

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 17, 1998, Meeting

Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission was held on Monday, August 17, 1998, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 6 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Greg Smith and Commissioners Jon Plank and Marie Wolf

STAFF PRESENT: Deputy City Manager Dan St. John, Public Works Capital Projects Manager Tim Homann, RTC Senior Engineer Harvey Brotzman, RTC Senior Engineer Tech Gary Fried, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (R.T.C. 8/17/98 Tape 1-0001.5)

CALL TO ORDER, AND ROLL CALL - Chairperson Smith convened the meeting at 6 p.m. Roll call was taken. The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - June 17, 1998 (1-0015.5) - Commissioner Wolf moved to approve the Minutes. Commissioner Plank seconded the motion and indicated that he would abstain from voting as he had not been present. Motion carried 2-0-1 with Commissioner Plank abstaining.

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS (1-0025.5) - Larry Borges reminded the Commission of his previous request that the telephone pole be relocated/removed at the corner of Walker and Quinn. It obstructs a driver's line of sight. He suggested a flashing speed indicator be installed on Edmonds/Graves due to the number of speeding vehicles he has personally observed. He also requested that either the flashing red light when traveling south on Edmonds which indicates the school zone or the end of the north bound school zone be moved so that the boundaries are aligned. He then urged the Commission to restrict truck traffic on Graves Lane from 8 p.m. to 8 a.m. Funding for soundwalls on Graves Lane should be provided for the already constructed southern section. Justification for the requests were provided. Chairperson Smith explained his support for having the soundwalls on the southern section of Graves Lane although this may not occur until after construction begins on the northern section. The Board of Supervisors will consider the truck restriction at its Thursday meeting. He then asked Mr. Borges to submit the other comments to staff in writing and for staff to respond in writing. Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S REQUEST THAT PRIORITIZATION OF THE PROPOSED ROAD IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS (INCLUDING ORMSBY BOULEVARD) CURRENTLY UNDER STUDY BY THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE NOT BE UNDERTAKEN UNTIL THE CARSON CITY TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN IS COMPLETED AND ADOPTED BY THE RTC AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (1-0118.5) - Chairperson Smith explained the protocol under which the discussion would occur. The issue of whether Ormsby Boulevard should be constructed would not be considered. New information should be brought forward. Commissioner Plank then explained the request that had been made by the Transportation Advisory Committee and welcomed Committee Chairperson Page. He had also had a similar discussion with Parks and Recreation Chairperson Bob Kennedy, who was in attendance. He pointed out the work which the Committee had devoted to the master plan element and the need for it to finish its work before action occurs. He did not intend to delay the Committee's work. Public input through the Committee process should be allowed to continue.

Transportation Advisory Committee Chairperson Page explained the Committee's efforts to complete the element and the issues it would address. Once it is completed, the Commission could use it in its deliberations. He also pointed out that the NDOT drainage study should be completed at about the same time and could impact future roadway designs.

Mr. Brotzman then described a potential timeframe which included public meetings with the residents. Bidding

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 17, 1998, Meeting

Page 2

may be let in March. Construction may start 30 to 40 days later. It has a 60 to 90 construction period. Comments indicated Ormsby could be completed by Nevada Day 1999 or as early as July 4th.

Maxine Nietz felt that RTC had originally voted to hold the project until the transportation element had been completed. She urged the Commission to hold to that commitment. Various issues which should be addressed prior to construction were indicated and should be answered by the master plan element.

Mr. Kennedy indicated he was present as a citizen and was not representing the Parks and Recreation Commission. He urged the Commission to allow the Committee to complete its work before acting on any portion of it.

Chairperson Smith explained RTC's decision to develop a new master plan element, its original delay of the project, RTC's direction to the Committee and consultant on Ormsby Boulevard, and his reasons for feeling that the Committee's input had been considered in the decision to move forward with Ormsby Boulevard. The extension had been on the previous master plan element. Mr. Kennedy felt that there could have been a misunderstanding between the Committee and the Commission on the request and questioned whether adequate time had been provided for a complete analysis. He urged the Commission to reconsider its action and allow the Committee to complete its work. Chairperson Smith agreed that the Commission had not provided clear direction as to the agenda/checklist which the Committee should analyze.

