A special joint meeting of the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) was held with and during the regularly scheduled Regional Planning Commission (PC) meeting on Wednesday, December 2, 1998, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 7:30 p.m.

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

RPC MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Verne Horton, Vice Chairperson Deborah Uhart, and Commissioners Allan Christianson, William Mally, Alan Rogers, Roger Sedway, and Richard Wipfli

STAFF PRESENT: Deputy City Manager Dan St. John, Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens, Public Works Capital Projects Manager Tim Homann, Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Senior Planner Juan Guzman, RTC Engineer Harvey Brotzman, Senior Engineer John Givlin, Deputy District Attorney Melanie Bruketta, Parks Planner Vern Krahn, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (R.P.C. 12/2/99 Tape 2-0735)

A. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM (2-0730) - The RTC was convened at 7:45 p.m. Roll call was taken. The entire RTC was present, constituting a quorum. Roll call for the PC was taken earlier in the meeting. The entire PC was present, constituting a quorum.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

1. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ADOPTION BY RESOLUTION OF THE CARSON CITY TRANSPORTATION PLAN, SPECIFICALLY INCLUDING THE TRANSPORTATION MODELING SYSTEM, STREETS AND HIGHWAYS ELEMENT, PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT, BICYCLE ELEMENT, PEDESTRIAN ELEMENT, AVIATION ELEMENT, AND A FINANCIAL ELEMENT AS AN ELEMENT TO CARSON CITY'S MASTER PLAN (2-0735) - Mr. Homann highlighted the changes which had been made in the master plan elements since the last meeting. Discussion among the Commissions and staff indicated the estimated project costs had been used within the budget element. The projects had not been listed in priority order. Signal upgrades had not been considered. The element does include new signal locations. The City's commitment toward having full freeway interchanges at Arrowhead and College Parkway was maintained by the plan. Clarification indicated the Ormsby Boulevard extension is estimated to cost $987,000.

Public comments were then requested. (2-1065) Sue Newberry voiced her opposition to the three minute time limit. She then explained that she had submitted written questions after the October 14th meeting but had not received a response. She also indicated that she had not been given a copy of the documents which the Commissions had received indicating the changes which had been made between the meetings. She questioned the reasons Goal A did not include other modes of transportation and suggested language which would provide a broad spectrum of transportation methods. She also questioned the proposal to widen Highway 50 to six lanes and the impact it would have on the bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The Edmonds and Fifth Street roundabout proposal was noted. She requested justification for the plan to widen this intersection. She complimented the Parks and Recreation Commission on its response to her suggestion that terms for bicycling be consistent with other national standards. Clarification indicated that her written remarks had purportedly been given to the RTC, Mr. Homann, and the secretary. The terminology regarding the paths had not yet been finalized. Federal requirements will be included in the decision. Staff did not feel that there had been adequate time to analyze and respond to Ms. Newberry's questions/comments. The plan is a dynamic one which will be revised as time goes forward and can be revised to include/respond to her comments as well as others. The bicycle paths are to be multi-use paths and would not be restricted to bicycles. Commissioner Rogers urged staff to include within the plan the ability to use the bicycle paths for alternate modes of transportation. Mr. Kastens did not feel that the community would support an ordinance restricting the bicycle path usage. Clarification indicated that Federal grants could be jeopardized if the correct terminology is not used. Control over street development is maintained by the "green Line" designating the bicycle paths. RTC Chairperson Smith espoused his desire to continue action on the plan until such time as staff is able to respond to Ms. Newberry's questions. He also questioned the justification for widening Edmonds and extending Curry, specifically, in view of the costs. Mr. Homann briefly characterized Ms. Newberry's questions. He felt that his responses should be finalized within two weeks. Chairperson Horton and Commissioner Rogers supported continuing the matter.

(2-1485) Laura Work urged the Commission to re-evaluate the need to extend Orsmby Boulevard due to the lack of funding available for higher priority items. Transportation Advisory Committee Chairperson Frank Page reminded the Commissions that the plan is only the beginning and will change as time goes forward. The Committee had struggled to meet the established timeframes and to stay within the criteria established for it. Once the community is designated an MPO, drastic changes in criteria will be created. Both Chairpersons iterated that the request to continue the matter is not due to any lack of Committee's and other public participants' efforts or dedication on the plan. Chairperson Smith described an example of poor road planning to illustrate his reasons for wishing to continue the matter until the questions have been answered. Commissioner Rogers also pointed out that by responding to the questions now, more support for the plan may be provided when construction commences. Commissioner Plank described the dynamics of the document which will allow for future changes.

