

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 8, 2002, Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission was held on Wednesday, May 8, 2002, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Jon Plank, Vice Chairperson Steve Reynolds and Commissioners Shelly Aldean, Bob Kennedy, and Richard Staub

STAFF PRESENT: Development Services Director Andrew Burnham, Community Development Director Water Sullivan, Street Operations Manager John Flansberg, RTC Engineer Harvey Brotzman, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (RTC 5/2/02 Tape 1-0001)

A. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM - Chairperson Plank convened the meeting at 5:30 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum of the Commission was present although Commissioner Staub had not yet arrived. (Commissioner Staub arrived at 5:32 p.m.–during the motion on the Minutes.)

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (1-0010) - Commissioner Aldean moved to approve the Minutes of April 10, 2002. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

C. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS (1-0021) - None.

D. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0028) - Chairperson Plank read into the record a letter he had received from Skipper Wall and his response. (Copies are in the file.)

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0090) - Chairperson Plank disclosed his personal relationship with Dr. Fred Young. Dr. Young's comments were to be discussed when the item is reached during the meeting. Chairperson Plank indicated that he would not personally benefit from any action taken on the item, therefore, there is no conflict of interest.

F. PUBLIC MEETING ITEMS:

F-1. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON ALTERNATIVES TO IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOW IN THE ROOP STREET/STEWART STREET CORRIDOR INCLUDING ALTERNATIVES AS LISTED ON THE AGENDA (1-0125) - Chairperson Plank disclosed his attendance at the public information workshop that was held prior to the RTC meeting. Street Operations Manager John Flansberg explained that the couplet had originally been raised as an alternative to the freeway. When the decision was made to support the freeway/bypass, the Roop-Stewart Street couplet proposal was abandoned. The Commission's February direction on a couplet was reviewed. Staff and the consultants had studied the couplet proposal to develop the cost estimates and traffic models.

Consultant Ken Dorr used computer enhanced slides to illustrate and explain the five alternatives. (Copies of the slides are in the file as part of the backup material.) His information included an indication of right-of-way which must be obtained for each alternative; a very preliminary cost estimate for that right-of-way; the amount of infrastructure improvements each required; and an estimate of the total cost for each alternative. The Commission's options were felt to be: continue to study the alternatives, or defer, abandon, or take action on

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 8, 2002, Meeting

Page 2

one of the alternatives. Clarification indicated that mitigation of the impact on parcels had not been included in the estimates, however, private driveway reconstructions and replacement of landscaping had been included. Public comments were solicited on his comments, but none were given.

Consultant John Long from DKS explained his analysis of the traffic patterns and the traffic model which had been developed as a result of the study and projected traffic volumes. Community Development's geographic information on the area and its future development as well as a traffic count of the current conditions had been used to develop the traffic model. The City's traffic service level policy was included in his explanation. Studies of today's conditions indicate that the afternoon traffic volume is higher than the morning volume. It also indicates that four of the Roop Street intersections are not meeting the policy standard during peak hours. This volume will be maintained or expanded until after the freeway is constructed. The freeway should reduce the north/south traffic flow. The traffic projections for the six alternatives were explained. It was felt that only the alternative that widens Roop Street will meet the City's service level policy until 2025 and provide relief for Carson Street until the freeway is constructed. The distance between Roop Street and Stewart Street was felt to be a disincentive for the drivers due to the extra travel that was created. Alternatives 3 and 4 transfer additional traffic to Carson Street which is currently experiencing problems with its traffic volume. Alternative 5 transfers traffic from Stewart Street to Roop Street and provides better service at the north end but worse conditions at Fifth Street. Discussion pointed out that the alternatives could change the traffic patterns to a degree, however, the volume would continue to increase until the drivers find a better or faster route or the freeway is completed.

Justification for having Roop and Stewart be one way streets was explained. It may be possible to have Roop Street be a one way street with Stewart having two lanes of travel in both directions as suggested by Commissioner Staub. Mr. Long agreed that Stewart could handle additional capacity which Roop cannot. Commissioner Staub felt that this alternative also needed to be analyzed. Mr. Dorr agreed that this concept could be developed and questioned whether the Commission wanted to spend the \$1,200,000 for acquisition rather than using those funds for roadway construction. Clarification also indicated that discussion had not occurred with the State concerning the concept to tie Stewart and Roop together at the south end. The cost was estimated at \$2,300,000. The benefits provided for the State were not known. The estimates for Alternatives 1 and 4 may not be valid if they are mixed. Right-of-way costs need to be developed by a professional appraiser.