Ms. Nietz explained her personal knowledge about master plans and emphasized that it is a living, vital document which changes as time marches forward. As such, it is incorrect to state that the master plan is incomplete unless all of the projects included within it are finished. Ormsby Boulevard should not be considered an unfinished item from the previous master plan. It should be considered as a part of the new master plan with a priority as determined within that document. Chairperson Smith agreed with the exception that in the Ormsby Boulevard case, the City already owns the right-of-way and had owned it for over 25 years. Commitments have been made and residences/property acquired/rejected based on that acquisition and those plans.

(1-0592.5) John Bullis referenced information which he had furnished the Commission at an earlier meeting regarding the priority table which the Committee and consultant had developed. The accepted priority standard indicated that Ormsby Boulevard was a low priority. Future traffic projects also supported this priority. The City's acceptable service standard clearly indicates that there are more streets at E and F levels which should be funded prior to the Ormsby Boulevard. Adequate funding is not available to do Graves and Curry Streets. He urged the Commission to use the Ormsby funds for those projects. When the element is adopted, it will have been approved by the Committee, Commission, Planning Commission, Parks and Recreation Commission and the Board of Supervisors. These approvals will support his request that the priorities as established within the element be adhered to. Chairperson Smith pointed out that the funding issue could be resolved. Commissioner Wolf reminded Mr. Bullis of her tour with him and former Public Works Director Jay Aldean and their discussion about the lack of additional accesses/egresses for the Kings Canyon area during emergencies. Mr. Bullis responded by indicating that at a June 1998 meeting that Mr. Bawden's representative had purportedly testified that the Fire Chief had advised him that the Ormsby Boulevard extension would not make a big difference in fire suppression or protection. Chairperson Smith felt that the comments had been whether it would increase/decrease response time to/from the area. He did not feel that it had included evacuation. He requested the discussion return to the agenda and whether the Commission had been premature in acting on Ormsby Boulevard. Mr. Bullis explained his personal experience in the area and with a fire on his property which indicated the Fire Department's response had been fantastic.

(1-0709.5) Additional public comments were solicited. Herbert Klemme urged the Commission to delay action on the extension until the plan is adopted. This will allow the City to maximize its funding priorities. The current usage as indicated by his personal traffic count would not justify the expenditure. Laura Werk urged the Commission to wait and use the funding for necessary projects. She and Commission Wolf had agreed to disagree on Ormsby Boulevard and its need. The street will only dump more people faster on Winnie or Washington as a complete access/egress route is not provided by the extension. Her contacts with several "safety experts" supported her position. Purportedly, Chief Deputy Sheriff Jerry Mather had advised her that the extension would not provide

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 17, 1998, Meeting

Page 3

additional life safety service. She thanked the Commission for allowing public input. Dr. Michael Fisher explained the conflict he faced related to the extension including safety concerns for children living along a busy street and property values. As a member of the Open Space Advisory Committee, he urged the Commission to allow the Committee to complete the element and to allow the Open Space Advisory Committee to analyze its impacts on open space. Chairperson Smith pointed out the side issue related to whether to connect Carriage Square/Chapparel to Ormsby. He, personally, did not feel that this should be necessary. He would support not connecting the two. Dr. Breedan may, however, have a problem with this closure as it will impact his response time to the Hospital. Midge Breedan supported the delay as indicated in her July letter. Other projects need the funds and have a higher priority than the extension. A quote from her letter was read to support her position. Dr. James Breedan felt that acting without all the information is a poor business decision and questioned the emergency driving the decision. Annabelle Simpson questioned the purpose of the extension and the benefit which would be provided. College Parkway had diverted the traffic to 395. Her personal experience with a Timberline area fire and a flood were explained to support her contention that the street would not assist in an emergency. She questioned the Commissioners about their access/egress routes during day-to-day activities, during the fire(s), and flood to support her position. Chairperson Smith reminded her of the agenda and asked her to return to that topic. Ms. Simpson urged the Commission to push for the Graves Lane extension. (1-1035.5) Ed Shore urged the Commission to delay the project as it would have little impact on anyone. Addition comments supporting the delay were solicited but none given.

Support for the project was then requested. Jim Bawden indicated he represented his neighborhood. The City could continue to study the project which would mean that more discussions would occur next year, the following year, etc. The former master plan had been completed except for this project. North and south connectors are the issue. They must be completed to make the transportation system work. Continued delay may eliminate the project altogether. The residents have been waiting 10, 15, and 20 years for its extension. They question the reasons for continuing to delay the project. It had been prioritized and it is time to build it. Finish the list!

