, Inc., explained that Washoe County is collecting higher rents to absorb impact fees and felt that there would have to be a major adjustment in Carson City rents for the same reason. Examples of Washoe County projects' fees were given. He had done three infill projects in Carson City in the last four years. The price for land had almost doubled while the rents have gone up only pennies per square foot. (Member Krahn left the meeting momentarily at 2:50 p.m. A quorum was present as noted.) His clients are looking at Douglas and Lyon Counties due to the bottom line costs. Business owners are looking for government to work with them to make the best deal possible for bringing employment and an additional tax base into the cities. Impact fees could slow down growth in Carson City and, specifically, in the downtown core. Property prices could rise which would further slow growth of the infill/rehabilitation projects. He then explained that an infill project rehabilitates an older structure or vacant lot that is in the downtown corridor.

Glenbrook Company Vice President/Project Manager and the Chamber of Commerce's Government Action Committee Chairperson Shelly Aldean suggested that the Transportation Advisory Committee explore other potential revenue sources. She is a member of the Urban Land Institute (ULI) which is a leading land planning organization. They frequently conduct studies on issues such as impact fees. She offered to contact them to see if they have any publications on how impact fees have affected growth and/or the economy in other communities. Carson City has become a veritable crossroads. Broader based funding mechanisms need to be explored. There is a lot of commercial growth in Carson City but not at the premium rent levels. The Chamber is attempting to attract a specific retail mix which is not easy. Deals have been lost due to the unwillingness to negotiate any further on the rents beyond that which the businesses feel are reasonable given their costs and fees. The negotiation task would be even more difficult if the City adds to that burden by implementing impact fees. Carson City has to remain competitive if they want new development. She urged the Committee to look at other funding sources which are not a superficial solution to the problems. She expected to find, through her research with ULI, that impact fees in other communities have been rescinded due to the negative economy effects. The Carson City retail center vacancy rate is about five percent. It is not uncommon for negotiations to take a year-and-a-half. National chains, in particular, are not accustomed to compromising, therefore, the absorption rate is quite slow. Douglas

## **CARSON CITY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of the September 15, 1998 Meeting**

**Page 3**

County's redevelopment attempt could increase Carson City's vacancy rates. If Douglas County is wise, they will make significant concessions especially to the "big box" retailers.

Builders Association Member and Landmark Homes representative Ron Kipp indicated that Landmark Homes was radically opposed to impact fees. An NDOT study had indicated that approximately 40% of Carson City's traffic is passing through without ever stopping. An impact fee is a burden on new people coming into a town. Carson City is stuck trying develop a mechanism which would distribute the costs for building roads to everyone who lives around Carson. Increases in gas, sales, and property taxes are felt to be much more equitable solutions than imposing an impact fee. Impact fees are an unfair and inequitable way to cover improvement costs.

Builders Association Vice President Gene Lepire, Jr., cautioned the Committee against using impact fees. Discussion ensued on the cost differentials between the different counties' fees and how the builders absorb those fees. Mr. Lepire felt that every time a fee is added, potential buyers are eliminated.

Mr. St. John discussed several suggestions on how to makeup the shortfalls including adding a dollar to the driver's licence fee.

Mr. Brotzman explained the Committee's intent to take a complete transportation plan to the RTC, Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors. The financial options were added for this reason. Concerns about ever increasing fees were discussed. Chairperson Page encouraged all with concerns to put them in writing and thanked all for attending and commenting. (Vice Chairperson Garcia left the room momentarily at 3:15 p.m. A quorum was present as noted.)

### **E. DISCUSSIONS - REVIEW DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE INFORMATION PRESENTED BY JOHN LONG (1-230)**

**1. REVIEW OF THE BICYCLE ELEMENT OF THE MASTER PLAN** - John Long reviewed the Bicycle Element. Member Krahn explained the changes he wished to make: Section 6.3 - Bicycle Safety and Education, add Enforcement of bicycle laws and ordinances; and Section 6.4 - Recommended Bicycle System Plan, change the last paragraph to read - The City should develop enforceable standards, etc. He then explained an alternative bicycle route for Roop street that complies with the intent to keep the north/south connection open. The dangers and liabilities of bicycling on Roop Street were discussed. (Member Ritchie left the meeting at 3:20 p.m. A quorum was present as noted.) The language in the report should reflect that whenever the City has an opportunity to widen Roop and/or Stewart Street that a bicycle lane be included. Discussion indicated that the Stewart Street and Roop Street bicycle route designations would be left out of the element.

Member Krahn indicated that he would like to make some changes to the plan (maps) as well. His discussions with staff and NDOT indicated there should be additions to the maps as well as the removal of one blue line on the south leg of the freeway. Federal Highways had expressed concerns over the map's showing two double lines for the south leg of the freeway. The NDOT consultant team's preferred alternative removed the line on the east side of the freeway. He indicated support for this alternative.

