

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the Special July 11, 1996, Meeting
Page 1

A special meeting of the Carson City Board of Supervisors was held on Thursday, July 11, 1996, at the Community Center Bob Boldrick Theater, 831 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 6 p.m.

PRESENT: Marv Teixeira Mayor
Greg Smith Supervisor, Ward 1
Janice Ayres Supervisor, Ward 2
Tom Tatro Supervisor, Ward 3
Kay Bennett Supervisor, Ward 4

STAFF PRESENT: John Berkich City Manager
Jay Aldean Public Works Director
Tim Homann Deputy Public Works Director
Steve Mihelic Division Fire Chief
Liz Hernandez Admin. Asst. to the City Mgr.
Katherine McLaughlin Recording Secretary
(S.B.O.S. 7/11/96 Tape 1-001 Side A)

OTHERS PRESENT: Nevada Department of Transportation Director Tom Stephens
and Representative Susan Martinovich

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL - Mayor Teixeira convened the meeting at 6 p.m. by leading the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call was taken. The entire Board was present constituting a quorum.

Before beginning the discussion on the agendized items, Supervisor Tatro explained that he did not have a conflict of interest with the issue even though he is employed by NDOT. His duties involve preparation of contracts. He is not involved with NDOT's projects, the selection of projects, nor establishing priorities. Although his father had been employed at the Nugget, his father did not have an ownership in it. His family does not have a financial interest in the Nugget. Supervisor Tatro would not benefit from any decision made directly or indirectly by the Board on the Bypass.

Mayor Teixeira then explained the program and invited the public to move to the front/middle of the auditorium. The Board then left the dais and moved to the seats on the auditorium floor. The presentation was made by City employees and NDOT's staff.

1. PRESENTATION BY THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND CARSON CITY ON THE 395 BYPASS AND POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES (1-018-A) - City Manager John Berkich explained the agenda, the development of alternatives, and the information packets which had been distributed to the audience, Board, and Clerk. (A copy is included in the file. Included in this packet are copies of the overheads used Ms. Martinovich in her presentation.) Mr. Berkich's introduction included the fact that the meeting would be aired by CATF this evening and on several future unannounced dates in addition to the radio station.

Ms. Martinovich began her presentation by welcoming the audience and thanking them for attending. She then reviewed the overheads which explained the goal to find a viable solution to the downtown traffic concerns, the traffic study which involved both internal and external traffic, estimated traffic volumes occurring in 2005, the history of the Bypass, the Alternatives, the evaluation criteria, the projected construction costs with and without the drainage costs, and the pros and cons of each alternative. The overheads also illustrated the alternate routes which she explained including their features. The traffic study indicated that the exterior traffic volume was considerably less than the interior traffic volume. Her comments pointed out the major drainage problems found with each of the alternatives. Not all of the drainage mitigation costs have been developed. Therefore, the complete cost could not be estimated. Ms. Martinovich repeatedly emphasized that the goal is for development of

a full elevated freeway. This goal will not be dropped if one of the alternatives is developed. The preferred alternatives were the modified freeway and the Roop Street couplet. The couplet will required an additional \$4 million in right-of-way costs. She then explained the projected traffic volumes on these alternatives in the year 2005. (1-357-A) The funding sources and projected budgets for the alternatives were then reviewed. The modified freeway was short \$34.1 million. The Roop/Stewart Couplet was short \$9.9 million. A funding source for this shortage has not been located as of the meeting. The State has acquired approximately 70 percent of the corridor right-of-way. The interchange needs for the northern terminus and the right-of-way needs south of Highway 50 at South Highway 395 have not yet been determined. She invited the public to contact either her Department/staff or the City's at anytime with questions, concerns, or comments. She requested the questionnaires which were in the informational packets be returned to either her staff or the City's. She also indicated that specific design requirements for intersections have not been completed in enough detail to provide accurate cost estimates. Only the alternative selected would be developed with this information. If the public had any questions after the meeting, her staff would be available in the lobby. She thanked the audience for listening.

2. DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AS THE PREFERRED CHOICE AMONG ALTERNATIVES AND DECISION ON FURTHER HEARINGS; AND, 3. DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO RECOMMEND THE PREFERRED CHOICE AMONG ALTERNATIVES TO THE NEVADA TRANSPORTATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TIMEFRAME FOR THE PROJECT AND STATEMENT OF THE INTENT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO ENACT THE FIVE CENT GAS TAX IF ACCEPTED BY THE NEVADA TRANSPORTATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS AT ITS SEPTEMBER MEETING (1-431-A) - Mayor Teixeira thanked Ms. Martinovich for her presentation. He then outlined the procedures. He polled the audience to determine whether everyone had signed the list to speak. He then acknowledged the number of individuals who had indicated a desire to speak and those who may wish to do so later. He requested that the speakers not repeat comments made by others.

(1-495-A) Supervisor Smith acknowledged the two options given by the staffs. He agreed that the best alternative was to build the freeway, however, its cost is prohibitive. He then questioned the funding source for the difference between available funding and the projected costs for these two options. Mayor Teixeira indicated that NDOT would have to provide this funding as the City only had its five cent gas tax. He also explained that the modified freeway had received a deferment of the repayment requirement for the funding used to acquire the right-of-way. The NDOT Board of Directors would then be required to establish priorities and appropriate funding. He then explained who is on the NDOT Board of Directors. Supervisor Smith and Ms. Martinovich explained that the couplet had included \$20.5 million in freeway improvements at the northern terminus of the Bypass. This still leaves a funding need of \$12.9 million to complete the couplet. Supervisor Ayres explained that NDOT funding is actually federal funds being passed through the Nevada Department of Transportation.

NDOT Director Stephens briefly explained that one-third of the funds are from the Feds. The remainder is from the State. Washoe and Clark County taxes for transportation needs were explained. He felt that their taxes provided for urban transportation needs. Carson City is an urban area also, however, it is impacted by residents living in the adjacent counties. These individuals cannot be assessed ad valorem taxes or development fees. Nevada has been receiving approximately \$125 million in Federal funds, however, this amount may be reduced in the future and, specifically, those funds used for "demonstration projects". Examples of demonstration projects were cited. He then outlined the State's maintenance funding and listed several projects being funded under this program. Seventy percent of this funding is allocated to rural areas. The majority of the Federal funding is allocated to Clark County. Clark County had often indicated that 2/3rds of the total budget should be allocated to it. He then explained that the freeway funding did not include the \$35 million in "Q" funds used for right-of-way acquisition which must be repaid although not for an additional ten years. He felt that there were many, many more projects on the list than funding could meet. He agreed that the allocations and priorities are tough issues which must be decided. He repeated the budget figures which indicate that the modified freeway is short at least \$30 million. He felt that the City's gas tax could provide impetus to his Board of Directors for beginning a phased freeway project. Timelines for the project would have to be established. He then explained the "joker" in

the project which is the hydrologic problems and their unknown mitigation requirements and costs. FEMA maps must be used and their regulations followed. The reason the path may not have been developed as the City grew may be related to the natural flood path as indicated by the FEMA map. One alternative to the flood issue is the elevated freeway, however, an elevated freeway is not cheap. He then indicated that both alternatives contain the same configuration at the northern end and that NDOT funding could be used for that portion. This would be the start. It would not be the panacea for all of Carson City's problems. Even if the final decision is to pursue the Bypass, it will not be constructed at one time. It will be phased construction over a long period.

(1-108-B) Supervisor Smith expressed his support for the Lakeview-Highway 50 alternative (modified freeway) concept. He was, however, concerned that all of the funding would be dedicated to this effort and that the remainder of the route would not be developed for 10-15 years. This project will not develop any resolution of the traffic problems currently occurring in the southern half of the City. Mr. Stephens felt that his Board of Directors may allocate as much as \$100 million for projects of this nature. Supervisor Smith then emphasized that his point is that if all of the NDOT funding was committed to just the Carson City Bypass it would take two full years' funding to accomplish the project. Mr. Stephens then explained that the largest project ever approved by his Board had been the freeway project just completed last February in Reno. This project had cost approximately \$60 million. It is normal for projects to be constructed in phases. He then pointed out the impact a freeway between Lakeview and Highway 50 would have on the assessed values of property surrounding it. If a developer tax is imposed, similar to Reno's, these funds could be allocated to the project as could some of the ad valorem taxes. He emphasized the desire to allocate the State funding in an equitable fashion around the State.

