

WEST WASHOE VALLEY CITIZEN ADVISORY BOARD



DRAFT

Minutes of the regular meeting of the West Washoe Valley Citizen Advisory Board held March 3, 2008 at Bowers Volunteer Fire Department, 3905 Old 395, Washoe Valley, Nevada.

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairperson Struffert called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m., with a quorum of five members present.
2. **MEMBERS PRESENT** – Hans Struffert (Chairperson), Jane Countryman, Rod Smith, Debbie Sheltra, William Elliott
MEMBERS ABSENT – Bob Rusk
3. **CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA FOR MARCH 3, 2008 MEETING** – Chairperson Struffert certified that the agendas for the March 3, 2008 WWV CAB meeting were posted at the designated locations by 9:00 a.m. three working days prior to the meeting date in accordance with the requirements of the Nevada Open Meeting Law.
4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR MEETING OF MARCH 3, 2008** – Jane Countryman moved to approve the agenda for the March 3, 2008 meeting. Debbie Sheltra seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
5. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 2008** - Jane Countryman moved to approve the February 4, 2008 meeting minutes. The following correction was noted: (a) on page 4, Item 13, "Todd Dyson" should be changed to Thor Dyson. Jane Countryman amended her motion to approve the February 4, 2008 meeting minutes as amended. Rod Smith seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
6. **UPDATES/ANNOUNCEMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE** – Chairperson Struffert announced he received an application by Sierra Reflections to extend the expiration date of the subdivision map until June 11, 2011. It was going to expire June 14, 2008. Sarah Tone explained the review process was purely administrative and that Chairperson Struffert only received this information due to the fact that he was the Chair. Chairperson Struffert reported he received the official notes of the last CAB Chair meeting and that he had already reported the major items of that meeting to the Board. Chairperson Struffert also reported he received information regarding Washoe County Department of Water Resources Franktown Estates/Lightning W Water System's Frequently Asked Questions and Washoe County Department of Water Resources Frequently Asked Questions Proposed Special Assessment District for the Lightning W Water System's Supply Improvement Project dated January 2008. Chairperson Struffert stated there were differences between the two documents, but there was also duplicate information. Cliff Low explained the Department of Water Resources created a Frequently Asked Questions document that answered questions relative to the need for creating more water and questions regarding what a special assessment district was and how it worked. Sarah Tone confirmed both documents were on the County web page.
7. **ACTIVITY AND INCIDENT REPORTS BY REGIONAL/COUNTY DEPARTMENTS** - These reports are based on need as determined by the departments as well as the availability of presenters.
 - A. **Washoe County Sheriff's Office Items** – Sgt. Phil Condon was in attendance to present a report. He reported West Washoe Valley had been quiet during the last thirty days. There were only five false alarms; four 911 hang-ups; and five citations issued. The jail expansion project was completed and tomorrow would be its grand opening. Sgt. Condon provided information regarding the new expansion.

Concerns/Comments

- Board member Sheltra reported musclepower.com was another bicycle group that started to use the area. They would be back on March 14 and March 15, 2008. She stated she would fax more information regarding the group to Sgt. Condon and thanked Sgt. Condon who stated he would inform the group to ride two-by-two when in the area.
- B. **Regional Dispatch Report** - Chairperson Struffert requested this item be removed from future agendas.
 - C. **Fire Safety Issues**
 1. **Reno Fire Department** – There was no one in attendance to present a report.
 2. **Sierra Fire Protection District**
 - A. **Update on Sierra Fire District Strategic Plan Funding** - Chief Mike Green was in attendance to present a report. He reported a recommendation would be developed and presented to the Board on March 25, 2008 from the input received from the CABs, the Homeowners Association, and Reno, Lake Tahoe, and Truckee Meadows. On April 22, 2008, action on the recommendation would be requested. He provided a short history of the District by stating that, originally, the Sierra Fire Protection District was part of the Sierra Forest Fire Protection District which ran Douglas, Carson, and Washoe counties and was established as a band of territory to allow a State Fire District. The original purpose of the District was to allow Federal funding to be used for water shed management and wild land. However, when the funds expired and the original purpose changed, it became under county control on July 1, 2006. At the time this occurred, there was an understanding that this was a short-term solution, but the problems were that there was a narrow-band of territory. There was a tax base which was limited by the tax caps due to the fact that it was primarily residential and that revenues would not keep up with expenses. This year, there was \$121,000 in revenue

