

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Minutes for the 2/9/00 Meeting
Page 1

A regularly schedule meeting of the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission was held on Wednesday, February 9, 2000, at the Cooperative Extension Service Conference Room, 2621 Northgate Lane, Suite 12, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chair Jon Plank, Vice Chair Steve Reynolds, and
Commissioners Kay Bennett, Robert Kennedy, and Marv
Teixeira

STAFF PRESENT: Street Operations Manager John Flansberg, RTC Engineer
Harvey Brotzman, Senior Planner Juan Guzman, and Recording
Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (R.T.C. 2/9/000 Tape
1-0001.5)

A. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM - Chair Plank convened the meeting at 5:30 p.m. Roll call was taken. The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (1-0016.5) - None.

C. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS (1-0017.5) - Item F-3 is to be taken before F-1 and F-2 as Mr. St. John had not yet arrived.

D. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0028.5) - None.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0050.5) - Chair Plank disclosed a telephone conversation he had had with Laura Work concerning entering letters into the record.

F. PUBLIC MEETING ITEMS:

F-3. DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING PRIORITIZATION OF REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION FUNDS FOR PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR LLC GRACE ENTERPRISES AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF WINNIE LANE AND US 395 (1-0067.5) - Street Operations Manager Flansberg described the request and the funding allocation. The project has been completed. Staff had performed approximately \$6,000 of in-kind services. The total impact to RTC is \$7,500 which is part of the 1999-2000 budget. Commissioner Reynolds moved to approve the \$7500 in RTC funding for the City's contribution to the right turn improvements made at 395 and Winnie Lane. Commissioners Kennedy and Bennett seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

F-1. DISCUSSION AND ACTION RELATIVE TO PRIORITIZATION OF CHALLENGER WAY EXTENSION AND INTERSECTION OF COLLEGE PARKWAY AS RELATED TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH LORRAINE WEIKEL. DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT TO ADDRESS PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISION LOCATED NORTH OF COLLEGE PARKWAY AND EAST OF GONI WAY AND MAY INCLUDE A PROPOSED PROPERTY EXCHANGE TO FACILITATE THE REALIGNMENT OF HOT SPRINGS ROAD (1-0172.5) - Deputy City Manager Dan St. John described the location, the street configuration, and his research on the commitments which had been made regarding its development. NDOT had indicated in writing its willingness to consider a tee intersection at that location in concept. The agreement was limned. Funding is within the current budget and will not impact next year's budget. The difficulty confirming the verbal commitments was noted. The City's commitment has always been to participate to a specified amount. RTC Engineer Harvey Brotzman explained the realignment required to connect Challenger Way to Hot Springs and then to College Parkway. His guesstimate of the cost was \$100,000. Reasons for bringing the issue forward at this time were noted. Weikel's development team had not supplied the cost estimates.

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes for the 2/9/00 Meeting

Page 2

Ms. Weikel's Representative Jake Movius claimed that there is a paper trail existing on the project. He described the improvement district which had been created to make improvements. The Weikel property was not part of the district. Their frontage to College Parkway was lost when it was constructed. They had not been compensated for the loss nor the loss of a primary access from Challenger Way. Small landscaping concessions were provided in exchange for property dedicated to College Parkway. The original drawings clearly show that Challenger is to be connected to College Parkway, however, it was never constructed. He had seen the cost estimates, however, did not have a copy with him. He felt that the estimate was over \$150,000. He could not make a commitment regarding the adequacy of the \$50,000 offer. Reasons the Weikel property had not been included in the district and the "paper trail" were then discussed.

Mr. St. John indicated that a letter had been written two or three years ago, however, a dollar amount had not been included. Mr. Brotzman explained that the City had not been involved in the district or its road designs. The funding within the budget had been established several years ago for work on Challenger Way. Reasons the request was now being brought forward and the amount of participation RTC/the City had had with the District were described. Mr. Brotzman's research indicated the preliminary design plans had included a connection between College Parkway and Challenger, which had been located approximately 250 feet further west, however, the final design did not include this connection. The City had not participated in the negotiations for right-of-way. Commissioner Bennett requested appropriate documentation be included when the issue is presented to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. St. John indicated the agreement would address the litigation issues. Discussion further limned the Weikel's industrial subdivision project proposed on their property and reasons for limiting the City's participation to \$50,000. Commissioner Kennedy questioned whether the Commission should grant the funding at this point in the negotiations. Mr. St. John felt that the offer of \$50,000 would allow the project to commence and was reasonable. A delay would impact the Weikel's ability to meet the project's timetable. There has been \$100,000 allocated for Challenger within the RTC budget which had been carried forward for several years. Comments indicated that part of the development agreement included a land exchange. Criteria used for such land exchanges was described.

