

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the November 10, 1999, Meeting
Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission was held on Wednesday, November 10, 1999, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Jon Plank, Vice Chairperson Steve Reynolds, and
Commissioners Kay Bennett, Bob Kennedy, and Marv Teixeira

STAFF PRESENT: Capital Projects Manager Andrew Burnham, Street
Superintendent John Flansberg, Parks Planner Vern Krahn, and Recording
Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (R.T.C. 11/10/99 Tape 1-0001)

A. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM - Chairperson Plank convened the meeting at 5:33 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present although Commissioner Bennett had not yet arrived.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - February 17 and October 13, 1999 (1-0008) - Commissioner Kennedy moved to approve the Minutes of the October 13, 1999, meeting. Commissioner Teixeira seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0.

Commissioner Reynolds moved to approve the February 17, 1999, Minutes. Chairperson Plank seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

C. MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA (1-0042) - None. Commissioner Bennett arrived--5:37 p.m. The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.

D. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0059) - None.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0065) - Chairperson Plank indicated he had given a packet of information to Brad Harker and discussed Item F-1 with him.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS

F-1. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON OPTIONS FOR THE SOUTH GRAVES LANE SOUND WALL BETWEEN U.S. HIGHWAY 50 AND STANTON DRIVE (1-0076) - Deputy City Manager Dan St. John reviewed the staff report. Staff discussed with the Commission the heights and the estimated costs for the different options. Additional right-of-way was not included in the estimates.

Public comments were solicited. Lona McGaffin described her reasons for beginning the effort to obtain a sound/safety wall on Graves at River Knolls. She felt it was time for the Commission to act and resolve the intolerable situation experienced by the residents or explain why they cannot have a wall. Larry Borges read his prepared statement into the record indicating that the area is no different than the Comstock Mobile Home Park. Additional traffic will be added when North Graves Lane opens. His area's health and welfare is just as important as other areas of the community. He felt that the residents would be willing to dedicate the necessary right-of-way for the wall. Funding could be taken from that reimbursed to RTC for the water line or from the contingency account. It was time to correct the mistake made by not installing the sound/safety wall when Graves Lane was extended in his area. He also requested removal of the trucks from Graves Lane at night. Brad Harker read his prepared statement into the record. (A copy is in the file.) The sound studies clearly indicate a sound wall is warranted and should be constructed along the entire length of River Knolls at Graves Lane. He found it unbelievable that the 1990 master plan had failed to recognize a minute increase in traffic on Graves Lane. The developer had used the master plan when selling the homes. Traffic today is over 12,000 vehicles per day. It will only increase until the freeway is constructed. Sound walls have been or will be constructed in other areas which will experience a decrease in traffic once the freeway is constructed--North Graves Lane, College Parkway, and at the Comstock Mobile Home Park. College Parkway's sound study was lower than that observed at River Knolls where the federal standards are exceeded. He felt it was unreasonable to ask the residents to wait 12 years or more for the traffic volume to drop. The quality of life and home values have decreased as a result of the traffic. The

residents were willing to work with the City staff and complete the necessary paperwork to allow construction of the sound wall, etc. He urged the Commission to act favorably on the sound wall. Audrey Allen supported the request for a sound wall due to the traffic impact on the residents' lives. Discussion indicated that she was willing to work with the City on the development issues including submittal of an application for a CDBG grant. John Woodward referenced a news article and questioned the reasons for constructing the northern portion of Graves Lane when the freeway will soon be constructed. He questioned the reasons it had cost so much and why Goni had been realigned, why holes are being cut in the unopened new portion of North Graves, the reasons for the Challenger to Ormsby extension? These funds should have been used for the sound wall. There are other areas which also need the funds. He claimed to be able to hear the traffic noises from Graves Lane at his residence which is one block away. Tim Rubald expressed his concern about the impact the traffic will have on his neighborhood and the precedence which the Commission would establish. The traffic volume is negatively impacting the residential quality of life. Without mitigation, their quality of life will continue to decline. He urged the Commission to support option two. Sue Newberry supported the quality of life issues and urged consideration of the criteria used to support the sound wall in other areas. She also felt that consideration should be given to the residents as well as the drivers when decisions are made on the location of major streets and arterials. The sound wall should be constructed on both sides of the street as the apartment dwellers are just as important as the single family residents. She recommended inclusion of the criteria within the development standards for future street construction projects. She also pointed out that a four lane road is not required for 4,000 cars, however, since the road has been constructed, the statement "traffic will come" had occurred. The community standards are high and should include sound walls.