shortfall and some unanticipated expenses. Next year, there would be a bigger shortfall, almost \$500,000. The transfer from State to local control allowed the Commissioners to create the plan for the next step, which was to become a County Fire District with some funding issues. With a PowerPoint presentation, Chief Green presented a summary of the financial dilemma and discussed the shortfall that would occur. There would be a \$392,000 budget shortfall next year which means no capital equipment. Even if tax rates were to be changed, it would not change the amount of revenue the Fire District receives due to the tax caps. The only way to increase revenue was by creating a new Government or a 474 Fire District, a County entity. For the first year of a new Government, there was not a tax cap. Chief Green stated he would return in April to discuss the anticipated revenue and the tax rate in order to achieve their goals. Alex Kukulus clarified the removal of the tax cap would only effect the portion of the tax cap related to the Fire District. Chief Green stated the public input he received were concerns regarding potential loss of service, taxes, and having a long-term solution. There was no desire for another short-term solution. The City of Reno, Lake Tahoe, and Truckee Meadows stated they wanted the Fire District to demonstrate financial self-sufficiency. Chief Green reviewed alternatives that were considered. Goals were divided into service, financial, and governance. Chief Green reviewed goals. Mr. Kukulus provided a map of the District area. Chief Green explained a stand-alone District would not change borders or address future funding needs. At this time, a slide was presented showing the advantages and disadvantages. The recommendations were to address the financial and service delivery needs and to obtain citizen input regarding facilities. A short-term fix was needed for a long-term fix.

Concerns/Comments

- Board member Smith asked if this was a one-time fix. Chief Green replied he would address the long-term fix because that regarded the recommendation, but they wanted to fix the one-time piece now because there were opportunities in the next couple of years to take advantage of it.
- Board member Sheltra interjected by stating the Board had never been told it was a short-term fix. Chief Green stressed the current recommendation was a short-term solution and that the two recommendations they were making to fix it was for a long-term solution.
- Board member Smith asked about exchanging areas. Chief Green explained they would have to be a 474 District to exchange territories.
- Board member Sheltra expressed concern regarding the County Commissioners reluctance to make Truckee Meadows pay for service from the Sierra Fire District. Discussion followed. Chief Green clarified NDF operated the Sierra Fire Protection District with the revenue generated from the Sierra Fire Protection District. The only time State funds were utilized was if there was a catastrophic wildfire. He and Board member Sheltra had a meeting tomorrow to ask for clarification regarding what NDF subsidized out of State General Funds to maintain the service level of the Sierra Fire Protection District.
- Board member Sheltra stated her goal at tomorrow's meeting was to find out what kind of mechanisms would be in place to maintain the station at the current level.
- Board member Smith commented on the residents who would be affected by the tax rate payment and on the disorganized solution.
- A question was asked regarding who provided service on the west side of Washoe Lake. Board member Sheltra explained approximately eighty percent of Sierra District fire calls were covering Truckee Meadows calls. Discussion followed.
- A question was asked regarding what the problems would be in combining all of Washoe Valley into one Washoe Valley Fire District. Chief Green replied the revenue that was generated in Washoe Valley would not support a Washoe Valley stand-alone station. A station would also require assistance with a wild land fire or a structure fire which would bring up the issue again of how services were being paid.
- Board member Smith asked where funding was being received. Chief Green replied funding was coming from the Galena, Montrose, and Battle Horn area.
- Board member Countryman summarized they were proposing a short-term fix to stabilize and a long-term fix to equalize so funding was received no matter where a call was received. She expressed concern that the medical portion would not be maintained given the current budget shortfall.
- Board member Sheltra expressed concern that bonding would be asked to maintain the level of service if the County does not solve the inequity after the short-term fix.
- Board member Smith suggested allowing the station to financially "die" in order to expedite an outcome. Chief Green explained if that happened, they would have to maintain the \$1 million amount so services would have to be cut. The \$1 million amount was to go for wild land cost per the agreement with the State as a 473 District. Board member Sheltra stated they had pointed out two years ago that the State had the ability to pay for wild land costs, but nobody listened.
- Cliff Low asked if inequities even out throughout the whole District area. Chief Green explained the north area would have to pay approximately \$375,000 to Washoe Valley and Washoe Valley would

