

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 1

The meeting of the Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization was held on June 11, 2008, 5:30 p.m. at the Community Center-Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chair Shelly Aldean
Vice Chair Russell Carpenter
Member Charles DesJardins
Member Larry Hastings
Member Richard Staub
Member Dennis Taylor
Member Paul Esswein

STAFF: Andrew Burnham, Public Works Director
Patrick Pittenger, Transportation Manager
Dan Doenges, Transportation Planner
Joel Benton, Senior Deputy District Attorney
Keith Pearson, Transportation Planning Technician
Katherine McLaughlin, Recording Secretary
Darlene Rubin, Transcribing Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the commission's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record, on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office. These materials are available for review during regular business hours.

A. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM - (5:30:47) Chair Aldean called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum was present.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - (5:31:31) Minutes of May 14, 2008. A motion was made to approve the minutes. It was seconded, and carried unanimously.

C. MODIFICATIONS OF THE AGENDA - (5:32:21) - None

D. PUBLIC COMMENT (5:32:24) - None

E. DISCLOSURES (5:32:46) - None

F. PUBLIC MEETING (5:33:08)

F-1. Approval of the CAMPO Fiscal Year 2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Dan Doenges, Public Works, noted that at the April meeting a preliminary draft of the *Unified Planning Work Program* (UPWP) for fiscal year 2009 had been distributed. Since then he had met with members of Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) as well as Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) seeking their input. Also, a public informational meeting was held on April 22, 2008, and the 30-day public comment period had come to a close. He had taken the few comments received and revised the UPWP and that document was presented for approval at this meeting. There had been very little change from the

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 2

preliminary draft; however, one, and perhaps the biggest change, was that the FTA had suggested removal of the work task that showed the CAMPO as the designated grantee and it was put into the TIP. Thus, there was no longer any 5307 funding shown in the UPWP and that would appear in the preliminary draft of TIP which would be seen later. Also, on the *Table* on the last page, was the removal of the work task reflected in the distribution of the local share. A note was added that the total local share for the operation of CAMPO will include any applicable projects in the TIP. The local share for responsibilities as the grantee would be \$10,000.00 to be divided among the three entities: Carson City, Douglas and Lyon Counties. Under the Work Element 2.3, the name was changed to “*Regional Consistency Review*,” to better represent what the work task was and to clarify that PL funds were not to be used to review local development plans. Chair Aldean noted a correction was needed on page 6, Task 1.1.1 Preparation of required MPO reports and memoranda (plural) and on page 9 under WORK ELEMENT 4 - Public Transit, 4.1, line four should read “. . . conduction of detailed passenger, etc . . .”

Mr. Doenges added that pending CAMPO’s approval at this meeting, he would be submitting the UPWP to NDOT and FHWA/FTA for their final approvals.

Member Hastings asked about the apportionment of Patrick Pittenger’s time: Was it correct that 70 percent was to CAMPO and 30 percent RTC? Mr. Pittenger said that was correct. However, the percentages did vary. Member Carpenter asked that his name be spelled with “two l’s” in deference to his mother. Mr. Pittenger noted that although no one from Douglas County was present, and while others had in the past attended these meetings, word had been received that David J. Brady was their official person and his name was to be placed on the list of members. Chair Aldean asked if there was a requirement that CAMPO officially authorize the use of an alternate. Mr. Pittenger felt it might be necessary to look at the policy and procedures again. However, he believed that the use of alternates was flexible. Jeff Foltz, Douglas County Senior Civil Engineer, believed that a new county engineer was being hired, Mahmoud “Moody” Azad, and that he would be designated as the person to sit on the board and he, Jeff Foltz, would be the alternate. **Member Carpenter motioned to approve the CAMPO Fiscal Year 2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.**

