

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission was held at 6:05 p.m. on Wednesday, June 11, 2008, at Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chair Shelly Aldean
Vice Chair Russell Carpenter
Commissioner Charles DesJardins
Commissioner Larry Hastings
Commissioner Richard Staub

STAFF: Andrew Burnham , Public Works Director
Patrick Pittenger, Transportation Manager
Vern Krahn, Park Planner
Harvey Brotzman, Senior Project Manager
Joel Benton, Senior Deputy District Attorney
Katherine McLaughlin, Recording Secretary
Darlene Rubin, Transcribing Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the commission's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting is a public record, on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office. These materials are available for review during regular business hours.

Chair Aldean called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M.

A. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM: (6:05:11) - Roll was called and a quorum was present.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

May 14, 2008 regular meeting
May 29, 2008 Special meeting.

Mr. Pittenger noted that chief deputy district attorney Melanie Bruketta was not present at the special meeting of May 29, 2008. Joel Benton, senior deputy district attorney was not present at the special meeting of May 29, 2008. **A motion was made to approve the May 14, 2008 regular meeting minutes and the May 29, 2008 special meeting minutes, as amended. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.**

C. MODIFICATION OF THE AGENDA: None

D. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

E. DISCLOSURES: None

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 2

F. CONSENT AGENDA: (6:07:36) - A motion was made to approve the consent agenda consisting of three items, seconded and unanimously approved.

G. PUBLIC MEETING ITEMS: (6:08:03)

G-1 Action to approve in concept the development of a Memorandum of Understanding between Carson City, Nevada, and the Tahoe Transportation District regarding financial support from Carson City to establish and maintain independent staffing for the Tahoe Transportation District. Additional action at a future meeting of the Regional Transportation Commission would be required to review, approve and enter into any Memorandum of Understanding. Patrick Pittenger noted that he had distributed a letter dated March 3, 2008, from Andrew Strain and Steve Teshara, who were members of the Tahoe Transportation District Board, of which he was also a member. The subject of the proposal was to establish greater local autonomy and leadership for the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD). It included a request for \$10,000.00 annually from Carson City and from the other local agencies who were members of the Tahoe Transportation District, to establish independent staff for their district. Currently they received staffing from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). Additionally, he noted that the matter had not come before TRPA but was scheduled for a meeting to be held Friday, June 13, 2008.

Steve Teshara, member-at-large, Tahoe Transportation District Board of Directors, asked for questions concerning the proposal. Chair Aldean asked how the City would benefit from making that contribution because, although it was a member of the TTD, had no constituents in the basin, nor an actual population served. Mr. Teshara said they were making the same proposal to all six governmental jurisdictions; the area of Lake Tahoe, the City of South Lake Tahoe, Douglas County, Carson City, Washoe County, El Dorado County, and Placer County. All were being asked to contribute equally. They were also asking the business community from the North Shore and South Shore through the local chambers of commerce to make a similar \$10,000 commitment. The primary reason, he explained, was to provide independent staff for the Tahoe Transportation District. TRPA was constrained by "color of money" issues; their staff could do only so much. The TTD was a separate regional entity set up within the compact of TRPA (Public Law 96551, Article 9) and the local jurisdictions formed the essence of that board. It had powers and duties separate from those of TRPA, and TRPA had provided staff willingly, but their staff was planning staff. Mr. Teshara said what was needed was more transit and transportation project development staff. For instance, within the Carson City jurisdiction at the Lake there had been discussions about creating some parking off highway for recreational opportunities, transit along the entire Highway 28 corridor, and so on. Those were the things TRPA had been unable to achieve because in the context of being a planning agency they did not have transit staff or project management staff. With Douglas County at the south and Washoe County on the north, the Carson City piece was a key link. Another value, he added, was that people were being asked to put up a modest amount of money but it would be leveraged with other dollars so that the end result would be that TTD would have some staff that was accountable to TTD as a board and working on a board-designed work plan. For a \$10,000 buy-in, Carson City, among others, would have a seat at the table, and a vote in deciding what sort of expertise they would be getting.

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 3

Chair Aldean asked about developing parking within Carson City's geographical jurisdiction. RTC had some preliminary conversations with BlueGO about providing service to Carson City, would that be something TTD could facilitate? "Absolutely," Mr. Teshara responded, in fact they had long looked at the need for transit between the Lake and Carson City, both for employee commutes and visitors wanting recreation. The TTD could play a role in the new service that linked the Carson Valley with the South Shore of Lake Tahoe.