pay approximately \$50,000 to them if a budget configuration was based on a dollar value. There were also inequities in service and infrastructure needs. It would make more sense to have a Truckee Meadows Station with more paramedic service. The problem was having a small band of territory with no revenue to provide for services. They were looking to stabilize and equalize to prevent a cut in service for any period of time.

- Board member Sheltra explained they had applied political pressure before, but they were not successful because the City of Reno and the unions were a lot stronger with more people and more influence.
- Alex Kukulus added that there was no standard service level for the area when the State ran the District and that there was no assurance service or revenues from the State would be provided in the future if the District was turned back over to the State.
- Chief Green also reported April 12, 2008 would be the training class and April 19, 2008 would be the evacuation drill.
- Board member Sheltra asked if there should be representatives from every street in attendance during the class and drill. Chief Green replied yes. He also asked to be contacted with more input regarding tonight's discussion at msgreene@washoecounty.us or 849-1108 or 882-9776.

3. Washoe County Fire Service - There was no one in attendance to present a report.

8. UPDATES AND LIAISON REPORTS

A. Liaison Report – Ann York, EVWCAB Liaison, was in attendance to present a report. She reported the East Washoe Valley CAB meeting was held February 12, 2008 and that Ginger Pierce had announced the evacuation training during the meeting. They also discussed the I-580 project and everyone was invited to attend the stakeholder's meeting with comments and recommendations regarding the issue. Information regarding the Franktown Estates municipal well was provided. The Department of Resources identified a location for a new well which was anticipated to be operational by mid-year. Existing water rights on the current well would be transferred to the new well. Mr. Evans was available to check domestic wells upon request. Concerns were raised regarding the impact to existing wells. Jeanne Reefer stated the new well was intended to replace the consumption of existing wells. A Regional Animal Services overview was provided by Cindy Sabatoni. Ginger Pierce provided information on the sale of water rights in the Pleasant Valley basin.

Concerns/Comments

- Board member Countryman requested clarification that water rights would be transferred to the new well. Ms. York stated it may be from the two existing wells. Discussion followed. It was reported there may be enough water rights for all three wells. Ms. York stated it was her understanding that the new well would be used for most of the water, but water from the other two wells would be used if a back-up was needed.

B. County Commissioner/Community Liaison Updates – Sarah Tone, Washoe County Community Outreach Coordinator, was in attendance to present an update. She distributed free dump vouchers and reported the last free dump week at Lockwood would be April 17, 2008. Last year, the well ownership mailing list was used to distribute free dump vouchers. This year, due to budget constraints, free dump vouchers could be obtained at the libraries and the CABs. In May, there would be the special clean-up effort with KTNV. A development code amendment would be presented on March 20, 2008 at the County Commission. She would provide information regarding a time and location when that information becomes available. It would update the regulations for partializing the property to allow for agricultural land. Budget hearings would begin next week. Ms. Tone reported two and a half to fifteen percent would be cut from each department. The Parks Department would experience a fifteen percent budget cut. Cindy Sabatoni would make a presentation on April 15, 2008 to the Board of County Commissioners regarding the relationship with the Nevada Humane Society. The Lightning W special assessment district passed and would be presented at future meetings.

Concerns/Comments

- Board member Sheltra suggested the Parks Department not hold or advertise special events in the area to combat the budget cut problem. Ms. Tone stated she would let the Parks Department know of that suggestion.