The Commission then discussed the options provided by staff. Commissioner Kennedy felt a more creative idea/concept needed to be found than the options which had been provided. Commissioner Teixeira felt that the residents were justified in requesting the sound wall based on the precedence established for walls in other areas. Additional traffic would be added to South Graves Lane once the northern segment opens and as growth occurs in Douglas and Lyon Counties. Other areas of the community are experiencing the same traffic impacts from this growth and will continue to experience it until the entire freeway is constructed. He was unsure where the funds could be found. The project should compete on the priority list. Chairperson Plank pointed out that the master plan states truck routes will be discouraged in residential neighborhoods, however, the route was established before that master plan was adopted. Graves Lane is a collector street and trucks may not be prevented from using it. The standards should be as equitable as possible. The City's standards are high. Additional growth will occur in both Lyon and Douglas Counties as well as along Highway 50. Even though the freeway may remove some of the traffic, the traffic created by the growth may elect to continue to use Graves Lane. If the wall is constructed, it should be done right. Concerns about the current priorities and their needs were noted including South Curry Street. EDA grants through the Western Nevada Development District may help construct these priorities. The MPO status may assist the community in obtaining additional grants, including the CDBG noted earlier. This may occur in two years--after the census is completed. Reasons he felt the City could obtain these grants were provided. He supported maintaining the standard. Commissioner Bennett referenced a traffic analysis related to traffic service levels D and F which had been conducted on River Knolls Phase 6. It suggests that even with an adjustment to the timing of the signal at 50 and Graves, the service level will drop. She had not found an in depth analysis of the impact Graves Lane's extension will have nor was any requirements placed on the developer for mitigation of those impacts. She supported Chairperson Plank's comments regarding the MPO and potential grants for future projects. She, too, urged the Commission to fix it right if the project is undertaken. Commissioner Reynolds described his tours and knowledge of the neighborhood. He felt that the City should implement a program which would justify a good sound wall when the volume of traffic experienced requires it. He was not comfortable prioritizing the expenditure this evening. The project should be compared with the other priorities and grants should be sought, if available. Chairperson Plank then indicated that he could support Option 2 and to do it right. He requested that the property owners abutting Graves Lane assist the City by doing everything possible to reduce the financial costs including dedication of the right-of-way and removal of the wood fence. Comments indicated that the fence removal should not commence tomorrow.

Commissioner Reynolds questioned the standard which should be established for sound walls due to the need for sound walls in other areas. Chairperson Plank felt that the developer should be required to assess future impacts more appropriately including the adjacent neighborhood and location of collector streets, etc. His personal

experience with Highway 50's traffic noises were noted. Commissioner Teixeira pointed out the future traffic impact the northern phase of the freeway will create in the traffic's efforts to proceed south to Douglas County, etc. If Saliman is used by this traffic, a similar request for sound walls could be justified. Criteria is needed to provide consistency. He suggested that the Commission analyze the priorities and establish the standards. He could not support a motion until this occurs.

(1-1091) Mr. Harker felt that the standards were set by the dba ratings. His area is now at or above the State and Federal standards. He felt that the apartment dwellers should have joined the effort or made their concerns known. They also have flexibility in choosing a residence which is not enjoyed by the home owners once the property is acquired. Commissioner Teixeira felt that if the problem exists on one side of the street, it should be mitigated for both sides. The apartment dwellers are entitled to the same safety and quality of life standards as the others even though they may not be able to afford it. The fiscal impact of empty apartments was noted.