Mayor Teixeira again noted the number of speakers and requested that the remarks be as brief as possible and that the speakers not repeat another's statements.

(1-178-B) Susan Newberry questioned the reasons for considering the modified freeway as it does not achieve the goal of removing traffic from Carson Street. Ms. Martinovich agreed that it did not meet the primary goal. The traffic study had presented a surprising discovery--that internal traffic was higher than external traffic volumes. The alternative does, however, meet the remainder of the criteria. Ms. Newberry then expressed her opinion that there would be a lot of opposition to the couplet even though it appears to be the one solution which could be afforded. She urged the Board to reconsider the elevated freeway from College Parkway to Spooner alternative. She commended the staffs on their efforts.

(1-211-B) Jon Plank felt the couplet was most affordable although he supported the College Parkway to Spooner elevated freeway. In response to his question, Mayor Teixeira indicated that neither the tax nor anything else would be done until State funding is committed to a project. Mr. Plank urged the Board to hold off making any decision until additional meetings have been held.

(1-227-B) Earl Atchison expressed his feeling that the Bypass is needed but that the City may have to wait a while. Mayor Teixeira explained that the gas tax has not been implemented and is not being collected. When it does it may leverage between \$16 and 20 million. Mr. Atchison urged the Board to put it on the ballot. Reasons for his request was outlined. He also felt that better timing of the signals would improve the traffic flow.

(1-272-B) Steve Hartman read a prepared statement into the record urging the Board to analyze the Roop/Stewart couplet a little more as it impacts the bigger picture and particularly the City's quality of life and public safety. His comments described the problems as he saw them with the couplet which he felt should be addressed before construction occurs. Ms. Martinovich agreed with some of this comments and indicated that additional study would be required before the ultimate design is developed. His comments urged the Board to consider the residents and businesses which will be impacted. He also expressed his feeling that the condemnation and the severance issues had not been considered seriously in the projected cost estimates. He reminded the Board of its previous experiment to remove the truck traffic off of Carson Street by putting it on Stewart Street. At that time NDOT had indicated that any couplet would have been only a temporary resolution--a bandaid. He felt that this is still true today. The couplet would be only a temporary bandaid and not a cure. He felt that the proposed gas tax funding was a major commitment. He agreed with Mr. Stephens that the external traffic should be assessed an

impact fee if a method to do so can be discovered. He then explained the original Watasheamu Dam proposal and its estimated cost. The price of this project at the completion of the study had grown from \$17 million to \$143 million. This will happen with the couplet if a decision is not made and is already occurring to a degree. He pointed out the working relationship presently experienced with NDOT and urged the City to utilize this relationship to provide direction to NDOT and its Board. This direction should be to utilize whatever funding is available to construct a portion of the freeway and to continue phasing the project until it is completed. He also felt that FEMA's map is being changed and that the requirements may not be there when construction occurs. He urged the Board to make a decision and follow through.

(2-015-A) Art Hannafin commended Mr. Hartman on his presentation, which had stolen his thunder. He commended both staffs on their efforts. He felt that more than just automobile traffic needed to be addressed. The "core" element of the City also needed to be considered as the couplet only moved the southbound traffic "500" feet from the main street and the northbound traffic an addition 5-800 more feet. The negative impact it would have on the area was described. NDOT's original commitment to the Bypass 25 years ago had involved long range planning for the future. This proposal is still viable and should be implemented now. The couplet is well intended but not a viable solution. He urged the Board to adopt the Bypass as the to do project and support it; otherwise the funding will be siphoned off for smaller projects and the freeway will never be constructed.

(2-065-B) Al Bernhard expressed his opposition to the couplet and urged the Board to concentrate on the Freeway.

(2-075-B) Paul Lumos explained his involvement as a previous City employee with the project since 1975. He urged the Board to maintain the freeway alignment and to follow through with the original commitment. To delay the project at this time would only delay the project for 10 to 15 more years. He urged the Board to support the Freeway, implement the five cent gas tax, obtain the State Board's commitment, and start the construction program. It will be a phased project which needs to begin. It will improve the area.

