

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 12, 2002, Meeting

Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission was held on Wednesday, June 12, 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 S. Staub

STAFF PRESENT: Development Services Director Andrew Burnham, Street Operations Manager John Flansberg, Deputy District Attorney Jason Woodbury, RTC Engineer Harvey Brotzman, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin
(R.T.C. 6/12/02 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. The entire Commission was present, constituting a quorum.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (1-0008) - None.

C. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS (1-0010) - None.

D. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0011) - None.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0020) - None.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS

F-1. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SELECTION OF AN ALTERNATIVE TO IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOW IN THE ROOP STREET/STEWART STREET CORRIDORS AS LISTED ON THE AGENDA (1-0023) - John Flansberg reviewed the Commission's direction at the last meeting. Ken Dorr described the purpose of the presentation made at the last meeting by John Long and himself. He expanded on the Commission's direction at that meeting. An explanation of the eight alternatives including the development of Alternatives 1-B and 1-C was provided. Staff and Mr. Dorr had met with the School District and attended two separate School Board meetings. The School Board's consensus is to work with the Commission/City, however, the roadway will create a significant impact on the Corbett School and its programs. The Board indicated it will expect Carson City to pay for the impacts as well as for the right-of-way. Discussion with State Public Works officials has indicated that the State is hiring a consultant to update its Capitol complex master plan. The master plan is to be completed by November. The master plan includes a needs assessment, building layouts, and traffic assessments. At this time they believe that construction will commence in the area of King and Second Streets and travel south. The area south of the Department of Motor Vehicles that the City needs may not have an established time line for construction. The State does not at this time see a need or benefit for a southern connection. If the City wants the State to participate, the City will have to obtain approvals from the Board of Examiners, the Governor's office, and the Legislature. State Lands Director Pam Wilcox indicated that they must sell the land as they cannot give it away even though it is to be used as for a public transportation project. NDOT is required to purchase right-of-way from State Lands; therefore, the City must follow the same requirement. Widening of Fifth Street may be required for their

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 12, 2002, Meeting

Page 2

projects when they are built out. He then explained that the property values which had been provided had been too low as the Assessor's taxable values had included "overly" depreciated structure values and did not include any relocation costs which may or may not be required. He felt that the revised figures were more realistic although somewhat conservative. Comparables had been used to develop the new fair market values. NDOT had helped develop the relocation costs which are mandated by Federal law. The criteria used to develop the relocation costs were limned. There is a 15 percent contingency provided in the estimates that should cover the worst case scenarios. He also pointed out that determining the right-of-way costs is problematic due to the lack of an established design. NDOT's program uses a range to estimate the acquisition costs. Criteria used in the development of the revised cost analysis was described. It was felt that the range for the acquisition of additional right-of-way would be between \$1,200,000 and \$1,900,000. He also explained that if there is a willing seller, the relocation costs are removed. Staff recommended Alternative No. 2, a full widening of Roop Street, and suggested that it be constructed in two phases with one being from Washington Street to Winnie with a construction date of 2003 and the second phase being from Washington to Fifth Street with construction occurring in 2006.

Douglas Coats pointed out that no benefits had been provided in the report. He was specifically concerned about the cost of Alternative No. 2, which was \$3.68 million.

Mr. Flansberg explained his work with Mr. Long to develop the benefits for Alternatives 1B and 1C. He described the Commission's standards for streets and intersections. He felt that Alternatives 1B and 1C would have afternoon periods in 2005 at eight and seven intersections, respectively, at low service levels. Alternatives 1 and 2 will only have five intersections experiencing low service levels. The other alternatives have significantly more intersections at low service levels. The formula used to establish the priority was described. The Curry Street alternative scored a 42. The Stewart and Curry Street alternative scored a 43. Roop Street's score is 40 to 41. Stewart going north did not fare as well in the formula due to the high acquisition costs. Staff may be recommending revising the formula to include traffic numbers, level of service, cost constraints, etc. The two alternatives that scored the best were No. 1, Stewart Street with one lane in both directions and a center turn lane, and Alternative No. 2, Roop Street widening. Alternative No. 2's costs were reduced due to the City's ownership of the right-of-way. It was \$700,000 less than the other alternatives. There is \$600,000 in curbs, gutters, and sidewalk improvements and the mill and overlay, which could be done as street maintenance. It also provides the best traffic flow at the least cost.

