

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the September 10, 2003, Meeting

Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) was held on Wednesday, September 10, 2003, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Richard S. Staub (arrived at 6:11 p.m.); Vice Chairperson Steve Reynolds, and Members Shelly Aldean, Charles Des Jardins, Jeff Fontaine, Dan Holler, and Bob Kennedy (arrived at 6:12 p.m.)

**STAFF PRESENT:** Development Services Director Andrew Burnham, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, City Engineer Larry Werner, Street Operations Manager John Flansberg, RTC Engineer Harvey Brotzman, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (CAMPO 9/10/03 Tape 1-0010)

**A. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM -** Vice Chairperson Reynolds convened the meeting at 5:38 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Member Kennedy and Chairperson Staub had not yet arrived.

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - JUNE 11 AND JULY 9, 2003 (1-0015) -** Member Aldean moved to approve the Minutes of June 11, 2003, and July 9, 2003, as written. Member Holler seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

**C. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS (1-0026) -** None.

**D. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0029) -** None.

**E. DISCLOSURES (1-0032) -** None.

**F. PUBLIC MEETING ITEMS:**

**F-1. ACTION ON THE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN FOR THE CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (1-0043) -** Community Development Director Walter Sullivan briefly reviewed the staff report and policy. Community Development had advertised the plan for 45 days as required. No comments were received on it. Street Operations Manager John Flansberg explained that the announcements had included the expanded definition of public as requested by Member Fontaine. Member Fontaine felt that the Federal definition should be included in the plan. He agreed that the public announcements should include identifying the public who should respond to the notices. Staff committed to this inclusion. Mr. Flansberg felt that this commitment was adequate to meet the Federal guidelines for funding. Discussion explained that the plan will be forwarded to NDOT for its approval and then on to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Future public notice periods will be for 30 days and not the 45 days required for this plan. Mr. Sullivan explained that the notice had been posted at approximately six City offices. The locations were listed. A list of individuals/agencies that will be impacted will be developed so that noticing will be more efficient in the future. Efforts had been made to notice everyone. Vice Chairperson Reynolds suggested that a hosted meeting be held on public transit similar to the

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the September 10, 2003, Meeting

Page 2

example in the video on MPOs. The stakeholders should be invited to this meeting. He hoped that this could be done before the next budget session. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Member Holler moved to approve the Public Involvement Plan for the Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization. Member Aldean seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

**F-2. PRESENTATION ON DEVELOPER FUNDED US 50 WEST INTERCHANGE AT AP-PROXIMATE MILEPOST CC 3.00 (1-0152)** - Mr. Flansberg explained the need to include this project in CAMPO's interim listing of projects. The project listing was corrected to indicated that this project will be funded by the developer. Member Fontaine disclosed that he, his wife, and sister-in-law own property in the area that will be impacted by the project. He will not vote on the item. NDOT Assistant Director of Planning and Program Development Kent Cooper was present to answer any questions regarding the project. Vice Chairperson Reynolds explained that the item is not agenzized for action. It is a discussion and information only item. A vote will not be taken. Discussion clarified that the project is listed on the interim plan which is to be acted upon under the following agenda heading. Member Fontaine indicated that he would not participate/vote on the interim plan, which is the next agenda item, for the same reason.

Transportation, Inc., Representative Garth Dull described the project, its location, and benefits of the project. It is a \$4 million project. NDOT will pay \$800,000 for its portion of the project as the project eliminates the need to relocate the current truck escape route. It will provide a legal access for the property owners along Clear Creek. Mr. Dull then explained the location by using the preliminary drawing. The present truck escape route is approximately one-half mile east of the proposed location. It will not be moved. As the project will provide a better interchange and eliminates the relocation of the truck escape route, NDOT has agreed to commit the funding for the escape ramp relocation to the project. The agreement has been signed by both the property owner/developer and NDOT. The property owner has a deeded right of access. Mr. Dull agreed that the majority of the deeded rights of access were for 20 feet. The proposed interchange will provide a safer access than having numerous access points along the highway. The plan consolidates some of the access points. The interchange is located in the middle of 120 acres owned by State Lands which is being transferred to a nonprofit entity. The interchange will provide a safer access to State Lands on both sides of the highway. It may also allow others to gain access by consolidating the access points and be an alternate access point for Clear Creek Road.