(2-112-A) Bob McClain explained the problems the Post Office will experience with the couplet particularly to his mail routing and patrons. He also pointed out the impact which would be created on his budget by the imposition of the five cent gas tax. He expressed the hope that a better solution could and would be found. He commended the staffs on their efforts.

(2-185-A) Carson City Library Board of Trustees Chairperson John Sparbell echoed the comments about the decision being a tough job. The couplet will pose a major impact on the library and its youth and senior users. These safety issues were emphasized to support his recommendation that the Board maintain its commitment to the freeway and direct staff to proceed with it even if it is phased. The couplet may only increase the cost of a freeway.

(2-212-A) Chamber of Commerce Executive Vice President Larry Osborne indicated that the Chamber had been working with staff and NDOT on trying to solve the problem. The Chamber does not support the couplet. This opposition is from the entire Chamber. He urged the Board to solve the total traffic problem and not just that in the downtown area. The couplet only moved the problem a few blocks to the east. It does not solve the long-term problem. If the price is the driving force, the cheapest answer is not to do anything. This, however, is not acceptable to the community. It has always been known where the freeway was to be located. Now is the time to begin concentrating the efforts on the development of a bypass and to stop looking for alternatives. He felt that if NDOT, the community, and Chamber could all work together on one project, the freeway will be developed. The Board needed only to make the decision to do it. They would make it happen.

(2-257-A) Division Fire Chief Steve Mihelic acknowledged the complexity of the issue and explained the impact the couplet would have on the Fire Department both pro and con regardless of the route selected. He felt that the Department was concerned about the overall traffic problem which he urged the Board to face.

(2-285-B) Bill Lewis, a partner in a Stewart and Highway 50 business, pointed out the impacts which the couplet

would create on this small strip mall. He questioned the value of the temporary relief which would be created by the couplet. He suggested that congressional support may be obtained if the project is started.

(2-307-A) Nancy Sweetland felt that the issue had been "talked to death". Her former husband's commitment to the freeway was noted. She questioned the reasons for supporting the couplet as traffic from the Lakeview to Highway 50 freeway would use Saliman to go south rather than Stewart.

(2-327-A) Betty Brinson supported the freeway as it will reduce the problems and total impact on the downtown area. Only the individuals wishing to visit the downtown area would go there. She suggested the freeway be developed as a toll road with the users being assessed a fee. She would utilize automated toll booths with only one teller who would make change. This proposal would generate the necessary funding.

(2-352-A) Phil Martin thanked everyone on the presentation. He felt that the populace supported the freeway. The couplet is opposed due to the feeling that it is only a bandaid. He could support the five cent tax if dedicated solely to the freeway. It is a quality of life issue. He urged the Board to proceed with the freeway.

(3-402-A) Ray Masayko felt that the populace think it is time that the traffic problems be addressed. They are skeptical that it will be done in 10 or 15 years. A study of the alternatives should be done, however, a final decision should be made. The elevated freeway should be constructed even if phased. The populace has also indicated its willingness to support the five cent gas tax as the traffic problems need to be resolved. The freeway will allow the community to reclaim its streets.

(2-441-A) Frank Shessler felt that the main street should have been double decked 20 years ago. He had suggested this to NDOT at a similar meeting. He lives on Roop Street and opposed the couplet. He felt that the traffic should remain on streets constructed for it. This is Stewart and Carson. He urged the Board to remove the signals and allow the traffic to be "shot gunned down Carson Street at 55-65 miles per hour" in the center of the City. This would create a free-for-all.

BREAK: A ten minute recess was declared at 8:30 p.m. When the meeting reconvened at 8:40 p.m. the entire Board was present constituting a quorum.

(2-495-A) Ellen Nelson seconded Messrs. Hartman and Hannafin's comments. She felt that the talking period should end. The couplet will delay any total resolution to the problem and emergency responses. Carson City is become the shopping hub for the surrounding areas. The traffic volume warrants a bypass.

(2-528-A) Doug Hone commented the staffs on the presentation and pointed out the need to address the interstate/intrastate traffic. He felt that Carson City is one of only three state capitols without a freeway. The UPS expansion project at the Carson Airport was cited to illustrate the increasing business traffic volume and truck sizes. The potential for a disaster to occur in the heart of the City was stressed. He urged the Board to consider the quality of life issues and public safety issues. He also acknowledged the difficulty and complexity of the issues. He urged the Board to make a decision.