Commissioner Bennett suggested that the Commission give staff direction to return to the Commission at a workshop on the City-wide impacts of the northern segment of the freeway. Modeling can be done which will clearly indicate this impact. The Commission can then analyze and develop mitigation methods and standards.

Commissioner Bennett moved that the Regional Transportation Commission include Option 2 with regard to the South Graves Lane sound wall between U.S. 50 and Stanton Drive on the RTC priority list to be re-evaluated with the upcoming budget process. Discussion indicated that the entire master plan will be re-evaluated in January. **Commissioner Teixeira seconded the motion.** Commissioner Kennedy cautioned against moving forward without establishing the process. He explained to the audience that the motion would place the project on a priority list which will consider several things. It's construction may not occur in three to five years. He was concerned about the lack of knowledge concerning the funding source, the reality of the grants, the timeframe, etc. He requested the workshop be conducted first, specifically, as two of the members had only recently joined the Commission. Commissioner Teixeira indicated that the motion would require the project to compete for funding with other projects. He was uncertain when or if the project would receive funding. Phasing may be possible. He felt that he could support the motion. Commissioner Bennett clarified the intent of her motion as being to place the project on the priority list which allows it to compete in January for funding along with the other projects.

Ms. Allen expressed a desire to discuss the project with Administrative Assistant to the City Manager Liz Teixeira and the possibility of using CDBG funds as a match as she felt there were low income residents in the vicinity. Mr. Borges reiterated his comments concerning his efforts to get the need for the sound wall recognized for years. He felt that the area was unique due to the impact created by the truck traffic. Carson Street is a main street. Graves Lane is a residential street. Construction trucks have used the area as a cut-through for years. The noise study had not occurred during construction periods. Therefore, it did not include this impact. He felt that if other areas could compete with the noise and emission pollution encountered in his area, they should have the same consideration. Stephanie Adams discussed the budget cycle with the Commission. Ms. McGaffin questioned whether the Commission was considering an option which had not been included in the staff report. Commissioner Kennedy indicated that he was not aware of any other options which had not been included in the report. Ms. McGaffin did not wish to continue studying/planning. Something must be done now. Commissioner Kennedy explained that his tenure on the Commission was rather brief and that he lacked knowledge on the financing and other aspects/options. His main concern related to financing. His support for the motion which will place the project on the priority list and allow it to compete for funding. Chairperson Plank indicated that the motion required a full wall. Commissioner Bennett reiterated that her intent of the motion had been to select Option 2. When the priorities are analyzed in January, if staff has other options, she would be open to considering them. This would be conducted in an open public hearing. Mr. St. John explained staff's efforts to "bracket" the options. The wooden fence along Comstock Mobile Home Park had been rejected at the request of the property owners. Mr. Harker indicated that Option 2 is for a ten foot masonry wall and that the motion would put it in the mix for priorities.

The motion as indicated was voted and carried 5-0.

BREAK: A recess was declared at 6:58 p.m. A quorum of the Commission was present when Chairperson Plank reconvened the meeting at 7:12 p.m. although Commissioner Teixeira was absent.

F-2. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON PRIORITIZATION OF REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION FUNDS FOR PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR LLC GRACE ENTERPRISES AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF WINNIE LANE AND U.S. 395 (1-1425) - Mr. St. John explained the traffic study, the original agreement, the proposed agreement, the NDOT's funding commitment, and NDOT's latest revision which had not been put in writing. Discussion pointed out the public benefit the improvements provide, questioned the validity of the estimated cost, described the amount of in-kind services provided by the City, and explained the need for a better analysis of the costs. Mr. St. John indicated that the developer had been aware that, if he proceeded without the agreement being signed, he did so at his own risk. Commission comments supported tabling the agreement until the final draft is developed, costs are determined, and funding sources, if appropriate, are developed. Staff was directed to hold the line to that which had been discussed originally. Chairperson Plank ruled the item deferred until the agreement is finalized. No formal action was taken.

