

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the September 19, 1995, Meeting

Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission was held on Tuesday, September 19, 1995, at the Carson City Administrative Complex Conference Room, 2621 Northgate Lane, Suite 59, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 9 a.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Greg Smith and Commissioners Kay Bennett and Marie Wolf

STAFF PRESENT: Deputy Public Works Director Tim Homann, RTC Engineer Harvey Brotzman, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (R.T.C. 9/19/95 Tape 1-0001.5)

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL - Chairperson Smith convened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. Roll call was taken. The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None.

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NONAGENDIZED ITEMS (1-0023.5) - None.

3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON NOISE ABATEMENT ALTERNATIVES ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF COLLEGE PARKWAY BETWEEN IMPERIAL WAY AND NORTHGATE LANE (1-0025.5) - Mr. Homann explained the noise assessment report which indicated the level of traffic noises is less than that generated by residential activities. At this time he could not support installing a block wall or taking other mitigating measures as the industry standard had not been met. He apologized to Louise Roberts for his failure to contact her about the meeting until this morning. Ms. Roberts had been given a copy of the report. Mr. Brotzman explained the test sites, the testing program, and the consultant's experience in this field. Chairperson Smith explained his change in driving patterns since College Parkway had opened and feeling that there had been an increase in traffic volume on it. Mr. Brotzman indicated another count would be performed next week. Chairperson Smith supported staff's alternative number two which would recognize the need to establish a noise mitigation policy. This policy would establish a priority procedure and be approved by the Board of Supervisors. He felt that the consultant could help establish the parameters. Commissioner Bennett noted the standards for noise levels established throughout the report and expressed the feeling that the street would soon meet the criteria for a wall. She supported taking a policy to the Board but urged consideration of its priority. Chairperson Smith suggested that the wall construction and the policy be pursued concurrently. Potential funding sources and validity of the cost estimate were noted. Commissioner Bennett encouraged staff to include landscaping and trees in the project. Ms. Roberts encouraged the Commission to install the wall by explaining the noise problem. Commissioner Bennett moved that the Regional Transportation Commission direct staff to prepare an ordinance to be brought the Board of Supervisors that will address the standards for noise mitigation. Chairperson Smith seconded the motion. Comments were solicited but none made. The motion was voted and carried 3-0.

Commission comments directed that the ordinance be considered by the Commission prior to the Board's review. Mr. Homann felt that it should be ready for the Commission's consideration at the next meeting. Mr. Brotzman was not sure if the consultant could make a presentation to the Board but he would contact the firm.

Commissioner Bennett then moved that the Regional Transportation Commission declare that there is indeed a noise problem that exceeds acceptable standards on College Parkway between Imperial Way and Northgate and that the Regional Transportation Commission prioritize the mitigation of that noise through the construction of a noise reduction wall using funds from an incomplete project in a not to exceed amount of \$125,000. Chairperson Smith seconded the motion. Mr. Brotzman cautioned the Commission against proceeding with mitigation measures prior to adoption of an ordinance establishing the parameters for mitigation. The action may establish a precedence for a lower mitigation measure than the ordinance. Chairperson Smith explained his support for the motion due to the fact that both the mitigation ordinance and the wall would be developed at the same time. Commissioner Bennett explained her feeling that the report would justify the necessary findings as the industry standard is 67 dB. The street noise is close to this standard now and may be over it by the time design and

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the September 19, 1995, Meeting

Page 2

construction occur. Mr. Brotzman reiterated the statements reflecting the traffic level is only at 63 dB and that the residential noises were higher. He felt that it would take several years to reach the 67 dB level. He agreed that the cost would be significantly more to construct the wall at that time. Chairperson Smith felt that flexibility in the policy may provide for meeting this increase in the plan. Mr. Brotzman indicated the wall would only lower the impact by five decibels. The motion to prioritize the mitigation of the noise on College Parkway between Imperial and Northgate and authorize construction of a noise reduction wall using funding from an incomplete project to a not to exceed amount of \$125,000 was voted and carried 3-0.

4. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING OF COLLEGE PARKWAY IMPROVEMENTS BY SILVER OAK DEVELOPMENT COMPANY (1-0359.5) -

