

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
Minutes of the April 2, 1998, Special Joint Meeting with the  
Carson City Board of Supervisors and the Carson City  
Transportation Committee - Page 1

A special joint meeting of the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission, Carson City Board of Supervisors, and the Carson City Transportation Advisory Committee was held during the regularly scheduled Board of Supervisors meeting on Thursday, April 4, 1998, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, which began at 8:30 a.m.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Greg Smith and Commissioners Tom Tatro and Marie Wolf

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PRESENT: Mayor Ray Masayko and Supervisors Tom Tatro, Greg Smith, Jon Plank, and Kay Bennett

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Frank Page and Members Kelly Garcia, Juan Guzman, Vern Krahn, Jack Loebeer, Dennis Ritchie and Walter Sullivan

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager John Berkich, Clerk-Recorder Alan Glover, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Acting Public Works Director Tim Homann, Chief Deputy District Attorney Paul Lipparelli, RTC Engineer Harvey Brotzman, Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Parks Planner Vern Krahn, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (B.O.S. 4/2/98 Tape 2-0105.5)

Chairperson Smith indicated for the record that the entire Commission was present constituting a quorum. A quorum of the Board had been declared present earlier in its meeting. Roll call of the Committee was taken. Member Garcia arrived near the end of the discussion. Member Loebeer left the meeting prior to her arrival. A quorum of the Committee was never present as Members Abbott, Bullis, Fronapfel, Mather, Hoffman, Robertson and Weaver were absent. For discussion of the agenda items see Board of Supervisor and Regional Transportation Commission Minutes.

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S MISSION STATEMENT AND PROPOSED TRAFFIC SERVICE LEVELS AND A STATUS REPORT ON THE PROGRESS OF THE TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN PROCESS (2-0162.5)** - Mr. Homann began the discussion by explaining the Committee's meetings and the District Attorney's opinion that the Committee must comply with the Open Meeting Law. The Committee, although it had met and drafted a mission statement, needed to ratify actions taken during those meetings. Member Guzman then moved to approve the Mission Statement as discussed previously, that is: "The Transportation Advisory Committee is dedicated to improving all levels of transportation in Carson City. The Committee assists the staff with the direction and planning of the Transportation Master Plan Element and its integration with other planning documents and regulations. The Committee provides local knowledge and direction with emphasis on safety and innovative ideas." Member Krahn seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. (See the following discussion which determined there was not a quorum present.)

Discussion ensued on whether there was a quorum of the Committee present which determined that there was no quorum present as only six members were present. Eight members were required to make a quorum. Mr. Lipparelli indicated that the Committee Members could provide input as individuals and that the Committee should take formal action to ratify its direction when a quorum is present. Chairperson Page explained the Committee's intent had been to act on the mission statement which had been drafted prior to the ruling on the need to comply with the Open Meeting Law requirements. Therefore, Mayor Masayko asked the Commission about its direction on the Mission Statement.

Commissioner Tatro moved to accept the Mission Statement as presented by the Carson City Transportation Advisory Committee that will, hopefully, be ratified by the Committee at its next meeting. Commissioner Wolf seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

Mr. Homann explained the Committee's request for the joint meeting and for clear direction and understanding of its role and activities. Chairperson Smith indicated his hope that the legal technicalities had been addressed and

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
Minutes of the April 2, 1998, Special Joint Meeting with the  
Carson City Board of Supervisors and the Carson City  
Transportation Committee - Page 2

that the Committee, Commission, and Board could now discuss the issues appropriately.

