A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization was held on Wednesday, May 12, 2004, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Richard S. Staub, Vice Chairperson Steve Reynolds, and Members Shelly Aldean, Charles Des Jardins, Bob Nunes, Dennis Taylor, and Mike Zola

STAFF PRESENT: Development Services Director Andrew Burnham, Deputy City Engineer John Flansberg, RTC Engineer Harvey Brotzman, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (CAMPO 5/12/04 Tape 1-0010)

A. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM - Chairperson Staub convened the meeting at 5:30 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Member Aldean arrived at 5:33 p.m. and Member Reynolds arrived at 5:48 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (1-0022) - None.

C. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS (1-0024) - Agenda Items F-5 and 6 are for discussion only this evening. These items will be considered after the District Attorney's office reviews and approves their procedures and forms. They may be considered at the next meeting.

D. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0031)- None. (Commissioner Aldean arrived.)

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0039) - Chairperson Staub indicated that Dennis Taylor is Member Fontaine's temporary replacement. He may become a permanent member of CAMPO in the future.

F. PUBLIC MEETING ITEMS

F-1. PRESENTATION BY WASHOE COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION STAFF ON THE RENO-CARSON CITY PRIDE TRANSIT SERVICES (1-0050) - Washoe County RTC Senior Public Transportation Planner Roger N. Hanson explained the successful beginning of the transit service and the decrease in ridership that occurred when funding and trips were reduced. The target of seven passengers per vehicle hour of operation has been reached. Twenty percent of the PRIDE ridership also use the Citifare system in Reno. The desire to have new buses next year was noted. Used buses were acquired for the PRIDE service when the contractor was changed as a result of the reduction in funding and trips. They are high maintenance vehicles. It may take as long as a year before the new buses arrive. Market-ing efforts were explained. Several illustrations were shown including advertising videos and the Bus Book. Copies of the Bus Book and a "PRIDE BUS RIDE GUIDE" were given to the Board and Clerk. (Copies are in the file.) Discussion indicated that an agreement had been worked out with Douglas County. The service now extends to Walmart on Indian Hill. A new bus costs approximately $350,000 but lasts a long time. Mr. Hanson felt that the Douglas County ridership had been weak. It is approximately ten riders per day. The ridership depends on the individual's ability to make it to the passenger pick up sites. The individuals who are using it appear to be the same ones who were catching the bus at the former Walmart site in Carson City. The riders appreciated the suburban coaches more than they did the old Citifare buses. At this time Mr. Hanson felt that the data regarding the impact higher gas prices had on the ridership was rather

limited. He was unsure if there was an impact although Citifare had seen an increase in ridership. He indicated that inclement weather has a larger influence on the ridership than gas prices. Public comments were solicited but none were given. No formal action was required or taken.

F-2. PRESENTATION BY MV TRANSPORTATION ON THE SERVICE CARSON CITY COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION (CCCT) IS PROVIDING WITHIN THE CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BOUNDARY (1-0180) - MV Transportation General Manager Paul Summers gave a slide presentation illustrating the ridership. (A copy of the slides is in the file.) He stressed the inability to meet increased demand during the peak hours of 8 a.m. to 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. He suggested that the number of hours be increased to six for Monday through Friday. At this time he felt that the service was capped at 3,000 and that additional riders could not be accommodated. Efforts to reduce the no shows were limned. A change in the hours could increase the passengers per hour ratio. Two new buses should arrive next week. It may be possible to use an older vehicle as a spare when the new vehicles arrive. (Member Reynolds arrived during his explanation.) Chairperson Staub asked him to revise his graphs so that the copies would clearly define his illustrations as the copiers do not print in color. He also asked that the pages be numbered and that a breakdown of the fleet including each vehicle's mileage and condition be provided. The news that two new buses are coming was good to hear. Discussion explained the plan to use the two oldest vehicles as backups when a mechanical problem occurs. These vehicles have between 200,000 and 250,000 miles on them. They are experiencing down time when a vehicle breaks down due to the lack of a spare vehicle. The cost effectiveness of repairing the vehicles was questioned. Mr. Summers felt that the public is satisfied with the current service level. An increase in the service hours would make them happier. There have not been too many complaints. The drivers are fantastic and understand the importance of their jobs. Transportation outside Carson City is not provided. Mr. Summers indicated that it is possible to prioritize the trips and to handle "time sensitive riders" before others. This would block out periods for dialysis, the OARC workshop runs, and the Senior Center runs. Riders between 11 a.m. and 2 p.m. can be accommodated. Attempts are made to move others to a different time slot if the request is made for service during the peak periods. Member Aldean suggested consideration be given to offering financial incentives to riders during nonpeak periods. Discussion pointed out that the unmet ridership was lower in April than any of the other months. Reasons for the decrease were questioned. Mr. Summers felt that the month is not as busy as the other months which allows more riders to be accommodated. Public comments were solicited but none were given. No formal action was taken or required.

