A regular meeting of the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission was scheduled to begin following adjournment of the Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization meeting on Wednesday, April 11, 2012 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Shelly Aldean

Vice Chairperson James Mallery Commissioner Charles Des Jardins Commissioner John McKenna Commissioner James Smolenski

STAFF: Andrew Burnham, Public Works Department Director

Darren Schulz, Deputy Public Works Director Daniel Doenges, Senior Transportation Planner

Ken Smithson, Transit Coordinator

Jeff Sharp, City Engineer

Tina Russom, Deputy District Attorney

Kathleen King, Deputy Clerk / Recording 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 part of the public record. These materials are available for review, in the Clerk's Office, during regular business hours.

- **A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM** (6:01:18) Chairperson Aldean called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Commissioner Des Jardins had temporarily left the meeting room, and returned at 6:03 p.m.
- **B. PUBLIC COMMENT** (6:01:42) Chairperson Aldean entertained public comment; however, none was forthcoming.
- C. POSSIBLE ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES March 14, 2012 (6:02:18) Commissioner Smolenski moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner McKenna seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0.
- **D. AGENDA MANAGEMENT NOTICE** (6:02:47) Chairperson Aldean entertained modifications to the agenda and, when none were forthcoming, deemed it adopted as published.
- **E. DISCLOSURES** (6:03:16) None.
- F. CONSENT AGENDA (6:03:30) Chairperson Aldean entertained requests to hear items separate from the consent agenda. When none were forthcoming, she entertained a motion to approve the consent agenda. Vice Chairperson Mallery so moved. Commissioner Smolenski seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.
- F-1. POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE AN INTERLOCAL CONTRACT WITH THE STATE OF NEVADA DIVISION OF HEALTH CARE FINANCING AND POLICY ("DHCFP") FOR THE REIMBURSEMENT OF PARATRANSIT ASSESSMENTS FOR MEDICAID RECIPIENTS ON THE JAC ASSIST SERVICE

- F-2. POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE AWARD OF \$1,400.00 IN BUS PASSES TO THE RURAL CENTER FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING / DO DROP IN FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013 (JULY 1, 2012 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2013)
- F-3. INFORMATION REGARDING A LETTER FROM THE CITY OF CARSON CITY IN SUPPORT OF THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION'S ("NDOT") TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT GENERATING ECONOMIC RECOVERY ("TIGER") GRANT APPLICATION FOR FUNDING FOR THE CARSON CITY FREEWAY
- F-4. POSSIBLE ACTION TO ACCEPT THE WORK AS COMPLETED, TO ACCEPT THE CONTRACT SUMMARY AS PRESENTED, AND TO APPROVE THE RELEASE OF FINAL PAYMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$16,368.68 FOR CONTRACT NO. 1011-242, TITLED "CARSON CITY GATEWAY SIGNAGE PROJECT," TO RaPID CONSTRUCTION, INC.