(2-623-A) Raymond May indicated he is an advocate for the full blown elevated freeway/bypass. He explained his moving to Carson City at the age of one and involvement/knowledge of the area and its issues. He felt that Carson City is treated as a "Cinderella stepchild". Examples of the traffic problems in attempting to cross the City or make left turns from the main street were given to support doing something now to solve the problems. (2-011-B) He supported the bypass. It would save the normal resident more in gas than it would cost to pay the five cent tax. It would reduce the need for maintenance/repair of streets being used as a cut-through which were not constructed for heavy traffic volumes and truck traffic. He urged staff to include these figures in the equation. Downtown businesses would experience an increase in residential shoppers as it would be more accessible. Travelers will not fight the traffic to shop in the downtown area or to purchase gas. If it is necessary, the five cent tax should be implemented, however, the expenditures should be made selected in a prudent and fiduciary manner. Examples of what may be perceived as waste were cited to illustrate his comments. He felt that the public and the audience

supported the full blown bypass and urged the Board to direct staff's attention to it.

(2-072-B) Tony Marangi urged the Board to stop talking and start construction. He urged: 1. NDOT to begin construction regardless of the distance; 2. NDOT's Board to commit whatever funding will be allocated for the next five years to Carson City so additional phases can be developed; 3. The Board of Supervisors to adopt the five cent gas tax and start funding so that NDOT will also provide the money; and, 4. The Transportation Commission must punch Graves Lane through and get the trucks off of Carson Street. He urged the Board to go forward with the bypass.

(2-103-B) Don Winne questioned whether the five cent gas tax would build the freeway. It may help get it started. Traffic problems experienced in attempting to go to the college were noted. He acknowledged the cost for the bypass but felt it was time to construct it. He questioned whether the couplet study had included the impact of the new Public Safety Complex. He explained his concern about the safety of the children at the Boys and Girls Club due to the increased traffic created by the couplet.

The list of individuals who indicated an intent/desire to speak had been completed. Public comments were then requested.

(2-152-B) Ron Aikins explained that he had signed the sheets but had wished to hear the presentation. He felt that the couplet was a bad idea which would be a bandaid and obsolete before it is completed. The resolution is an elevated freeway even if it must be constructed in phases. He questioned whether the City could support the five cent gas tax and if the funding would be adequate to provide the funding suggested. He felt that the bypass would be beneficial to others and should not be constructed at the residents' expense. It is an NDOT project and they should pay for it. He suggested gas taxes from Douglas County, Lyon County, etc., be tapped if at all possible.

(2-198-B) Jim Foley felt that a lot of speakers had supported the full blown bypass, however, the presentation had indicated that only a portion would be developed. Funding will take 20 or 30 years to complete it. He did not feel that the project should be started if it will not be finished. He opposed the couplet. He also indicated that the bypass would not be a panacea for all of the traffic problems as locals will not use it. He urged the Board to undertake a comprehensive traffic program.

(2-242-B) Jerry Massad opposed the couplet as it will not solve the traffic problems. He indicated that the traffic problems for the southern portion of the City would remain regardless of the project developed as they are all in the northern sector of the City.

(2-250-B) Additional comments were solicited but none given.

The signup sheets which Mayor Teixeira had contained approximately 40 names of individuals supporting enactment of the gas tax. Thirty four individuals supported the bypass while five opposed it. A majority had opposed the couplet. He thanked the audience for its turnout and participation. Board comments were then solicited.

(2-268-B) Supervisor Smith began the discussion by commending staff on its efforts. The couplet was an alternative which would fit the economics and provided an option. It is clear that whatever commitment is made should be substantial and in the bypass corridor. He was concerned that the public thought that the five cent gas tax would provide the full blown freeway. This is not the case. He felt that this clearly indicated the need for additional education due to the misconceptions and incorrect information circulating. The five cent gas tax will only provide \$16 million of the necessary \$200 million for the project. He felt that the gas tax issue should be considered by the electorate before it is implemented. This would also provide the necessary education. Although the first phase of the project may be considered "a road to no where", it could also be considered as the "first building block". He agreed that the gas tax would be supported by tourists, truckers, etc. He reiterated his statements that the tax should be on a ballot before it is implemented. He also commended the audience on its attendance and presentations.