F-2. Update on the CAMPO 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (5:40:13) Mr. Pittenger stated this was an informational item only and reported that shortly after last month’s meeting he met with FHWA and members of NDOT staff to discuss the new regulations for fiscal constraint in regional plans. “We now have to prove we have the money for anything we put in a plan.” Previously a project to add a third northbound lane on 395 in Douglas County could be listed as NDOT, developer, and Douglas County funds, now, however, unless there was a signed developer agreement, it could not be included in the plan. The significant difference, he added, was that “. . . we need to have a fiscally constrained element, and if we so choose we can have an illustrative element that shows what we want to have happen, but at the present time cannot prove that we have the funds available.” Mr. Pittenger then presented several maps--Maps 1 and 2 showed 2015 Fiscally Constrained and Illustrative, respectively, but there was not a substantial difference. However, looking at Map 3 for the year 2030, the Fiscally Constrained Model could not include the widening of U.S. 50 from Saliman east, nor the widening of 395, nor the additional lands on the freeway from U.S. 50 to Spooner Junction. Some serious negative effects were shown; the freeway was at level of service (LOS) D and E and because of the poor performance of the freeway there was increased congestion--“people were going right past the freeway on 50 over to Saliman on 5th Street.” Fairview was at LOS D, E and F South of U.S. 50. Additionally, Douglas County began to see some of their local roads revealed a LOS E and F, as well. On Map 4, Mr. Pittenger noted that in this illustrative model there were still difficulties, however, it was a better picture of the performance growth of Fairview and the freeway from 50 to Spooner Junction.

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 3

Turning next to Figure 1, Mr. Pittenger described the total VMT in the CAMPO model area by LOS for each model scenario. There was much less traffic LOS D, E and F with the projects implemented that were intended to be pursued. He added that "submittal of the RTP under the new federal requirements would be the first time around for everybody . . . we may be the Guinea pigs in that we may be the first ones to turn ours into the Federal Highway Administration, and it may be interesting to see their interpretation of all the new federal regulations that had come to pass." He expected to have the preliminary draft of all that had been shown by the end of the month. The comment period would go through July, and by August he could come back before the CAMPO with a plan for adoption, which had to be done prior to September 30, when the TIP expired.

Member Hastings asked if the model would take into consideration the increase in gas prices and many people riding bicycles, as well as the increase in transit ridership. Mr. Pittenger said he expected increased transit ridership and even larger changes such as people living closer to work. However, the current model had not reflected that as it was evolving at present. In the future, the plan would be looked at again when those economic patterns and conditions were evolving as well as new federal legislation due out in September 2009. "Wholesale changes" were expected as the federal government's highway trust fund and transit funds were about to "go broke nationally."

Mr. Hastings then asked if any studies were planned in the interim to take into account vehicle occupancy, rider ship, pedestrian counts, and so on. Mr. Pittenger said he could do that and could add that to the planning efforts as CAMPO wished.

Member Carpenter noted that the 2030 Illustrative Model ignored the Heybourne Road Alignment. Mr. Pittenger agreed it was a good point. At a previous meeting it was indicated there was no funding for that and the representative from Douglas County here present, had expressed his concurrence with what was being discussed as not having that alignment in. There were other routes that could be put in, as well as a road to Dayton, but at the current time, Mr. Pittenger stated, "we are already so far beyond our funded locations for the federal government, it was removed from the plan." Mr. Carpenter said he had noticed the objections to the Heybourne Road alignment, however, he believed that as long as an illustrative model was available it was irresponsible not to at least include that as an option. He believed further that at some future date people would wonder if, as a member of CAMPO, Russell Carpenter had ever spoken of the Heybourne Road Alignment, and he wanted it known that indeed he had.

Chair Aldean believed that there were other options and asked if there was an interest on the part of Douglas County to include any of those alternate alignments in the *Illustrative Plan for 2030*. Jeff Foltz, Douglas County, said they were not prepared to fund any of those at this time. Ms. Aldean said that as she understood the illustrative plan, funding was not a constraint. Mr. Pittenger agreed, the illustrative plan indicated what was more probable even though the funding sources might not be. (He understood that both Washoe and Clark Counties had added a third element called the "Unfunded Element," which went even further beyond the illustrative model. He had no intention of adding that.) Therefore, it could be added to the illustrative model if the board desired. However, there was no appetite for a road so far as Parks and Recreation was concerned, but it was CAMPO's job to serve the transportation element, therefore, he hoped it could be put into the model at some point to see how that would affect the "huge purple area that stretches for miles . . ." Mr. Pittenger responded that they had shown at a previous meeting what it would be like to have the other eastern roadway at the Heybourne Alignment; it had only a very marginal effect. Mr. Taylor's group had done a similar study and they found that while it had preserved an alternative, it had not solved the "purple color" on the map.