Member Carpenter asked for clarification on the amounts: \$10,000 annually from each of the counties and \$20,000 total from the business community through North Shore Chamber and South Shore Chamber. Mr. Carpenter said that Carson City had a basin population of just three people and he felt everyone else stood to benefit a great deal more from that kind of planning, therefore, he asked if Mr. Teshara had considered having that funding proportional to the population of the county? That had not been considered, he responded, although he could do that if it became complicated to determine population density versus contribution. He would take the RTC Board's direction on that back to the TTD Board. Mr. Carpenter felt \$10,000 might "be a little tough to come by."

Commissioner Charles DesJardins commented that perhaps Mr. Teshara's presence at the RTC might be a little premature since TTD had not yet met, but allowed that perhaps they had informal commitments from other jurisdictions. Nevertheless, Mr. DesJardins felt "hard pressed" to be in favor of making that commitment especially in view of the cut backs throughout the City's budgets. He could not do that.

Commissioner Larry Hastings said he would not have any problem giving seed money for a year, however, would not want to commit to multiple years after that. He wondered if the TTD would be looking at a funding source for ongoing activities after the initial commitments; i.e., paid parking, increase in gaming tax, or some other revenue source. Mr. Teshara stated they were only asking for a one-year commitment, and in fact, others had expressed similar concerns. TTD would be looking at other funding sources to replace the initial funds.

Commissioner Richard Staub, following up on Commissioner Carpenter's comments, said it seemed to him that the reasonable and most fair approach would be based upon linear miles of roadway in each jurisdiction being asked to participate. He requested Mr. Teshara to address his request at least for Carson City's contribution based upon that formula. Next, he asked what kind of staff TTD would be able to obtain with one-year funding? He added that he liked synergies and was glad he had asked all the jurisdictions to participate, however, if Mr. Teshara had approached RTC from a historical standpoint in Carson City, he was surprised he had not asked for \$20,000 or \$30,000, because Carson City had always seemed to carry the brunt of any request for funding. To sum up his concerns, he wondered how much could be accomplished in a year with the quality of staff that could be recruited for the money they had requested.

Mr. Teshara said one of the things the TTD Board would be discussing at Friday's meeting would be whether to do this on a contract basis. However, they had hired contract people before and they were well qualified. Then if the position stayed open and they wanted to stay, an arrangement was made to transition over to employee status. He added that they had several commitments already and the idea of appearing

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 4

at this meeting had been to inform the Commission, answer questions, and if the Commission were willing to explore the possibility, to direct their staff to do that, then TTD would come back with a specific proposal for the Commission's review.

Chair Aldean stated that members of the Commission were given the TTD FY '09 Staffing Plan and discussion ensued regarding the "Funding by Source." Based on those figures it appeared as though the funding needs had been somewhat eased by the new funding source of "Federal Lands Highways." She said she was sensitive to the fact that Carson City "had a place at the table." She believed there may be an opportunity to further the linkage between Tahoe and Carson City through the extension of the transit service in South Lake Tahoe. She recalled that many years before she had accompanied her father going from jurisdiction to jurisdiction trying to raise money for an Urban Land Institute study at the Lake, and Carson City had contributed half of what the other jurisdictions had contributed--\$2,500 instead of \$5,000--thus, from her perspective she felt it was important that Carson City have a seat at the table and be an equal player. But, as the other commissioners had pointed out, the benefits to Carson City were exceedingly smaller than to the other jurisdictions around the basin. Therefore, her direction to staff would be to look at some sort of compromise that would result in a reduced contribution by Carson City, enabling them to be a player and acknowledge that addressing the transit needs at Lake Tahoe was very important, while also being aware, as the mayor had often said "... we really don't have a dog in this hunt."

Mr. Pittenger reported a correction on the staff plan: the \$52,500 was actually an erroneous number. "The bottom two numbers--second and fourth rows of the spread sheet were not added into that--so it was actually \$80,000." Also, there were eight different bodies that Mr. Teshara was approaching for the \$10,000 contribution. Mr. Teshara believed the Chair's comments were legitimate and something they should discuss. He would like to come back and assist Mr. Pittenger with a report back to the RTC, following the Friday meeting with his board.