(2-0344.5) DKS Consultant John Long used an overhead projector to display "bullets" highlighting the master plan elements which will be considered and maps illustrating the current residential areas, projected residential growth areas, projected traffic patterns including those created by through traffic from neighboring counties, current traffic service levels, projected traffic service levels on those same roads, projected traffic service levels with roads which will be constructed between now and 2005 as well as 2012 and those same roadways if the entire Bypass is constructed, the recommended "base" improvements with and without the full freeway including signal upgrades, reasons for the request to allow intersections to have an "E" service level, and alternatives to this policy change. Criteria used to develop the maps was explained. Classifications for the level of service were defined. His comments clearly indicated that several major arterials would experience an F level of service--gridlock--by 2005. This will cause diversions to other roadways and, likewise, reduce their service levels. Chairperson Smith pointed out that the maps verify the contention that the northern half of the freeway will not alleviate local traffic congestion but will help alleviate the through traffic problems. (2-0621.5) Copies of new level of service policy statement and alternatives were distributed to the Board, Clerk, Commission and Committee. Board comments indicated that this policy should be reconsidered periodically as the freeway's status changes. Mr. Page pointed out the need to consider the Highway 50 improvements which are needed when the northern leg of the freeway is constructed. Mr. Long delineated those improvements including those which he felt would be "throw always" when the southern leg is constructed, such as traffic signals. These improvements were discussed and stressed the importance of having the southern leg.

(2-0771.5) Discussion ensued on the need for the Ormsby Boulevard extension and the Commission's desire to act on it during the budget process. Mr. Long pointed out that this street may have issues which are not related to circulation and could change his map. Mr. Long felt certain that these issues could be analyzed at the Committee's May meeting. RTC Chairperson Smith explained the urgency and requested this information be furnished as soon as possible. Mr. Long described Ormsby Boulevard's different traffic volumes with and without the southern leg of the freeway. Commissioner Wolf did not feel that the freeway would have that much of an impact on Ormsby. Mr. Long indicated that the traffic volume would be created by local residents and not individuals passing through town.

Discussion returned to the impact created on Saliman if the freeway is not constructed. Comments emphasized safety concerns for the students at the three schools on this street. (Mayor Masayko stepped from the room during this discussion--12:38 p.m.--and returned at 12:40 p.m. A quorum was present the entire time.) Traffic concerns and volumes on College Parkway, Graves Lane, and the extension between Arrowhead and Graves with and without the southern leg of the freeway were discussed. Comments also indicated that the freeway to be constructed with four lanes and have the ability to be expanded to six lanes. It was felt that this would occur some time beyond the forecasted 15 year period.

Discussion ensued on the service level policy; reasons levels A, B, and C had not been recommended including the cost factors; and a description of the service level labels and standards. (2-1140.5) Chairperson Smith requested copies of the service level standards chart be given to the Board. Committee Chairperson Page indicated that these issues are part of the reason for the request that the consultant's contract and submittal of the master plan element be extended. His comments included concerns about the amount of work which the Committee needed to consider, i.e., the bicycle path, pedestrian trails, etc. Concern was expressed that the Committee may not be able to provide adequate direction as to the type of projects which should be considered in next year's budget prior to the completion of these elements. Other issues which the Committee should evaluate were also listed. Chairperson Smith supported his desire to analyze other modes of transportation as a part of the master plan element and explained the criticism he had heard when these modes have been ignored.

(2-1204.5) Chamber of Commerce Downtown Mainstreet Committee Member Steve Browne indicated the Committee supported the Bypass and urged the Committee, Commission and Board to implement programs so that the downtown area could be taken back by the businesses. Traffic in the downtown area will be the same after the freeway is constructed as it is today because it will become a designation point. It should be a pedestrian and bicyclist friendly area with plenty of parking. He volunteered Mainstreet's assistance in developing policies and

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
Minutes of the April 2, 1998, Special Joint Meeting with the  
Carson City Board of Supervisors and the Carson City  
Transportation Committee - Page 3

plans to reconstruct Carson Street as a two lane road with on street parking. He supported having alternate roads which will allow residential traffic to circumvent the downtown area. This will help make the downtown area a designation point rather than an pass through. He urged the Board/Commission/Committee to develop a program which will allow for service level A as a minimum even if this costs more to accomplish.