Mr. Coats responded by explaining the location of his residence which allows him to avoid the use of this street to get to his work place. He felt that the project would speed up the traffic on Roop, however, the bottleneck on South Carson Street will remain. Mr. Flansberg explained NDOT's program to restripe South Carson Street to six lanes. This will increase the capacity on South Carson Street. The traffic model and analysis had included this project. The level of service comparison had included the project as well as the conditions in 2005, in 2015 when the freeway is built, and in 2025 when the City is close to built out.

Theresa Watson questioned whether the cost analysis had included guaranteed safety for the businesses and residences along the roadway. The Commission must guarantee the safety and reduce the noise if it makes the changes. Mr. Flansberg explained that the cost analysis had not included these costs. Mitigation measures had been included in the costs for relocation/replacement of fences and landscaping. Ms. Watson felt that this did not guarantee their safety and pointed out that the vehicles will be within ten to 15 feet of the

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 12, 2002, Meeting

Page 3

residences/businesses. She also questioned where the individuals who live in the apartments are to park. Mr. Flansberg explained the curb design, which is considered a vertical impediment to vehicles. This is the same standard as is used on other streets. Ms. Watson felt that the curb will not stop a vehicle. The proposal will put the vehicles inside their homes. Mr. Flansberg pointed out that the roadway will be signed for 25 miles per hour. Ms. Watson responded that they are not traveling at 25 miles per hour now.

Marian Bush felt that staff and Capital Engineering had decided Roop should be widened. Two streets will handle more traffic than one street. The project is only considering the area between Fifth and Winnie. Consideration needs to be provided beyond those points. Mr. Flansberg explained that they had only presented the numbers from the traffic analysis, geometrics, and the cost estimates. Staff makes the recommendations. He also explained for her the traffic model and travel demand programs which imitate the destination and point of origin studies to generate the traffic numbers for the roads. The model is updated every two to three years to show the existing conditions. The models have been consistent and were recently updated. Ms. Bush reiterated her concern about the fact that all of the streets in the Valley View Subdivision were 66 feet with the driveways on the road. Her house will not conform to that lot size due to the "feet on the side". If they go down Robinson, they will cut off everyone's driveway. This will eliminate her entrance into her property. This is not the best choice. Chairperson Plank explained that this is one parcel which will have to be addressed. Ms. Bush felt that there are other parcels that will be similarly impacted.

Discussion between Commissioner Aldean and Mr. Flansberg indicated that he had provided Ms. Bush with a map when the discussions originally began. The recorded subdivision map shows the right-of-way as 66 feet on Robinson and Roop Streets. Ms. Bush lives on the southeast corner of that intersection. The street improvements are normally constructed within that width. There is seven feet behind the sidewalk. The street right-of-ways vary throughout the community between 50 feet and 80 feet in width. Commissioner Aldean pointed out that it is a standard practice to allow the abutting property owners to use any portion of the right-of-way which is not used for the street, curb, gutter and sidewalk. This provides a false sense of security to the property owner particularly when a formal agreement is not issued allowing this usage. Mr. Brotzman explained that only landscaping is allowed to be placed in this area. Signs or structures must have an encroachment permit. NDOT has the same requirements. He agreed that the majority of the property owners do not know where the property line is. Commissioner Aldean reiterated that this policy provides a false sense of security to the abutting property owners. Ms. Bush indicated that the improvements had been put in when the house was constructed. She also described the area when Roop was constructed. The proposal to widen Roop will put it in her house. Chairperson Plank explained that his front yard extends approximately 12 feet into the street right-of-way and that he has planted landscaping in it.