(1-0318) Public comments were solicited. Al Kramer, speaking as a resident on Old Clear Creek Road, felt that the proposal will improve Old Clear Creek Road in Douglas County only. The residents along Old Clear Creek Road desire to have the Carson City portion of the road improved also. The easement had been returned to the property owners years ago. It has continued to be used as a prescriptive easement by the public. It is not maintained by anyone except as a safety matter for fire or ambulance services. Mr. Kramer asked that the project not be included on the interim plan unless there is a commitment to improve the road in Carson City. They believe that the residents of the proposed project will use Old Clear Creek Road to access their homes, particularly, when leaving the shopping center on Indian Hill. A description of the road was provided. Mr. Kramer felt that the additional traffic will worsen its condition. The residents who were present were asked to stand. One-third of the Carson City residents living along the roadway were present to support the request. Three others had provided notes and two had left telephone messages supporting the request. Now is the appropriate time to address the road. The next item should be conditioned to maintain the road in the future. Additional public comments were solicited. None were

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the September 10, 2003, Meeting

Page 3

given. It was felt that Mr. Kramer had spoken for the other residents.

Mr. Dull explained that a number of years ago there was a tentative agreement between NDOT, Carson City, and Douglas County regarding the road. It had never been consummated. He was unsure of what the development would do for a Carson City road other than providing an alternate access route. He then indicated that the road being provided by the developer will allow public access due to the NDOT funding.

Member Holler explained the project's intent to provide a road from the Washoe Tribal Lands to the interchange as a privately maintained road with unlimited public access. This may require dedication to Douglas County. The homeowners must maintain it and cannot restrict access to it. It was assumed that a traffic analysis had been used to indicate any areas needing mitigation. Douglas County conditioned the project to have a road connecting to Highway 50. There will be an emergency only access road from Jacks Valley Road for fire and other emergencies. It will connect to Old Clear Creek Road at the Tribal property. They had not conditioned the development to include any improvements on Old Clear Creek Road due to the easement and private property issues. Everything west of the Tribal property is a public right-of-way and recorded on the map. He believed that the traffic analysis had indicated that 90 percent of the traffic would access the development from Highway 50.

Mr. Dull was not aware of a traffic analysis of the project's impact on Old Clear Creek Road. The traffic analysis will need to be upgraded due to the increased density of the project. Vice Chairperson Reynolds felt that the Carson City residents had a valid concern regarding the impact to the road. Mr. Dull explained that this was the same concern as expressed several years ago as there is no legal access to the area but houses were allowed to be constructed along it. This was the reason for the mutual agreement. The road could not be gated due to prescriptive easement issues. Clarification indicated that the prescriptive rights had not been adjudicated.

Mr. Kramer explained his understanding of Carson City development requirements mandates two accesses must be provided. Emergency accesses do not count. Without Old Clear Creek Road, there will be only one access from Highway 50. The project will maintain the Douglas County portion of the roadway. No consideration has been given for the Carson City portion of the roadway. The emergency access is gated and cannot be used as a secondary access. He felt that in 1995 all of the property owners had submitted a letter of intent to grant an easement to Carson City, NDOT, Douglas County or anyone who would maintain the road. This was done on the Carson City side only. If necessary, he believed that additional paperwork could be developed in approximately two weeks supporting this proposal. He believed that there would be an impact to the residents along Old Clear Creek Road. He reiterated his belief that the individuals residing in the proposed development will use Old Clear Creek Road to go home after shopping at the Indian Hills retail center(s). He also suggested that heavy trucks may use the road. It is in bad shape today. This traffic will worsen its condition. The current "easement" does not meet county standards. If the potholes and shoulders are fixed and Carson City performs some annual maintenance work on it, the residents will support the project and continue to allow the public to use the roadway. Member Aldean asked if Carson City and Douglas County accept responsibility for Old Clear Creek Road's maintenance if the homeowners will have a reciprocal arrangement for the maintenance. This arrangement would be the same as the new development's maintenance requirements. Mr. Kramer indicated that he had not discussed this suggestion with the residents and was not qualified to answer. (Chairperson Staub arrived during this discussion—6:11 p.m. A quorum was present as previously indicated. Vice Chairperson Reynolds turned the gavel over to Chairperson Staub.)