Mr. Brotzman reviewed the College Parkway's history including its alignment and the flooding problems which had occurred at the intersection. He felt that the direction given to Mr. Hartman had been to construct only 900 feet of the roadway at its final design including curb, gutter, and sidewalks. The remainder would be a two lane roadway. Items 13 through 39 deal with utilities and reimbursement should be requested from the Utility Department. Items 45 through 62 are related to Sierra Pacific and reimbursement should be requested from it. As the City had already paid a consultant to design the original alignment, staff could not recommend reimbursement for the redesign created by the developer's realignment. These costs are related to Items 63 through 65. Clarification indicated RTC had funded \$188,000 for the roadway and outlined the original plan. Silver Oak Development Representatives Steve Hartman and Garth Richards explained their reasons for feeling that the Board had directed them to construct College Parkway as a completed project based on the current traffic demand. They stressed that the street is not needed by the project at this time and will not be needed for some time to come. Comments also pointed out the different construction standards mandated for Silver Oak's project than for City projects. The utilities had been included to eliminate destruction of the street when the demand for services is made. Mr. Hartman also explained his feeling that the City's cost estimate was based on the original estimates and not on present day costs. Mr. Homann explained staff's willingness to phase projects which he felt had been the direction given by the Board and staff. Messrs. Richards and Hartman's comments stressed that this was part of their contention that there is a dual standard for City and private developments. Improvements mandated by the flooding problem were cited to support this contention. These improvements had been the result of litigation filed by the Harootunians which Silver Oak had helped mitigate by its acquisition of the property. Chairperson Smith stressed the benefits created by extending Graves Lane rather than development of Nye Lane as was originally contained in the Streets and Highways Master Plan Element. Mr. Brotzman responded by explaining the Commission's policy to not develop roads for the benefit of developers. (1-0762.5) Commissioner Bennett also pointed out that a more prudent public policy would be to build for future needs. Discussion ensued on the Code requirements for development and the City's original concept which would have phased construction of the roadway as the surrounding area is developed. Mr. Hartman felt that the difference between his development and Northridge's deals with internal and external demand for roadways and that the storm drain requirements would have forced construction of the entire roadway. This would not have allowed phasing. The dual standard would have allowed the City to use "V" ditches and open drainage but not a developer. Mr. Brotzman explained the traffic volume and base requirements for the roadway originally proposed by the City. Commissioner Bennett questioned whether the Code needed to be modified to provide for regional facilities which College Parkway is rather than continued development through phasing. Chairperson Smith supported her suggestion by explained the impact and need to extend Ormsby Boulevard including curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and sidewalks. Julio Sandoval joined Mr. Hartman in explaining each of the items and reasons for feeling that RTC should participate in their costs. This discussion included differences between the staff's original estimate, the cost-of-living impact on the figures, lack of responsibility for utility improvements, methods to avoid a similar situation in the future, change in the original plan and the final product, the establishment of a precedence if additional funding is granted, and the Harootonian litigation. Chairperson Smith expressed his feeling that the additional 546 feet should be a subject for discussion/negotiation between Silver Oaks and staff based on the public benefit, the City's failure to include inflation in its estimate, and the storm drains. Mr. Brotzman explained the street width requirements for sewerline maintenance. Mr. Hartman explained his intent to meet with Deputy Utilities Director Ahrens on the utilities. Commissioner Bennett reiterated her concerns about establishing a dangerous precedence. She supported Chairperson Smith's suggestion that staff negotiate/discuss the 546 feet and the storm drain. She requested staff establish a list of these items and return for direction. Mr. Hartman then explained the storm drain, water and sewer line realignment projects he had undertaken to support his contention that the street alignment had created additional costs for the project and that RTC should be responsible for some of these costs. Mr. Brotzman

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the September 19, 1995, Meeting

Page 3

reminded the Commission of the number RTC funding requests being placed upon RTC. Economics and priorities dictate the need to phase projects. Mr. Hartman felt that the difference between his project and others was created by his willingness to participate and develop a project wholly and completely at the beginning and the amount of public benefit it would create. The pros and cons and precedence concerns were debated at length. Messrs. Hartman, Sandoval, and Richards continued to express their feeling that the Board of Supervisors had demanded complete construction of the project and disallowed phasing. Mr. Homann expressed a willingness to accept this contention and negotiate on the curb, gutter, and storm drain requirements. Utilities would be addressed by Ms. Timian-Palmer. The fire hydrants should be funded by the General Fund or Water Department. Electricity is between Mr. Hartman and Sierra Pacific. Utility company improvements are addressed at the time a plan is approved. Mr. Richards expressed a willingness to dedicate a right-of-way for Ormsby Boulevard south from Graves to Unit 1 if the City will require the utility companies to relocate their service lines.

(1-1487.5) Joe Trinastic expressed his feeling that a project of this magnitude should have had an adequate contingency to handle the \$188,000. He also felt that it was "very meritorious of the developer to clarify the situation for the next developer".