Mike Schellin explained his property location and support for two of the plans as the City needs to move traffic through the community. His concerns were safety and speeding issues. His building has been hit two times due to the current configuration of the Long and Roop intersection. Traffic accidents at the corner of Long and Roop were described to illustrate his belief that the roadway design created a traffic hazard particularly during snowy conditions. He also pointed out that some street designs, such as John Street and Carson Meadows, encourage drivers to go faster. He suggested that sound walls or "hit" walls be constructed for improved safety. Alternative No. 2 was felt to be shortsighted. Roop Street definitely needs help. The south end of Stewart Street must be opened in order to provide relief for Carson Street. He preferred Alternative 1C.

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 12, 2002, Meeting

Page 4

Irving Schleicher explained the location of his residence. He opposed any alternative which would extend Stewart Street through his quiet neighborhood. It will change the character of his neighborhood. The least impact, the least cost, and the least right-of-way requirement, etc., support the full Roop Street widening.

Shade Tree Council Chairperson Jean Bondiett explained that the plans had been submitted to the Council. The Council prefers an alternative which does not require the removal of the trees, specifically those between Washington and Fifth Street on Roop. As a private citizen, she encouraged the Commission to develop the Curry/Stewart couplet.

Frank Page explained his involvement with the 1998 transportation master plan. It had not included a bicycle path on Roop Street. He urged the Commission to not place a bicycle path on Roop Street due to his personal involvement with a bicyclist on it and his safety concerns for bicyclists. He also pointed out that widening Roop Street will create a parking problem and that the residents should not back into Roop Street traffic when leaving their driveways/residences. Problems encountered with his alley were described to illustrate the parking issues which may be created. He urged the City to do something about his alley parking problems specifically due to his concern that additional traffic on Roop will increase the alley parking problem. He also requested that "No Parking" signs be installed in this alley between Musser and Telegraph and that the alley be paved. A signal at Musser and Roop is warranted and could meet traffic standards particularly after the new building under construction at Second and Roop is completed. (During his comments, Commissioner Staub stepped from the room—6:26 p.m.—and returned—6:28 p.m. A quorum was present the entire time.) He also felt that traffic is not adhering to the posted 25 miles per hour speed limit and could jump the curb as illustrated by his example of an accident at Roop and Robinson. The traffic enforcement problem should be addressed. The City should provide relocation assistance for individuals who find the widening unbearable. The City could resell the parcels. He displayed photographs illustrating his alley problem. He acknowledged the need to address the City's growing traffic problems, the personal concerns regarding the taking of property, and, although he desired to see Stewart extended, understood the problems related to it.

Stuart Dunn explained his commute from Incline Village and his use of a bicycle to get around Carson City. He urged the Commission to do a cost analysis of computerized signals. The traffic backup problems encountered at signals were felt to be due to the lack of a computerized program as indicated at a signal which is green but does not have any vehicles on them waiting to cross the main street. Mr. Flansberg explained that the real problem on Roop Street is when the one to two hour peak usage periods occurs. Roop Street's signals are all operated by a loop detector. Mr. Dunn felt that loop detectors cause a change in the cycle that lasts for 30 minutes. Computerized programs automatically control the number of cars that are allowed through an intersection. Neither the proposal nor Widening Carson Street will help unless something is done with the Highway 50 traffic. The proposal will only provide relief during nonpeak hours. Mr. Flansberg explained that the signals use computerized programs which are tripped by either the loop detector or a video camera. Mr. Dunn continued to reiterate his suggestion that the signals be totally computerized due to his feeling that the signals are not tied together, i.e., Winnie and Long at Carson, which cause a "parking lot" to occur on Carson Street for two to three hours. He did not feel that the signals are computerized to the fullest extent possible with the loop detectors and video camera operations. This program works on a specified traffic speed and synchronizes all of the signals. Chairperson Plank felt that the Commission understood his suggestion and that it could be related to the alternative which is selected.