G. PUBLIC MEETING ITEMS:

- G-1. RECOGNITION OF JACK SHELTON, WINNER OF THE 2011 KATHERINE McCLARY PROFESSIONAL OPERATOR OF THE YEAR AWARD FOR MV TRANSPORTATION, DIVISION 51 (CONTRACT OPERATOR OF THE JAC SERVICE) (6:04:09) Chairperson Aldean introduced this item, stepped from the dais, and invited Mr. Shelton to join her at the podium. Chairperson Aldean read into the record the language of the Certificate of Appreciation, copies of which were included in the agenda materials, and presented the original Certificate to Mr. Shelton. She thanked Mr. Shelton for his "faithful service to our community." (6:05:10) Mr. Shelton commended his fellow employees and managers, and accepted the award "on behalf of everybody that works at MV Transportation." The commissioners, City staff, and citizens present applauded. Chairperson Aldean commended the "exemplary public transportation system in Carson City ... reflected in the continual increase in ridership." She thanked the MV Transportation staff for "doing an exemplary job of servicing our community."
- G-2. POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE ACCEPTANCE OF ADDITIONAL AWARD OF \$181,289 FROM THE STATE ENERGY PROGRAM AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT (6:06:48) Chairperson Aldean introduced this item, and Mr. Schulz reviewed the agenda materials. Chairperson Aldean entertained questions or comments of the commissioners and, when none were forthcoming, public comments. When none were forthcoming, she entertained a motion. Commissioner Smolenski moved to approve the acceptance of additional award of \$181,289 from the State Energy Program American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Commissioner McKenna seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.
- G-3. POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE A \$1,000 CONTRIBUTION TO SECRET WITNESS OF NORTHERN NEVADA TO PROVIDE A REWARD FOR INFORMATION LEADING TO THE ARREST AND SUCCESSFUL PROSECUTION OF ANY INDIVIDUAL(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR VANDALIZING ROADWAY SIGNS, FREEWAY LANDSCAPING, AND ARTWORK, AND OTHER TRANSPORTATION-RELATED PROPERTY WITHIN CARSON CITY (6:09:12) Chairperson Aldean introduced this item, and Mr. Doenges reviewed the agenda materials. Chairperson Aldean commended the idea to treat the rock veneer portions of the gateway signs with an anti-graffiti coating. Mr. Burnham discussed the importance of including the anti-graffiti coating, and provided additional clarification of the purpose for the contribution to Secret Witness. In response to a question, Chairperson Aldean further clarified that the reward would be "restricted to information leading

to the arrest and successful prosecution of anyone who defaces or vandalizes an improvement ... in Carson City. ... the next step is to contact Secret Witness ... and contract with them and be very specific." Chairperson Aldean suggested agendizing the contract for approval by the commission.

Chairperson Aldean entertained public comment and, when none was forthcoming, a motion. Vice Chairperson Mallery moved to approve a \$1,000 contribution to Secret Witness of Northern Nevada to provide a reward for information leading to the arrest and successful prosecution of individuals responsible for vandalizing roadway signs, freeway landscaping, and artwork, and other transportation-related property within Carson City. Commissioner Des Jardins seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

G-4. INFORMATION REGARDING RTC AND STREETS REVENUES AND PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE COSTS (6:12:43) - Chairperson Aldean introduced this item, and Mr. Schulz reviewed the agenda materials in conjunction with displayed slides. Chairperson Aldean noted that a portion of the gas tax revenues is obligated to NDOT for completion of the freeway. Mr. Schulz and Mr. Burnham responded to questions of clarification and discussion took place throughout the presentation.

Chairperson Aldean entertained questions or comments of the commissioners and of the public; however, none were forthcoming. In response to a comment, Chairperson Aldean suggested reagendizing, for discussion and possible action, the possibility of reducing the size of the municipality relative to the producer price index. Following a brief discussion, she thanked Mr. Schulz and Mr. Burnham for their presentation.

- G-5. POSSIBLE ACTION TO REVIEW AND APPROVE THE RTC, STREETS, TRANSIT, AND CAMPO BUDGETS FOR FY 2012 / 2013 (6:37:54) Chairperson Aldean introduced this item, and Mr. Burnham reviewed the agenda materials. He advised that the subject budgets will be presented at the April 19th Board of Supervisors meeting. Chairperson Aldean entertained questions of the commissioners and, when none were forthcoming, of the public. When none were forthcoming, she entertained a motion. Commissioner Des Jardins moved to approve the fiscal year 2012 / 2013 budgets for RTC, Streets, Transit, and CAMPO, and forward them to the Board of Supervisors for inclusion in the City budget. Vice Chairperson Mallery seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.
- G-6. POSSIBLE ACTION TO PROVIDE DIRECTION TO STAFF REGARDING THE MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A PORTION OF SIERRA VISTA LANE (6:43:45) Chairperson Aldean introduced this item, and advised of having requested staff to agendize review and approval of the budgets prior to this item, noting the importance of keeping our financial limitations in mind in the context of discussing the ultimate maintenance and disposition of Sierra Vista Lane. Mr. Sharp provided background information on this item, and reviewed the agenda materials in conjunction with a displayed aerial photograph which was also included in the agenda materials. In response to a question, he clarified the location of the Sierra Vista and Rio Vista Lanes intersection.