Mr. Movius then described how the realignment would impact the parcel including its property value. Mr. Movius did not feel that the realignment would guarantee a positive impact.

Commissioner Bennett moved that the Regional Transportation Commission approve authorization to fund \$50,000 for payment to Lorraine Weikel in accordance with the proposed development agreement addressing the connection of Challenger Way to College Parkway and to place the project on the current RTC Transportation Improvement Plan with a high priority; fiscal impact is \$50,000 from RTC funds which are currently budgeted. Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

F-2. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE PRIORITIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF THE INSTALLATION OF A TRAFFIC SIGNAL AT THE INTERSECTION OF US HIGHWAY 395 AND SONOMA STREET AND ENTERING INTO A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR FUTURE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SONOMA STREET EXTENSION (1-1452.5)- Mr. St. John's introduction explained the RTC's history on the extension. Conkey's Representative Mark Palmer further described the history, reasons for developing a new approach, and the proposed alignment. The Sonoma Street extension is a collector street with a medium priority on the City's Master Plan. Efforts to negotiate with the adjacent property owner had not been successful, therefore, the new concept is to have a majority of the street right-of-way on the Conkey parcel. Its construction is proposed to be phased and constructed as the Conkey parcel is developed. Discussion indicated that a Mr. Allensworth owned the adjacent parcel. The City does not currently have a development agreement with him. Commissioner Bennett voiced her opposition to the concept due to her feeling that Sonoma should be extended the entire distance if a signal is installed on Carson Street. Comments indicated that Curry Street is now under design and stressed the need for its extension and widening. Conkey's commitments, as indicated in the staff report, were discussed in depth. Mr. Brotzman indicated that Sonoma Street on the east side of Carson Street will have to be realigned to allow connection with the proposed west side. Safety concerns mandated this realignment.

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes for the 2/9/00 Meeting

Page 3

Conkey Representative Steve Trolio pointed out the different designs allowed by having/not having the extra parcel which the City would be required to purchase for the extension of right-of-way through Mr. Allensworth's parcel. As he would not have the parcel in the beginning, he could not include it in his design; therefore, the additional parcel would be of little value to him. Mr. Palmer then explained the proposal to sell the "pie" shaped piece created by the realignment of Sonoma to Mr. Allensworth in trade for the portion needed to extend the right-of-way from Conkey's parcel to Curry Street. Clarification explained how the property value had been established. Commissioner Teixeira questioned at length whether Conkey would purchase any property the City had to acquire beyond that required for the right-of-way without a successful commitment from the Conkey representatives. Jim Conkey of Conkey Development explained that his firm was already paying for 87 percent of the improvements and that it was unfair to require more. He was willing to work out a reasonable and fair project but did not feel that he should be forced to carry the entire load as Mr. Allensworth would also benefit from the project. Commissioner Bennett explained her opposition to the proposal as being due to the benefits which the Conkey Development would receive and Conkey's desire to have RTC pay for those improvements until 2012. Discussion with staff indicated that the funds would be taken from another project to provide the signal at Sonoma and Carson. Commissioner Bennett then pointed out that without the improvements people will cut through his property to access Curry/Carson. Mr. St. John indicated that Mr. Allensworth was not interested in developing at this time. He is purportedly open to a reasonable offer. He felt that Mr. Conkey had made an honest effort to develop that offer without success. He then explained Mr. Conkey's ability to install a signal on Carson and have a private roadway into his development if the project had not been included on the Master Plan. He agreed that the signal must meet NDOT standards and warrants. Mr. Palmer then explained the reasons for suggesting that the project be developed in increments had been based on the Master Plan consultant DKS's indication that the extension would not be needed until 2012. They could not control the development beyond their property. Mr. Allensworth is not willing to do anything as it is not needed for his business. The development agreement will require the adjacent property owner whomever that may be to pay a fair share of the costs. This would make Conkey the "bank" for the project. Chair Plank noted the difference between the original proposal and the current proposal. He suggested that Conkey and staff develop a better plan showing the impact to the City if the City uses its eminent domain powers to continue the project to Curry Street. This would include Conkey's purchase of the excess property gained from this acquisition and the salvage value of the building. Mr. Conkey indicated that the property would be of no value to his development if he purchases it in two years. Chair Plank continued his list of criteria to be developed by staff to include the acquisition date of the area required to extend the right-of-way. Mr. Palmer felt that the extension would not be required until 2012 and at that time the City should "purchase the dedication at fair market value". The 2012 date had been based on regional numbers and not dependent upon development of the property. The right-of-way will provide the community with an access route to Curry Street which he felt will be needed when the northern half of the freeway is completed. He also pointed out that Curry Street will be of little benefit to south bound traffic until it is widened and extended. Chair Plank suggested that the item be continued and for staff to work with Conkey to have Conkey acquire the additional parcel and dedicate one-half of the right-of-way and complete the construction to Curry Street. Discussion indicated that Conkey was willing to construct the entire right-of-way with a reimbursement agreement for the Allensworth portion. Commissioner Bennett described the public's current efforts to access Curry Street require cutting through various commercial properties. She felt that the proposal would encourage additional cutting through. She encouraged them to provide a completion date within two years. Mr. Trolio felt that the 2012 date had been dictated by DKS and the City. A signal will encourage the public to access his property and Curry Street. Safety concerns if the signal is not installed were expressed.