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 12, 2002, Meeting

Page 5

Rita Waters questioned the reasons sound and safety is not being included in the program. The curb will not stop a vehicle. She wanted a wall. She questioned the reasons the residents must sacrifice for a bike path. She requested a recorded document showing where Ms. Bush and her rights-of-ways are. She felt that she would lose property from both her front and back yards as well as the access to the lot. Her adjacent neighbor would also lose a portion of his/her backyard. This will hurt their property values. Trees will be lost although Mr. Flansberg had purportedly indicated that she would not lose her large oak tree. She questioned the amount of property which would be taken for relocation of the utilities and how much it will cost them. She felt that better guidelines should be established. She recommended the Stewart Alternative or a combination of it. She did not want to give up anything.

Theresa Waters supported Alternative 1C.

Mr. Coats explained that research indicates the front yard of his rental property includes 12-1/2 feet of the 66-foot right-of-way. Just because the City/Commission could take the land does not mean that it should. Relocation of the sidewalk will leave him a ten foot wide front yard. This will make it difficult for him to rent his property. He urged the City/Commission to consider the impact widening the street will create on the residents and the neighborhood. The estimated costs should include the price to make the property liveable. The bicycle path should be eliminated. The City should clean up the shoulders so that people can ride their bicycles on them. Photographs illustrating the area where he felt the sidewalk would be located were given to staff.

Ada Stewart felt that the project would leave her with traffic eight feet from her front door. A sound barrier or wall/fence will narrow the access to the front door even more. This will make the property worthless as a rental. She preferred option 1C. No one uses the bicycle paths. The traffic speed on Roop is too fast for bicyclists. She encouraged the bicyclists to use the sidewalks as pedestrians are not using them.

Mr. Page gave the photographs of his alley problem to staff. Chairperson Plank encouraged him to meet with staff and Alan Biddle to discuss the problem. He also explained that the City arborist will help the City in dealing with the property owners so that the landscaping and trees are damaged as little as possible. Mr. Brotzman explained the City's vegetation policy and the arborist's role in evaluating the landscaping and the appraisal process.

Public comments were then closed. Discussion ensued between the Commission and staff on the costs and benefits of Alternatives 1 and 2. Mr. Flansberg prioritized the Alternatives as having 1 as the first choice and Alternative 1C as the second choice if alternative 2 cannot be undertaken. Mr. Brotzman explained the turnout for the Monday evening workshop. Comments are to be received at the office until Friday.

Commissioner Aldean explained the items she had considered in making a selection. She questioned whether the economic impact had been analyzed. Before the meeting she supported creating new streets rather than increasing capacity on existing streets. At this time she supported Alternative 1 in its original configuration.

Commissioner Staub explained his original concerns with the project and reasons for seeking alternatives. He understood the costs and explained his belief that the impacts and quality of life issues should be included in the evaluation. He had attended the workshop in order to look at the cost estimates for the projects. He

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 12, 2002, Meeting

Page 6

supported punching Stewart Street through and providing relief for both Roop and Carson Street. He empathized with the residents on Roop Street as he would not want traffic within eight feet of his home. He was certain that there is no acceptable barrier that can halt a vehicle from hitting a structure if it is going between 25 and 40 miles an hour. Widening Roop Street is not the best way to handle the problem even though it may be the most cost effective method. As the Church is interested in selling its property, the time is right to extend Stewart Street. The opportunity should be seized to do it. The destruction of the property values had not been considered. It could make the cost to widen Roop Street more than estimated as potential legal costs had not been included. Property owners who reside in the residences along Roop Street are like other residents and do not wish to give up their property. He had not been convinced that Roop Street should be widened. He acknowledged the problem at the Corbett School with extending Stewart Street but felt that it is possible to overcome it as the City will own the Church property and could relocate the modulars to it. This will leave approximately three residences on Moody who may be impacted. These residences may all be rentals. The small cost difference between the Roop Street widening and the extension of Stewart does not warrant consideration. He was certain that the impacts and estimated costs of widening Roop were understated. Extending Stewart will provide full utilization of both Stewart and Roop Streets. Stewart is considered a truck route but it is not easy for the truckers to negotiate the corner at Williams and Stewart nor at Carson and Williams. Connection of Stewart and Roop could provide the truck route. He would not support Roop Street. His priorities were Alternative No. 1 and 1C.