Member Krahn telephone conversation with Nick Haven of TRPA was explained. TRPA has adopted a Master Transportation Plan including bicycle routes for the Lake Tahoe basin. It was Mr. Krahn's understanding that if TRPA's plan is not included in Carson City's plan, as part of a connected system, TRPA will be unable to access Federal and/or State Highway funds for its portion of the bikepath. Member Hoffman explained that the Federal Highway Administration does not look at the TRPA's plan as it looks at each individual county's plan. He suggested referencing TRPA's element as part of Carson City's plan. Members Bullis and Mather felt that it was important to help the Lake Tahoe bicycle plan. Member Krahn proposed to reference the TRPA plan to meet the requirements. Chairperson Page requested the TRPA's request be made in writing.

Member Krahn felt that he had received enough information from citizens, the Committee, and Parks and Recreation to indicate that this is a viable plan and element. He requested approval in concept of the bike element and plan and to let him, Mr. Long, and Mr. Brotzman work out the details. Member Abbott questioned the

## CARSON CITY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the September 15, 1998 Meeting

Page 4

availability of funding for the bicycle element. Member Krahn explained that the fund amounts were estimates and that the recreational part of the plan would be a long-term project. Chairperson Page suggested putting a comment in the plan stating that the City will only build what can be funded. Member Abbott expressed concern about taking an \$11 million project to the next level when the City has only \$3 million worth of funds. Mr. Brotzman explained that certain trails would be funded by different entities and funding sources. He suggested putting in an explanation that the financial shortfall is for the off-trail system and that there is no other funding sources with the exception of RTC and Open Space. Comments indicated that this is already explained in the plan. Discussion ensued on the project priorities. Member Krahn explained that opportunities could shift the priorities and, if the priorities were listed specifically, the City may lose these opportunities. The physical improvements will be set as the need arises. Mr. Long explained that the funding sources may have their own process for prioritization of projects. **Member Guzman moved to approve the Bicycle Element of the Carson City Transportation Plan subject to the amendments as discussed including language to incorporate the TRPA Bicycle Designated Route within Carson City. Member Robertson seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Member Guzman moved to approve the Carson City Bicycle System Plan subject to the ratification of the Roop Street and Stewart Street designations based upon whatever zoning and inclusion of language to include the TRPA Bicycle Designated Route within Carson City. Member Krahn seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

**2. REVIEW OF THE PEDESTRIAN ELEMENT OF THE MASTER PLAN (1-1974)** - Mr. Long stated that he could not add much more to this element. He felt that the plan stated that the City should fund an inventory and a plan in the next fiscal year. Chairperson Page commented that the community has shown interest and a willingness to do this project. It is viable and the proposed items are reasonable. **Member Abbott moved that the Pedestrian Plan be adopted as stated. Member Guzman seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.** Mr. Homann suggested forwarding a cover letter from the Committee saying that they had worked long and hard on this. It is a compilation of a lot of things. The Pedestrian Element is not addressed very thoroughly and is relatively generic. Therefore, the cover memo should include a quick statement saying to pay attention to the Pedestrian Element as it is a long term commitment. So, when they pass it, they know that it actually exists and it does not get lost in the shuffle. **In response to Member Guzman question, Member Abbott moved to amend his motion to include Mr. Homann's comments. Member Guzman concurred with the amendment. Motion carried unanimously.**

**3. REVIEW OF THE FINANCIAL ELEMENT OF THE MASTER PLAN** - Mr. Long explained changes in the plan which had been made since the last version. He referenced the discussion on the previous version of the plan related to traffic impact fees. An alternative is a minimum traffic impact fee which is a disclosure issue. As was pointed out in the earlier discussion, there is more than one way to fund a shortfall. The consultant was only attempting to point out that impact fees are a potential funding source. The title of Table 9.4, on page 80 of the plan, had been changed to "Minimum Traffic Impact Fee." It demonstrates the minimum amount of funds needed to makeup the shortfall and is a disclosure document estimating the fee. Table 9.5, page 81, "Estimated Under 'Full Funding' Scenario Traffic Impact Fees" was added. Conceptually, new development pay for projects where they cause the increased traffic. Projects that are needed to cover some of the existing deficiencies in Carson City were discussed. Mr. Long reiterated that these tables were disclosure calculations. They show only the range of fees starting at the low end, which makeup the shortfall, and go to the high end, which requires all new development to pay for all of the projects. They are informational only for presentation to the Board of Supervisors. The consultant did not advocating any level of fees. Table 9.3, on page 78, "Likely Improvement Phasing Without New Revenue Sources", is the "do nothing" alternative. This is the best that can be done in terms of a "pay as you go" alternative.