(2-0721.5) Mr. Trolio described the proposal which would construct the entire Sonoma roadway to the entrance into his parcel and then half of the roadway width approximately one-half of the distance along his property and to dedicate the entire roadway to the City. Mr. Allensworth would be required to reimburse Conkey for the improvements made to his parcel. A property trade for the additional area acquired for the right-of-way and the pie shaped parcel abutting Carson Street will occur. These parcels may be of equal value. Mr. Conkey felt that they should not be required to give the City everything but was willing to provide a fair and reasonable amount.

Discussion noted the cost for the Curry Street project had been estimated at \$900,000. The concept will provide a second connection to Curry. Commissioner Teixeira felt that the project provides an opportunity to have the street.

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes for the 2/9/00 Meeting

Page 4

Conkey will recoup 50 percent of the improvement costs. The adjacent property owner will not be allowed to access Sonoma without reimbursement. The value of the two parcels also had validity. He supported continuing the project until the remaining issues could be resolved. Mr. Conkey felt that a 30 day delay would significantly impact his project. He also felt that Mr. Allensworth was not going to participate. Chair Plank asked staff to provide a better value for the property. Mr. Trolio requested a special meeting be held if the matter is continued.

(2-1189.5) Commissioner Teixeira moved that we re-agendize the item for the next RTC meeting in March but at the same time set aside \$200,000 in arterial costs not be spent but set aside based upon our decision at the next Board meeting; in other words, we will not commit that money for fiscal year 2000-2001. We will set that money aside and let it compete if we can cut a deal. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion for discussion. Clarification by Commissioner Teixeira indicated the funds were to be set aside from the 2000-2001 priority list. It will compete later when the final determination is made regarding a deal with Conkey. Mr. Trolio indicated that Conkey needed the \$200,000 to be set aside for the signal and not the arterial. Commissioner Teixeira corrected his motion to be for the signal. He further indicated that the money would held and allocated as part of the coming fiscal budget if the deal can be developed. Otherwise, the funds will be spent for a different project. Commissioner Kennedy pointed out that without the street, the signal would be of no value. Commissioner Teixeira indicated that the signal must be there if the development is to occur. The road could be moved. He agreed that 2012 is to far out for the road. If the money is set aside, a timeframe which will work is established, and staff is able to develop more definitive numbers, it will come back. It should not be necessary to rediscuss the entire issue. This proposal would allow Conkey to advise its tenants that the request had not been entirely denied. The money had been set aside. The decision will be made at the next meeting. He felt that the Commission could prioritize all of the funds except for this \$200,000. Its allocation would be done at the next meeting. If the deal is cut which would satisfy the Commission and put Sonoma through, then the funds would be available for the development. Clarification by Commissioner Bennett indicated that this would mean that some signal on the priority list would not be constructed as result of his motion. Commissioner Teixeira agreed that a project may not be accomplished--some road work or a signal.