F-3. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON EXERCISING OPTION TO EXTEND CONTRACT TO MV TRANSPORTATION FOR FINAL YEAR OF A THREE YEAR CONTRACT TO CONTINUE OPERATING THE CARSON CITY COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION TRANSIT SERVICE (1-0354) - Deputy City Engineer John Flansberg briefly highlighted the contract terms. This is the final year of a three-year contract. Discussion indicated the budget contains adequate funds for this contract and PRIDE. The contractual amount is split 50-50 between Carson City's General Fund and CAMPO. Member Aldean noted that the contract in the Board packet shows only the amended sections. She asked that the entire contract be provided in the future. The changes should be highlighted. The revisions fail to provide the sections which are referenced. Mr. Flansberg explained the need for the Board of Supervisors to also approve the contract. He indicated that he will submit the entire contract to the Supervisors. Discussion indicated that the contract does not include an escalation clause that would allow them to pass on the increased fuel costs. Mr. Flansberg agreed to consider fuel escalation and de-escalation clauses when future contracts are developed. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Member

Aldean moved to exercise the option to extend the contract with MV Transportation for the final year of a three-year contract to continue operating the Carson City Community Transportation Transit service through June 30, 2005, for a contract amount not to exceed $410,000; fiscal impact is $408,118.96; and the funding source is the General Fund Transit - one-half of the operating costs in the amount of $204,059.48 and FTA 5307 Funds - one-half of the operating costs in the amount of $204,059.48. Member Des Jardins seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