F-3. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING CARSON CITY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) PROCESS REQUIREMENT (1-1807) - NDOT Representatives Leif Anderson and Ken Cooper discussed with the Commission the process required to be declared an MPO; the advantages of being a MPO; the funding competition for communities over 50,000; the need for an agreement with TRPA regarding the portion of the Carson City now included in its MPO area; potential funding opportunities; reasons Carson City may not be eligible for air quality funding; the eligibility change from rural funding to urban funding when the population reaches 50,000 which mandates the MPO status; who should be the MPO and their roles--RTC, BOS, PTAC, etc.; the need to carefully weigh the pros and cons of all the Federal financing plans prior to commitment; the State's administrative duties; funding potentials for fulfilling the MPO requirements; the possibility of including adjacent Counties within the City's transit plan and WNDD's work on a regional transit program; and the need for 20 year master plans and models. Mr. Anderson indicated a need to determine whether an interlocal agreement would be required with Paratransit on the transit system. Mr. Cooper felt that the MPO status could provide funding for the southern portion of the freeway. Comments emphasized the need to commence working on the MPO requirements. Mr. Cooper volunteered his staff and his support people, including Randy Beller with FHWA, to assist the City in its efforts to comply with the MPO requirements. He felt that the City had already completed a lot of these requirements. Mr. Cooper did not feel that the City would be required to have smog checks so long as the air quality standards are maintained. Discussion ensued between the Commission and Mr. St. John on the need for a "point person" dedicated to working on the MPO requirements. Chairperson Plank directed Mr. St. John to develop a flow chart indicating the process and timing for fulfilling the MPO requirements. Commissioner Bennett suggested that in January the Commission establish a steering committee to work on the requirements. She proposed that the committee include City and NDOT staff as well as members of RTC, PTAC, and the public-at-large. Chairperson Plank directed staff to work on the concept and questioned whether January would be too soon to establish the committee. Commissioner Reynolds suggested that the Commission consider the personnel needs and suggested committee after the timeline is developed. Commissioner Kennedy also felt January was too early and supported directing staff to develop the flow chart and time frames. Mr. Cooper reiterated his offer of assistance and volunteered Sandy McGrew's assistance. Mr. Anderson emphasized the need for the timeframe to establish the process between now and the MPO status and then for developing the necessary work programs, transportation plans, and transportation improvement work programs with public participation. Federal funding will not be available after MPO is established and these programs are developed. Commission comments complimented Mr. Cooper's children for their patience and attention during the lengthy meeting. No formal action was required or taken.

G. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS - NON-ACTION ITEMS - FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (1-3028) - Discussion ensued among the Commission and Mr. Flansberg on the date for the Graves Lane ribbon cutting ceremony and reasons for its delay. Chairperson Plank felt that the Commission should discuss the East Winnie Lane and Roop Street intersection and described his concerns with the southeast sidewalk and gravel ramp. Commissioner Reynolds described the sight problems with the right turn, southbound traffic and suggested that staff analyze this area also. Mr. Flansberg announced the Street Department

CARSON CITY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the November 10, 1999, Meeting
Page 5

leaf and limb removal program which was to begin on Monday, November 15.

There being no other matters for consideration, Commissioner Reynolds moved to adjourn. Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0. Chairperson Plank adjourned the meeting at 8:30 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 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Minutes of the November 10, 1999, Meeting
Page 6

The Minutes of the November 10, 1999, Carson City Regional Transportation Commission

1999.

ARE SO APPROVED ON ___December_8___,

_____/s/_____

Jon Plank, Chairperson