Chairperson Aldean entertained comments or questions of the commissioners. Vice Chairperson Mallery commended Mr. Sharp's presentation. Vice Chairperson Mallery read into the record the last half of the last paragraph of the agenda report at page 2, and inquired "isn't this a little different issue than asking the City to maintain the road?" Mr. Sharp explained that the option for certain property owners to be included in the homeowners association was offered as a "potential ... that might be ... logical ... if this commission were to decide that the City would not do maintenance. The thought is, it would be up to them to determine if they wanted to spend money on this road ..."

Commissioner McKenna expressed concern over "an adversarial tone in this whole discussion [which won't solve the problem. This problem could have been solved ten ... eleven years ago by the Supervisors. They decided not to. This problem could have been solved back when the ... houses were first approved and the lots were first split." Commissioner McKenna expressed the opinion "we have a group of people that have very nice houses and they're sitting in a place where their access is a problem. ... is it a City problem? Is it their problem? It's everyone's problem and we need to resolve what we're going to do about that." Commissioner McKenna expressed a preference to develop "some type of agreement to solve this problem for the rest of time ... Lots of ways to do it and ... negotiation is the best and it doesn't have to be solved this year. We don't have to go out and spend a million dollars to tear that road out and redo it this year." Commissioner McKenna noted that "things have changed out there. The City now owns parts of these parcels under the public lands bill. The other thing that's changed is this area is used more and more for recreation and the City has not done anything to close it off from recreation. So there are valid Carson City people uses that are not uses by the residents." Commissioner McKenna expressed a preference to address the "whole thing ... as a problem that needs to be solved; not an either / or; or 'We're going to abandon you and you can do whatever you want to with the road,' to the homeowners." He suggested that the Board of Supervisors may be the more appropriate body "to give direction to solve the problem, but this problem is not going to go away." Commissioner McKenna expressed opposition to be "watching this on TV ten years from now and have the same discussion with a new set of residents or maybe the same residents at higher cost."

In response to previous comments, Ms. Russom advised that the commission cannot provide direction to the homeowners association. She further advised that the commission "only has the option to either give direction to staff or to reject ... the roadway and conclude that the City is not going to maintain it or take over maintenance of it."

Chairperson Aldean entertained additional commissioner comments or questions. Commissioner Des Jardins expressed agreement with Commissioner McKenna's comments. He advised of having recently driven on Sierra Vista Lane, and expressed the opinion "this is a very, very big-picture item. ... it isn't just trying to take care of a small part of the road." He agreed "we have a huge issue there that wasn't addressed originally when whomever gave approval for building permits and a lot of other things." Commissioner Des Jardins suggested considering the matter "in a big way, solve this, and just ... not come back ten or twenty years from now and have the same problem there."

Chairperson Aldean entertained public comment. (7:00:03) Donna Gray advised of having researched the history of the subject matter, and presented the same. She advised, "This issue was never addressed. ... There was one mention in a footnote in a staff report which says, "The area is reached by a roadway known as Mexican Dam Road easement," and that was all. There was nothing about maintenance." Ms. Gray "suspect[s] that the reason this wasn't addressed was that it was initiated by the City and it wasn't a private developer that was developing these applications." Ms. Gray continued reviewing the researched history relative to Sierra Vista Lane, including past actions of the Planning Commissions, the Board of Supervisors, and the City's Building Division. She suggested that maintenance of Sierra Vista Lane is a City responsibility in consideration of ensuring City services are "adequately accessible to the citizens ..." She emphasized that building permits have continued to be issued. "So now you've got 30 residences there that rely on this road. This is the only ingress / egress route for this community." Ms. Gray acknowledged the budget limitations, but reiterated the belief that maintenance should be the City's responsibility. She noted that the residents are "not the only users of this road. We already pay our taxes. We already buy gas and contribute our ... income to City roads. Twenty of the 30 residences that are there already pay for maintenance of our internal roads. So we're already paying for the adequate access of emergency vehicles

to get to our houses. ... We're not talking about \$80,000 or \$100,000 of improvements to the road. [She] just want[s] to make sure that the road remains passable so that emergency vehicles can get to us when needed."