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the September 10, 2003, Meeting

Page 4

Old Clear Creek resident Gigi Valenti explained that she had lived along the road the longest of any of the residents. When she had moved, there the access was from Old Clear Creek Road. An emergency only road had been counted by the City as the second ingress/egress. NDOT had purportedly advised her that the prescriptive easement was created by the State Camp at the end of Old Clear Creek Road. She believed that if the camp was eliminated, public traffic and its need for an access will be eliminated. The public is the cause of the damage to the roadway. The 13-15 residents along the roadway are not responsible for it. Carson City has purportedly listed the road as a bicycle trail. One needs to be constructed. (Member Kennedy arrived during her remarks—6:13 p.m. The entire Board was present constituting a quorum.) Ms. Valenti questioned who would be liable if an accident occurs. People are roller blading on the road. There is no room for two cars and a bicycle or a person on roller blades. There are two on ramps being added to the road. It is not fair for the residents to shoulder all of the liability. It is a nice area to live in. She liked the idea of having the off ramp. She wanted the road upgraded to City standards. Her husband had provided snow removal on the roadway. The residents do not mind doing some of the work but should not be responsible for all of it. If the roadway is gated, it should be done at 395 and use the other access as a prescriptive easement to the State Camp. The residents could then maintain it as a private roadway. She believed that the better decision would be to bring it up to City standards and require maintenance as part of the project.

Chairperson Staub apologized for being late and requested additional comments. Project Consultant Don Miner explained that they had a meeting with the Old Clear Creek residents and discussed the issue. There is a problem with the legal access to Old Clear Creek Road. They were not ready to make a commitment beyond the ones to provide a road to the County standards to the State Camp and to maintain it. After an agreement is reached with the Carson City residents, they will go to Carson City and obtain its rules. The homeowners association can participate or privatize the road if the prescriptive easement is addressed. They had gone as far as they could with the Douglas County requirements and were willing to continue to work with the homeowners to satisfy their concerns.

Mr. Kramer questioned the commitment that had been made. He did not believe that the developer would work with the residents without CAMPO's leverage. Chairperson Staub explained that the item had not been agenzized for action. Mr. Flansberg explained NDOT's request that the project be added to CAMPO's interim project listing.

Member Aldean suggested that when Item F-4 is discussed the project could be conditioned upon a resolution of the maintenance and access issues. Mr. Flansberg indicated that he was not sure that a conditioned interim project listing would be allowed by FHWA or NDOT. Member Aldean felt that it would be a compromise and compel the parties to work together to resolve the issues.

Member Reynolds explained a need for additional information regarding the ownership of the easement, prior decisions, the need to know the process which should be followed, and concerns about CAMPO's authority in the situation. He felt that there will be a lot of traffic on a Carson City road that had not been planned or addressed.

Mr. Flansberg explained staff's letter to Douglas County regarding the project which had requested some conditions. These items were not included in the project as it is being developed in Douglas County. The effort was an attempt to raise concerns regarding the Clear Creek Road issues and impacts. IT was not included in the discussion. NDOT

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the September 10, 2003, Meeting

Page 5

had requested that the project be added to CAMPO's interim project listing as it is on a national highway system. He was unsure whether the listing could be conditioned. CAMPO does not have a financial investment in the project. The project will increase traffic on a substandard road. Discussion by Member Holler and Mr. Flansberg explained that 3/4 of a mile of roadway is in Carson City and one mile of roadway is in Douglas County. Costco was located along NDOT right-of-way two years ago when Mr. Holler discussed the situation with Mr. Burnham. Part of the roadway is owned by the Washoe Tribe and the Forest Service. They could not condition the project to include Clear Creek Road due to private ownership of the roadway. The developer cannot access the private property to make the improvements. The traffic study did not show any impact to it. Therefore, they could not justify the condition. If such a condition is appealed to the courts, it will be thrown out. The applicant has continued to talk with the homeowners regarding the ownership of the easement and the need for a dedicated easement as well as the Tribal and Forest Service portions. It could not be a private road. The challenges of obtaining the easements and providing for maintenance can be addressed. The roadway standard can be resolved. The potholes could be patched. It will cost millions of dollars to bring the roadway up to County standards due to the need for onsite drainage and additional width. A major highway is required which is not worth the investment. The developer wanted to gate the top of the roadway but that was not viable as they need the access for the Clear Creek residents. The ownership questions must be addressed before funds are put into the road. The Washoe Tribe has expressed a desire to maintain the road but is not willing to give an easement to either entity. He reiterated that Douglas County cannot require roadway conditions on a project with these problems. Once the issues are addressed CAMPO could do something and the long-term maintenance and initial reconstruction issues can be addressed.