Commissioner Reynolds expressed his respect for Commissioners Aldean and Staub. The City needs better north/south traffic conduits. The public has repeatedly stated that something needs to be done about the traffic problems. The consultants have stated that the traffic benefits of Alternatives 1 and 2 outstrip other benefits. He was concerned about the amount of time it would take to complete acquisition of the property needed to extend Stewart Street. The consultant has indicated that the Stewart model shows that it will not relieve much of the Roop traffic. His experience has shown that any street changes impact private property owners but it also benefits the community. He questioned whether Alternative 2 provides relief for the community sooner with longer term benefits within the available funding including mitigation for traffic on Roop Street. There is a safety problem on Roop Street now. Speeding cars can and do go over the curbs. There are more cars on Roop today than it is capable of carrying. Mitigation costs will be high regardless of the route selected. The estimated \$590,000 for street improvements and maintenance is needed today. Today, there are no sidewalks and curbs in some of the areas. He questioned the time required for Alternative 1, and its subalternatives, as compared with Alternative 2. His discussions with people outside the meetings indicated support for Alternative 2 and less support for extending Stewart Street. He questioned whether the impact would be simply going from the frying pan to the fire if the project is moved from Roop to Stewart?

Mr. Flansberg explained that the two projects have similar time frames as the delay in making a decision regarding Roop Street had already pushed it to the fall or the following spring. Both projects will have unique challenges. Roop Street will have mitigation issues. Alternative 1 will impact larger property owners and remove on-street parking. He then explained the traffic modeling which showed that North Roop Street between Winnie and Beverly currently handles between 14,000 and 20,000 cars a day. The Stewart extension will remove between 6,000 and 7,000 vehicles north of Beverly/cemetery on Roop. It will reduce traffic south of Beverly/cemetery on Roop Street by 5,000 vehicles. There will also be a decrease of approximately 1,000 vehicles south of Highway 50. This area has even less traffic than north Roop Street. The heavy Roop Street usage is found between Highway 50 and Long Street. This is also the location of the City's highest accident

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 12, 2002, Meeting

Page 7

rate. This is the reason staff began looking at the area. There has been a 20 percent increase in traffic in this area during the last three years.

Chairperson Plank pointed out the bottleneck that is going to be created when Carson Street is restriped to six lanes and then is reduced to two lanes at South Stewart Street. A similar problem will occur when Stewart and Roop merge at Dan. Mr. Flansberg agreed that there will be a problem at Winnie and Roop even if it is signalized. This intersection currently meets warrants for a signal. The freeway will relieve this congestion. Chairperson Plank encouraged the Commission to take action today.

Discussion between Commissioner Kennedy and Mr. Flansberg explained that the time frame difference between widening Roop and extending Stewart would be the time required to do the appraisals and obtain the Stewart/Moody Street property. It may take 120 days to obtain the appraisals due to a backlog in the appraisers' work. The City will also need to acquire three feet of right-of-way from Lee to Park Street along the west side of Roop Street. It will be difficult to build next spring or summer. Commissioner Kennedy felt that it would take more than six months to complete the negotiations with the School District. Alternatives 1 or 1C could take more time to accomplish. Mr. Flansberg explained that the consultant had indicated that, if nothing is done at this time, the traffic volume will return to the current status once the freeway is completed in 2015. Roop Street is an internal commute route. The freeway relieves Carson Street's congestion. Traffic from Roop will move to it after the freeway is completed.

Commissioner Aldean felt that it is a difficult decision. She understood the need to alleviate congestion and to do so expeditiously. She also supports private property rights. She empathized with the property owners. The City will have to endure congestion until the freeway is completed. She felt that people are creative and will find alternative travel routes. She supported Alternative A or some form of Alternative A.