C. Nuisance Ordinance (Proposed) - Board member Countryman reported the Citizen's Committee was asked to expedite their review and that their review was expected to conclude by the end of June. Currently, the Committee was reviewing the Nuisance Ordinance. Progress was made regarding the definitions. Ms. Tone commented that Commissioner Weber noted at the meeting the Committee had been meeting for two hours, twice a month, for over a year.

D. I-580 Project - Board member Rusk was not in attendance to present an update.

E. South Valleys Area Plan - Board member Countryman reported the next meeting would be held this week.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Ginger Pierce distributed domestic well information and stated the forms could be completed and sent to Jeanne Reefer. Ms. Tone stated the information was also provided on the Water Resources website. Ms. Pierce reviewed the method of communication used for handouts in Pleasant Valley.

10. OLD BUSINESS -

A. Mitigation of Traffic Hazard for Left Turns From Joy Lake Road (Parker Ranch Road) - Presentation by Thor Dyson, NDOT, and recommendations/requests from the CAB. This presentation will not exceed 15 minutes.

Thor Dyson was in attendance for a presentation. He introduced Steve Williams, Mike Fiest, Dave Barti, and Tom Warr. Board member Countryman commended Steve Williams and his maintenance crew for clean-up efforts during the recent storms. Board member Elliott requested that the ditch in the Chocolate Factory area be dug deeper so water does not blow on the road and freeze over. Mr. Dyson stated he would look into the matter. Todd Montgomery, Project Manager, requested to know concerns regarding Parker Ranch Road. Board member Sheltra explained they were requesting a solid barrier and a free left turn lane while being rerouted through the Chocolate Factory area. Chairperson Struffert stated actually they would like NDOT to look into what they could do in order to remove accident hazards in the area. Mr. Montgomery stated they were equally concerned about safety and provided a brief status on the project by stating that the project had been shut down since December 6, 2007 due to weather conditions. Work had been done in the Galena Creek area where the critical path was, but work would begin in the southern end of the project when weather conditions were better. With presentation material, he reported the proposed route when work was being done on the Bowers Mansion interchange was to re-route the traffic to Parker Ranch along the Kelly Canyon Road, then Davis Creek, and then back onto Bowers. Mr. Montgomery summarized by stating it was a work in progress and he was in attendance for Board and public input. He stated different options and alternatives had been considered including the use of an easement and re-routing traffic through the Belleview Interchange. Board member Sheltra commented on the heavy traffic impact that occurred in the Belleview area during the Price Lake Flood. Mr. Montgomery explained that was an alternative they had considered from a safety perspective. Initially, they had thought the detour would be in place for approximately a year, but alternatives were considered to shorten that time. Another option they considered was a temporary de-tour just south of the right-of-way. The grades were flat and there was adequate space for the accel/de-accel lanes, but the problem was the 70-mile an hour speed limit. Board member Sheltra requested to know if the 70-mile an hour speed limit could be backed further to the south by a mile. Mr. Montgomery stated that could be an option, but they were more concerned with community impacts because more right-of-way would have to be acquired and they were against a lot of right-of-way issues. It would provide some additional cost for the fill. There were some drainage issues due to the wetlands. Lighting was considered for the area and multiple staging because of the difference in the grade. They did not want large equipment in the area with public traffic. Chairperson Struffert stated that solution would allow them to do just about anything they wanted on the real intersection because there would be no passenger traffic. Mr. Montgomery stated another option was a detour that would utilize the existing accel/de-accel lanes, but there were safety concerns regarding this option and impacts with the contractor. They revisited the option to provide a detour from Bowers up to Davis Creek across Kelly Canyon Drive. There were no accel/de-accel lanes in the area, but it would provide a better opportunity to separate construction traffic with public traffic. It would not impact the contractor. There also would be minimal community impact. However, they still have to deal with issues regarding accel/de-accel lane so they would take a better look at that. They were considering improving the intersection which may provide the best detour. He reviewed the intersection using a topographical map. The focus was to try and improve the safety that met with public concerns. They considered installing a posited barrier which would provide an opportunity for traffic to turn left. However, with a posited barrier, there would not be adequate room and to install a rail in the "clear zone" would be another hazard in the roadway. Although, it would provide positive delineation of how traffic should flow and assist with the accel/de-accel lanes, it would create another hazard.