Development Services Director Burnham explained that there was to have been an agreement and efforts had been undertaken to address some of the issues. The legal access issue and the Washoe Tribe issues at two different points along the road continue to remain in spite of the efforts to address them. A number of the Carson City property owners want to develop, however, the access issue remains. Until it is resolved, Carson City cannot approve additional developments. This matter should be brought to the Board of Supervisors for direction. The proposed interchange will provide a second access, however, the legal issues remain. He then explained that the Carson City property owners want the entitlement issues addressed. Any road work Carson City property owners want to do requires a permit. It is automatically approved if it meets the City standard. At this point he did not believe that there is an issue which requires either CAMPO or the City's involvement. Chairperson Staub felt that Carson City/CAMPO and RTC are not involved in these private property issues except as a facilitator in the discussion between private parties. Mr. Flansberg reiterated NDOT's request to include the project on CAMPO's interim listing as it is on the national highway system. Only the interchange on Highway 50 is to be included on the interim listing. Old Clear Creek Road is not part of the listing.

Mr. Kramer explained that several years ago former City Manager John Berkich had developed an agreement, which all of the Carson City property owners had signed, giving the easement for the road back to the City. Douglas County did not know who owned its roadway as they had not reverted it back to the abutting property owners. The letters that had been submitted were intended to grant the easement so that the roadway improvements could be made. These documents had never been recorded due to concerns related to those properties which are owned by one person and were split by the roadway. He felt that it was in the City's best interest to make the improvements. Chairperson Staub indicated that he understood but as things now exist unless the organization changes, it is a private property issue. Carson City could act as the facilitator between the parties but CAMPO

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the September 10, 2003, Meeting

Page 6

cannot do anything. It can only address the interchange on Highway 50 West as it is a national highway. CAMPO should not be involved in discussions regarding this matter. CAMPO is not the location for discussions on the roadway. Additional public comments were solicited but none were given. No formal action was taken or required.

**F-3. ACTION AND APPROVAL OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2003 TO 2005 INTERIM**

**PROGRAM OF PROJECTS FOR CAMPO (1-0926)** - RTC Engineer Harvey Brotzman distributed a new interim listing of projects to the Board and Clerk. (A copy is in the file.) Mr. Flansberg limned the changes that were made to the listing and justification for having an established program of projects. The listing included all projects in the MPO area that have federal funding, are listed on the national highway system, or are a federally significant roadway. Member Aldean requested another column designating the funding sources for each of the projects. Mr. Flansberg indicated that the matching funds were either from the General Fund or RTC and agreed to add this column. Approval of the plan will reimburse the Counties for funds spent on the listed project. Discussion briefly described the reimbursement process and indicated that reimbursement could take 60 days. The funds indicated either were available or will be provided by reimbursement. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Member Aldean moved to approve the Fiscal Year 2003 to 2005 Interim Program of Projects for the Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization as depicted on the new version of said program recently received by each member of the Board. Member Des Jardins seconded the motion. Following a request for an amendment, Member Aldean amended her motion to include that the item "US Highway 50 construct interchange" is being added to the list at the request of NDOT and is included only for that purpose without any endorsement from Carson City. Member Des Jardins concurred. Member Fontaine pointed out that he had disclosed a conflict prior to discussion of the previous item and that he would be abstaining on the vote due to that relationship to that particular project being added to the list and his property ownership as it relates to that project. Motion was voted and carried 6-0-1 with Member Fontaine abstaining.