Supervisor Bennett stressed the importance of the work which the Committee had done and commended the Commission and staff for establishing it. She also commended the Committee on its progress. Her original concept when she first suggested the Committee was explained. (Committee Member Garcia was present at this time. Committee Member Loebeer was absent.) Supervisor Bennett requested copies of the colored maps be given to the Board. She also suggested that the study include any impact which public transit may have on the service levels and, specifically, on service level F.

Mr. Browne requested the study include the impact making Carson Street a two-lane roadway would have and options which would allow the City to make this change, i.e., the use of Stewart Street.

Discussion between Supervisor Bennett and Chairperson Page explained the reasons the Parks and Recreation Commission is working on the bike plan and the Committee's awareness of the Bicycle Master Plan Element.

(2-1384.5) Chamber of Commerce Executive Vice President Larry Osborne expressed the Chamber's appreciation for being allowed to have a member on the Committee and to provide input into the process. He briefly noted the funding provided by Congress for Nevada and expressed his feeling that there would be additional requests for it. Competition against Southern Nevada projects will be heavy. Efforts to obtain the southern leg of the freeway must continue. The Chamber will continue to work with the City in any way it could on this endeavor. He then noted the impact some of the roads would have on different residential areas and neighborhoods. He also pointed out the impact which will be created on the entire community if forward motion is not maintained.

(2-1408.5) Committee Member Ritchie indicated that the Committee would be analyzing all of the issues which the Commission/Board had raised. Mr. Long had indicated the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit issues would be considered by the Committee. Until the overall picture is completely analyzed it is difficult to assess the impact on each neighborhood. He also commended Mr. Long on his knowledge of the community. Better answers should be available by the next meeting.

Member Krahn then described the status of the bicycle master plan element and his support for the Mainstreet's Carson Street plan. Supervisor Bennett expressed her feeling that the Board/City will be faced with some tough decisions in the next five years and the need for substantiated factors upon which to make those decisions.

(2-1475.5) Lynn Gallagher expressed his support for public transportation within the City. He questioned whether an impact study had been conducted to determine whether public transit would help mitigate some of the service level concerns and, specifically, at those sites labeled D and E. Based on figures of \$78 million and \$400,000 which he had heard were being spent on roadway improvements, he felt that the allocation of \$50,000 for public transit was an clear indication that the City looked at public transit as a low priority. Chairperson Smith indicated that there had been several studies completed on public transit including the impact on traffic volumes. Financial concerns with public transit systems as experienced nationwide were noted. Until the funding problem is resolved, the reality of a public transit system is questionable. He also pointed out that now that the City has reached a population of more than 50,000, it can access a new classification of Federal funding programs. These funds could be used for a public transit system. He also pointed out that Carson City is the last capitol without a public transit system and one of a few cities of its size without a public transit system. The desire is to add the service to the community without taking funding from another worthwhile project/service.

Discussion between the Committee and Commission indicated that the next Committee meeting would be on April 7. Chairperson Smith indicated that the Commission will be able to discuss and act on the Committee's request for direction at its April 15 meeting. He also pointed out that vehicular traffic should be the number one priority, however, bicycle, pedestrian, sound wall, landscaping, etc., considerations are also warranted. Chairperson Page agreed and indicated that these issues may have to be a second part of the project.

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
Minutes of the April 2, 1998, Special Joint Meeting with the  
Carson City Board of Supervisors and the Carson City  
Transportation Committee - Page 4