Commissioner Hastings noted that in the past and recently, RTC had dealt with Douglas County on some of the transit funding issues and he hoped that a compromise could be reached. Commissioner Carpenter liked Mr. Staub's idea of basing each jurisdiction's contribution on their linear mileage; the State Park was primarily all that Carson City had there. In summation, Chair Aldean said "we are not disinterested, but we want our contribution to be commensurate with our interest in the basin."

Commissioner DesJardins asked if he could get some early feedback from the meeting on Friday, which he felt would be helpful in formulating a response. Mr. Pittenger agreed to contact Mr. DesJardins after the meeting.

G-2 Action to approve a Memorandum of Understanding between Gardeners Reclaiming Our Waysides (G.R.O.W.) and the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) regarding GROW's role related to Carson City's construction management of the Carson City Freeway "Ultimate" Landscaping Project - Phase 1 (Northern Leg). (6:28:32)

Vern Krahn summarized what had transpired at the last meeting regarding the clarification and definition of roles between GROW and RTC as they related to the Carson City Freeway "Ultimate" Landscaping Project. GROW had not been present at that meeting, however, the Commission directed staff to get together with Mary Fischer and whomever else she wanted staff to work with regarding that Memorandum

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 5

of Understanding (MOU). Joel Benton, along with Mary Fischer and he had worked on the MOU presented here.

Commissioner DesJardins asked how the GROW representatives would be notified, as some meetings might happen quickly and, as they were volunteers, he wanted to make sure they received adequate notice to be able to give their input. Mr. Krahn said there were two MOUs--one with the City and the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) which dealt with the whole project. But Mary Fischer felt very comfortable that during the design and planning stages, she and her group would be involved just as they had been the first time. There would be regular meetings of which everyone would be notified. Regarding the MOU herein, when they got into construction, Public Works would hold weekly meetings; the contractor, City staff (Public Works and Parks and Recreation), and GROW representatives, all would be present to talk about project schedules, possible change orders or deletions to the project, or issues that had come up. GROW would be an extension of City staff, they would have access to emails, meeting minutes, and Mary "was not bashful about picking up the phone to call City staff."

Chair Aldean remarked that had been done to provide an increased level of comfort between GROW and RTC, because the Stewardship Agreement itself stated that GROW should participate in selecting consultants, project meetings, including bill reviews, right-of-way settings, review meetings and pre-construction conferences. Although it was not specifically included that was a way of reaffirming the fact GROW would be participating in project construction management meetings as well, even though one could not infer from the Stewardship Agreement that they would be included. Mr. DesJardins said they just wanted to make sure GROW was involved throughout the process to the end so that the maximum benefit would be derived as a part of the large amount of money GROW had secured from the federal government.

Mary Fischer, president of GROW, said the MOU was seen as part of their stewardship also. She hoped to be able to add to the committee, everything would go smoothly, and a very good project would result. She said they had used \$500,000 of the federal money as matching for the community grant that they were able to secure two years ago, which was going to be earmarked for more hardscape just as the money from the Highway Department was earmarked for softscape. Federal money could also match more state money. She did not know when the next community match would come up but assumed it would be this fall. She felt it would be wise, before spending the money, to see about using another \$500,000 and asking for more money for additional hardscape or softscape onto the freeway, as it had been four years since receiving the money and expenses had increased significantly. To be able to secure more money by using the money now would be a very judicious use of money, in GROW's opinion, because once it was spent it would not be available for that 50-50 match. Ms. Fischer asked the Commission to consider that, and she would be working with Andy Burnham on redoing the original grant request so that it could be submitted expeditiously.

Mr. Burnham commented that in discussions with Mr. Pittenger, NDOT did not appear to be going forward with grant programs. Mr. Pittenger said NDOT had received numerous revisions from different funding programs, and while the City did not receive CMAQ money, the enhancements "did affect us and they had already done other measures, i.e., cut off cost increases for existing projects, and were very unlikely to increase any enhancement projects." Chair Aldean asked Mr. Pittenger to continue monitoring

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 6

the situation to see if they decided to release those funds “we could be first in line to apply.” **A motion was made to approve a Memorandum of Understanding between Gardeners Reclaiming our Waysides (GROW) and the Carson City Regional Transportation (RTC) regarding GROW’s role related to Carson City’s construction management of the Carson City Freeway “Ultimate” Landscaping Project - Phase 1 (Northern Leg). It was seconded and carried unanimously.**

Chair Aldean asked Mr Pittenger how the constriction on funding affected the Gateway projects? He said that constriction applied to the federal enhancement funds not community match funds.