**F-4. ACTION AND APPROVAL OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2004 TO 2006 INTERIM PRO-**

**GRAM FOR CAMPO (1-1076)** - A new listing of projects was distributed. Mr. Flansberg explained the changes. Member Fontaine explained his feeling that a listing beyond 2005 was not necessary at this time. Mr. Flansberg agreed to remove those items from the program. Those items had been added for information purposes as they illustrate future projects the Board may wish to consider. Discussion noted the plan without those items had already been approved and that no further action is needed. Discussion ensued concerning the funding level Carson City had been providing for public transit. Carson City budget for this year's transit was \$308,000. Mr. Flansberg withdrew the item. Chairperson Staub ruled that no action is required and that the item was withdrawn.

NDOT Assistant Director of Planning Kent Cooper explained the need to develop and submit to FHWA a schedule indicating when the TIP and RTP will be completed. Reasons for this requirement were noted. The schedule must be submitted before the Interim Program is submitted. Mr. Flansberg indicated that he would include the schedule when submitting the documents. The Transportation Master Plan should be adopted by June 30, 2004. The TIP should be adopted within 60 days thereafter or August 31, 2004. Mr. Cooper felt that this timeframe was acceptable.

Chairperson Staub then explained his discomfort with the actions which were being taken. He recognized the projects as listed and noted that they had been approved previously. The projects were merely being listed in a

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the September 10, 2003, Meeting

Page 7

different format and being submitted to FHWA as required for the MPO process. He hoped that in the future there would be a better understanding of the actions required. He acknowledged the need to move slowly. Mr. Burnham acknowledged that staff has the same tenuousness as that being experienced by the Board. The entire process is a new learning experience for all. Staff is attempting to stay ahead of the game. Chairperson Staub hoped that next year the Board will have a better understanding of what is being done. Member Fontaine explained that this is the first step which creates the program. In the future as the planning process is more defined and the projects have had an enhanced public participation process with a thorough analysis of the need and funding, a better understanding will be provided. Many of the projects on the listing were NDOT's and have already been through that process. NDOT is also documenting how projects are being listed in the program. This interim process evolves as time marches on. The approval is for a program of projects which the MPO wishes to move forward. No amendments, contracts or commitments are being made today. CAMPO still has an opportunity to back out of the projects if the funding is not there or other problems arise which are unforeseen today. This is the first step in a long process. Chairperson Staub felt that they had seen the projects before. The action was a way to tell the FHWA that these are the projects which CAMPO must adopt as we are now an MPO. No formal action was taken or required as the Interim Program had already been approved.

**F-5. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE 2004 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PRO-**

**GRAM (1-1258)** - A Page 7 was distributed to the Board and Clerk. (A copy is in the file.) Mr. Flansberg explained that the funding had been overspent for Item 4.3 and the need to designate other funds. The need for a unified planning work program, the changes which had been made in the simplified work statement to create the unified planning work program, and the type of items which were included in the program were limned. This process leads to development of the master plan and the ultimate development of a fiscally constrained TIP. The need to expand the City's traffic model to include the Douglas and Lyon County portions of the CAMPO area were cited as an example of the type of information needed to determine all funding sources, planning needs, and work programs for the future. The majority of the funding is in development of the short range transportation study. The proposal allocates \$162,700 for this process. The funds for this purpose are available during fiscal years 2003 and 2004. The majority of the funding for this purpose are from FHWA. Either the General Fund or RTC will be asked to pay the matching portion. The matching source depends on who the beneficiary is. Douglas and Lyon Counties will be asked to fund their portions.

Member Aldean asked that clarification of the funding sources be provided which will show the original allocation, the portion that is being allocated, and the amount of funds still available for allocation.

Discussion explained staff's request to dedicate another staff position to planning for transit and transport-ation. The FHWA funds can be used for this purpose and will be there in 05 and 06. The consultant's purpose is to provide the tools to make a determination as to what should be done by CAMPO.

Clarification ensued concerning the ability to use the staff person for either CAMPO or RTC projects, the funding for the staff position, and the status of congressional acts to fund staff positions. The funds will be there before the staff or the consultant are retained. The short range traffic study is a large project and may not have to be adopted before the transportation master plan is approved. It could take over a year to complete. The RTP is part of the master plan. The master plan identifies where you want to go. The TIP tells you how you are going to get there and

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the September 10, 2003, Meeting

Page 8

its funding. The planning program shows what you have, where you want to go, and what can be done. This integrates the cycle. The transit element is one portion of the transportation master plan. The interim program allows funding to be drawn and starts the process. The schedule delineates when the remaining portions will be completed. The funding becomes available when the master plan is adopted.