Jim Robertson indicated the street had been on the master plan for 15 to 20 years. The link will complete Ormsby Boulevard from King Street to College Parkway. It will reduce the impact on Mountain Street. He quoted the Minutes from the June meeting to point out the need, as indicated by Commissioner Tatro, to use common sense and to support the extension.

(1-1121.5) Ron Kipp used a map to illustrate the need for a north-south roadway. The project would leave only a small section near Fifth Street remaining to be done to complete another north-south route. Adequate information had been provided when the decision was made to complete the project. The traffic studies and projections had been available. If the extension is not completed, its projected traffic volume will be forced on other north-south routes. The information will not change. He urged the Commission to proceed with the road and complete it.

Hank Thomas questioned the need to rediscuss the project. Construction should occur now. Dick Murray expressed his feeling that the west side had a mentality which forced all the roads to be located on the east side of 395. Examples to support this contention were provided. He questioned what had happened to common sense and logic in planning the north-south roadways. Twenty years had been long enough to study traffic movement on the west side of town. Jim Carraden urged the Commission to approve the project and move forward. His business on Division is impacted by the traffic use of Division Street as a north-south route. Division allows the traffic to avoid all of the 15 mph speed zones on Mountain. The question is not whether the extension is needed but rather how quickly is it needed. Funding will never be found if its not constructed now. Growth in the northwestern sector is demanding the extension. Joanna Buel stressed the need for another north-south route. Longview is dangerous now and the bike trail proposed for it will make it even more hazardous. Additional development in Kings Canyon by Ryder Homes will create even more traffic. Chairperson Smith read a letter into the record from Michael Griffin, who was writing as a resident of the community and not as a District Judge. It was addressed to Chairperson Smith as Chairman of the RTC. Mr. Griffin supported the extension due to the increased growth in his neighborhood and its resulting traffic volume. The bicycle trail will also create additional safety concerns. Ormsby Boulevard had been designed to go from King Street to Winnie Lane since the early 1950s. It was always on the City's master plan. The right-of-way is owned by the City. The need warranted construction at this time.

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 17, 1998, Meeting

Page 4

Committee Chairperson Page acknowledged the work the Committee had done on the master plan element. Work remains to be done to complete it. The Committee knows where it is going and what is required to complete the task. Time is not being wasted. Chairperson Smith agreed.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Lipparelli questioned whether the Commission's action, if approved, would require the Commission and Board of Supervisors to reconsider their decisions to move forward with Ormsby Boulevard, Graves Lane, and any other projects on the element's priority list or would the adoption of the master plan element give the staff the green light for all of the projects. Chairperson Smith felt that the latter was his understanding of the process. Commissioner Plank agreed and explained that his intent in agendizing the issue had been to consider the Committee's request to delay any projects until after the master plan element has been finalized. He could support a deadline for the Committee to complete its work, which may be as soon as in six weeks. The project will not continue to be studied. There will be a deadline and a completion. Volunteers who serve on committees should expect to be respected and given time to complete whatever project they are assigned before the oversight Commission acts. Reasons for this concern were cited as being the lack of response to the recruitment process for the Storm Drain Committee. He reiterated Chairperson Smith's comments relating to the need to include other issues in evaluating the priority beyond the engineering warrants/points. These issues include social and political elements. The suggested motion would not stop the process but would only delay direction until the plan is completed and all of the community needs are analyzed. He was not for or against Ormsby Boulevard. It is an infill project but similar streets could be found throughout the community, i.e., Ponderosa, Saliman, etc. These projects should not be forced to adhere to a policy of continuances. Another issue is the cost to finish the job now versus in the future.