In response to a question, Mr. Sharp advised of having spoken with Fire Chief Stacey Giomi who advised "there are zero issues ... up to the south end ... as far as emergency access is concerned. ... once you get into the gravel roads, if you continue on Sierra Vista Lane, there's a hill and ... it's washboarded out and ... that will cause some concerns for emergency services, especially for the ambulances because they'll have to travel slowly ..." Ms. Gray expressed appreciation for Mr. Sharp conveying Chief Giomi's comments and advised "we can do something about that." In response to a question, Ms. Gray advised there were no representations made relative to maintenance of the road at the time she purchased her property. "I purchased my property in 2004. It was already built so I didn't need to get any permits." She advised of having recently reviewed her title documents "and there's nothing in there."

In response to a question, Mr. Burnham estimated that a previous moratorium on subdivision development was ended in the early 1990s. He advised that the City has "done parcel maps for years and years in a lot of places." He suggested the subject matter is similar to the Clear Creek Road maintenance issues. "That one's a little more complicated because it has a whole lot of right-of-way issues related to it. But we did go to that community and suggest to them ... the possibility ... of an assessment district for raising funds to ... raise the level of that roadway to a standard that could be maintained. ... we provided costs and went to every ... homeowner that was part of the interest up there and they soundly said 'No,' they didn't want to pay the dollars to do that ... and as a result we don't maintain that roadway."

Commissioner McKenna inquired as to details of the subject process. Mr. Burnham advised that "it really comes down to a policy decision by either this [commission] and / or the Board of Supervisors. It's a money issue. Do we want to spend money on it or not? And you're right. It's not a lot of money to keep it in a position to maintain it for emergency access. That's not a lot of money. But every dollar we spend on that roadway is a dollar we don't spend on asphalt which we just saw is not enough. It's just a matter of stretching dollars and a policy decision by this [commission] as to where we spend our dollars. From staff's standpoint, we can maintain the roadway just fine. It's just a matter of where you tell us to spend the money." Commissioner McKenna explained the reason for asking the question at this time "so that those in the audience that are bringing their opinions forward at least have some information as to what their options are." He expressed an interest in everyone's comments and emphasized the importance of solving the problem "even if it's we will do nothing for ten years and then build a bridge across the River … I don't want this thing to go on any longer than it has to go."

Chairperson Aldean entertained additional questions or comments for Ms. Gray and, when none were forthcoming, additional public comment. (7:11:23) Greg Regan advised that he and his wife live "in the very first occupied parcel on Sierra Vista Lane. We built our house five years ago and, when we got our permits, there was no problem. No one ever asked us about the access ..." He advised of having noticed the "greatly expanded recreational use of that area. We're getting a lot more traffic than we did even five years ago. People are coming out from Carson City to go to the River and to go to the parks. They just expanded the park down by the bridge and put in picnic areas so that our traffic is not just the people that live on that road. Our traffic [is] the citizens ... who are using the recreation areas." Mr. Regan expressed the opinion that "all the people of Carson City should be responsible for maintaining those roads."

(7:12:55) Mark Kimbrough discussed his knowledge of the history of Mexican Dam Road / Sierra Vista Lane, the various improvements made over the years, and homeowners association laws. "And we found ourselves trying to spend more money outside the subdivision on a road that we don't own and we're trespassing essentially. That really puts our neck out when we're out on that road." Mr. Kimbrough advised that he plows the road in the winter. "It's no man's land. We were victims in this. We assumed that when we moved out there, that was all squared away to get us out there." He provided background information on meetings with former Transportation Manager John Flansberg and former City Manager John Berkich. Mr. Kimbrough expressed agreement with Ms. Gray "that the City has some real responsibility in this. ... We're had. We don't have any choices with that piece of property." Due to a certain undersized culvert in the road, Mr. Kimbrough advised "if that blew out, we wouldn't have access to our homes." He emphasized "there's no blame here," and expressed understanding for the budget limitations, "but we're kind of like victims ..." in consideration of poor planning.