City Engineer Larry Werner explained his belief that the right-of-way estimates were on the low side for the northern portion of the alternatives as they had not included the State and Federal mitigation costs required for relocation. Commissioner Staub disclosed his conversation with the Pastor at the church on John Street which indicated the figures which had been quoted were accurate for it. There would not be "many more" individuals displaced by the extension of Stewart Street. He questioned the figures which had been presented due to his feeling that the freeway will not provide as much relief as suggested and that the streets would continue to be heavily used. He was also willing to consider this alternative if it is economically more feasible as it will displace fewer individuals on Roop Street. He questioned the amount of displacement which would occur on Moody Street. The long term results should be analyzed. Discussion indicated that the utility relocation costs were not included in the estimates as each utility is required to relocate when requested according to the franchise agreements. He agreed that the church parcels could be obtained without any displacement costs. There are four individual residential parcels which will incur displacement costs. There will be a lot of

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 8, 2002, Meeting

Page 3

inconvenience connected with the Roop Street alternative. Some of those parcels may be on the market now.

Discussion explained that the traffic study had indicated there are a lot of east/west turning movements off of Roop Street at Fairview. Its volume will increase after the northern portion of the freeway is constructed. The predominate traffic on Roop Street at Fairview is north/south. Clarification indicated that DKS had not studied the traffic designation or origin. It could be done. Significant short-term benefits of the couplet will be the transfer of traffic from Carson Street and Roop Street. Short-term was defined as 2005. Alternative No. 2 provides more long-term benefits and will meet the service policy.

Chairperson Plank explained his concerns about using Saliman as a north/south route due to the three schools which are located on it. Mr. Long explained that this alternative provides the most short-term benefit as an alternative to the freeway. Saliman must, however, be extended to Stewart in order to provide the maximum benefit. The freeway will reduce the usage once it is completed. Commissioner Aldean explained her reluctance to use Saliman and the feeling that the public would not use it as an alternative. A detailed analysis of this route had not been conducted. Mr. Long explained the modeling which had been performed that illustrated an increase in the traffic on Saliman. It was felt that Saliman would become an alternative to Roop Street. Its volume would not double but could be enough to create some congestion problems in the future. Chairperson Plank pointed out that this would be without the Hillview extension.

Clarification indicated that only the area where the modular building is located will be needed from the School District. It is approximately one-half of an acre. (During this discussion Commissioner Staub stepped from the room—6:42 p.m. A quorum was still present.) Commissioner Kennedy was not comfortable with Alternative 1 unless additional information regarding the School District's need for the parcel is obtained.

Mr. Flansberg explained the reasons the School District had not been contacted. He pointed out the long-range traffic benefits of widening Roop Street, Alternative No. 2, specifically those at the intersections. (Commissioner Staub returned during his comments—6:45 p.m. The entire Commission was present, constituting a quorum.) Although benefits are created by all of the alternatives, there is no substitute for the freeway. It may be possible to realign the Stewart Street extension and reduce the impact on the School District. This would, however, impact commercial property. They will need 8,000 square feet of right-of-way of which 5,600 square feet will be obtained from the State. The State's Second Street plans will not be impacted by widening Roop Street. If the Stewart Street couplet alternative is selected, additional infrastructure improvements and signal improvements will be required. This was felt to be an incremental amount. The major difference between Alternatives 1 and 2 is the cost of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks which must be added to No. 2. Justification for adding these improvements was noted. A mill and overlay project is scheduled for Roop Street in two years. These issues create a 21 or 22 percent difference in the alternatives which further supports staff's recommendation that Alternative 2 be selected.

Commissioner Staub pointed out that political issues may reject the most cost effective route as illustrated by his example. Mr. Flansberg explained that his recommendation is based on engineering criteria. The political issue is up to the Commission/Board. Commissioner Staub pointed out that the City owns the right-of-way on Roop Street. If additional funds are spent investigating the couplet concept, it may indicate that the capacity issue provided when the community has reached its maximum growth would justify a different alternative. He