Commissioner Staub reiterated his commitment to move traffic. He did not support paving over the front yards of the residents regardless of whether the City owned it or not. The opportunity to extend Stewart Street should not be overlooked. The Church is for sale and the School District is willing to work with the City. The excess property at the Church could be used to mitigate the School District issues. The widening of Roop Street will adversely impact each and every property owner along it. This versus the potential impact to three property owners along the Stewart extension. The property rights must be considered. The estimates are close enough to warrant consideration of the extension of an under utilized four lane street. The opportunity to do Roop Street will still be there for future development which could provide the property owners time to mitigate any potential impacts. His personal evaluation of the impact that the freeway will have on his residence was described to illustrate how this mitigation could occur. He reiterated his belief that the extension of Stewart Street would more effectively utilize a four-lane road and the opportunity to do so at this time.

Commissioner Reynolds explained that everything the Commission does impacts private parties. Participation by individuals who will be significantly impacted on Roop Street had occurred for the last several meetings. He questioned the balance between the 14,000 drivers on Roop Street and the eight residences along Roop Street versus the three property owners who will be impacted with the extension. He acknowledged the value to extending Stewart as the Church property is for sale. He personally did not believe that the freeway would be completed in the next 30 years. Another alternative is to do nothing. He urged the residents along Roop Street to begin to consider its future. It is not a quiet residential area today. It will become a commercial or

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 12, 2002, Meeting

Page 8

business area in the future. He felt certain that the Commission will be forced to reconsider it again if nothing is done due to the need for a southeast route.

Mr. Brotzman pointed out that some of the residences which will have to be removed for the Stewart Street extension contain asbestos which will lengthen the removal process.

Commissioner Aldean pointed out that partial takings also require more work due to their complexity. Discussion with Mr. Flansberg indicated that the model showed that the connection of Stewart Street and Curry will become a higher priority if the extension is constructed. Discussion with Mr. Flansberg also explained the commuter model showing reasons the Roop project should be phased from Winnie to Highway 50 included the gridlock that will occur in 2005. The southern portion has some problems at two intersections. Development Services Director Andrew Burnham explained the need to relocate the utilities in the southern portion and the time and cost to do this which also justifies doing it in the second phase. Mr. Flansberg pointed out that Roop Street traverses the City commencing as Silver Sage at Snyder/Clear Creek Road and goes to Arrowhead and Emerson on the north. At some point in time it will need to be widened to handle the traffic as a main north-south connector. Saliman and Lompa were also cited as other streets which may at some time need to be extended. At this time Graves Lane is the only connector going north-south.

Commissioner Staub moved that the Commission adopt Alternative 1 or a variation of 1 as a priority for the Stewart-Roop corridor. Commissioner Aldean seconded the motion. Ms. Bush stated that if the Commission widens Roop in either alternative, it would make her property worthless. She questioned who would want a freeway at their front door. Either proposal will ruin her property. Additional comments were solicited but none were given. The motion was voted and failed on a 2-3 vote with Commissioners Kennedy and Reynolds and Chairperson Plank voting Naye.

Commissioner Kennedy moved that the Commission go with Alternative No. 2 in two stages as recommended by staff. Clarification indicated that the project will be staged as proposed. The motion died for a lack of a second. Commissioner Reynolds indicated he would not second the motion as he was not satisfied with either Alternative 1 or 2. Without his vote neither project could move forward. As he had heard comments indicating that the traffic relief will not be substantial enough to force a decision this evening. The project could not be constructed this year. It will not waste money to wait one more month before making a decision. There are good points for both projects. When he came to the meeting, he had been in complete support of Alternative 2. Valid points had been raised regarding Alternative 1. Clarification indicated that additional information was not needed for that meeting as a substantial amount had already been presented. He "strongly" supported Alternative 2, however, wanted more time to digest the information that had been presented this evening. Commissioner Staub explained that he respected Commissioner Kennedy's opinion. It is a difficult decision. He had originally supported any alternative that would have moved traffic. Time is of the essence. The Church is for sale and could be sold to another congregation as there are other potential buyers besides the City who are interested in the property. He asked that staff contact the Church and determine a firm price and to talk with the School District on the issues. It is an option that is worth consideration. The preliminary discussions should begin. Chairperson Plank also asked that staff confer with counsel regarding the time frame for obtaining the real estate. Discussion with staff indicated that full blown appraisals are required for acquisitions. Discussion expressed the hope that a decision would be made in July. Commissioner Aldean explained a comment made by a Chamber of Commerce member regarding the need to "make a decision, any