Vice Chairperson Mallery inquired as to Mr. Kimbrough's thoughts at the time the Board of Supervisors authorized the one-time repair. Mr. Kimbrough recalled feeling very appreciative, and advised that "when they said, 'You're going to have to maintain it,' I thought that a lot of this stuff had been solved with the rights-of-way, with the decent road design. I didn't see us being the Titanic. I knew that would be a tough decision. ... I assumed we'd be back because there's no way with the amount of money we have and ... trespassing, trying to work on somebody else's property, working on roads ... We've made a couple attempts to patch a few of those so you get volunteers on their own time, using their own trucks, getting blacktop, and we're out there with guys and gals and those gas[-powered] tamping machines, trying to put patch down and we spend all day and you get twenty square feet of pavement done with our whole budget gone." Vice Chairperson Mallery reiterated an interest in the thought-process when the residents were told it would be a one-time thing. Mr. Kimbrough commented, "When you have a homeowners association and change of membership and change of people who manage it and work with it, it's very difficult to get ... decisions made that everybody's going to agree to. ... when the road was paved, I had people complaining to me that they wanted it dirt because they didn't want all these people coming out and finding out our secret place out there ..."

(7:24:02) Bernard "Duke" Thorson advised of having constructed his home in 1992 on Mexican Dam Road, and provided background information on his military service and health issues. "So I haven't really gotten involved with that out there." He advised that "from where [he] sits down there and look up that hill, where Sierra Vista goes, people drive too fast. And it's not the people out there in the homeowners association. It's people from Johnson Lane. They cut through the back there. They work over in Dayton and when they come through that back there, they have to slow down." He discussed concerns relative to safety in consideration of blind curves on the road, and inquired as to "how much a human life is worth." He expressed the opinion that Sierra Vista Lane "is the most dangerous road [he] has driven on," and invited the commissioners to drive on the road. Chairperson Aldean thanked Mr. Thorson for his testimony and reiterated the budget limitations. She described the deteriorating condition of Goni Road in her neighborhood, and expressed understanding for Mr. Thorson's concerns.

Chairperson Aldean entertained additional public comment. (7:30:53) John Peterson suggested that Carson City has "obviously encouraged ... recreation along the River" in consideration of the recent park improvements. He estimated that "ninety percent of the traffic on that road is not the residents of our area ..."

(7:31:24) Mickey Miller inquired as to the results of a recent traffic study. Mr. Sharp advised of having placed a traffic counter for a period of seven days. "It was average vehicle trips of 200 vehicles per day."

Mr. Miller stated "that's definitely way more than the people living out there." Mr. Sharp advised there are thirty built homes "on that stretch of road past where the counter was." In response to a question, he explained that planning traffic counts for subdivisions accounts for ten trips per residence per day. "Based on that, the traffic that's out there is consistent with the dwelling units that are built." Chairperson Aldean suggested anecdotal information indicates increased traffic due to recreational use. Mr. Burnham acknowledged that the residents of the subject area likely leave once a day and return once a day. "It's much different living in a rural area."

Chairperson Aldean entertained additional public comment. (7:32:59) Donna Matthias advised of having moved to the area in 1994, and of having done "some study on the road when we've had problems before. ... that piece of Indian land belongs to an Indian couple, Arroyos, and ... they did say that we could pass through that land because we were not going to buy the land unless we could go across the Indian land and they showed us that we could go across that Indian land. So if you decide to help us out, that land is not going to have to be as big a problem ..." Chairperson Aldean requested Ms. Matthias to share her information with Ms. Russom and Mr. Sharp.

Chairperson Aldean entertained additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, thanked the citizens for the civility of their testimony. She expressed understanding for the importance of the issue to the residents. In response to a question, Mr. Sharp advised that the City is not included in the cross-easement. Ms. Russom acknowledged that the City would need to be included in the cross-easement in order to maintain the subject segment of roadway. Mr. Sharp disagreed, and advised that the easements shown on the parcels indicate public access. "With everything, except for the Indian allotment land, ... there's an easement in place. We may have to go and let the homeowners know that we're going to be doing maintenance out there, but ... we don't have to go and buy an easement or get onto a cross-easement ... Those cross-easements don't say it's for x, y, and z people. It's for public access. That's what the cross-easements were for." Additional discussion followed to clarify the purpose for the cross-easements. Mr. Sharp acknowledged there is a general public easement on every one of the lots, except for the Indian allotment land. In response to a further question, Mr. Burnham advised that the road would not have to be brought to City standards.