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 8, 2002, Meeting

Page 4

wished to spend RTC's limited resources prudently and in a manner which does not adversely impact a lot of people. Combining Alternatives 1 and 4 should be investigated further. The City could at any time use its right-of-way to widen Roop Street. The Stewart extension would also be available for use during that time. Mr. Flansberg agreed that whenever an additional route is opened, additional capacity is provided. His concern is how will that traffic be handled when it reaches the north end of Roop Street where Stewart ties into it. This could require additional improvements at that location and further north. This bottleneck may occur in 2025. Alternative 2 provides the best benefit at that point. He was not sure what the impact would be in 2030 or 2040. Commissioner Staub felt that the only individuals who would be impacted by extending Stewart Street would be tenants and that it would provide better utilization of the currently under utilized Stewart Street. Mr. Flansberg pointed out that the impact to Moody would be an increase from the current traffic volume of between 100 and 200 vehicles per day to a projected volume of 8,000 to 9,000 vehicles a day. Roop Street currently carries between 18,000 and 19,000 vehicles a day on the northern portion and approximately 23,000 at Beverly. Although the real benefit is between now and when the freeway is completed, there are benefits in 2025 also.

Commissioner Aldean pointed out that it is cheaper to acquire property now than in the future. The property for the extension is needed. Moody is needed for Alternatives 3, 4, and 5. Stewart Street is part of the economic strategic plan for the downtown area and its needs should be included in the discussion.

Chairperson Plank pointed out that the benefit is not to the property owners but to the traffic flow. Commissioner Staub noted that additional right-of-way is required in order to accomplish an alternative. Chairperson Plank explained that the traffic on Carson Street will not change when the freeway is completed. Some of the traffic problems are created by growth in the surrounding counties. The freeway will not mitigate the traffic between Lyon County and Reno. Mr. Flansberg explained that all of the models clearly indicate Highway 50 will be at a service level of either D or E by 2015. This will be the next big challenge for NDOT.

Commissioner Staub felt that the information had indicated a need to delay action on the decision. A discussion with the State must occur. The road connecting Stewart and Roop at the south end will cross over their property. Oregon Street is substandard now. If the State participates, it will reduce the cost to the City. Discussions should also occur with the School District. The church is for sale now. This opportunity should not be ignored. As Stewart is maintained by the State now, it will provide more north/south pavement.

Chairperson Plank suggested that if this discussion occurs, additional information should be obtained regarding the property which will be impacted including the commercial site if the school property is not obtainable. He acknowledged that this additional work could increase the cost of the study. Commissioner Staub felt that it would be a small cost in light of the estimate of \$4,000,000 for the project. It should not be that expensive to make the necessary contacts to determine what the additional acquisition costs may be. He reiterated his suggestion that Roop Street north of Fairview to 50 or between the south couplet and 50 could be maintained as a one way street with Stewart Street remaining just as it is. Chairperson Plank indicated that he would not oppose any alternative as long as it does not create an impact to Saliman and the schools on it. Any impact to the schools will create a large political force which will have to be dealt with. Commissioner Staub pointed out that this is "Not In My Back Yard" and that many towns have major roads in front of their schools. Saliman currently handles the traffic well. Its problem times are at 8 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. When the freeway ends at Highway 50, the traffic will utilize all north/south routes regardless of the adverse impacts to property

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 8, 2002, Meeting

Page 5

owners. Chairperson Plank also pointed out that there should not be any undulations installed on the couplets or Roop and Stewart. Discussion indicated that the Moody neighborhood should be noticed and that another workshop should be conducted before the RTC meeting. Commissioner Staub suggested that a comparative market analysis be performed on the property which needs to be acquired as it can be done quicker and with less cost than a detailed appraisal. Realtors can provide this analysis. The State should know what it is planning to do with the southern portion. Commissioner Aldean also explained that a letter of appraisal which provides a value range could be obtained for approximately \$500. Comments also noted that the delay would impact the construction schedule. A status report on the City's MPO standing will be provided later in the meeting. A letter has been received indicating that Carson City has been "urbanized" with a certified population of 58,000. A majority of the necessary documents have been completed with the exceptions of a unified work program, a transportation improvement work program, and completion of the updated master plan. The selected alternative will be added to the master plan which must be fiscally constrained. The MPO impacts how federal funds are spent in the community. Failure to complete the master plan by the date for allocating the federal funds could impact the freeway. Mr. Flansberg hoped to have the master plan completed by August/September. Chairperson Plank explained that NDOT Director Tom Stephens had indicated that the City should get with it or we will lose the federal funds.