F-4. PRESENTATION OF PLANNING EFFORTS BY THE WESTERN NEVADA DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT FOR LYON COUNTY SPECIFIC TO THE US 50 CORRIDOR INCLUDING DAYTON AND MOUNDHOUSE AND THE INTERFACE WITH STOREY COUNTY AND CARSON CITY (1-0453) - Western Nevada Development District Planning Director Bill Cadwallader and Lyon County Public Works Director Chuck Swanson described the need for an alternate route along U.S.Highway 50, reasons for making a presentation to the Board, the area considered for a possible route, the potential routes and their challenges. A map delineating the area and potential routes was distributed. (A copy is in the file.) The map is also on Lyon County's website. The introduction included an explanation of a potential internal Dayton circulation plan which would eliminate the need to use/cross Highway 50. Discussion reiterated the current need for an alternate route to Highway 50, particularly when accidents close the Highway. Member Aldean pointed out the time it has taken for Carson City to get its freeway. She urged them to consider a funding source as well as development of an alternate route. This could assist them in obtaining the land over time. Mr. Cadwallader agreed that this process would allow them to include the route when subdivisions are considered and when NDOT makes improvements. The remaining segments will have to be done by Lyon County. Lyon County will have to develop the funding mechanism for it. The purpose at this time is to develop reasonable alternatives and to eliminate those which were felt to be unreasonable. Public input during the process has indicated that the Sutro and the River Road areas believe the alternates are unsuitable. Board comments complimented them on their willingness to consider and plan for the future. Mr. Cadwallader reiterated that the map is on the website and is available to the public. They have worked with NDOT on the plan, however, it is only conceptual at this time. He committed to working with and keeping NDOT, BLM, and the Federal Highway Administration informed. He also felt that there is a limited transit service similar to PRIDE operating along the Highway 50 corridor. Washoe RTC Senior Planner Hanson felt that the only transit service operating in that area is within the communities themselves. There is no connecting transit service between the communities. Discussion ensued on the growth rate expected along the Highway 50 corridor. The green areas on the map designate the approved/proposed subdivisions. Growth is forcing the study. Mr. Swanson indicated that 1200 housing units will be constructed each year. They expect the population of Dayton to reach 40,000 in ten to 20 years. The plan will allow Lyon County to acquire rights-of-ways from developers and work with NDOT and BLM on other rights-of-ways. This will allow controlled growth to occur. They hope to have a draft narrative completed in June, however, it may be delayed a month or two. Discussion pointed out the impact 6,000 additional housing units between Dayton and Ten Mile Hill will have on the traffic and wished them success in their planning. Mr. Swanson explained the NDOT widening projects between Dayton and Chavez Road and between Fernley and Fallon. Development Services Director Andrew Burnham pointed out the traffic impact Carson City will experience as a result of Lyon County's growth and the need to work with NDOT on it. Chairperson Staub felt that both Carson City and Lyon County may already be behind in their planning. Mr. Cadwallader expressed a desire to consider extending the CAMPO boundary to include this area. Concerns were expressed regarding the impact the Reno-Tahoe Industrial Park will have on the Stagecoach/Silver Springs residential area and the need to include Storey County in the transit plan for this work force. Comments stressed the need to consider

regional transit issues as a result of growth throughout the area. Chairperson Staub pointed out that if the population in the Dayton corridor reaches 40,000, they may be their own metropolitan planning organization. No formal action was taken or required.

F-5. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON ADOPTION OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES BETWEEN THE CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION AND THE CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (1-0770) - Chairperson Staub announced that no action will be taken on Items F-5 and F-6. Deputy City Engineer John Flansberg described the need for and purpose of the document. Some of the items in the document need direction/action by the Board. The document will be revised accordingly and brought back for adoption at next month's meeting.

Strategic Project Management Consultant Jerry Hall indicated that basic assumptions had been made in drafting the policies and procedures. These assumptions were based on past history. It is a work in progress and may need some revisions before adoption. The main procedures were addressed in the document. Other procedures were referenced, such as Federal and State regulations. Mr. Hall used the table of contents to describe the purpose of each chapter. The Board was asked to make a decision regarding temporary replacements. Justification for having bimonthly or quarterly meetings rather than monthly meetings was provided. Member Aldean indicated that the frequency of meetings does not require monthly meetings. Later in the document, however, it references monthly meetings. She suggested that the frequency of meetings paragraph be revised to read "it should not be more than once a month and not less than on a bimonthly basis". The Chair could determine when a meeting is not needed. Mr. Hall pointed out that if a special meeting is needed, it would create a conflict as there would be a second meeting in a month. Member Aldean also explained that the majority of the non-elected committees that she serves on provide for the designation of at least one alternate. Having more than one alternate could create a loss of continuity. The requirement that there be four votes to approve an item could create a disadvantage if alternates are not allowed. Discussion indicated that appointed members should be allowed to have an alternate but not the elected members. The Member should keep the alternate members informed about the Board's actions. The elected officials are held to a higher standard than appointed officials. Therefore, they should not have an alternate.