Discussion ensued between the Commission and staff on the notification process to the Utilities Department and the procedure used to coordinate activities. Mr. Hartman explained that the misunderstanding arose when it was determined that the City's participation was not to a maximum of \$400,000. He felt that this was the City's original commitment and that it should have been adequate. It was only a month ago when the figure became \$188,000 that the need for direction/clarification by the Commission/Board arose. The road had an estimated cost of \$8 to \$900,000. Staff indicated that the funding had always been at \$188,000 for the first 900 feet plus the signal. Commissioner Bennett felt that the funding should have been discussed in more depth originally. Discussion noted utility improvements normally are not developed on vacant parcels. Commission direction indicated these issues should be discussed with Ms. Timian-Palmer and the private utility companies. Mr. Homann supported updating the cost figures. Commission comments supported extending the length of the project and development to full standards. Commission comments indicated the Board of Supervisors would also review the ultimate funding. The different soil designs and asphalt requirements were explained. Chairperson Smith directed staff to include in the figures the cost difference between the original 2-1/2 inches of asphalt and the five constructed as well as the difference between 20 and 26 foot widths. Mr. Hartman also felt that the median curb had been required by the Board and should be included. He also felt that the median requirement should be included on Ormsby Boulevard and Lompa. Commissioner Bennett felt that the median issue should include beautification and landscaping also.

(1-1727.5) Mr. Trinastic expressed his feeling that any action taken by the Commission could be negated by the Board of Supervisors. Chairperson Smith explained that RTC funds are allocated by the Commission and not the Board. The Board only authorizes the expenditure of funds so allocated. Based on his clarification, Mr. Trinastic withdrew his comments.

Mr. Hartman indicated there were still several items he would negotiate with staff regarding "distances". Clarification by Mr. Hartman indicated the cost sharing would be on a 50/50 basis. Commissioner Bennett moved that the Regional Transportation Commission direct staff to prepare a final cost accounting based upon the list that was prepared during this meeting which the Regional Transportation Commission feels should be supported and for staff to return to the Commission by the next meeting with a recommendation to go to the Board of Supervisors on a cost sharing participation. Commissioner Wolf seconded the motion. Chairperson Smith noted that Mr. Hartman would be working with Mr. Brotzman on the list that the Commission supported which should be handled in a professional manner without personal feelings. The motion as indicated was voted and carried 3-0.

(1-1835.5) Mr. Richards expressed his feeling that the traffic counts had indicated that 2-1/2 inches of asphalt could have been constructed and an overlay done at a future date. This was the first time he had been told about this standard. Mr. Brotzman indicated that the 2-1/2 inches would have been acceptable for a traffic count of four to five thousand.

Commissioner Wolf stated for the record her belief that the City had been fortunate to have had this firm involved with the project. The City would never see a project with this type of quality again. They had landscaped the project beautifully. The street contours and aesthetics were beautiful. She felt that the Commission is always

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes of the September 19, 1995, Meeting

Page 4

concerned about the developers and failed to think about the benefits provided by the developers for Carson City. She felt that some of the codes should be rewritten. She felt that the Engineering Department had been remiss in failing to maintain written records of all discussions in a file. She urged staff to correct this deficiency. Mr. Hartman indicated he had been working with Mr. Brotzman since the inception of College Parkway. He felt that Mr. Brotzman had been "great to work with" and had helped with a "lot of stuff" like Granite. He appreciated all the efforts made by Mr. Brotzman, Mr. Homann, and his staff. He felt that the misunderstanding had been created by the fact that he believed the figure was \$400,000 and that the problem with Granite would not have arisen if the asphalt had only needed to have been 2-1/2 inches. Commissioner Wolf continued to stress her feeling that written documentation of all conversations would have addressed this issue. Mr. Richards also felt that serious discussions would have occurred before now if the construction cost of \$188,000 had been known. This point was discussed at length.

BREAK: A six minute recess was declared at 11 a.m. When the meeting reconvened at 11:06 a.m. a quorum was present although Commissioner Bennett did not return until 11:08 a.m.

8. PRESENTATION BY JOE TRINASTIC ON ALTERNATE ROUTING OF CARSON CITY STREETS (1-1925.5) - Mr. Trinastic briefly outlined his feeling of rejection created by the Board of Supervisors failure to find a committee/commission where his talents could be used. (A copy of his written statement is included in the file.) He felt that the State should provide assistance and funding to resolve the traffic congestion downtown. He invited the Legislature and City government officials to join him at his residence for coffee and to discuss his proposals. He felt that the State should provide a remote parking area at College Parkway with a free shuttle bus to the State Complex. This would relieve some of the traffic congestion encountered in the downtown area. Employees could be "forced" to utilize the bus or pay for the convenience of parking in the downtown area. Cities using this program were cited to support his proposal. He urged the City to cooperate with the State and remove on-street parking. The State should provide additional parking garages and less land for lots. One way streets and the elimination of the 18-wheel traffic on Carson Street would also improve the downtown area. Public cooperation would force the Board of Supervisors to change their minds. Commissioner Wolf explained her feeling that his comments should be directed to the State. Mr. Trinastic continued to explain examples of his proposal found in the Midwest and cited several small Nevada cities which had received contributions from the State. No action was required or taken on this item.

5. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FOR STOP SIGN INSTALLATION AT DESATOYA DRIVE AND AIRPORT ROAD (1-2166.5) - Chairperson Smith outlined the reasons for including this on the agenda and recommended approval. Mr. Homann indicated the intersection did not have an adequate history to provide the necessary warrant criteria for approval. He was concerned about the sight distance which may support having the signs. If the three-way stop sign is approved, he recommended removal of the stop sign at Gordonia and Airport Road. Clarification indicated that this issue is actually a Board of Supervisors item and that action by the Commission is unnecessary. The intersection had been stripped to provide a left turn lane from Desatoya. A crosswalk was painted. Mr. Brotzman felt that the Board of Supervisors could address the item in November. Mr. Brotzman requested Commissioner Bennett stop by his office and review the history of the dirt pile on the east side of Airport Road. No formal action was taken or required.

6. REPORT ON CARSON CITY COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON ESTABLISHMENT OF A MISSED RIDES POLICY (1-2335.5) - Mr. Brotzman explained the request to establish a policy on missed rides due to the increased demand for service. The warning letters were discussed. Commissioner Wolf suggested the third letter be revised to indicate that, based on a third no show, the riding services were suspended. Tracking problems could be encountered if a lot of no shows occur. Chairperson Smith explained his support for the policy based on the increased demand for service and the 24-hour notice for scheduling. The policy would provide for responsible use and eliminate/reduce the need to refuse to provide a service when demand is beyond the provider's ability to meet the need. Comments supported increasing the warning letter's terminology. Commissioner Bennett suggested standards be adopted based on current/projected ridership and needs. She also suggested copies of the policy be given to all the riders. Mr. Brotzman agreed to provide the statistics on the missed rides for the next meeting. Commissioner Wolf moved that the Regional Transportation Commission adopt the procedures to inform the citizens utilizing the City's transit system of the

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the September 19, 1995, Meeting
Page 5

ride policy, including providing them with a copy of the letters in their packets, and that the Commission adopt the policy as indicated. Commissioner Bennett seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

7. NON-ACTION ITEM: STATUS REPORTS ON FAIRVIEW/SALIMAN, ROOP STREET, GRAVES LANE EXTENSION, GONI ROAD AND ORMSBY BOULEVARD PROJECTS (1-2578.5) - Staff reviewed the status report which included the problems encountered with the Nevada Public Works Department on the Roop Street expansion project. This project will be undertaken next year. The parking lot project proposed at Governor's Field will be included in ultimate design for Roop Street. Commissioner Bennett encouraged staff to begin considering the approach to Centennial Field. Right-of-way needs for Goni Road were defined. Driver education problems with the Hot Springs cul-de-sac were discussed. Vehicles are being counted on College Parkway and Winnie. The counting procedures were outlined. Demand for the new traffic counters was outlined. Washington and King Street traffic will also be counted as part of the Ormsby Boulevard extension considerations. Public safety concerns were stressed as reasons for supporting the extension. Commissioner Bennett also noted that the extension would increase the property values. Discussion also explored the status of the median at College Parkway and Carson Street and the access route to the 7-11 at this intersection. No formal action was required or taken on this item.

9. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS (1-2937.5) - Discussion ensued between the Commission and staff on the difference in construction standards as indicated during Item 4. State requirements for projects over five acres in size had changed the requirements for this site. Mr. Homann explained that staff would have supported a phased project with a 26 foot roadway for traffic purposes only as long as no development surrounding the roadway is proposed. The project had not considered this development program purportedly due to their understanding of the Board's direction/requirements. Commissioner Wolf reiterated her comments concerning the need to formalize discussion(s) with contractors. Staff supported her recommendation and explained that this is a normal procedure. Mr. Brotzman indicated there had been a development agreement which included the funding amount. Commissioner Bennett explained the progress occurring on the development of the next Highway 395 median. She also requested Mr. Homann relay her appreciation of Bill Barker's work on weeds in the Curry Street culvert adjacent to Lake Glen Manor. Discussion also explored the status of the Curry Street improvement plan. No formal action was taken or required.

10. STAFF COMMENTS (1-3120.5) - Mr. Brotzman noted the letter on the Hot Springs Road Traffic to Ms. Milligan which had been copied to the Board of Supervisors and Commission for informational purposes only. No formal action was taken or required.

11. ACTION ON FUTURE MEETING DATE(S) AND TIME(S) (1-3138.5) - Following discussion, the next meeting was scheduled for October 26 at 9 a.m.

12. ADJOURNMENT - Commissioner Wolf moved to adjourn. Commissioner Bennett seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0. Chairperson Smith adjourned the meeting at 12 noon.

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 September 19, 1995, Carson City Regional Transportation Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON _____, 1995.

Greg Smith, Chairperson