Concerns/Comments

- Board member Sheltra asked if it would be a cement barrier or like in front of Winter's Ranch. Mr. Montgomery replied right. It would be the same type of barrier. He discussed the possible liability issues that may occur with the installation of a posited barrier including extending the barrier which would deny access to Cattleman's. Discussion followed regarding other accesses in the area. Board member Sheltra stressed the importance of having a similar barrier to combat the traffic problem and provided an example. Mr. Montgomery stated they were still in negotiations with the contractor for small improvements and to shorten the duration.
- Chairperson Struffert asked if there was an expected vehicle count from Parker Road to Old 395. Mr. Montgomery stated he would imagine it was in close proximity to what was used at Bowers. Chairperson Struffert clarified he was suggesting installing a traffic light with an induction loop on Parker Ranch Road that would allow traffic onto the road. It was reported that option had been considered. Mr. Dyson stated that could not be done because it would violate State Law. Chairperson Struffert explained that may be a simple fix to the problem.
- Board member Sheltra asked if there was at least as much traffic as at Stephanie Lane and 395, if not more. It was reported the capacity of traffic would be more if a light was installed. Discussion followed regarding the number of vehicles in the area.
- Chairperson Struffert explained that stretch of road from 395 to Winter's Ranch was prone to accidents, minor and fatal, and that they wanted to get NDOT's attention in order to reduce the traffic hazards.