Member Fontaine felt that the designation of special studies as the final item needed to be more specific. Mr. Flansberg suggested that the item be left out of the program and that the program be adopted as revised. Mr. Burnham suggested that the funding allocated for that purpose be redistributed to the other projects in the program. Mr. Cooper felt that the designation was valid but needed to have more details or, if the Board desired, the funding could be redistributed as Mr. Burnham had suggested. The program could also be amended in the future at any time to add the studies. Mr. Flansberg indicated that 100 percent of the available funds had been distributed in the program. Consultant Jerry Hall explained that the program had been structured to the funds for the necessary tasks which must be done quickly. There is a carryover summary which also needs funds. There are other funds that are available but before a commitment can be made for them the basic tasks must be completed. Mr. Flansberg also indicated that the funding for 2004 is a conservative estimate. Member Holler felt that this indicates that additional funds will be available in the future. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Discussion suggested that a revised motion be adopted which would eliminate the special studies from the program and reallocate the funds to a line item entitled available funding balance. Once the actual funding level is determined, an amended program will be submitted which will allocate the funds. Member Holler moved to approve the 2004 Unified Planning Work Program with the exception of Task 5.1 Special Studies with the balance of the funds allocated to that item to be held in the fund balance for future programs. Member Des Jardins seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**F-6. ACTION TO ACCEPT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION TO CONTRACT WITH STRATEGIC PROJECT MANAGEMENT FOR COMPLETION OF THE TRANSIT ELEMENT OF THE TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AS NEEDED (1-1612)** - Mr. Flansberg explained that staff could enter into contracts up to \$25,000 without action from the Board. The need to ensure adherence to NDOT and FHWA requirements and their acceptance of the process were noted. Direction from the Board was solicited, however, action was not to be taken. Clarification indicated that the contract with Mr. Hall had been included in the process. Member Fontaine explained that Mr. Hall is qualified to do the work, however, the problem is FHWA's requirement that the process be approved by NDOT or NDOT's procurement process must be used before the contract is approved by CAMPO/staff. Staff's recommended process has not yet been approved by NDOT.

Mr. Cooper described NDOT's procurement procedure which mandates that only individuals/firms on a pre-qualified list may be contracted. At this time the City does not have a prequalified list. Another procedure requires that three consultant proposals must be obtained. NDOT's procedure was developed under the federal guidelines which mandate that the process be competitive. There are sole source options available. Mr. Burnham indicated that the City has a number of procedures and will meet with NDOT and make any modifications necessary.

Mr. Flansberg indicated a desire to have an approved process. Staff will analyze the procedures used by other Boards and communities. Examples of different items which need to be considered, i.e., a transit vehicle advertisement policy which will provide additional funds for transit, the transit element of the master plan proposal,

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the September 10, 2003, Meeting

Page 9

the master plan update, the individual tasks which should be accomplished for the TIP, the need to develop a process creating measurable and reporting procedures, etc. Chairperson Staub felt that staff should continue to work on the process and bring the item back as quickly as possible. He then directed that the item be withdrawn. Discussion indicated that the item would be reconsidered in 60 days. (Member Fontaine left the meeting—7:20 p.m. A quorum was still present.)

Clarification indicated that the Board should provide direction regarding the consultant's scope of work and grant staff the ability to continue to work on the transportation master plan. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Member Aldean moved to direct staff to proceed with completion of the transit element of the Transportation Master Plan and Administrative Matters as required. Member Kennedy seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

**G. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS - FUTURE**

**AGENDA ITEMS (NON-ACTION ITEMS) (1-1857)** - Mr. Flansberg apologized for the lateness in getting the agenda packet to the Board. He hoped to have the agenda prepared two or three days before it is required. This procedure will allow the Board to add items to the agenda. The packet is to be delivered on Friday before the meeting.

**H. ADJOURNMENT (1-1865)** - Member Aldean moved to adjourn. Member Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Chairperson Staub adjourned the meeting at 7:22 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 September 10, 2003, Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON December 12, 2003.

/s/  
Richard S. Staub, Chairperson