

A special meeting of the Carson City Board of Supervisors was held on Thursday, March 14, 1991, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 5:15 p.m.

PRESENT:           Greg Smith                           Supervisor, Ward 1  
                  Tom Tatro                                 Supervisor, Ward 3  
                  Kay Bennett                                 Supervisor, Ward 4

STAFF PRESENT:  John Berkich                           City Manager  
                  Kiyoshi Nishikawa                     Clerk-Recorder  
                  Michael Griffin                             District Court 2 Judge  
                  Louis Buckley                                 Fire Chief  
                  Dan O'Brien                                 Public Works Director  
                  Charles P. Cockerill   Chief Deputy District Attorney  
                  Tim Homann                                 City Engineer  
                  Katherine McLaughlin                     Recording Secretary  
                  Rob Joiner                                 Principal Planner  
                  (S.B.O.S. 3/14/91 Tape 1-0052)

**DOWNTOWN PARKING WORKSHOP** - Mr. Berkich called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Roll call for the Board was not taken, however, a quorum was present. Mr. Berkich explained the purpose of the workshop and noted the consultant's report which had not been evaluated. A report would be made to Redevelopment on April 4. A second workshop may be held. He then introduced Messrs. Joiner, Homann, and O'Brien. Mr. Homann explained his duties to oversee Parking Enforcement and noted the January Board discussion on the parking situation and permit policy. His concern about the governmental abuse of the permits and use of client only parking for employees in view of the Code stipulations were outlined. He was seeking information concerning the parking situation before submitting a proposal to the Board. Mr. Joiner then explained his involvement with Mainstreet which had been studying the parking needs in the downtown area. His comments noted the consultant's study of the area, the potential for super blocking, utilization of streets for parking, the Presbyterian Church joint venture super parking lot proposal, the State's new garage, the relocation of the Supreme Court and Attorney General's office, other State office relocations, and the possible impact these plans would have on the parking needs around Musser and Curry Streets and the downtown area. Mr. Joiner explained for John Copoulos that Mr. Lyle Stewart's evaluation would be based on City figures for the parking needs and the grandfathering of the parking needs in the downtown "district". A parking standard for the downtown area was suggested, however, the concern was that if a policy is established for one area, it should be enforced uniformly throughout the entire City. Mr. O'Brien elaborated on the abuse of parking permits, Code stipulations on government vehicles, and reasons for issuing permits to City employees. He then explained for Mr. Rick Davis that there had been only 63 permits issued this year which were to the Legislators. The Board had directed that the old permits be honored until a decision is made. Ms. Molly Yilk suggested that a determination be made concerning the number of parking spaces required for each facility in the downtown area and that adequate parking spaces be required to meet that need. Mr. Joiner responded by explaining that when parking requirement had been adopted, the downtown area was grandfathered which waives the requirement for that area as public parking is to make up the void. Mr. O'Brien noted that the deficiency was and had been there for a long period of time. Mr. Joiner noted that attempts were being made to fill the void. Ms. Yilk continued to stress the lack of adequate parking. Mr. O'Brien then noted that permits are not issued to the businesses in the same area. Client parking spaces can be purchased for \$100, which may not be the value of the space. He felt that the permits could be considered an unfair advantage for government employees. Mr. O'Brien suggested that government permits be issued and a section designated for their use. This would leave the areas adjacent to the business open for public use. (1-0815) Judge Griffin then explained the fluctuation in parking needs during court sessions and the safety concerns of the court employees who work after normal hours. Currently the Jurors' tickets for the first day are voided but they are responsible for any after that. He urged staff to resolve the parking questions. (1-0988) Tom Patton, representing the Attorney General's office,