Chairperson Aldean read from a set of Board of Supervisors minutes researched by staff. She suggested "some buyer's remorse and ... on the one hand, you can insist that people bought their property realizing what the limitations were on the traversability of that road. ... what's compelling is the fact that it is being used more and more by members of the general public." She discussed the importance of the residents taking some responsibility for the solution, and suggested "there's ... enough culpability to go around. ... people bought their property knowing ... the limitations on the road. The City approved ... the issuance of building permits in that subdivision." Chairperson Aldean suggested convening a work group, consisting of staff, Commissioner McKenna, and the homeowners association, and developing a solution that doesn't entirely rely on the City to solve the problem. Mr. Schulz noted the purpose of the agenda item for the commission to determine whether or not the City accepts some sort of responsibility. "... if we can't spend any sort of money on this road, what do we come to the table with ... if we sit down and talk to them." He requested direction of the commission, and reiterated "if we don't accept the road for maintenance, then we can't spend any money."

Commissioner McKenna reiterated the problem needs to be solved "and spending money is the last thing that happens. ... What do we want Sierra Vista to look like? ... Open Space has land out there now. The park's been expanded. That area of the world is different than it was back in 1990." Commissioner McKenna expressed an interest in conducting a study "with the knowledge that a solution has to be arrived

at. And it doesn't have to be a mutually-agreeable solution but that would be best. But if you went out there and did a study and you found out that in the documentation for subdivision, the subdividers were told, 'It's your problem to get access to this and the City has nothing to do with it,' if there's a smoking-gun document like that and we find that, then I'll live with that document. But what we have is ... residents of Carson City who are paying Carson City tax who have asked for services that I expect ... and so there's equity there. Were they taken advantage of by the people that parceled the map out? Is Carson City culpable for not enforcing good standards now? We can get into all that old stuff, but what is the solution that is best for Carson City and for these people and how do we then implement it?" Commissioner McKenna clarified he was not considering a "one-year implementation ... If five years from now, there's money saved, there's dedications, there's pavement put down ... and that's what everybody agrees to, I have no problem ... This could have been solved in 2000."

Chairperson Aldean cautioned that no one should perceive that even if the City accepts responsibility the road is going to be repaired. "There are plenty of roads around town that are in dire need of maintenance. It just means that in the hierarchy of looking at the required improvements on these various roadways around town, ... it will be factored into the equation." She reiterated the recommendation to convene a study group. Mr. Burnham advised of having struggled with the issue for over a year and expressed the opinion "we're not much further along. ... we know a little bit more information, but it really comes down to the fact are we going to want to maintain it in one fashion or another." He expressed the opinion that the City will likely accept maintenance responsibility, but it may be at a very minimal maintenance level. He suggested making the decision to maintain the road "at some level and that we will work, as staff, to determine what that level is and it'll be at a fairly minimal maintenance." He expressed the opinion that the residents would be happy with that decision "and move forward and just get it done." He advised "the amount of money that we're talking about is fairly small and I'm not suggesting we take all the roads ... but this is one of the roads that apparently ... has changed over time, especially the recreation aspects of it." He reiterated the suggestion to accept maintenance responsibility. "We're talking a mile of roadway. We already maintain a mile and a half of roadway and we'll figure out how to do it within the budgets that we have in Public Works and ... we'll resolve it." Chairperson Aldean reiterated the "need for increased dialogue," and expressed the opinion that the residents are looking for "something more substantial ... long term." Mr. Burnham suggested that the level of maintenance would be generally what is done on the first mile and a half of roadway "which is filling the potholes. We'd probably resolve some of the drainage over time because that's an issue that we also have a concern with ... from an emergency standpoint ..." He reiterated the suggestion to accept maintenance responsibility, to resolve the budget issues over time, spend a minimal amount of money, but continue to maintain emergency access. In response to a question, Mr. Burnham advised that the commission has authority to make the decision.