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 12, 2002, Meeting

Page 9

decision". This is the attitude of many individuals who are watching the issue. Both proposals have merit. It is the valuations and their impacts. Chairperson Plank briefly explained the issues which had to be dealt with regarding the extending Graves Lane which had included a threat of a lawsuit. No formal action was taken and the item was deferred to the next regular meeting.

RECESS: A recess was declared at 7:45 p.m. The entire Commission was present when Chairperson Plank reconvened the meeting at 7:55 p.m., constituting a quorum.

F-2. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT

PROGRAM PRIORITY FUNDING MODEL (1-2456) - Mr. Burnham reviewed the spread sheets on funding alternatives. Bonding will not be requested next year. It may be requested the second year. This will save a significant amount in interest costs. He then highlighted the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Flansberg explained that signals were costing more than had been previously spent due to the video cameras, a different lighting technology, and the fire/emergency receivers. Discussion also pointed out that there is little competition in this field although there are two firms in Nevada doing this work. Discussion indicated the Boys and Girls Club funding for the Lompa Lane extension had not been included in the figures. The Club's addition will reduce the impact to RTC. The amount will be determined in the future. Challenger Way's design had been submitted to staff. Mr. Brotzman indicated that the contractor had commenced work on this project. Mr. Burnham explained the reasons for its delay. He also indicated that the TIP would be modified as priorities are established. Once the City becomes an MPO, it will be necessary to revise the spread sheet format to separate the NDOT funds. Action could not be taken on the item until the previous item has been resolved. Clarification indicated that the delay in taking action regarding the funding mechanism will not impact any of the projects currently underway. Bonds will not be sold for two years. If Alternative 1 is selected, staff will recommend the sale of a higher number of bonds in the second year than required for Alternative 2. The bond amount will be determined when the TIP is established during the second year. Public comments were solicited but none given. No action was taken on this item.

F-3. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION URBANIZED AREA AS DEFINED BY THE 2000 CENSUS DATA (1-2845) - Mr. Flansberg used a copy of the census map to explain the census tracts and the area included in the Carson City census figures. This area included portions of Douglas and Lyon Counties. Future transit plans must include these areas. These areas will no longer be eligible for rural transit funds. They will be asked to contribute 50/50 for operations and 80/20 for capital items for services in their Counties. This requirement only impacts federal funds spent on items within the MPO area. This requirement may make it more difficult to develop programs than originally conceived with just the Carson City area in the MPO.

Mr. Burnham pointed out the effect the inclusion will have on the proposal for the RTC to be the MPO as recommended last September to the Board of Supervisors and Governor as the RTC does not represent the entire area. Staff will meet with Douglas and Lyon Counties to determine how to proceed with the MPO representation. It may be that the RTC will be expanded to include representatives from Douglas and Lyon Counties. Chairperson Plank introduced Lief Anderson, NDOT's ex-officio member. Discussion indicated that he will still be involved with the MPO. Additional information regarding the MPO and its committee will be provided in the future. The biggest change at this time was felt to be the move from rural funds to urban funds. Previous grants were in the range of \$50,000 a year. As an MPO the City will have access to grants

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 12, 2002, Meeting

Page 10

in the \$400,000 a year range.

Commissioner Reynolds explained the original proposal to expand PTAC and have it be an advisory committee to the MPO instead of to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Burnham agreed that a broader representation may be required. It could serve as the technical advisory committee and address pedestrian, bicycle and multi-modal transportation items as well as its transit duties.