Commissioner Reynolds explained that in 1997 the City had a committee develop the transportation master plan. There had been a substantial amount of work involved with that plan including the development of substantial matrixes on traffic flows. The current proposal has more questions than answers. He questioned the benefits of moving traffic onto Moody. The "NIMBY" concerns related to the extension of Graves Lane were noted. He also pointed out that it may be possible, with the extension of Stewart, to convert Roop to a neighborhood street. Stewart could handle the heavy traffic volume. The pros and cons to each alternative should be spelled out. If the Commission's sole responsibility is to consider traffic, the other issues should not be raised.

Commissioner Kennedy pointed out that the acquisition costs should be determined. It should only require a few calls to determine them. A decision should be made. They could not continue to delay things for three months. Chairperson Plank agreed that the work plan needs to be established to avoid problems with the MPO status. It could be revised as deemed appropriate in the future. Mr. Burnham felt that it would be possible for staff to obtain the comparative sales analysis and the alternative suggested by Commissioner Staub. He suggested that the Commission allocate \$4,000,000 for Roop Street and prioritize the remaining projects/funds. The Roop Street project could be redefined later. Commission comments supported this concept.

(1-1895) Public comments were solicited. Former Chairperson for the citizens advisory committee on the transportation master plan Frank Page pointed out his experience with NDOT indicates that it takes time to develop projects. He complimented the Commission on its willingness to consider other alternatives to Roop Street. Stewart Street should have been extended years ago. The same is true of Carson Meadows, Saliman, etc. He also explained his involvement with a 1976 transportation master plan. The 1997 plan will satisfy some of the MPO requirements. He, too, supported the request for additional information. He urged the Commission to keep bicycles off of Roop Street due to the traffic hazard they pose. His current concerns and experience with bicycles on Roop were explained to support his request. He also felt that none of the property owners along Roop would want to give up additional property for a bike path. He had suggested that the State close Telegraph and Proctor as they are short blocks. This would reduce conflict points. School districts are

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 8, 2002, Meeting

Page 6

attracted like a magnet to major roads. Saliman was cited as an example of the attraction. Once the freeway is constructed to Highway 50, traffic will use Saliman to go south. People will have to adjust to this impact. It may be necessary to take all of some parcels along Roop Street, specifically if you put the right-of-way against the person's front door. There will be problems for these individuals when they attempt to access/egress Roop Street. His alley problems with people who live in the apartments abutting it were noted. Off-street parking should be provided for the Roop Street residents and enforcement provided to address his alley problems.

Allen Cooksey read his letter to the Commission. A copy was given to the Clerk. He urged the Commission to extend Roop Street to College Parkway and not stop at Winnie Lane. His design for the intersection at College Parkway was described. It would eliminate the need for a roundabout/traffic signal. Additional comments were solicited.

Marion Bush explained that the Valley Subdivision had designed all of the streets to be the same size. All of the lots are 66 feet wide. There was purportedly an agreement between the developer and the City regarding how the residences and driveways were to be constructed. Mr. Flansberg explained that Roop Street had originally been 80 feet wide. The Board of Supervisors had abandoned the portion outside the 66 foot width several years ago. Mrs. Bush alleged that a preliminary title search had not found that width and that she had not been notified about the right-of-way during her 37 year ownership of the parcel. She opposed having two lanes in one direction and two lanes in the opposite direction. Two roads should provide more access than one road. For safety reasons, fences against the sidewalks had been installed in the downtown area. She also needed something to mitigate the noise. She urged the staff to look for the subdivision's survey map/agreement. Chairperson Plank explained that the Commission is analyzing alternatives. Additional comments were solicited but none were given. No formal action was taken. The item is to return in 30 days.

RECESS: A recess was declared at 7:30 p.m. The entire Commission was present when Chairperson Plank reconvened the meeting at 7:40 p.m., constituting a quorum.

F-2. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE PRIORITIZATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (1-2162) - The funding options are: pay as you go; refinancing the 1994 Graves Lane bond; and bonding the City's freeway commitment. Discussion indicated that refinancing the bonds will provide funds for the Roop Street corridor, the Curry Street improvements, and several minor projects. It was estimated that there will be \$400,000 available annually for projects after the bond payment is made. Refinancing/bonding the remaining portion of the City's freeway commitment could be done in the future. Staff recommended refinancing the bonds. Discussion indicated that the Stewart Street to Curry connection was included in the Curry Street project. Mr. Flansberg then explained the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) spread sheets. Discussion pointed out that the Boys and Girls Club extension of Lompa and the Fairview widening project had been included on the 2005 list of projects. Chairperson Plank felt that the City should work with NDOT on the Fairview widening as it will be needed for the freeway traffic until the freeway is completed further south. Mr. Flansberg explained NDOT's request that the City take over some residential streets on the west side in trade for assistance with Fairview. Comments also indicated that the Fairview project may be needed in 2002-03 if the Roop/Stewart couplet is completed. Reasons for the high priority of a signal at Sonoma and Carson Street were noted. Funding for this project had not been provided. Its installation will be developer driven. Discussion indicated this project should have a lower priority or be