Chairperson Aldean reiterated the importance of coming to a longer-term solution "that may involve an increased contribution from the folks this road is serving. That doesn't mean that the City shouldn't be a partner in maintaining it, but do we take all of the maintenance or part of the maintenance? Do we take a portion of the maintenance in recognition of the fact that this road is used by recreationalists in the area and then we rely on the people who use this as a way of accessing their homes to participate somehow in the ongoing maintenance? That's what I'm suggesting and that's the sort of thing I don't think we can decide this evening, but ... we could by sitting down, face-to-face, and having that conversation. ... this is a bandaid approach this problem ... but I don't want my successors to deal with this two years, three years hence because new people move into the area ... and that's why I'm suggesting a more global approach to looking at a long-term solution to this problem." In response to a question, Chairperson Aldean clarified her suggestion relative to the work group. Vice Chairperson Mallery volunteered to participate.

At Ms. Gray's request, Chairperson Aldean entertained additional public comment. (7:48:17) Ms. Gray advised that "at least ten of the residents are not members of the homeowners association." Discussion followed, and Chairperson Aldean expressed the preference for the first work group meeting to take place within one month and for a recommendation to be returned to the commission within two to three months. In response to comments, Vice Chairperson Mallery suggested that two to three months longer should not make much difference in consideration of the ten-year problem.

Vice Chairperson Mallery commended Mr. Burnham's and Chairperson Aldean's suggestions. He noted the various comments relative to "people coming from Johnson Lane, driving like crazy when they get to Sierra Vista, being accident prone, the liability to the City, ... plus all of the issues of the potholes, the dollars, and everything else." He expressed the opinion that each one of the issues should be addressed, and reiterated there should be no problem taking the time to arrive at a longer-term solution. Discussion followed, and Chairperson Aldean expressed the opinion "there needs to be some participation by the chief recipients of the money that we are diverting from other streets ..." She reiterated the importance of developing a long-term solution, but also noted the importance of ensuring equitability "because we don't want people in other remote parts of town saying, 'Well, look what you did for Sierra Vista. Do the same thing for us." Vice Chairperson Mallery suggested that the residents "made tremendous headway" at this meeting.

Commissioner Smolenski expressed agreement with Vice Chairperson Mallery's and Mr. Burnham's comments. He further agreed with the importance of determining the "minimal acceptable maintenance of that stretch of road." Chairperson Aldean entertained additional public comment. (7:54:16) Greg Regan advised that he is not a member of the homeowners association, and expressed concern that a work group of "three or four people" cannot "decide for 47 residents, none of whom are bound in any way, other than scraping their dirt roads ..." Chairperson Aldean suggested notifying all the affected residents and users, and acknowledged the City cannot bind any of them to a commitment.

(7:55:50) Duke Thorson commended Mr. Burnham's suggestion to "fix the minimal as soon as possible." He reiterated his concern over the existing safety issues, and discussion followed.

Chairperson Aldean entertained a motion. Commissioner McKenna moved to direct staff to develop and bring back, by the end of July, their recommendations to maintain "the road, Sierra Vista Lane, but that section of Sierra Vista Lane." The motion was seconded. Commissioner McKenna explained the intent for staff to "come back with their recommendations to maintain the road. What we have said is we are going to maintain the road. And I want staff to have the leeway to come back and tell us how they want to maintain the road, what's best for the City. When they bring this plan back, we can then ask them to implement a longer-term plan based upon their recommendations. I don't want to get into directing staff to pave the thing and have a four-lane wide freeway. I don't want them to say we'll maintain it at a minimal level and the minimal level is they drive through it once a week to make sure it's still there. It's direction to staff is what it is. We're going to maintain the road. Let's figure out how we're going to maintain it. That's what I'm asking."