Commission discussion supported the continuance. Commissioner Rogers requested copies of all correspondence before the next meeting. Commissioner Uhart requested another workshop meeting to allow for additional public input. Chairperson Smith explained the PC and RTC rolls in the master plan element. The PC should not become embroiled in the establishment of priorities and funding. The RTC's involvement with the engineering formula and the politics of project priorities was described. Mr. Homann described the process used to develop the plan including the priorities and staff's roll. He had apologized to Ms. Newberry about his inability to respond. An answer will be provided as soon as possible. The Commissions will make the decision as to whether the answer(s) will modify the plan. RTC had been given all of the correspondence. He apologized for missing the PC. The correspondence was briefly described. Chairperson Horton felt that staff needed the time to respond to all of the public input and supported having one additional meeting. He opposed reopening the entire process at step one. Chairperson Smith supported an additional meeting and reiterated his reasons for support Ms. Newberry's request. Commissioner Christianson felt that the additional meeting should occur prior to Chairperson Smith's term expiring. Chairperson Page pointed out the size of the community and its growth to support the need for additional staff. Commissioner Uhart then explained her reasons for abstaining on the Ormsby Boulevard issue and feeling that the right-of-way should be used for a multi-purpose trail. No money should be spend on the extension. Discussion ensued amoung the PC members concerning the next meeting and its agenda. It was decided that the plan would be agendized for formal action. Mr. Homann expressed the hope that the meeting would be before the end of the year. No formal action was taken.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ADJOURNMENT (2-2130) - There being no other matters for consideration by the Planning Commission, Commissioner Wipfli moved to adjourn. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0. Chairperson Horton adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:57 p.m.

2. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO PRIORITIZE AND PROVIDE FOR THE FUNDING OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE EXTENSION OF LITTLE LANE BETWEEN ROOP STREET AND SALIMAN ROAD (2-2149) - Mr. Homann reviewed his staff report. The project had been included in the Master Plan Element as one which would be funded entirely by the developer. The request was for the Commission to prioritize the project and provide "upfront financing" of the project which will be repaid when the development to the east of the proposed post office site is developed. The proposed funding would not impact future projects as the funds will be reimbursed. The project estimate is $124,000 of which $112,000 relates to street work and $12,000 relates to water utility work. If the proposal is approved, a development agreement will be entered into with Mr. Bernard, who represents the property owner Ira Anderson and the post office. The proposal anticipated "a full widening of Little Lane in the presently uncompleted section". The project could, however, scale back this width to match the half-street improvements to the east of the property. This half-street improvement is a 26 foot street without curb and gutter infrastructure on the north side. If this is implemented, the actual cost may be even less than the estimated $112,000. At the present time warrants do not justify a traffic signal at Roop and Little Lane. The traffic study indicates that when the post office is completed, two minor traffic signals will be warranted. Therefore, staff does not oppose installation of the signal, however, staff can not indicate that the location has a higher priority than other intersections identified in the Master Plan. This issue may be one addressed by the developer and the post office in their negotiations. Staff's experience indicates that the intersection will not experience service level D with the post office facility in place. Staff, therefore, cannot require the signal. Discussion explained that there will be a left turn lane in Roop Street, the criteria used to determine signal warrants, the need for a left turn stacking lane between Fifth and Little Lane, the traffic study conducted on the current post office location, the perceived benefits of the Little Lane site, and whether opening Little Lane will put more traffic on Saliman.

(2-2571) Mike Lewark, Capital Budgeting Manager for the Post Office, explained the criteria used to select the site and its $7.5 million budget. The proposed extension of Little Lane will provide a third access/egress. Reasons for requesting the signal were described. Acquisition of the site is contingent upon the Commission's willingness to put a signal at Little Lane and Roop. The post office is willing to negotiate and provide some funding for it. Construction should commence in 2000 with a 360 day completion date. Discussion indicated that the current site will be used for other Federal offices and noted that both the proposed site and the current site are not on the tax rolls. The site contains six acres. Mr. Lewark agreed to include in the negotiations the signal due to safety concerns.

Public comments were solicited. Al Bernhard encouraged the Commission to welcome the post office. He acknowledged that he would be rewarded for selling the parcel and pointed out the safety benefits of the proposed site. The site will be accessible to the downtown area even though it is not in the heart of the downtown area. He encouraged the Commission to approve the request in the interest of public safety.