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 8, 2002, Meeting

Page 7

listed as an unnamed traffic signal with a high priority. The location could be designated when a location is determined. The need for a signal at Roop and Northridge was suggested as a possible signal location. The development agreement requires the developer to participate in this signal. Chairperson Plank explained an audit exception which could be made if a designation is not provided. Mr. Burnham pointed out the need to replace the funds that had been removed from the Clearview Drive project. The Eagle Station traffic improvements were cited as an example of the cost of making improvements to Carson Street which would be similar to those proposed for Clearview Drive. Mr. Burnham agreed that there are other funding sources besides RTC, such as Redevelopment and developer participation agreements, which may be used for this project. Chairperson Plank suggested that two signals be placed on the TIP as a high priority and used the possibility of "Best Buys" acquiring the former Supply One site to illustrate the need to have the ability to install two signals during a year. Mr. Brotzman explained that the last bond they had issued had not identified the signal locations. Mr. Flansberg pointed out the need to justify signals through the use of "warrants". For this reason he felt that the locations had not been identified. Chairperson Plank reiterated his belief that there should be two signals listed on the TIP. The location could be determined at a future date. Historically, the City has always built at least one signal per year. The State's program to resurface Carson Street may require additional green time on the side street signals. Commissioner Staub asked that the east side of Clear Creek at 395/Carson Street be added to the list. More people are using that area to leave Carson. As the RV park at that location is purportedly for sale or will be soon, the time is right to acquire additional right-of-way to improve this intersection. Clarification indicated the street is called "Lupine". Mr. Burnham indicated that the transportation plan would have to be amended to show this project. If it is amended, the developer who acquires the property could be required to assist with the improvements. Discussion indicated that the "Dingman" project on the west side of Clear Creek Canyon is for 80 to 90 units. Mr. Burnham felt that the Clear Creek signal had been designed with adequate capacity to handle this impact. Comments indicated that NDOT is not interested in having the developer build a road to the project from Spooner/Highway 50. The project will eventually be "dumped into Carson City's lap" and will have to be addressed.

Discussion ensued on which plan to adopt for funding the projects. Chairperson Plank and Commissioner Staub supported refinancing the Graves Lane bond. Commissioner Staub's discussion with Finance Director David Heath indicated he also supported refinancing the bond. **Commissioner Staub moved that the Commission approve the refinancing of the current bonds that are outstanding in order to provide funding for future projects for 2002 to 2007. Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion.** Following a request for an amendment, **Commissioner Staub amended the motion to approve the concept for the Transportation Improvement Program for 2002-2007 of refinancing the bonds as a part of that program. Commissioner Kennedy concurred. Motion carried 5-0.**

(1-2840) Mr. Flansberg reviewed the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Discussion indicated that the low priority ranking for the Brunswick Canyon Bridge would not impact its ability to obtain federal funds and corrected its last year's listing to be 04 and 05. It will remain on the federal funding list. The economic value of the sand pit accessed via this bridge was noted. In order to obtain the federal funds, the City will have to prove that it has the right-of-way on both sides of the bridge at the time the application is submitted. Discussion also corrected the priority of the Sonoma-Carson Street signal to match the extension of Sonoma from Carson to Curry and placed both on the low list. Reasons Clearview Drive had been placed on the high priority list were limned. Comments indicated that until a tenant is found for the Walmart site, Clearview should remain as a high priority. Justification for raising Fairview to a high priority was discussed. Mr.