- Board member Sheltra stated they had been asking for assistance with reducing traffic hazards since the design's inception. She asked what was in the contract for the area. Mr. Montgomery stated it was the detour that he explained earlier regarding the detour onto Kelly Canyon Road from Bowers with the existing striping on the road currently. They were still working with the contractor to see if there were ways to optimize that and reduce the duration. The contractor also raised the option to route traffic over the structure onto the northbound ramp which would provide the accel/de-accel once the bridge was completed.
- Board member Countryman commented on speeding problems in the Belleview area and suggested an option be some type of enforcement on that road. Mr. Montgomery stated that could be an option. Mr. Dyson reported there was also the possibility to change order and tell Washoe County Sheriffs to patrol the area and fine speeders. Board member Countryman explained that the road may have to be built up in order to handle the traffic impact and may cost less than trying to build a different type of infrastructure and also may provide more safety. She also expressed concern about putting a road across the pasture and scarring the area. She asked if they would be able to re-vegetate the area. Mr. Montgomery stated that some of the terms of the contract were to drop in a freeway. They would attempt to re-establish the pasture, but it would take awhile to grow back. There were also some community impacts and right-of-way impacts that had to be considered. Board member Countryman stated the Belleview area was still not viable during storms. The deck was icy, dark, and steep. Discussion followed. Mr. Dyson suggested installing a temporary light and more anti-icing at the Belleview structure. They could also do more additional treatments. Mr. Montgomery stated there would also be a problem with emergency vehicle access in the Belleview area. Another option was to just have the striping without the physical barrier, but there would still be the reduction in traffic issue. It would also make it illegal to make a left turn and create a liability issue. There was the option of using the existing intersection, but it would not provide the accel/de-accel lanes. They also considered installing a temporary signal, but that option was dismissed. They also considered using a flagger in the area to stop two lanes of traffic, but that may create a more unsafe situation. Another option considered was to find an alternative way for Cattleman's to gain access if they decided to go with the striping or the striping and the barrier/rail.
- Cliff Low stating he was seeing some intertwining of diverse issues presented at tonight's meeting. He expressed concern regarding how residents would evacuate during the evacuation drill on April 19, 2008 if the south access was cut off and how double- and triple-trailers would get back on 395 with no traffic controls and no acceleration lane and with traffic from the freeway being diverted due to high wind conditions and high-profile vehicles also being diverted.
- Board member Sheltra asked if they owned enough right-of-way at Parker Ranch Road to widen the lanes temporarily for an accel/de-accel lane and to divert traffic. Mr. Montgomery stated he did not believe they did have enough right-of-way. Discussion followed.
- Board member Sheltra asked what solution NDOT was considering at this time. Mr. Montgomery stated they were still focusing on ways to improve the intersection at Parker Ranch Road and other solutions. He stated they were looking for public input at tonight's meeting to take that also into consideration.
- Chairperson Struffert requested that the Board be kept informed as progress was being made.
- Board member Sheltra asked about a time frame for the decision. Mr. Montgomery stated it was tough to say due to the fact that the contractor may determine what flexibility was available. Once work actually begins, a better determination of a time frame could be given. Board member Sheltra expressed disappointment that this problem was not solved in the ten years since the design's inception. Mr. Dyson explained the contractor was money-driven and that maybe he can come up with a solution that was money-driven that would work out. It would be as safe as possible and would meet minimum requirements set by NDOT. Board member Sheltra and Chairperson Struffert stressed the importance of installing a barrier to reduce the number of fatality accidents.
- Board member Sheltra suggested narrowing the traffic lanes down to one lane in each direction further to the north. Mr. Dyson stated there was no way that could be done due to heavy traffic.
- Cliff Low asked why a temporary traffic signal light could not be installed. Tom Moore explained NDOT had to follow specific Federal guidelines in order to install a traffic signal. He explained they were pushing freeway-level volumes of traffic on that road so a congestion mess would occur if they ignored Federal guidelines and installed a traffic signal light. A question was asked regarding what the difference was between installing a light in this area and Carson Valley. Mr. Moore explained it was the number of left turns that were actually taking place. There were very specific requirements in order for a signal to be incorporated or considered including the volume of the traffic, pedestrians, and the number of left turns that were occurring.
- Board member Sheltra asked if the same volume was at the Mount Rose Intersection. Mr. Moore stated there was more traffic making left turns in the Pleasant Valley area than at Bowers Mansion. Board member Sheltra clarified she was asking about the north/south traffic. Mr. Moore replied yes. Board member Sheltra explained NDOT installed a light at the Mount Rose intersection. Mr. Moore stated NDOT would re-consider installing a traffic signal light.

- Chairperson Struffert asked if the Board was in agreement to be informed in advance before a final decision was made. The Board agreed. Mr. Dyson stated NDOT representatives would keep the Board informed of the process.
- Board member Elliott asked if NDOT could lease the property from the land owners on both sides of the road to temporarily widen the roads. Mr. Dyson stated potentially, but it could be very costly and very time-consuming.

11. NEW BUSINESS – Time for each item’s presentation is limited to no more than ten minutes, unless an extension is requested and granted by the Chair.

A. Update on Rerouting of Traffic During High-Wind Conditions, Installation of Light Barriers, and Mitigation of Traffic Hazard for Left Turns from Joy Lake Road onto US 395 - On the light barrier, Mr. Dyson reported it would be put in as a Government project. It would go through an official process. Experts would also review the project. They do not want the lighting mitigation to cause any additional problems such as drifting snow piling up on the highway. Once locked in and funded, the project would come to fruition. Chairperson Struffert stated that, from his point of view, the far more important issue was the Parker Ranch Road issue. As far as the truck issue, trucks were closed to Bowers Mansion as a result of public input. Trucks were closed on main line and on 429. Once the freeway project was completed, it would clean-up the traffic issue. Mr. Dyson stated another option they were considering was to put messages on reader boards stating no trucks in Washoe Valley and to put the reader board as far back as possible to stop trucks before the Mount Rose interchange. They were doing tremendous outreach when Donner Pass was closed to trucks due to weather conditions and it has been successful.