G-3. Action to determine that Contract No. 0809-066 is a contract for services of a professional engineer; that the selection was made on the basis of the competence and qualifications of the engineer for the type of services to be performed and not on the basis of competitive fees; and therefore not suitable for public bidding pursuant to N.R.S. 625.530; and approve Contract No. 0809-066 with Manhard Consulting, Ltd. to provide Engineering Services for Sonoma Street Improvements through September 30, 2008 for an amount not to exceed \$50,551.00 to be funded from the RTC Sonoma Street Extension Account as provided in FY 2008/2009. (6:38:39)

Mr. Burnham reported that Items G-3 and G-4 had been an outgrowth of the work being done on the Curry Street Project. He explained that the project had turned into a large drainage project because of the nature of the interception of all of the flows coming off the westside canyons that fed Curry Street. Additional design work was needed due to that drainage. The Sonoma Street Project (discussed earlier in the week with some members of the Board in relation to the auto mall project), and the other portions of the project were on Carson Street.

Chair Aldean noted that relative to the meeting she and Richard Staub attended, there had not been a consensus with respect to the alignment of Sonoma Street, therefore, they were not going to design something before they had a consensus.

Ken Dorr, Manhard Consulting, Ltd., reported that Items G-3 and G-4 for the Sonoma Street and US 395 Bridge Improvements were offshoots of the drainage improvements that were included with the Curry Street Project, as far as the significant storm drainage facilities to handle flows from a large portion of the southwest portion of Carson City. One of their tasks for Manhard Consulting in the Curry Street Project was to analyze the drainage from that entire area. They prepared a master plan document looking at the overall flows, they went through a number of iterations and came up with a series of improvements which involved the conceptual improvements included in Curry Street through the Sonoma Street Corridor and along 395. They had found that although they were in the final design mode and nearly complete with the Curry Street Project, they now had to take a look at planning and at doing more detailed design work for the downstream storm drain improvements which were included in the Sonoma Street Project and along 395. The problem they were faced with, he said, was to make sure that since a lot of the City’s money was being spent on storm drain improvements for that overall area they had to work. Further, without having those downstream facilities in place, they had to go through some initial design to get those facilities “figured out.” Some of the downstream design included in Sonoma Street and in an US 395 drainage projects would be included in the Curry Street Project, specifically: at and near the intersection of Rhode Street with US 395. There was no definitive alignment yet on Sonoma Street but there were three or four

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 7

alternatives. They had to make “some fairly gross assumptions at this point as to the possibility that the Sonoma Street alignment would tie into Curry Street and coordinate the drainage improvements so that we had those pipes that were going to route down Sonoma Street in the future.” Mr. Dorr went on to explain the design assumptions and so on at some length. They intended to make a quick analysis and come back before the Commission and make a decision as to where the storm sewer alignments would run.

Chair Aldean asked if, without a definitive alignment, would he be preparing four separate scenarios. He said they proposed to do two more formal scenarios, but would probably be looking at a couple of other ones, explaining the assumptions for each possibility. The real key to the two projects, he added, was to make sure they did not foul up the storm sewer that was going in Curry Street. Ms. Aldean said that in terms of timing his design work, he could start with the Curry Street design and work over to Sonoma Street, and in the interim she thought they might be able to get the issue resolved. Mr. Burnham felt that what was most likely to happen, considering the schedule for Curry Street, was that they would have to “get into Sonoma Street, come back before the Board, decide which one of the alternatives was going to go,” but he suspected that Curry Street would already be out to bid, and he hoped the last minute changes could be handled by addendum or a change order during the construction contract. The good thing, he added, was that they would have prices established at that point and should not have to negotiate with the contractor. Chair Aldean felt the awarding of the contract might be an incentive for the parties to come to a resolution. Mr. Burnham said the Sonoma Street costs suggested in this contract would be paid for by RTC. The costs for Highway 395 (Carson Street) would be paid for by the Drainage Fund. They had been able to collect about \$440,000.00 from NDOT on some old drainage projects thus there was some money for the drainage costs to be paid for without going to RTC. Chair Aldean asked the difference between the two projects for the purpose of making a motion. That was discussed briefly.