Frank Page expressed his disappointment that the Commission was not considering the Transportation Advisory Committee's recommendations and study. NDOT must approve the signal prior to its installation and will not approve it unless the warrants justify it. The entire street is needed. If the street is not constructed, the City will lose. Another signal will further impeded Highway 395. Curry Street needs to be constructed and extended to carry the traffic. The City could be facing a lawsuit without the signal. The motion changes the Committee's priorities. Commissioner Teixeira responded that the motion was based on staff's statements that if the development is constructed, the warrants will be there. Sonoma Street must be put through. Current egress problems for East Sonoma were noted. The motion would allow the discussion to occur which should include NDOT and allow the process to proceed. Mr. Page responded by indicating that the motion would take money from other projects and make the signal a higher priority. Mr. Palmer and Chair Plank indicated that Conkey had done the traffic study and that the intersection meets the warrants for a signal.

Craig Hartman supported Mr. Page and questioned whether the signal would meet the manual for traffic control devices and warrants. Mr. Brotzman indicated it did. Mr. Hartman explained his personal safety concerns for left turning traffic. The City's liability will be increased if a signal is installed without NDOT support and appropriate warrants. He did not feel that the drivers would stop if it is not warranted. It would also impede the highway traffic. He expressed concern about the trees found in the vicinity and what would happen to them. Clarification by Mr. Trolio indicated there are no trees at the intersection. Mr. Hartman then indicated that there are trees on the parcel and in the roadway and questioned if they would be removed. Mr. Trolio reiterated that there are no trees on the north side of the parcel. Chair Plank indicated that there are pine trees where Southwest Gas' building had been. Mr. Palmer again indicated that the traffic study had been completed and that NDOT is reviewing it now.

Chad Dorenseth from the National Motors Association indicated that the entire area is being developed as a business district. Another signal will hinder traffic flows unless additional money is provided which will allow for synchronizing all the lights. Without a "flow management" plan, the proposal is ill-advised. Chair Plank felt that this issue would be addressed later in the meeting. Mr. St. John indicated that the lights would be synchronized so

that they would work together. Mr. Brotzman then explained that the current signal management program was based upon the posted traffic speeds. Clarification indicated that this does not mean that the signals are synchronized according to the traffic flow but rather in accordance with the speed limits, the time of day, and traffic flows. Mr. Dorenseth was to contact Mr. Brotzman regarding this issue.

The motion to reagendaize the item and set aside \$200,000 for signal costs as indicated was voted and carried 5-0.

BREAK: A recess was declared at 7:50 p.m. Chair Plank reconvened the meeting at 8:02 p.m. The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.

F-4. DISCUSSION AND ACTION RELATIVE TO PRIORITIZATION OF RTC PROJECTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001 (2-1761) - Mr. St. John reviewed the Transportation Improvement Program developed at the workshop. The previous motion placed \$200,000 into fiscal year 2001 which reduces the fund balance to \$640,000. Funding would be available until 2003, when the level drops to \$120,000 below the minimum level. Clarification indicated that the ending fund balance is being reduced. Curry Street should be under construction or completed in 2003 and 2004. Clarification indicated that the term "Other Uses" were for the debt service commitments for Graves Lane and two signals. Refinancing these bonds had not been included in the calculations. This option could be explored if so desired in the future and if the rates are favorable. Discussion between Commissioner Teixeira and Mr. Flansberg indicated that there is \$1.1 million budgeted for projects next year. This figure included the \$200,000 commitment on the previous item. The Clear Creek improvements would not be done without Costco's participation. It is also possible that another funding element could be found for the City's portion of this project. Mr. Flansberg then indicated that the Carson and Clearview project had been developed in response to a potential project. He was unsure whether this project would be developed as it is contingent upon the developer's ability to acquire property from NDOT which was made available by the freeway's redesign. Mr. Brotzman briefly highlighted the street improvements involved with this project. Discussion explained the terms "Available for Capital Program" and Capital Outlay, their funding sources and expenditures. Clear Creek funding and projects were noted. The \$125,000 for Clear Creek is to upgrade the improvements required by Costco. A reimbursement agreement may be required for future developers which will repay the RTC for fronting these costs. Direction was solicited on this topic. Commissioner Bennett felt that the same requirements mandated for Conkey should be required of others. She then explained a constituent's request for a left turn signal at College Parkway and North Carson Street. Mr. Flansberg indicated that when development at the northwest corner occurs, the signal improvements will be made and provide for the protected left turns this individual had requested. This will be done at no cost to RTC. Justification for funding the three medium level projects was provided, i.e., the Lompa-Graves signal, Timberline safety improvements, and Arrowhead Connector Road. Few projects are proposed for 2003 due to the desire to save funding for 2004 which contains the Curry Street widening and extension. Discussion also explained that the \$200,000 for the Sonoma-Carson Street signal is to be funded by the Commission at its next meeting and how it would change the budget. Comments also explained that Ormsby Boulevard had a low rating and had not been funded on the spread sheet which went to 2006.