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 8, 2002, Meeting

Page 8

Flansberg explained his understanding of the Commission's direction had been that any project on the TIP with a median ranking should be constructed before 2005. He agreed that Fairview's priority should be raised. It was recommended that Edmonds Drive remain as a low priority based on the traffic modeling which indicates that its service level will not fall below the approved standard. Commissioner Staub stressed his belief that Fairview, Edmonds, and Clearview needed to be placed higher on the TIP than proposed due to their use as a bypass. They will also provide an additional truck route. Clarification indicated the sound walls for Graves Lane south of Highway 50 were listed as number five on the first page. Chairperson Plank supported raising the sound wall's ranking to high. The residents had originally expressed a willingness to dedicate the easement for the sound wall. The truck traffic on Edmonds and the point system used to evaluate projects were limned. Commissioner Reynolds suggested that the point system include the value of land in its criteria. Commissioner Aldean supported Commissioner Staub's comments regarding the need to remove truck traffic from Carson Street by improving Edmonds and Fairview although she opposed improving the speed with which traffic could reach the Douglas County/Indian Hills shopping center. Mr. Burnham supported raising Fairview to a high priority but was unsure whether Edmonds should be raised as the traffic models say it will not be needed once the freeway is completed. He recommended it remain at medium. Discussion indicated the roundabout keeps traffic moving. The landscaping should be going to bid soon and is to be installed this year. The weeds have purportedly been removed. Commissioner Staub requested Fairview be moved to high and Edmonds be moved to medium. Chairperson Plank requested the sound walls be ranked the same as Edmonds. Public comments were solicited but none given.

Commissioner Staub clarified his recommended that staff investigate extending Clear Creek through the mobile home park as it is his understanding that the mobile home park is for sale. Discussion indicated that Lupine is the short piece of road between Carson Street/Highway 395 and Clear Creek Road to the east. It was felt that by placing it on the TIP, any buyer would talk to the City before developing the site.

Discussion indicated the following revisions had been made: Carson and Fairview intersection improvements - high; widen Fairview Drive to four lanes from Saliman to Roop - high; Edmonds Drive widening - medium; Fairview Drive widening - high; Clear Creek-Lupine and south 395 - medium; Sonoma and Carson Street signal - low; and added two unnamed signals. **Commissioner Reynolds moved to prioritize the TIP as discussed. Commissioners Aldean and Kennedy seconded the motion.** Mr. Burnham explained that the Roop Street costs will be refigured. Four million dollars will be allocated for it. It will have a high priority. Discussion explained that the title for Roop Street should be revised to indicate a Roop/Stewart Street corridor project. This will include any alternatives which the Commission selects in the future. The funding should be limited to \$4,000,000. Discussion then indicated that the funding priority for the large projects would be Roop, Fairview and Curry. This will allow time for the NDOT project to restripe Carson Street to be implemented. Mr. Burnham indicated that staff will bring back the table with recommendations on how the funds should be allocated for the Commission to act on at the next meeting. Clarification indicated the motion would direct staff on the options which are to be considered for allocation of the funds. All of the modifications and recommendations will be used in the MPO transportation master plan including the unified work plan and the transportation improvement plans. **The motion to prioritize the TIP as discussed was voted and carried 5-0.**

F-3. PRESENTATION OF STATUS REPORTS REGARDING: 1. NORTH CARSON STREET AND COLLEGE PARKWAY LEFT TURN; 2. MILLS PARK AND HIGHWAY 50

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 8, 2002, Meeting

Page 9

PARKING EXPANSION; AND 3. CARSON CITY AND MPO STATUS (1-0024) - The Board of Supervisors will consider the contract for the mill and overlay on West College Parkway at its next meeting. Albertsons will open on June 22nd. The signal and drainage work should be completed prior to the opening. The Mills Park parking expansion project is to be completed between July 4th and September 1st. The MPO designation has been received. The population figures of 58,000 had been a surprise to staff. This population figure will help with the transportation and transit programs. Establishing the priorities will help staff develop the transportation master plan. The modeling for the Roop/Stewart corridor cannot be completed at this time. The plan should be completed by August/September. Staff has been working with NDOT to develop the transit requirements for being an MPO. They will be ready for the Commission when the designation is received. Public comments were solicited but none given. Discussion explained that the Edmonds Drive repaving project is being held up by the Clearview drainage and alignment design. Mr. Flansberg felt that the Board will see the paving contract in 45 to 60 days. Construction should occur within 30 days after the contract is approved. Concerns were expressed regarding the patch work that had been done on Edmonds. No formal action was required or taken.

G. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (NON-ACTION ITEMS) - FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (2-0094) - None.

H. ADJOURNMENT (1-0096) - Commissioner Reynolds moved to adjourn. Commissioner Staub seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Chairperson Plank adjourned the meeting at 8:45 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 May 8, 2002, Carson City Regional Transportation Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON July 10, 2002.

/s/

Jon Plank, Chairperson