(1-0994) Mr. Hall continued his review of the table of contents with Section 4. His explanation of the separation of powers and duties between CAMPO and RTC indicated that the agreement, which follows, will define the separation of powers and duties even more than that listed in the policies and procedures. Justification for the separation of duties and powers was provided. Additional agreements with Douglas County on the Section 5307 urbanized area formula grants will be needed. These agreements will be appendixes to the final document. Clarification indicated that the separation of duties meets the Codified Federal Regulations requirements for CAMPO. Clark and Washoe Counties' RTC and MPO Members are the same on both agencies. This allows them to collect and spend their revenue in ways which CAMPO will not be able to do. An illustration was provided clarifying the difference. The document spells out this delineation in duties and responsibilities for both the Board, Commission, and staff. Clarification indicated that CAMPO will have the authority to review Douglas County proposals for the portion of the North Valley area inside CAMPO's boundary. This plan must be part of CAMPO's transportation master plan and transportation improvement plan. These federal documents create the ability to reimburse Douglas County for those projects. Douglas County would also be responsible for developing the grant applications and must submit it to the designated grant recipient who will submit the grant to the FTA. Douglas County must follow

the same Federal regulations mandated for Carson City to obtain and use the grants, i.e., ADA, Civil Rights, Title 6, DBE, etc. Clarification indicated that CAMPO does not have to be concerned about Douglas County expenditures within the CAMPO boundary unless it uses Federal funds. CAMPO would review any Federal grants which Douglas County submits. If the project is on the CAMPO transportation master plan and the transportation improvement plan, CAMPO should approve and submit it to the FTA. In order to do this, a funding agreement should be in place regarding the program. NDOT has been serving as the current designated recipient for these grants for CAMPO/Carson City and Douglas County. Mr. Flansberg clarified that the CAMPO Board will act on the expenditure of Federal funds within its boundaries. The paragraph also indicates that the Board of Supervisors has adopted a resolution authorizing CAMPO to expend the funds for Carson City so long as the funding is budgeted. CAMPO has the authority to expend the Federal funds for the portion of Douglas County within its boundaries.

Mr. Hall then highlighted Section 5 of the table of contents. Member Aldean supported including a Lyon County representative as a member of CAMPO's technical committee. She felt that Lyon County should not have a representative on the CAMPO Board. Mr. Flansberg explained Indian Hills General Improvement District's request that it be allowed to have a member on the technical committee. Mr. Burnham asked if the Tahoe MPO and Washoe County RTC should have members on the technical committee. Discussion explained the staff involvement on the technical committee. Mr. Hall suggested that the staff members be the City Engineer, the Public Works Director, a City Planner, etc.

Mr. Hall then indicated that Section 6 is the public involvement policy which the Board had adopted previously. No changes were made to that policy. Discussion indicated Section 6.4 "PO2U" is a typographical error. Mr. Hall then highlighted Section 7. He suggested that the threshold for issuing RFP and RFQs be increased to $25,000. Mr. Burnham noted that the City's current policy is $25,000. Mr. Hall then explained Mr. Taylor's assistance in providing NDOT's on call list which they had used for the traffic study. He recommended consideration be given to having CAMPO establish a similar list of contractors. He then highlighted Section 8. His explanation included the intermodal planning group and its purpose. The intermodal planning group's meeting had provided a great opportunity for networking as the Region IX representative was a former MPO director. He understood Mr. Flansberg's position and concerns. He has since assisted in opening doors for the CAMPO staff. Member Reynolds explained that the video on developing an MPO had stressed repeatedly the importance of maintaining a relationship with the other stakeholders in the area. The program does not appear to do this but rather announces CAMPO's decisions after the fact. Mr. Hall explained that they are touched by the outreach in the public involvement process and may participate in development of the transportation improvement plan and the transit element. Mr. Hall's current involvement with CCCT and MV Transportation was described. He suggested that a portion of the document include an outreach program, which would include OARC, the Senior Center, and other unnamed groups and organizations. Efforts should be undertaken to consolidate these services for efficiency and fiduciary reasons. He also indicated that OARC may wish to submit a request for a vehicle through CAMPO and under the MPO regulations could do so. He then explained that a Federal regulation mandates inclusion of private operators, such as OARC, to have a seat at the table. Member Reynolds suggested that the procedures include a provision that would require scheduling a meeting for the stakeholders to assist in the planning process.