Staff comments expressed the desire to have the Commission and Board act on the level of service question. **Commissioner Tatro moved that the Regional Transportation Commission adopt the level of service policy as follows: Maintain the level of service D standards for all intersections and roadway segments in the City with the following exceptions: Allow a level of service E on Carson Street and U.S. 50 if the improvements to level of service D are unacceptable due to impacts and/or cost and for construction, project planning, and prioritization allow worse than level of service D standard on roadway segments where improvements will not be necessary with construction of the U.S. 395 Bypass. Commissioner Wolf seconded the motion.** Commissioner Tatro then indicated that his motion is not popular with Mr. Osborne and the Chamber of Commerce. His intent, with the terms "construction, project planning, and prioritization", is that the Committee would not have to be concerned if the Bypass is not constructed. If a business desires to open a store in Carson City, which would create a negative impact on the traffic volumes to such an extent that it would be below level of service D and if the construction of the bypass at some future time would improve the level of service, these improvements would not automatically be waived. Staff could look at them and an intelligent choice could be made based on the facts surrounding the area, even though the master plan process does not provide community guidance other to the community developing the project to take the community out 15 years, so that when changes to the transportation infrastructure and impacts on the transportation infrastructure are being proposed the developers will assume the responsibility for those impacts. Reasons for this direction included the fact that the southern leg of the Bypass could take as long as the north leg of the Bypass to get started. Although this is really unlikely, it is possible.

Mr. Osborne expressed his concern that the Commission/Board were moving too fast. Although the master plan is not an ordinance or law, the comments had urged the process to go forward slowly. He urged them to take the time to have additional input before the final decisions are made. He was unsure whether the amount of information provided to date was adequate to make a decision to accept this as the policy. The proposal establishes the level of service standard which the community would be forced to accept. He recommended directing the Committee to go back to work and study other options. Something better may be found. It may be possible to ask for a higher level of service. He did not like the idea that the community was accepting something that is lower than a D service level. He questioned whether that level was E or F. He urged the Commission/Board to take more time and study the impact of higher levels. The proposed level of service was unacceptable at this time based on the amount of information provided.

Member Sullivan indicated that he had been the individual to ask the Board to define the Committee's course and obtain direction. The Committee definitely needed the direction, particularly if the motion passes. It will provide the threshold or compass on which the Committee relies in the formulation of recommendations for consideration by the Commission/Board in the future. Without a bench mark/threshold the Committee could not go forward. The Committee will be analyzing a meridian of items including level of services C, D, E, and F. This will quadruple the workload and push the completion date further back. Everyone wants something done now. The Committee needs this direction now. He urged the Commission/Board to poll the Committee. The Committee is willing to use the level of service D standards in its analysis.

(2-1742.5) Mr. Browne supported Mr. Sullivan's comments. The Commission/Board had pointed out earlier in the discussion that the standards would create a difference in applications and questioned whether the expenditure of \$100,000 or more for one situation could be justified with one situation as compared to another scenario. The question is the idea of maintaining a certain service level, which he felt was good, and allowing the Committee to analyze alternatives when the cost of the level justifies it. The majority of the objection is to the exceptions, what is said and whether they are really clearly defined, and whether the Commission/Board should go ahead and approve it right now when the Commission/Board is not even sure what those exceptions are. His point of view was against having Carson Street in the listings as an exception based upon whatever criteria may be established. He supported attempting to achieve no degradation of Carson Street. In fact, he supported improving the level of service which is the reason behind his exception to the motion.

Chairperson Smith indicating his support for the motion and a desire to consider the issue further. He then asked whether the Committee could consider the issue between now and next RTC and Board meetings. This would not

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
Minutes of the April 2, 1998, Special Joint Meeting with the  
Carson City Board of Supervisors and the Carson City  
Transportation Committee - Page 5

cause a lengthy delay. Mr. Brotzman indicated that the last Streets and Highways Master Plan element had established the proposed D service level as the standard for arterials. Other communities have this same level of service. The cost to implement the A, B, and C levels is prohibitive. Reno's policy was described. It allows the area inside McCarren to have a level of service D with everything outside having a level of C with the exception of the downtown area which is F. Upgrading the downtown area would require the City to remove a lot of the improvements along Virginia Street. The same is true for Carson Street. Chairperson Smith indicated that the intent was to establish a policy which would be "boiler plated" but still reflect some of the unique characteristics and attributes of the City within the statement. Mr. Brotzman felt that this could be contained in other policy statements which do not pertain to the service levels. The last document had contained three pages of policies which the Committee will be working on. This policy statement relates strictly to the level of service of the roadway. The other policies address the pedestrian friendly element, etc. The level of service policy will allow the Committee to commence analyzing the improvements. If the level of service is raised, the bank may be broken.