explained the employee needs for the Attorney General's office, the Supreme Court, Courthouse, and Fire Department. He suggested that the two hour restricted parking around the Presbyterian Church be returned to public parking. He had discussed this with the Joe Di Lonardo, a Presbyterian Church representative, who was present and willing to cooperate. He also noted that some of the employees had been utilizing Dennis Sayan's lot on the corner of Second and Curry, however, Mr. Sayan had closed this lot due to liability concerns. Mr. Sayan was willing to sell or lease the lot to the State and/or City. He noted that when the Supreme Court is relocated, there may be a short period of time when there will be adequate unrestricted parking in the area. He urged the State and City to seriously consider Mr. Sayan's and the Church's offers. The Church's offer is a short-term answer. By the time the Church needs the parking, the Supreme Court will have moved, reducing the parking demand. He then explained his knowledge of the Santa Clara County parking permits which are issued to jurors as a possible solution to that need. (1-1215) Mr. Joe Di Lonardo acknowledged the Church's expansion efforts and expressed a willingness to cooperate on the parking issue. The Church had originally requested four hour parking around the Church, however, the City does not have a four hour parking zone. Supervisor Bennett suggested that a satellite parking lot be provided on the parameter of the area and a shuttle bus be utilized to transport the employees. This is the solution utilized in another area which was considered quite successful. Mainstreet Representative Gail Thomssen stressed her feeling that parking was part of the business' responsibility and that government is a business. She felt that on-street parking should be for the businesses. She, too, urged the City/State to purchase/lease Mr. Sayan's lot. Mr. Berkich responded by explaining that meetings had been held with the State about a joint venture parking facility. The State budget includes funding for a parking facility in the downtown area. (1-1485) Chamber of Commerce Executive Vice President Larry Osborne acknowledged the parking problem in the downtown area. He urged adoption of an affirmative action program including procuring Mr. Sayan's lot, utilizing State funding, and support from the City. Businesses need parking spaces to rotate in order to generate customers. Permits were not the answer. Employee parking was not the major concern. Also, the fee for client parking was inappropriate. He urged the limitation of parking permits and for employees. (1-1568) Chief Buckley explained his concern and need for adequate parking for the volunteers who respond to emergencies. (1-1625) Ms. McLaughlin suggested that Nevada be made one way going south at least from Telegraph, that Second Street from Nevada to Carson be one way going east, that diagonal parking be placed on one side, and that Curry Street remain restricted but Nevada and Second be unrestricted. She felt that this would provide adequate parking to meet all of the needs and not force employee to park in the adjacent Residential Office area as this merely relocated the parking problem. (1-1828) Mr. Davis explained his feeling that the volunteers and jurors should be provided parking. Joint venture parking facilities should be provided by the State and City. Under his proposal this facility could be restricted to employees only. This would meet the parking requirements placed on the governmental buildings. (1-1955) May Ruth French supported the shuttle bus and satellite parking facility suggested by Supervisor Bennett. Discussion ensued concerning the closest City owned, unoccupied property to the Courthouse. Her comments stressed the need for public transportation which this proposal would initiate. (1-2020) Gary Sheerin supported the one way concept as it was an excellent means of "getting around" and would provide additional parking, the client parking and its original purpose, however, stressed that the problem which appears to be only a downtown problem was in fact a City problem. He suggested a general assessment district for the entire City to provide funding for resolution of the parking problems as the entire City would benefit from the facility. Mr. Nishikawa suggested that the Courthouse parking problem could be alleviated if the employees utilized the Northgate parking area and the suggested shuttle service. Ms. Thomssen stressed that the parking lot proposed for Second and Curry should be a joint venture and utilized by the State and City. One further north could be a City and private enterprise venture. Mr. Berkich explained staff's attempts to have all parking facilities remain open to the public. Ms. French stressed her feeling that if the City had a public transportation system, the parking problem would be eliminated. She felt buses could be obtained at the same price as Mr. Sayan's lot. Mr. Berkich noted that this was being analyzed. Mr. Homann then explained that the parking problem was a result of governmental growth. Those offices had been constructed before the Code had required parking spaces which grandfathers in the parking. He stressed that if the City/State are mandated to provide parking under the current Code, the same would be required of private enterprise which could create additional problems. Mr. Berkich then thanked everyone for attending and participating. The next meeting on the topic would be held on the first Thursday in April with Redevelopment and the Board of Supervisors. If another session is warranted, anyone who had signed the list would be contacted. He then adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

The Minutes of the Special March 14, 1991, Carson City Board of Supervisors meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON \_\_\_March\_21\_\_\_\_\_, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Marv Teixeira, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Kiyoshi Nishikawa, Clerk-Recorder