Concerns/Comments

- Cliff Low expressed concern that the topic of discussion was about I-80 and other areas. Mr. Dyson explained if there were fewer trucks on I-80 that would mean fewer trucks in Washoe Valley.
- Board member Sheltra asked if trucks would be taken off when the new freeway was completed at the Bowers interchange. Mr. Dyson replied no. There were two areas built on the new alignment set up to allow trucks to turn around. Board member Sheltra asked if there would be a big sign near the freeway off-ramp for trucks to get off to get onto 395. It was reported there was an electric sign there currently.
- A question was asked regarding if the old 395 alignment would still be used to reroute trucks at Bowers Mansion with the new highway. Chairperson Struffert clarified they were asking if truck traffic would still be rerouted onto old 395. Mr. Dyson replied right. If trucks come down the Winter’s Ranch interchange, they would be turned around.
- A question was asked regarding if there was a turnaround where the trucks had to exit. Mr. Dyson reported there was a turnaround at Winter’s Ranch.
- Chairperson Struffert commented that once a truck has passed the turnoff onto 429, trucks cannot turn around any longer. Mr. Dyson stated, if trucks get to the current intersection of 395 and Bowers Mansion Road, trucks can be turned around. Discussion followed. It was reported NDOT had not decided if old 395 was safe or not. Mr. Dyson reported NDOT was still collecting wind data. For the most part, wind data was showing that wind was less on old 395 than through the valley. Discussion followed.
- It was explained that the issue was not if it was less windy on State Route 429, but if the same wind threshold was reached on old 395 as on the freeway, should high-profile vehicles still be allowed on old 395. Mr. Dyson stated he would not know that until he had a way of determining that.
- Board member Sheltra explained the Board had asked for a permanent wind measurement system south of William Brant Road. Mr. Dyson stated a request could be put in near the area of William Brant Road. Board member Sheltra suggested measuring wind conditions during heavy storms with a portable measuring system to know where there were the heaviest wind conditions.
- Chairperson Struffert explained the Board was looking to NDOT for measurements to determine if it was or was not safe to reroute traffic to old 395 during windy conditions. Mr. Dyson explained the components that helped determined road conditions. He stated a system should be in an area very visible for the full effects of the weather. Chairperson Struffert reported the windiest part on old 395 was south of William Brant Road. Discussion followed.
- Board member Sheltra commented on the visibility problem near the Lakeview Hill area and suggested cutting a portion of the hill and pulling the fence back in order to see on-coming traffic. Mr. Dyson stated if they can knock it down, they would knock it down.
- Mr. Dyson summarized discussion by stating the issues were Board member Elliott’s concern regarding water from the ditch blowing and freezing over onto the road in the Chocolate Factory area; NDOT should coordinate with Ms. Tone to keep the Board informed on the process of Parker Ranch Road; NDOT would look at the dirt pile in the Lakeview Hill area; and they would look in having a permanent wind measurement device installed.

12. CHAIRMAN/BOARD MEMBER ITEMS – (This item limited to announcements of topics/issues posed for future workshops/agendas.)

Chairperson Struffert reported there was a request by a Public Information Officer to make a presentation to the Board regarding the Truckee River Flood Project, which was about a \$400 million item to mediate the Truckee River going over its banks in Reno and Sparks. Chairperson Struffert stated he would inform Bob Webb that the project does not directly affect the West Washoe Valley area and that the Board would let him know when they have the time in their itinerary for this presentation. Sarah Tone stated she would let the presenter know the Board's decision. Board member Countryman reported she had heard that the next two CAB meetings in April and May would be joint meetings with East Lake to review the South Valleys Area Plan. Chairperson Struffert stated before the Board can consider the request the Committee which consists of both sides of the valley and the Community Development Department has to come up with a draft. Once a draft was created, then the Board can discuss the issue. Board member Countryman expressed concern with having a joint meeting considering the number of items the Board already has to discuss. Ms. Tone stated she would follow-up. Chairperson Struffert stressed the importance of having the South Valleys Area Plan completed as soon as possible. Discussion followed.

18. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m. Rod Smith moved to adjourn the meeting. William Elliott seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.