Albert Le Balch felt that Mr. Bernhard should use a loan from a bank rather than taxpayers' funds. Chairperson Smith agreed that Mr. Bernhard would make money from the project. The post office will have a better location. A lot of residents will use the road who are not going to the post office. There will be other benefits to the proposal. When the property to the east of the site is developed, the funds will be returned to the City. Mr. Homann indicated that this is a policy decision which RTC and the Board of Supervisors should make. The Master Plan suggests the developers should pay the Little Lane improvement costs. The City Code mandates the developer provide half-street improvements. The proposal will construct a full street with reimbursement when the remaining vacant properties are developed. Staff had submitted the developer's request to determine whether the proposed policy should be implemented. Clarification indicated that Mr. Bernhard would dedicate the right-of-way for the Little Lane street improvements. The improvements are on the priority list, albeit, a low priority. If the proposal is denied, the project may not occur. This may at a future date force the City to pay for the entire cost of the project including the right-of-way acquisition costs. Benefits of the proposed project were reiterated including the additional emergency access/egress route to Saliman. Commissioner Plank also pointed out that any funds obtained for the signal could be considered as an offset to the loss of ad valorem monies created by the Federal government's acquisition of the site.

(2-3019) Frank Page supported sharing the cost of the improvements due to the fact that Little Lane would have remained unimproved if the post office had not decided to relocate to that site. He suggested that the developer, the post office, and the City each pay one-third of the costs. He was certain that there should be adequate funding within the $7.5 million budget to assist with the project.

Discussion ensued on the estimated costs of the improvements and the need for a deadline for the reimbursement period. Mr. Bernhard pointed out that the City will be reimbursed all of the costs eventually and that he will dedicate the right-of-way. Commission comments supported including a deadline within the contract.

Mr. Page suggested that if the signal is not warranted that the conduit be installed under the road.

(2-3115) Keith Work felt that the City would receive the deed to the right-of-way regardless of the proposal to provide funding for the project. Mr. Homann explained that the signal may cost $150,000. If the Board of Supervisors and/or the Commission decide to include an interest rate for the funds, direction should include the rate. Mr. Lewark indicated that the post office would not maintain a presence at the current facility once the Little

Lane facility is completed. Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

Mr. Homann then explained the 98/99 budget including the Graves Lane project, the College Parkway soundwalls, the Murphy Drive improvements, the Edmonds-Fifth Street signal, Arrowhead and Graves connector roadway, Roop Street widening from Little Lane to Evelyn, the Challenger Way-College Parkway connector, and his proposed funding realignment. Chairperson Smith supported the realignment as the projects are done over multiple fiscal years. Clarification indicated that the College Parkway soundwalls are not part of the Graves Lane project. Additional right-of-way is still needed for the College Parkway soundwall which has delayed final design. Comments also pointed out that the adjacent Little Lane properties may suddenly become of interest to other developers who will reimburse the City funds or eliminate the need for City funding. Mr. Homann was certain that the $112,000 estimate is the maximum which will be required. The figures will be adjusted to match the final costs.

Commissioner Plank moved that the Regional Transportation Commission designate the extension of Little Lane between Roop Street and Saliman Road as a funded RTC priority project to facilitate public safety for a U.S. Post Office facility and recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve a development agreement allowing for the RTC budget to provide up front interim funding for the Little Lane Construction with reimbursement from the property owner upon future disposition of the property but containing a sunset date which is acceptable to the City on the reimbursement of the funds. Commissioner Wolf seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

Mr. Homann explained that the foregoing direction indicated to staff that the development agreement negotiations should also include what should be done about the signal. He agreed that it is a separate issue between Mr. Bernard and the Post Office. If the entire signal cannot be funded by the Post Office/Mr. Bernard, the project will be brought back to RTC for funding consideration.

D. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-3462) - None.

E. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS - None.

F. STAFF COMMENTS TO INCLUDE THE NEXT MEETING DATE - Mr. Brotzman indicated the next regular meeting had been scheduled for the 16th.

G. ADJOURNMENT - Commissioner Wolf moved to adjourn. Commissioner Plank seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0. Chairperson Smith adjourned the meeting at 3 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 Special December 2, 1999, Joint Carson City Regional Transportation Commission and Carson City Regional Planning Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON____September_8__, 1999.

_/s/____
Jon Plank, Chairperson