(2-320-B) Supervisor Tatro felt that none of the options would totally address the problem. The freeway would not remove the traffic from the downtown area. He also pointed out the safety problems which would be created for the western portion of the City if something is not done to remove some of the traffic on Carson Street. He explained the issuance of RTC bonds for the construction of RTC projects including the extension of Graves Lane north from Highway 50. The five cent gas tax will exhaust the City's funding for any traffic related issues. He felt nervous about this commitment due to the potential problems with traffic in the downtown area. Reasons for this concern were provided. If the freeway is constructed at a rate of \$20 million a year, it will still not be completed before the traffic volume reaches 55,000 cars a day in the downtown core. He also expressed concern as to whether the NDOT Board of Directors would continue to support the project annually. This may extend the total project timeframe even more.

(2-376-B) Supervisor Bennett felt the testimony supported the need to begin construction of the bypass and for the Board to have the courage to implement the five cent gas tax. This would provide the necessary statement that the City is willing to contribute its share to the project. She then stated to Mr. Stephens that it was very painful for her as an elected official of a community, which has managed its resources, finances, growth, and people to achieve an excellent standard for the quality of life, to be forced by an entity in another area to bend to the impact that its businesses create. She felt that this situation would never end. She expressed her feeling that Carson City needed an advocate in Mr. Stephens as well as the community, which had been well demonstrated this evening. She emphasized the need for Mr. Stephens' advocacy as well as that of the legislators and residents. She felt that this advocacy should emphasize that as the Capitol of the State, we deserve our turn and our time. It is now our time to take care of our needs. No, we cannot offer up the billions of dollars. We can do what we can do. A decision must be made today and forward momentum begun.

(2-435-B) Supervisor Ayres thanked the public for its attendance. She supported Supervisor Smith's statements that the public must understand that the gas tax will not build the entire freeway. She also noted that the turnout was impressive, however, the total population base is 46,000. Personally she would like for this meeting to be the beginning of the public education program. She felt that there should be at least three additional public meetings including additional televised airings of the presentation made this evening. Radio programs should be conducted as well as a major distribution of the handouts provided this evening. She did not feel that a decision should be made this evening. The bypass is the answer and everyone wants it. She felt that everyone needed to understand the process required to obtain the bypass including the funding, timetable, etc.

(2-475-B) Mayor Teixeira noted his support for the couplet. He felt that the question before the Board was whether there had been enough input to make a decision today. The staffs have requested direction. The decision is whether to undertake the couplet or the modified freeway from Arrowhead to Highway 50. The community had clearly indicated something needed to be done about the truck traffic through Carson and that the couplets will not work. Various impacts of the couplets were noted. Part of the commitments made when the Supreme Court and State Library were moved to Stewart Street had included keeping Stewart Street a two way street without increased traffic volumes. These are good faith issues. His appearances before the NDOT Board of Directors were then noted. The bypass had originally been opposed by the businesses in the downtown core. Twenty-five years later it is apparent that unless something is done about that traffic, it will eventually kill commerce in the downtown core. In 1989 the Board of Directors had told him that Carson City would never get the bypass. The gas tax will help "Carson City help itself". He felt that if the ratio is carried forward, Washoe County should be required to provide \$125 million in gas taxes for its projects. He had met with Federal Highway Transportation Director Slatter and discussed the proposal. Mr. Slatter had indicated that there would not be a transportation problem if all of the communities contributed. Mayor Teixeira, therefore, felt that the City's contribution is significant and substantial. He felt that the Board owed it to the community to establish the preferred route, take the case to the NDOT Board of Directors, and let them "say no". Anything less would be a disservice to the public. All the surveys since 1990 have said traffic is the major concern. It is time to do something. There are no options as the couplets will not work in the long run. He then explained a letter from a resident off College Parkway on Quinn Drive about the truck noises. If trucks are put on Stewart and Roop, these complaints will increase. He appreciated the work which had been done. As the issue had been studied several times, the options had all been clearly defined. The time is right for a decision. The question is whether to establish the preferred route or have more hearings.