(1-1430.5) Commissioner Plank moved that prioritization of the proposed road improvement projects, including Ormsby Boulevard, currently under study by the Transportation Advisory Committee not be undertaken until the Carson City Transportation Master Plan is completed and adopted by the RTC and the Board of Supervisors. Following comments concerning the desire to include a date in the motion, Commissioner Plank continued his motion to include: which should be completed by the end of September 1998. Mr. Brotzman expressed his concern that the plan may not be to the Board by that date and suggested either the Board of Supervisor's meeting date of the third Thursday in October or the first Thursday in November or the elimination of any timeframe. Commissioner Plank amended his motion to have the plan completed by the first Thursday in November. Mr. Homann indicated that this would be the outer limits of the timeframe. Commissioner Plank amended his motion to include: "or sooner". Chairperson Smith seconded the motion so that comments could be taken. He then explained that the consultant's point system is only one of several components which should be used in establishing the priorities. Mr. Bullis' points emphasize this argument very clearly. The numbers suggest "X". It is very clear in the consultant's mind. This goes back to his point that the Commission is not flying blind. It had operated with the information and that this component of the overall Master Plan had been discussed thoroughly by the Transportation Advisory Committee and was brought forward to the Commission in June. He would have agreed wholeheartedly had the Commission been operating without this information based on the motions which he supported in 1995 and 1997. This, however, is not the case. Again, if you simply follow that point system, none of us need to be here this evening. The City Manager could have hired a consultant who would have come back with his numbers and that is where the money would have gone. He did not believe that anyone wanted it done in this fashion. As polarized as the group appeared to be---, and, ---although he hated to send neighbors out of the room having a difference of opinion on something like this, but---, again, this is why we all get together and discuss these things. This is why he had let the meeting go on this long. He could have corralled the discussion much more. Again, he wanted to be sure that if anyone walked out of the room either happy or unhappy with the decision it would not have been due to the lack of an opportunity to make the Commission understand his/her feeling. The other thing which had been talked about relating to this type of a decision is the good of the community and one of the things which he had a concern about, which is a point which has not yet been reached so his comments may help the other argument out, is that the Traffic Advisory Committee possibly put a little bit too much effort into alleviating traffic on Carson Street and used that as the center focus, that being the big problem--the major problem in town. He felt that everyone would agree that the major alleviation of that problem will be the Bypass and not any of the other roads. He did not think that it was fair to look at everything in terms of that context. This was on the books for a number of years. There has been plenty of information on why it should go through. There has

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 17, 1998, Meeting

Page 5

been plenty of testimony from folks who live over there who are intimately involved in the traffic who have reasons why it should not go through. His biggest concern, which Mr. Brotzman and Mr. Homann are going to get mad about and he will hear from them tomorrow, believe him, he had dealt with those folks for six years on RTC, if we approve or do not approve this project and the Master Plan is coming back in six to eight weeks, they will not be that far ahead on this project. Staff will be organizing design meetings with homeowners who will come in and help give input on how it will be designed, so on and so forth. If there is a fatal flaw at that point, as you have heard this evening, the first shovel is not going to go into the ground until next summer, if there is a fatal flaw, it will be dealt with. He could appreciate the fact that some people will say "Yeah, but if you do that you are spending money on design, and so on and so forth". The project, as he understood it, is already 30 percent design complete. So, again, he did not see a whole lot of difference whether you vote for the motion or against it because he felt the time is still built in there. If there is a fatal flaw when the Master Plan is considered, and he sure hoped that the audience would be back down here in front of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors making their case again as it is their right to do so, this is where that argument should be dealt with. Again. You could say you don't believe that those folks made the right decision. At this point, he felt that the Commission was making the right decision. They had operated with all the information that was given to the Commission. There had been plenty of information. For those individuals who are just now coming on and questioning what the hurry is, Dr. Breedan had made an excellent point regarding, you know, if you have the opportunity to gather information and such, you have a duty to do so. He felt that the Commission had done that and had waited until that component of the Master Plan to come out of the Committee before the Commission had moved. If the Commission had done it before that point, he could have agreed 100 percent with the argument that it had been done prematurely. With that, he indicated that he would call for a roll call vote and we will see where we are. The motion that prioritization of the proposed road improvement projects, including Ormsby Boulevard, currently under study by the Transportation Advisory Committee not be undertaken until the Carson City Transportation Master Plan is completed and adopted by the RTC and the Board of Supervisors, which is to be considered by the Board of Supervisors not later than the first Thursday in November, if not sooner, was then voted by roll call with the following result: Wolf - No; Plank - Yes; and Chairperson Smith - No. Motion failed on a 1-2 vote. Chairperson Smith indicated that the motion was considered dead. He then reminded the audience that when the Master Plan is considered, the audience would have another opportunity, not just with the Commission as you know where that will go, but with the Planning Commission and with the Board of Supervisors and he invited them all to attend those meetings.