Discussion also indicated that the expansion of the consensus area beyond Carson City had resulted in an increase in the City's certified population figures from 45,000 to 58,000 even though they had left out some areas of Carson City, e.g., Timberline, Lakeview, Pinion Hills, etc. Staff is recommending that the area be expanded to include all of Carson City except for Lake Tahoe, which has its own MPO. The census area is based on contiguous blocks containing populations of at least 500 people per square mile. The area can only be modified every ten years and only then with a great deal of difficulty. It may be the prelude to changing the southern county border. Public comments were solicited but none given. No formal action was taken or required.

F-4. STATUS REPORTS INCLUDING NORTH CARSON STREET AND COLLEGE PARK-WAY LEFT TURN; MILLS PARK AND HIGHWAY 50 PARKING EXPANSION; STEWART STREET EXTENSION FROM CARSON STREET TO CURRY STREET; AND CARSON CITY FREEWAY (1-3095) - College Parkway had been paved. Albertson's had opened on schedule. The signals are finished. As the same contractor had done the paving for Albertson's improvements, a continuous surface had resulted. The Mills Park parking expansion design is almost finished. The project should go to bid on July 18. The cost estimate had been revised on Friday. A meeting regarding the funding will be held with Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens in the near future. Forest Service Supervisor Robert Vaught had opposed the project. A copy of his letter was included in the packet. Both the local ranger and Mr. Flansberg felt that an agreement had been reached regarding the Stewart Street extension. It is a lower priority item. Staff will continue to work on it. Discussion indicated that the staff/Commission may need to pursue a political remedy due to the impact on Curry Street as well as the economic impacts of future development along the Carson Street corridor. The State's support for the extension was granted contingent upon receipt of approval from the Forest Service. Staff was not willing to accept Mr. Vaught's denial and will continue working through other channels as expeditiously as possible, specifically in view of the mitigation efforts already implemented to obtain the property. A media article on the freeway was cited. The FEMA conditional letter of map revision provided the conditions under which some of the freeway site designs/submit additional information for the letter of map revision will be done. It also allows staff to finalize the freeway design and move forward with it. NDOT may be making an offer to the Lompa's for their property later this month.

G. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (NON-ACTION)

INCLUDING FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (1-3352) - Mr. Flansberg explained the street improvements proposed on West Koontz Lane at Carson Street as part of NDOT's restriping/widening of Carson Street and the City's mill and overlay of Koontz. Chairperson Plank indicated that the Stewart/Roop item will be agenized for the next meeting. Mr. Flansberg suggested that the agenda include removal of parking on South Roop/Silver Sage between Fairview and Clearview. This suggestion is based on the recommendation that Roop/Silver Sage provide a bicycle lane which was removed from Carson Street by NDOT's restriping project. Discussion indicated that RTC can make a recommendation regarding this matter to the Board. Chairperson

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 12, 2002, Meeting

Page 11

Plank explained his aversion to curbside parking on major streets due to the dangers it poses and the obstruction of capacity created by the parking. The removal of curbside parking on East Fifth Street was cited as an example. Commissioner Staub asked that notification be provided. Mr. Burnham agreed that the region needed to be notified. Commissioner Staub commended staff on the improvements and use of Curry between Koontz and Clearview. People who use the route are approaching him and complimenting the City on cutting the road through. He asked that this project be watched and kept in good shape as there are a lot of people using this route daily. Mr. Brotzman indicated that the traffic volume is 2500 vehicles per day. Mr. Burnham indicated that this figure is growing daily. This is an area high on the list of projects for economic development. Commissioner Staub and Chairperson Plank indicated their personal use of the street. Mr. Flansberg indicated that two of the agenized items discussed earlier will be reagenized for the next meeting. Chairperson Planked thanked Mr. Dorr and his daughter Susan for their presentation and Mr. Anderson for his presence. No formal action was required or taken.

H. ADJOURNMENT (1-3551) - Commissioner Kennedy moved to adjourn. Commissioner Staub seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Chairperson Plank adjourned the meeting at 8:40 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 June 12, 2002, Carson City Regional Transportation Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON July 10, 2002.

/s/

Jon Plank, Chairperson