Commissioner DesJardins asked if Ms. Aldean had any more information that would assist them in making a better decision. Chair Aldean said four scenarios were being looked at, however, as Mr. Dorr had pointed out and Mr. Burnham had reinforced, there were only two “exit points.” The four scenarios related to taking a straight shot from Curry Street to 395, as opposed to a more circuitous route, and it had to do with negotiation between the two adjacent property owners. So there were really only two scenarios that had to be analyzed, because the ultimate configuration of the road as it crossed over to 395 was not as relevant as where it intersected with Curry Street.

Commissioner Staub moved to determine that Contract No. 0809-066 is a contract for the services of a professional engineer; that the selection was made on the basis of the competence and qualifications of the engineer for the type of services to be performed and not on the basis of competitive fees; and therefore not suitable for public bidding pursuant to NRS 625.530; and approve Contract No. 0809-066 with Manhard Consulting, Ltd. to provide Engineering Services for Sonoma Street Improvements through September 30, 2008 for an amount not to exceed \$50,551.00 to be funded from the RTC Sonoma Street Extension Account as provided in FY 2008/2009. The Motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

G-4 Action to determine that Contract 0809-067 is a contract for the services of a professional engineer; that the selection was made on the basis of the competence and qualifications of the engineer for the type of services to be performed and not on the basis of

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 8

competitive fees; and therefore not suitable for public bidding pursuant to NRS 625.530; and approve Contract No. 0809-067 with Manhard Consulting, Ltd. to provide initial Engineering Services for Carson Street - US 395 Drainage Improvements through September 30, 2008 for an amount not to exceed of \$99,706.00 to be funded from the Storm Water Construction Projects Account as provided in FY 2008/2009. (6:51:05) Mr. Burnham noted this was a follow-up contract to Item G-3, to determine all the improvements needed to carry the water from Sonoma Street and Rhodes north to the linear ditch. The improvements anticipated were at Rhodes Street, potentially Campagni property if it developed, and other properties as they developed would develop the other sections of the improvements. He did not propose that all the improvements be done at the same time, rather done in sections while moving forward with different projects. Funding, he added, would be from the Storm Water Drainage Fund.

Mr. Dorr noted only that the 395 drainage improvements were in effect to determine those downstream improvements in order to make sure that the Curry Street Project worked. The one component of the 395 drainage analysis would be at Rhodes Street and would be included within the Curry Street Project. They had their 100 percent plans in with the City for review now, and they had a “big circle around the intersection of Rhodes Street with 395...there’s a pipe in there and we’re not sure where this goes yet. But we know we have to get that designed quickly to get included with the Curry Street bid project, otherwise there was no place for the water to go.”

Commissioner DesJardins remarked that there was a lot of work before Mr. Dorr’s company and asked if he was “up to it?” Mr. Dorr said “yes.” Manhard Consulting had both the Carson and Reno offices and also people from one of the other offices would be helping out with the two projects. In anticipation the Board would approve the two contracts, they had already begun a certain amount of work as they felt it was necessary to make sure they had good product on Curry Street. Everyone was committed to getting that done. **Commissioner Russell Carpenter made a motion to determine that Contract No. 0809-067 is a contract for the services of a professional engineer; that the selection was made on the basis of the competence and qualifications of the engineer for the type of services to be performed and not on the basis of competitive fees; and therefore not suitable for public bidding pursuant to NRS 625.530; and approve Contract No. 0809-067 with Manhard Consulting Ltd. to provide Initial Engineering Services for Carson Street - US 395 Drainage Improvements through September 30, 2009 for a not to exceed amount of \$99,706.00 to be funded from the Storm Water Construction Projects Accounts as provided in FY 2008/2009. Fiscal impact not to exceed \$99,706.00. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.**

G-5 Action to accept Public Works recommendation on the “North Stewart Street Extension-Engineering Services Task Order Agreement,” Contract #2004-051, Amendment #3 and authorize Public Works to issue additional payments to Manhard Consulting, Ltd. in an amount not to exceed \$131,890.00 from the RTC North Stewart Street Extension Fund and from the Water - Stewart Street Extension Fund as provided in FY 2008/2009. (6:56:23) Mr.

Burnham reported that staff had proposed to add replacement water lines in three streets: Corbett, Park, and Adams Street, as part of the North Stewart Street Project. All three of the streets were already going to have storm water lines and sewer lines going down the streets, and it was an old area of town where they

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 9

had been replacing water lines in the past. He added that since they were already tearing up the street for the new sewer lines and storm water lines, rather than come back in a year or two to replace water lines and disrupt the neighborhoods again, better to do it now and rebuild the streets upon completion. The water utility would be paying the greatest part of the cost (about \$500,000). Additionally RTC had a couple of clean-up items in the item, related to some right-of-way and specification changes. Funding was approximately \$25,000.00 from RTC and \$106,890.00 from the Water Extension Fund, for a total not to exceed the amount of \$131,890.00.