The options for the route are the couplets or the modified bypass. He recommended a decision be made this evening. **Mayor Teixeira** then passed the gavel to Mayor Pro-Tem Smith and **moved that the Carson City Board of Supervisors select the modified bypass with everything salvageable, an at-grade at College Parkway, from Lakeview to Highway 50 as the preferred route. Supervisor Ayres seconded the motion.**

(2-621-B) Mr. May expressed his feeling that it is a Northern Nevada issue and not a Carson City issue. The gas tax is a significant contribution by the Carson City residents but it is an issue which should be considered as a regional issue. NDOT should fund the full blown bypass not just a bandaid.

(3-001-A) Mr. Hone urged the Board to make a decision. It did not feel that it should be left to the 46,000 residents of Carson City. They wanted the Board to make the decision as it had been elected to do.

(3-006-A) Ms. Nelson responded by explaining that the population figure is closer to 47,000 of whom only a portion represented the electorate. A lot of individuals had purposely remained home to watch the hearing on television. If the question could not be placed on the 1996 ballot, she urged the Board to make a decision and not have any more hearings. Twenty-five years is too long.

The motion to select the modified bypass with everything salvageable, an at-grade at College Parkway, from Lakeview to Highway 50 as the preferred route was voted by roll call with the following results: Bennett - Yes; Tatro - No; Ayres - Yes; Mayor Teixeira - Yes; and Mayor Pro-Tem Smith - Yes. Motion carried 4-1.

Mayor Teixeira requested Mayor Pro-Tem Smith keep the gavel as he wished to make another motion. He then explained that the established route had been decided. He emphasized that nothing would happen until the NDOT Board of Directors give a signal. He felt that the gas tax should not be implemented until the Board of Directors have given the City a timetable and project. At that time the gas tax will be brought back to the Board of Supervisors for enactment. Supervisor Bennett then encouraged the Mayor to make the motion due to his dedication and hard work on the project. **Mayor Teixeira moved that the Board of Supervisors propose to the, restate the Board's position on the preferred route to the Nevada Department of Transportation Board of Directors, if possible, as early as their September meeting, they meet every quarter, and that we state the intent to enact the five cent gas tax, if accepted by the Nevada Department of Transportation Board of Directors that simply means, as I am qualifying this, that they step up to the plate and are going to fund the balance of it as this is all we have Ladies and Gentlemen. Supervisors Tatro and Ayres seconded the motion.** Clarification indicated that this would mean that when and if the Board of Directors accept the proposal, the Board will enact the five cent gas tax. (1-048-A) Mayor Pro-Tem Smith reiterated his request that the five cent gas tax be placed on the ballot. He requested that his statements not be "misread", however, he found it interesting that the deadline for having the issue on the General Ballot is Monday at 5 p.m. He understood the reasons for having the meeting this evening. A question could be drafted before this deadline, however, it is not possible for the Board to have meeting before that deadline to approve the wording for a ballot question. This option had been removed from the table for 1996. He found this to be very disappointing. His other comment is a prediction, which he will make, and that he would vote no on the motion. He liked the preferred route. He liked it as a starting point. He liked it as a building block. He was making a prediction right now that, even though the overwhelming majority of these folks here and the people who signed up and the comments and questions we have had, look at how The Nevada Appeal worded its "Two Cent" column. "Do you favor the couplets or the Bypass?" Well, that's a no brainer. But I'm telling you right now that a lot of citizens, I don't know how many, but a lot of citizens do not understand that enacting that five cent gas tax is now going to get them from Highway 50 to Lakeview Hill and that's it and that we have taken the gas tax all the way up to the cap that we are allowed to by law--we are allowed to have nine cents of gasoline tax as a community. We already have four. This five will take us to the max allowed by law. There will be no more to do anything else for twenty years. To be able to go from Highway 50 to Lakeview Hill and if it works, if it forces NDOT to look at our situation a little quicker, if it forces the powers to be to allocate more money to finishing the project sooner than otherwise would have been done, it's a great win for all of us. But if it doesn't, that's what we have. And I don't think that the people understand that. I know the folks in this room certainly do. You sat here and have been educated along with me and everyone else