Chairperson Aldean entertained additional commissioner comments. Vice Chairperson Mallery inquired as to the reason for waiting until July, and expressed the opinion "we should try to stick to two months. The second is, to Jeff and Andy, what are you going to be able to provide, based upon this motion that you haven't already provided … You've talked about potholes, you've talked about paving it, you've talked about drainage, you provided a tremendous amount of information already so what new would you provide by July as part of this motion?"

Mr. Burnham stated, "We would likely provide some more detail to what we've provided already and maybe some alternatives as to different levels of maintenance that we might be able to do. And you could pick, as a policy group, what makes sense to you." In response to a question, Mr. Burnham advised that the information could be returned to the commission at the May meeting. "It's not very hard to do." Mr. Sharp stated, "We have the detail as far as patching the road. ... we've measured ... by the square foot. We have a spreadsheet that's three or four pages long and put a dollar per square foot to that so we know what kind of work needs to be done out there. It's just a matter of, I'm not sure what we bring back more than what we've already brought. The fact is, I gave you some cost numbers and that's included in here of what it takes and if we only have \$20,000 to spend, then we'll spend \$20,000 on it. If we want to spend \$200,000, then we'll spend that, but that's what it boils down to is dollars and cents, I think. ... we could study this thing to death, but the fact is we've already studied it to death, to the point of measuring and putting numbers to what can be done out there."

Commissioner McKenna explained the reason for designating July in his motion "is [the] City has budget hearings pretty soon. The end of the fiscal year is June 30. It's going to be, in my opinion, a very, very tough discussion as to where we go and what we fund and what City services are going to look like. There is no money. In fact, there probably is less money than what we need. So that's why I picked July so these guys would have time, if they needed it, to see the whole picture. The other thing is, what I would hope for is you not fix Shelly's street this year and you take that money and apply it to this project. That's why I put in here to give you guys the chance to create a plan. I don't want you to study it death, I don't want you to spend any more money on studying it, but Andy may be sitting there going, 'Well, if we gotta do it, then let's do it this way versus this way.' I don't want to ever get in a position where I'm directing staff on how to do your job. I want you to come back and tell me how you can do your job best."

Chairperson Aldean entertained additional commissioner comments and, when none were forthcoming, called for a vote on the pending motion. **Motion carried 3-2.** Chairperson Aldean requested staff to include in the analysis "other portions of the City that we are currently required to maintain [that will] suffer as a consequence of diverting these funds. ... it's important that we have that discussion because we could very well be contacted by those folks, ... when this becomes a matter of public knowledge ... because we're going to have to make a command decision as to what suffers as a consequence of doing the work on Sierra Vista Lane. So, I'd like you to include that when you bring this back to the [commission]."

H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- H-1. STREET OPERATIONS REPORT FEBRUARY 2012 (8:04:20) Chairperson Aldean introduced this item, and Mr. Schulz provided an overview and entertained questions. None were forthcoming.
- H-2. PROJECT STATUS REPORT (8:04:45) Chairperson Aldean introduced this item, and Mr. Schulz reviewed the agenda materials. He reviewed the new format for the report starting next month. In consideration of the gateway signage project having been finished under budget, Chairperson Aldean inquired as to who shares in the savings. Mr. Sharp explained that NDOT reimbursed half of the expense. In response to a further question, Mr. Schulz advised that the City is not eligible to apply for the unexpended grant funding. Chairperson Aldean entertained questions of the commissioners; however, none were forthcoming.
- H-3. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (8:06:14) Mr. Doenges reviewed the tentative agenda for the May commission meeting. Chairperson Aldean entertained requests for future agenda items; however, none were forthcoming.

- **I. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS** (8:07:48) Chairperson Aldean entertained commissioner comments. Commissioner Smolenski thanked Mr. Burnham and Mr. Schulz for publicizing the work that is being done on the freeway overpasses / underpasses. Chairperson Aldean entertained additional comments; however, none were forthcoming.
- **J. PUBLIC COMMENT** (8:08:16) Chairperson Aldean entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.
- **K. ACTION TO ADJOURN** (8:08:48) A motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:08 p.m.

The Minutes of the April 11, 2012 Carson City Regional Transportation Commission meeting are so approved this 9th day of May, 2012.

SHELLY ALDEAN, Chair