Chair Aldean asked about the improvements that would be made after the lines were upgraded on Corbett, Park and Adams. Would the improvements run from Carson Street to Roop? Mr. Burnham said "yes." Next, Ms Aldean asked what line item the repaving would come from Mr. Burnham said it would come from the Water Line Item. He added that they would have to address some ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) improvements on all three of the streets simultaneously. Mr. Pittenger commented that there would be many ADA improvements in the future; ADA was a new focus area of a newly-appointed assistant director of the Federal Highway Administration who had taken it upon himself to send his National ADA and Title IV Coordinator to every state in the country. He was here in Carson City on Monday last and Mr. Pittenger had spent many hours with him, among others, and there would be further discussions of all the things to be done with respect to the ADA regarding transportation. Chair Aldean pointed out that it was not an option; when a major road project was done it was mandatory. Commissioner Carpenter surmised that this combining of the project for the three streets was a cost-saving measure, which it certainly was, Mr. Burnham said. **Commissioner DesJardins motioned to accept Public Works recommendation on the "North Stewart Street Extension - Engineering Services Task Order Agreement, " Contract #2004-051, Amendment #3 and authorize Public Works to issue additional payments to Manhard Consulting, Ltd in an amount not to exceed \$131,890.00 from the RTC North Stewart Street Extension Fund and from the Water - Stewart Street Extension Fund as provided in FY 2008/2009. Fiscal impact not to exceed \$131,890.00. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.**

H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (Non-Action Items)

H-1 Street Project Report (7:03:12) Harvey Brotzman confirmed for Chair Aldean that the Clear View Drive improvements anticipated completion date was the 2008/2009 budget year. He added that they had resubmitted the application and should be able to make the deadline. Mr. Burnham commented regarding the Fairview Project, that Saliman to the south of Fairview, the section between Colorado and Fairview was rapidly deteriorating and wondered if that should be included as a change order in the project, or do it as a separate project. It would not stay together much longer. Chair Aldean felt it could not be done before spring of 2009, but Mr. Burnham thought if it was done with a change order with the current Fairview Project it could be done this year. It would have to be designed in-house and the Commission would have to decide if it was to be full improvements or just replace the section that was there; it was four lanes as it connected the two four-lane groups. He asked if the Commission wanted to have him look at it, he would bring it back as a design and cost. Chair Aldean asked what the parameters were for that section. He said they would either replace the section, or expand it to include the four lanes. Mr. Brotzman said that would have to be done the same way as the portion north of Fairview--cement treated base, which was about 1,000 feet long, and they were currently doing 4,400 feet of Fairview.

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 10

Commissioner DesJardins asked if the deterioration was a problem with construction trucks on Fairview (there were many “triples” around town); as he believed a lot more damage was occurring than they ever planned for. Mr. Burnham said the detour there was not for trucks; but there was construction traffic because they were using part of the right-of-way for a marshaling area and the contract did not restrict them from using that area. Chair Aldean believed the condition would only worsen and it was a section of road that needed to be upgraded, thus, with the Commission’s concurrence, she recommended going forward with preliminary design work and bring it back to the Commission for review.

Next, regarding Hot Springs Road Improvements, Chair Aldean, addressing her comments to Mr. Pittenger, said they were underway but they did not include bike lanes and Muscle Powered had expressed some disillusionment, therefore, something needed to be put on the record that the nature of the constraints limited some things. She recalled they had spoken about Mr. Pittenger looking into sidewalks for youngsters bicycling along Hot Springs and possible alternatives to using the street. Mr. Pittenger had checked into the NRSSs and learned that a bicycle with a small diameter wheel (as would be used by a young child) could be used on a sidewalk. He added they were doing a substantial amount of work on Hot Springs improving what was now there that was somewhat erratic; some sidewalks, some curbs, attached and unattached, or non-existent. There was some parking with one lane each direction and no center left turn lanes. When completed, the project would contain an 11-foot center left turn lane, a 12-foot lane in each direction, and parking would not be allowed. There would be sidewalks on both sides of the street, they would meet ADA requirements, there would be four improved bus stops, one of which was co-located with a middle school bus pick-up point where the sidewalk would be 11-feet wide, with a shelter to be used by both JAC and school bus passengers. He added that while the unified master plan did not include any provision for bike lanes, there will be an improved situation for bicyclists even without the bike lanes as it would be legal to ride on the road as on other city streets and there would be a consistent curbline, better drainage, and the prohibition of parking would also be helpful.