Mr. Hall then noted the glossary and that it will need to be updated periodically in the future. It also needs to include the acronyms. He then indicated that the RTC section may be changed during development of the

intermodal agreement(s) and with Board of Supervisors input. He highlighted the RTC section. Member Aldean explained that the current practice is to have contracts reviewed and approved by RTC before being considered by the Board of Supervisors. This process allows RTC to allocate the funding. Mr. Hall had not understood this process when the document was drafted. Chairperson Staub indicated for the record that both he and Mayor Masayko have questioned whether RTC has the ability to enter into contracts. They have agreed among themselves that it does which conforms with what is written. During the last meeting, however, two issues were raised where the Board of Supervisors took action to approve agreements. These issues are being resolved by the District Attorney's office. Mr. Burnham agreed that, until this information is received from the District Attorney's office, the structure of the document related to this process is not known. He felt that the intent is to have RTC enter into construction contracts. Member Aldean felt that the contract executed by the Mayor had related to CAMPO and RTC. She then read Carson City Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 2003-R-19 into the record. It does not refer to the RTC. Mr. Burnham explained that, if RTC is to be allowed to execute contracts, a similar resolution will be adopted for it. The policies and procedures document will then need to be revised. Mr. Hall then explained the need for legal counsel to provide a certification on the legal issues to the Federal Transit Administration regarding the legal responsibility and ability of the Agency to participate in the processes as the grantee. This may decide what RTC can and cannot do as related to the transit issues. It will not speak to the CAMPO issues. He then concluded his review of the RTC policies and procedures. He indicated that the document will be drafted in accordance with the Board's comments and the legal opinion. It should be ready for the Board's consideration at its next meeting. Public comments were solicited but none were given. No formal action was taken on this Item.

F-6. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON ACCEPTANCE OF AN INTERLOCAL COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, AND THE CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DEFINING THEIR RESPECTIVE RESPONSIBILITIES (1-1541) - Mr. Hall highlighted the agreement and its purpose. Discussion indicated that Section 2 under "RTC Agrees" and Section 3 under "City Agrees" should be removed as the City in Section 12 authorizes CAMPO and RTC to have jurisdiction over streets and highway projects and the development and execution of agreements and contracts. Additional comments were solicited but none were given. No formal action was taken on this item.

G. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS - NONACTION ITEMS

G-1. STATUS REPORTS ON PLANNING ACTIVITIES INCLUDING THE SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN AND THE TRAFFIC MODEL SUFFICIENCY REVIEW (1-1624) - Mr. Flansberg indicated that the RFP for the short range transit plan is on the streets. He hoped to get between six and eight proposals. The top three will be interviewed. A presentation will be made to the Board at its July meeting. He hoped to have the work completed by December. The purpose of the traffic model sufficiency review was described. He hoped to have it completed by August or September. No formal action was taken or required.

G-2. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (1-1690) - Mr. Flansberg indicated that he would not be at the June meeting. He requested a special meeting on June 29 to consider the draft transportation plan. The

Planning Commission will consider it on June 30. The Board of Supervisors will consider it on July 1. It must be sent to the Federal Highway Administration on that date.

Member Taylor explained NDOT's written request to be on the June agenda to review and approve NDOT's road improvements program. It will then be forwarded to the State Transportation Board.

Chairperson Staub asked that the agenda include discussion/action on the Board's name. He felt that it should tell the public what the Board does. One suggestion was "CATO - Carson Area Transit Organization". He felt that if the name is closer to what they do, the public may understand it better. No formal action was taken on any of these items.

H. ADJOURNMENT - Member Reynolds moved to adjourn. Member Aldean seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Chairperson Reynolds adjourned the meeting at 7:14 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 May 12, 2004, Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON___July 29_____, 2004.

_/s/_____
Richard S. Staub, Chairperson