Mr. Homann suggested discussing alternatives including the potential Statute revisions. (Member Mather left the room momentarily at 4:10 p.m. A quorum was present as noted.) Vice Chairperson Garcia felt the plan should reflect how much taxes would increase. Member Hoffman opined that if this kind of detail is used on the impact fee portion, that it should also be available for any other options. Mr. Sullivan indicated that the average tax on a

## **CARSON CITY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of the September 15, 1998 Meeting**

**Page 5**

household, to make up the deficit, should be shown, as that is where the comparison is provided. Tax increases and bonding were discussed. Vice Chairperson Garcia felt that the plan suggested that impact fees were the only answer. She supported presenting four different alternatives in the plan. (Member Guzman and Vice Chairperson Garcia left the room momentarily at 4:20 p.m. A quorum was present as noted.) Chairperson Page questioned what other sources should be shown, such as gas tax, property tax, and sales tax. Member Hoffman gave NDOT's perspective on funding. Member Robertson indicated he did not like the way the plan was written as he felt it reads that the impact fees are the way to fund the projects. There are four different ways of funding which should be shown. Member Guzman indicated that the Committee should show as many financing alternatives as possible. Discussion ensued on the bypass, funding sources, and the Committee's parameters. Member Mather felt that the report was weighted towards impact fees and that there were other viable funding sources. Mr. Long provided some financial figures on the tax increases which indicated the gas tax would be increased approximately one cent to pay for the shortfall. The sales tax would increase approximately one-quarter of one cent. A property tax estimate could not be made at this time. Vice Chairperson Garcia suggested reducing the impact fee information and presenting all of the alternatives equally. Mr. Long explained the difficulty in doing that. Mr. St. John pointed out that the Board of Supervisors are capable of looking at the plan as a source or reference document. There will be additional financial studies. This financial element will remain as a source document. A cover memo will clarify that the Committee does not endorse one alternate over another. The Board of Supervisors will carry through the political process. Discussion indicated that the Committee should collectively decide how the financial element will read. (Member Abbott left the room momentarily at 4:45 p.m. A quorum was present as noted.) Discussion ensued on the south leg of the freeway and putting the financial issue on hold until the next meeting.

#### **4. REVIEW FIGURE 12 - FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION YEAR 2012 ROADWAY SYSTEM**

**IN REPORT** - Mr. Brotzman referred to Figure 3-10, on page 36 of the plan. He explained traffic counts on Robinson and Sonoma Streets and questioned whether they should be shown as collectors. Vice Chairperson Garcia felt that Sonoma should not be shown as a collector east of Silver Sage. Mr. Brotzman suggested that Sonoma Street be shown as a collector only between Curry Street and Silver Sage and that Robinson Street not be shown as a collector to Stewart Street. Discussion ensued on traffic and enforcement problems. **Vice Chairperson Garcia moved to make the changes that Mr. Brotzman had suggested. Member Guzman seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

#### **9. DISCUSSION - COMMITTEE MEMBERS** - Member Bullis' iterated his memo regarding the ability

to use speed bumps, video taping, and warnings to slow traffic. He felt that the Committee's failure to discuss speeding and safety issues was a failure to address its mission. Mr. Homann indicated that certain studies show that communities remove their speed bumps after two years. He also agreed with Member Bullis that traffic calming is a goal that the community should have. Member Mather indicated that more funding was needed for traffic enforcement. Mr. Long questioned the appropriate planning document in which these issues should be placed. Suggestions were: a tool box, appendix, and the cover memo. Mr. Long suggested crafting policies to increase spending on enforcement rather than a tool box or an appendix. Member Mather explained that there are only three deputies assigned to cover traffic throughout the City seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day. He asked for support for traffic enforcement funding. Chairperson Page suggested putting these issues into the cover memo. Mr. Long suggested that a section regarding these safety issues be inserted into the policy section of the plan. (Member Krahn left the room momentarily at 5:05 p.m. A quorum was present as noted.) Discussion ensued on speeding, traffic volume, and the public's perception of these issues.

#### **8. TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF COMPLETION, AND 11. FUTURE COMMITTEE ITEMS** - Mr.

Homann mentioned Mr. Sullivan's suggestion that a presentation be made to the Planning Commission on October 14 and that the Commission be asked to adopt the Plan at its October 28th meeting. Future meeting dates with other Committees were discussed. Discussion also indicated that the September 29 meeting would be Mr. Long's last meeting.

#### **7. REVIEW OF CHANGES OF GOALS OF AUGUST 4, 1998 MEMO** - Mr. Long referred to the

memo. (A copy is in the file). Objective A-11's comments suggest that the V & T Railroad is out of study's realm. Vice Chairperson Garcia stated that as it is a mode of transportation, it should be included. Financial issues were

**CARSON CITY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the September 15, 1998 Meeting**

**Page 6**

discussed. Policy B-3b was left out because Mr. Long was unclear on the concept and the special language which was added. He felt it should be a policy related to school issues. **Vice Chairperson Garcia moved to approve the memo as corrected. Member Mather seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

**11. ADJOURNMENT** - Member Guzman moved to adjourn. Member Robertson seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Chairperson Page adjourned the meeting at 5:20 p.m.

A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's office. This tape is available for review and inspection during normal business hours.

The Minutes of the September 15, 1998 Carson City Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON \_\_\_\_\_,  
1998.

---

Frank Page, Chairperson