H-2 Street Operations Report: (7:11:51) Mr. Pittenger reported that the ADA requirements on Winnie Lane and Carson, one block west and going north, had been completed. Also the Andorra Job had been completed with the installation of a rubber sidewalk, a design unique in the City in that it curved in and around the trees, as those sidewalks had been damaged by the roots of the trees. The directions: west on Long and north on Andorra.

H-3 Fairview Drive Westbound Lane Closure/Detours Map (7:14:36) Mr. Pittenger said the map was widely distributed to businesses all along the area, among many others, and they contacted the school district, but the closure had not happened until five days after most schools were out. Chair Aldean asked how many calls had been received? Mr. Brotzman said he had none but he had met with the Quail Run president and others, their concerns were answered and they were very complimentary. Only one complaint had been received. Mr. Pittenger said the nineteenth reimbursement check for Quail Run residents was about to go in the mail. Of the remaining potential recipients, one was non-responsive, one indicated no interest.

On another Fairview matter, Mr. Brotzman indicated that originally the two center lanes of Fairview (east

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 11

of Saliman) near the crown, were going to be paved, however, the paving foreman contacted him about doing the north two lanes where the crown extended from the curb to the center of the road, and have temporary grindings and base material on the south side of the road as a two-way detour. Later they would come back and finish the south lanes from the lip of the gutter to the crown. He added that he had met with Mr. Burnham on that. There would be about one week to ten days that the temporary road on the south side of Fairview would be grindings and base but that there was so much ongoing construction and many signs about “loose gravel,” “rough road,” etc., but the contractor felt they could probably save about ten days off the contract. Chair Aldean asked for confirmation that the roadway would still be driveable, which Mr. Brotzman said it would be, with additional traffic control as well.

Commissioner Carpenter said the DMV, where he worked, received an “All Points Bulletin” about the Fairview Drive closure and a copy of the map sent to all the staff at the DMV headquarters, and complimented whomever was responsible for that.

Commissioner DesJardins recalled that at the last regular meeting they had spoken about the intersection of Fairview and Roop and in today’s newspaper, he believed, there had been a *Letter to the Editor* regarding that intersection.

H-4 Notice of Contract No. 0708-057 between the City and County of Carson City and DKS Associates for “On-Call” Travel Demand Forecasting and Analysis Services. Mr. Pittenger reported that this item had been included for informational purposes to inform the Commission that the City/County was continuing its relationship with DKS Associates for modeling services, as had been done for quite some time.

H-5 Future Agenda Items: (7:20:09) Regarding Mary Fischer’s (GROW) request to ask for a match for \$500,000 for hard and softscape for the freeway project, Chair Aldean said they would adopt a “wait-and-see” attitude with respect to the availability of funding future matches.

A general discussion ensued in which Mr. Pittenger reminded that next week there would be a special meeting on Monday, June 23, 2008, at 12:00; the purpose of which was to award a street maintenance contract, on which bids had been opened today. He thanked the Commission for “doing these special meetings with us.”

Commissioner DesJardins requested that the public “be patient.” There was a lot of work going on. Several staff commented they were all working together to make this flow as seamlessly and quickly as possible. A comment was made that with all the dirt truck traffic going on, it was believed that some of the trucks were overloaded. Can anything be done to enforce that? “No,” Mr. Brotzman said, the City did not enforce Nevada Highway Patrol (NHP) issues. The only part the City enforced was where identified trucks were in a “no trucks allowed” situation. Chair Aldean said when the issue came up on Imus Road and hauling out of the Bernhard Pit, they had imposed on the NHP to make spot inspections to make sure the trucks were not overloaded. She asked if that could be done again. It was suggested to wait until Fairview Drive was completed before doing so. Nevertheless, Chair Aldean thought it would be appropriate to ask NHP to do some spot checks,

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008
Page 12**

I. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made to adjourn, it was seconded and carried unanimously.

Chair Aldean adjourned the meeting at 7:23 p.m.

The Minutes of the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission of June 11, 2008 ARE SO APPROVED on October 8th, 2008.

SHELLY ALDEAN, CHAIR