Member Taylor confirmed Mr. Pittenger's statement about the Heybourne Alignment; there simply was not money

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 4

for it, even in the long range. If there were money for it, in order for it to have any impact on 395 or South Carson Street, the Carson City freeway Phase II-B would have to be complete, 395 south would have to be widened, and nearly all the other projects identified in that corridor study would have to be completed to make a significant impact. Nevertheless, he added, they had done the model runs with all those improvements from that corridor study and had evaluated with respect to South Carson and what impact those improvements could have.

F-3. Preliminary draft of the CAMPO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for federal fiscal years 2009 to 2012 (October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2012). (5:54:25) Mr. Pittenger reported this was informational only regarding a preliminary draft of the TIP which the federal government required to be approved and in place for any federal funding to flow. “We cannot ask for them to even review this unless we do it subsequently to or concurrently with the Regional Transportation Plan.” The TIP was not a long document and a preliminary draft had been completed, but it would not be released until the Regional Transportation Plan had been released. The fiscal constraints mentioned above applied to the TIP as well. While there were many projects that were significant to NDOT, Carson City, and other local agencies, they did not need to be in that document. Mr. Pittenger stated there was no need to bog down the document with projects that had already been listed in those agencies’ TIP’s. The bicycle and pedestrian improvements included enhancement projects, again federal funds and transit ended up looking very big, because there were multiple operators in the urbanized area and both capital and operating expenses, all federal funds, had to be listed. Other improvements included the V & T and two enhancement projects for the Nevada State Railroad Museum. He added that it would be put out for public comment at the same time as the Regional Transportation Plan, and would seek to add or subtract as required prior to submitting to the Federal Highway Administration and NDOT/FTA in August.

Chair Aldean noted on page 4, under the *Local Funds* summary, the county option sales tax to be used for road maintenance should probably be identified as such, because the one cent motor fuel tax and the state shared revenue had been specified.

(Mr. Pittenger distributed the final resolutions of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission and the Carson River Advisory Committee.)

Mr. Pittenger commented that one of the project areas listed was the freeway landscape improvements along the new Carson Freeway, that money came from the federal earmark, the RTC, and the State Community Match Program, and the members of GROW were instrumental in securing that and it had been duly noted in the TIP to make sure that was not an obstacle in getting that project through. Chair Aldean noted that it was slated for completion in 2009.

F-4. Action to authorize the publishing of proposed Fiscal Year 2009 DBE goals. (5:58:39) - Keith Pearson, Department of Public Works, sought authorization to publish the proposed *Federal Fiscal Year 2009 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goal*. (He noted that although his report stated simply “Fiscal Year” it was in fact the Federal Fiscal Year.) He had spoken with NDOT’s Roc Stacey, and was informed he would be required to set a goal for the 5307 funds; everything else would be covered under NDOT’s plan for their DBE goal. There would be only one contracting opportunity with the Jump Around Carson (JAC) for the transit service, for which he hoped the option would be exercised at the RTC meeting. He added that everything else was done in-house using City resources, as was done in Douglas County as well. **A motion was made to authorize the publishing of the annual DBE Goal for zero percent for federal fiscal year 2009. It was seconded and carried unanimously.**

CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2008

Page 5

G. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (6:00:25)

G-1. Future Agenda Items - Mr. Pittenger noted that because they would be in the middle of the public comment period on TIP and RTP, and by next month hoped the Public Participation Plan would be approved, he therefore expected nothing else to arise.

Member Hastings would like to see what kind of study the Commission might want to do during the summer to become familiar with what was going on out on the streets. He believed it would be a great opportunity to see how many people--more or less--were coming into Carson City. Mr. Pittenger remarked that "we are getting about 30 bicycles on buses every week." Chair Aldean asked how Mr. Pittenger wanted to proceed and he felt he wanted to give it some thought and see what kind of resources were available--"we're really good at counting cars"--but for counting in other areas no methods were available. Ms. Aldean suggested counters could be put down on streets where there was typically a large volume to see if there had been a dramatic increase or decrease. Also, Muscle Powered could be enlisted to take some counts.

I. ADJOURNMENT (6:02:3) - A motion was made to adjourn, it was seconded and carried unanimously.

Chair Aldean adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.

The Minutes of the June 11, 2008 Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization meeting ARE SO APPROVED this _____ day of _____, 2008.

SHELLY ALDEAN, CHAIR