(3-0003.5) Herbert Klemme questioned the reasons Ormsby was listed. He urged the Commission to remove it from the list as it is unneeded. Other State maintained roads provide the same north/south traffic patterns. The funds are needed for higher priority projects. Laura Work explained that the project's priority changed annually with each change in RTC members. She suggested Ormsby Boulevard be removed from the list. Chair Plank read the letters from Carol and David Aalbers, Jeffrey Foltz, Robert Conroy, and James Bawden into the record. The originals of these letters were given to the Clerk and are in the file. He also indicated that his telephone calls on this subject one year ago had been evenly split on the issue. Discussion indicated that the original \$780,000 budget had been reassigned to the ending fund balance. The development plans had been completed and are shelved. Funding for it will be allocated when demand indicates the extension is needed.

Discussion then indicated that work had been done on the College Parkway soundwalls which suggested the estimated cost is \$34,631, \$16,000 had been spent on the Arrowhead connector road, and described the

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes for the 2/9/00 Meeting

Page 6

expenditures on Curry Street. The estimated cost of this project had not been developed due to legal problems regarding the rights-of-way and accesses. The high priority list was read. Discussion ensued on how to signalize Roop and Winnie and an alternative. Murphy Drive improvements should occur next year. The Stewart Street extension had been analyzed by DKS when the Master Plan had been developed and requires inclusion of the Curry Street improvements. Only the design is included in 2001. Current funding had developed 30 percent of the Curry Street plan. Next year's funding will complete the plans. Staff agreed to include funded projects on the spread sheet next year. Commissioner Bennett urged staff to analyze and improve, if possible, the intersection of Moses and Curry. Justification for the request was provided. She also requested adding to the shoulders of Ormsby Boulevard in the loop to widen the roadway. Mr. Flansberg agreed to look at Curry, however, Ormsby is a State route. Commissioner Bennett then requested yellow striping on Curry Street from Lake Glen Manor through the curves to the south.

(3-1125.5) Mr. St. John explained for Craig Hartman that the funding for traffic calming project(s) is contained within the enhancement projects or within specified projects. Several examples of the enhancement projects were noted.

Commissioner Reynolds moved to accept the priority list as presented by staff for the years 2001/2002. Discussion indicated that the \$125,000 for Old Clear Creek Road should be included on the listing. The funds will only be spent if needed. Commissioner Bennett seconded the motion. Chair Plank agreed with the funding for Old Clear Creek Road. If another funding source can be found, the funds will be retained. Mr. St. John reiterated that the Sonoma and Carson signal would dip into the reserves in 2003. He also indicated that other projects may not occur or additional funding may be found which would not cause this to occur. It will also dip into the reserves in 2004 but by 2005 the reserves will not be as impacted. The motion to accept the priority list as presented was voted and carried 5-0.

G. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

G-1. CURRY STREET DESIGN CONTRACT STATUS REPORT (3-1340.5) - Engineering Manager Andrew Burnham indicated the project is on schedule and described the work Lumos and Associates had completed and a contract amendment for drainage improvements. No formal action was required or taken.

G-2. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (3-1368.5) - Commissioner Bennett briefly noted her attendance at an NDOT public transit seminar and invited the Commission to attend the PTAC meeting tomorrow to hear a program by Peter Shower, a national expert on transit and transit systems. NDOT had indicated a willingness to have Mr. Shower conduct an assessment of the City's transit system. Staff was also encouraged to attend the PTAC meeting. Mr. Brotzman indicated the next RTC meeting would be on March 8. No formal action was required or taken.

H. ADJOURNMENT (3-1432.5) - Commissioner Teixeira moved to adjourn. Chair Plank seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Chair Plank adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's office. This tape is available for review and inspection during normal business hours.

The Minutes of the February 9, 2000, Carson City Regional Transportation Commission meeting

2000. ARE SO APPROVED ON ___April 12___,

/s/ _____
Jon Plank, Chair

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Minutes for the 2/9/00 Meeting

Page 7