tonight. But I am making a prediction right now that the the people in this community do not understand at this point in time, if this motion passes, that their five cent gas tax got them that. That is my comment. Supervisor Ayres indicated that this had been what she had attempted to indicate a while ago. She had been told soundly at that time that this is representative, and so she would not argue that any more. Mayor Teixeira indicated that he understood Supervisor Smith's concern. It is his intent, until we know what the NDOT timeframe is and the commitment, it will only be our intent to do the gas tax. If a deal can be cut with NDOT, then there will be hearings to inform the people before the tax is implementation. He felt strongly that the question must be asked so that an answer/commitment can be made. Mayor Pro-Tem Smith then questioned the motion as it indicates that the gas tax will be implemented if NDOT commits to the program. The motion does not indicate that there will be hearings on the gas tax. Mayor Teixeira reiterated his reasons for feeling that the key is to show NDOT that the City is willing to participate. If NDOT then says "yes, if you do that, you have a deal", then the ball is in our court. Until the City gives the NDOT Director the ability to indicate there is a deal if it is done, all we can say is that "we want the bypass, by the way, would you start building it?". He then explained that if it includes the City's gas tax, it would defer the repayment of \$25 million which had been used for property acquisition. He felt it was necessary to ask the question. He emphasized that it is the Board's intent to enact the gas tax. The City staff and NDOT staff will have to work together to reach the best solution possible and going together hand-in-hand to tell the Board of Directors what can be done including that Carson City's intent is to enact the gas tax. The question of whether the Directors are willing to play can then be asked. If the City then fails to enact the gas tax, there will be no game. Supervisor Bennett then expressed her feeling that the enactment of the gas tax is not just for the small preferred alternative portion. It is her intent to have the money for the entire twenty years be applied to the entire project. The \$20 million could be more as time goes on and should be applied throughout the entire project. That is what the City brings to the table for the entire project and that is the way it should be seen. The decision as she understood it, was that the project is to start from the north and go to Highway 50. That is the direction that this Board wants to bring to the NDOT Board of Directors. That is the place and the corridor that we want to start. By no means is it her intent to to say that is as far as we will go. We will do the whole thing and build the whole thing and, god willing and the creek don't rise too high, we will be there in seven or eight years. But we are in it for the long haul and it's not her intent to just use our \$20 million for a portion. Mayor Teixeira restated the intent of his motion as being to take the proposal to NDOT and working with the NDOT staff and ask that the NDOT Board of Directors, based on the Carson City Board of Supervisors intent to pledge this money and make this happen. He wanted to know when it would start, how much dedication--is it going to be \$10 mill a year, and can it be done, and if they are willing to put \$20 million or \$30 million more dollars with the project to make this bypass start, then we vote it in. That is the intent to do that. If NDOT does not play, at least we have given them the option to take our offer. If they don't think that's significant enough, then it's beyond our move. Then we go back to square one. Mayor Pro-Tem Smith requested additional comments from both the Board and the audience. On hearing none, **the motion to restate the Board's position on the preferred route to the Nevada Department of Transportation Board of Directors and state the Board of Supervisors' intent to enact the five cent gas tax was voted by roll call with the following result: Tatro - Yes; Ayres - Yes; Bennett - Yes; Mayor Teixeira - Yes; and Mayor Pro-Tem Smith - Very briefly, you know, and once again, without belaboring the point, No. Motion carried 4-1.**

Mayor Pro-Tem Smith returned the gavel to Mayor Teixeira. Mayor Teixeira then expressed his feeling that this was a milestone for this community but he was not sure what NDOT would do. He felt that staff understood the Board's direction and encouraged them to work on the product to take to the NDOT Board. It should be the best possible plan which makes the most sense to get rolling.

There being no other matters for consideration by the Board, Supervisors Smith and Ayres moved to adjourn. Mayor Teixeira seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Mayor Teixeira adjourned the meeting at 9:45 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.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the Special July 11, 1996, Meeting
Page 10

The Minutes of the Special July 11, 1996, Carson City Board of Supervisors meeting

1996.

ARE SO APPROVED ON ____September_19,

____/s/_____

Marv Teixeira, Mayor

ATTEST:

____/s/_____
Alan Glover, Clerk-Recorder