(2-1835.5) Member Garcia explained that her understanding of the reason for coming to the Board had been based on the Committee's discussion that attempts should be made to increase the service level to C, contentment with level D, attempts to be innovative as stated in the mission statement, and whether the Committee was being innovative. The entire process will be required to develop the goals and objectives so that they could work together and not conflict with each other or create unnecessary constraints which will eliminate the ability to look at other methods of doing something. She asked the Board if it wanted a service level C or is D the primary focus. The Committee could then work on the exceptions as there can be changes. Funding will allow only so much to be accomplished on the arterials particularly if the Bypass becomes reality. Chairperson Smith expressed his desire to go to service level C, however, the funding was not available.

Commissioner Tatro expressed his feeling that some type of direction should be given. All of the issues under discussion could be reconsidered in the future if necessary. The Committee could consider the comments and determine whether modifications could be made to the recommendation. The bar had to be set somewhere today so that the Committee could go forward. He requested a vote on the motion as indicated. He then explained his statements at the last Commission meeting that a discussion would occur at its next meeting on the Ormsby Boulevard extension and questioned when this could realistically occur. Mr. Brotzman indicated that the budget had to be finalized in April. It will be adopted by the Board on May 5. Commissioner Tatro questioned whether it could be changed. Mr. Brotzman indicated that the Ormsby extension had been listed but was not in the funded items which he had taken to Internal Finance. He agreed with Commissioner Tatro that the Commission could change this funding later. Clarification for Chairperson Page indicated that Commissioner Tatro wanted a recommendation on just Ormsby Boulevard. Mr. Homann indicated that Mr. Long had an adequate amount of data for the Commission to determine the service level of Ormsby Boulevard but enough information was not available to determine where this would place Ormsby Boulevard on the priority listing. Comments indicated that only Curry Street's estimate needed to be developed to establish its priority on the listing. Mr. Long He agreed that the Committee could consider other issues than the cost and traffic volumes. Discussion between Mr. Long and Chairperson Smith indicated that the anticipated completion date for the entire project is mid-summer. Mr. Long felt that an adequate amount of information could be provided to the Committee to allow the Commission to hold a public hearing in June. The only reason this would not occur is if the Committee decides it cannot reach a decision based on the information/discussions. He agreed that the Committee was busy with the bike plan and other items which could be reprioritized. Chairperson Smith explained the reason for wanting a target date. Therefore, he set the June meeting date as the final target date. Chairperson Page agreed.

The motion that the Regional Transportation Commission adopt the level of service policy as follows: Maintain the level of service D standards for all intersections and roadway segments in the City with the following exceptions: Allow a level of service E on Carson Street and U.S. 50 if the improvements to level of service D are unacceptable due to impacts and/or cost and for construction, project planning, and prioritization allow worse than level of service D standard on roadway segments where improvements will not be necessary with construction of the U.S. 395 Bypass was voted by the Commission and carried 3-0.

Commissioner Tatro then moved to adjourn the Regional Transportation Commission meeting. Commissioner

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
Minutes of the April 2, 1998, Special Joint Meeting with the  
Carson City Board of Supervisors and the Carson City  
Transportation Committee - Page 6

Wolf seconded the motion. Motion carried and Chairperson Smith adjourned the RTC meeting at 1:38 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 April 2, 1998, Special Joint Carson City Regional Transportation Committee, Carson City Board of Supervisors, and the Carson City Transportation Advisory Commission meeting

1998.

ARE SO APPROVED ON \_\_\_\_\_,

---

Greg Smith, Chairperson