BREAK: A 15 minute recess was declared at 7:35 p.m. The entire Commission was present when the meeting was reconvened at 7:50 p.m., constituting a quorum.

4. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS TO THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO REDUCE IT FROM 14 TO 11 (1-1555.5) -

Discussion indicated that there were 11 active members. Chairperson Smith explained his request that the Board of Supervisors revise the NRS by expanding the RTC to have two Board members and three public-at-large members. Commissioner Wolf moved to reduce the number from 14 to 11 on the Transportation Advisory Committee. Commissioner Plank seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

5. STATUS REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS (1-1625.5) - Mr. Brotzman gave an oral status report on the signal at Fifth and Edmonds; Graves Lane, its connector road to Arrowhead, and potential access/egress improvements for the Comstock Mobile Home Park; and the warning lights for Fritsch Elementary School. Chairperson Smith commended the Street Department for painting the crosswalk and installing signage near the different schools.

6. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS (1-1669.5) - Commissioner Plank thanked the staff for the crosswalk on Beverly near the Senior Center. Commissioner Wolf questioned the designations on King Street--the bicycle path and the parking area--and how to make left/right turns. This movement required crossing both lanes. She suggested that the Transportation Committee review this area. Mr. Brotzman explained that NDOT had designated King Street as a bicycle trail in 1994. There will be another bicycle element in the Transportation Master Plan

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 17, 1998, Meeting

Page 6

Element which will identify other bicycle routes and connect them with the Eagle Valley Trail System. The difference between bicycle lanes and bicycle routes was described. Commissioner Wolf stated for the record that this would instill some real dangerous situations because, as you may know, bicyclists do not like to move over and they like to pedal along two or three abreast. She could foresee nothing but problems with those lanes that are supposed to be really wonderful. We will have some real problems.

Discussion explained the new NDOT crossing designations. The wider, partial strip is considered a stop bar for traffic. The next two strips are considered the crosswalk area and should be from curb to curb. Drivers have not been educated on these designations. Supervisor Plank felt that the marks at Mountain and Long are at an area which the driver's line of sight is obstructed. It may be possible to see a pedestrian but cross traffic cannot be seen. Mr. Homann explained the manual regarding the stop bars and crosswalks. A driver should stop at the cross bar, check for pedestrians and proceed cautiously into the intersection while checking for traffic. Carson City has not used this method but should begin to be more consistent with the manual as it had been adopted. The State adheres to it religiously.

Chairperson Smith expressed his concern about the message which was being sent to the Transportation Advisory Committee members. His experience with other volunteer committees on which he had served was noted. One hundred percent of their recommendations have not been implemented/accepted by the oversight commission. He hoped that the Commission's action would not discourage the members or cause them to feel that the Commission does not appreciate their work. He felt certain that the majority if not all of the other recommendations would be accepted. Concern with the lack of acceptance on the first item out the chute was reiterated. He expressed a willingness to meet with the Committee at its next meeting to attempt to provide damage control and to be sure that this is not the message which was being sent to the Committee. The Committee's purpose is to assist with the development of a master plan element and, as part of the process, all of the recommendations are not accepted/approved. He reiterated that anyone with concerns about Ormsby Boulevard still had an opportunity at the Board of Supervisors level as the Commission only establishes the priorities and the Board controls the purse strings. He hoped that the public felt it had had the opportunity to voice his/her feelings both pro and con on the subject today. He expressed an intent to remain fair and objective when such presentations arise at the Board level.

8. STAFF COMMENTS TO INCLUDE THE NEXT MEETING DATE (1-1853.5) - The next meeting will be on September 16th at 6 p.m. at the Capital Conference Room. Meetings starting with October have been scheduled for the Sierra Room on the third Wednesdays of the month commencing at 6 p.m. Efforts will be made to have those meetings televised. Mr. Homann described the notification process staff had undertaken on the first agenda item. Chairperson Smith commended the media for its assistance in broadcasting the agenda.

9. ADJOURNMENT (1-1905.5) - Commissioner Plank moved to adjourn. Commissioner Wolf seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

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 August 17, 1998, Carson City Regional Transportation Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON February 17, 1999.

/s/

Jon Plank, Chairperson