

In the Matter Of:

RTC Meeting

RTC STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP-2 MEETING

November 05, 2020

Job Number: 681225

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
ARLINGTON AVENUE BRIDGES PROJECT
STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP

---o0o---

RTC Stakeholder Working Group-2 Meeting
Thursday, November 5, 2020
Reno, Nevada

24 Reported by: Brandi Ann Vianney Smith
25 Job No. 681225

1 ---o0o---

2 RENO, NEVADA, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2020, 9:00 A.M.

3 ---o0o---

4

5 MS. TORTELLI: Well, welcome everybody. It's a
6 little after 9:00, so I am going to go ahead and get
7 started.

8 Can you hear me okay?

9 (SWG responded "yes.")

10 MS. TORTELLI: I would like to welcome everybody,
11 and let you know I'm Judy Tortelli, Project Manager for the
12 RTC. I am here to talk about bridge concepts the team
13 carried forward for the Arlington Avenue Bridges Project.

14 I have two folks that are going to assist me with
15 this meeting: Ken Green is here in the office from Jacobs.

16 MR. GREENE: Hi, everybody.

17 MS. TORTELLI: And I also have Mike Cooper from
18 Jacobs on the line.

19 MR. COOPER: Good morning.

20 MS. TORTELLI: I wanted to let everybody know that
21 I do have a court reporter on the call. She is going to
22 capture meeting notes for the discussion today.

23 So I've kind of got everybody's name up on the
24 screen, I'll go through this in just a minute for those
25 people that I don't know, but she may be asking you to

1 identify yourself when you speak if we don't know who you
2 are. So that may be coming.

3 So today we will run through a presentation and go
4 over what the team has been up to so we can get this project
5 moving along again. Things were delayed just little bit
6 with COVID and trying to get into this situation of virtual
7 meetings and how to handle all of that stuff.

8 Ken will be helping me cover the environmental
9 side of things, and Mike will assist with the bridge
10 concepts specifics.

11 I would like to ask that as we go through the
12 presentation, everybody please mute your speaker. It looks
13 like everybody's doing a great job with that. Thank you.

14 As we go through presentation, make a note of any
15 questions or comments that you may have.

16 I have several breaking spots identified
17 specifically for questions, so if you could just kind of
18 keep track of what questions you have, we will address those
19 when we get there.

20 Now I am going to try to go through just a rough
21 attendance. I have Brian Seaman on the line, Mike Cooper,
22 Kelly, Brandi is here, our court reporter, Barb Satner,
23 Gregory Erny is on the line, Claudia, Lauren Ball, Theresa
24 Jones, Andrea --

25 Andrea, you're from FHWA; correct?

1 MS. GUTIERREZ: Yes. Correct.

2 MS. TORTELLI: And then I have Michon, Adam
3 Carmazzi (phonetic), Michael Moreno, Toni Harsh, Vern Malloy
4 (phonetic), Travis Truhill, Kerrie Koski.

5 And that's all the names that I'm seeing on my
6 screen. Is there somebody that is on the line that I
7 haven't call out?

8 MR. L'ETOILE: John L'Etoile.

9 MS. TORTELLI: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you.

10 MR. L'ETOILE: John L'Etoile.

11 MS. TORTELLI: Oh, hi, John.

12 MR. NEGRETE: Judy, Matt Negrete is also on.

13 MS. TORTELLI: Hi, Matt.

14 MS. KOSKI: Judy, this is Kerrie. I did invite
15 the stakeholder for the -- the Council members stakeholders.
16 They may join us as we are moving along through the meeting,
17 but I can't guarantee.

18 MS. TORTELLI: Okay. Okay. Thank you, Kerrie.

19 And, then, there was also --

20 Can I see that list for just a second, Ken?

21 We also had Kayla Dowty from Carson-Truckee Water
22 Conservancy District. She may be jumping on a little bit
23 later. She had a conflict right at nine o'clock, so we'll
24 kind of work through that.

25 Can everybody see the presentation on the screen

1 okay?

2 (SWG responded "yes.")

3 MS. TORTELLI: Okay. So the purpose of today's
4 meeting is to discuss bridge concepts for project, give you
5 an overview of what we've done, and determine which bridge
6 alternatives should be carried forward.

7 We're here to convey input received from the
8 Technical Advisory Committees, which I will also be
9 referring to as "TACs."

10 The TACs are small groups of more specialized
11 individuals that dive into the details of the project based
12 on the broader direction that has been provided by you all,
13 the Stakeholder Working Group.

14 At our first Stakeholder Working Group meeting
15 held back in February, we discussed engineering design and
16 environmental constraints and criteria associated with the
17 project.

18 From the information gathered, the team determined
19 applicable evaluation attributes, anticipated permitting
20 requirements, and compiled materials to be presented to the
21 TACs.

22 We have held two meetings: On July 15, TAC-1
23 focused on permitting and regulatory requirements, and back
24 in August, TAC-2 focused on bridge and roadway elements.

25 Our goal through this process has been to reduce

1 the range of alternatives that are carried forward into NEPA
2 and design.

3 Based on the TAC meetings, I think you will find
4 there is a distinction between which alternatives should be
5 carried forward.

6 So here's an agenda of what we're going to cover
7 today. I want to review project scope, process, purpose and
8 need, schedule, and background. This is not new material,
9 but it has been awhile since we have all met.

10 These are all items that were presented at our
11 first public meeting, and again at our first Stakeholder
12 Working Group meeting.

13 I'll give you a little recap of our first
14 Stakeholder Working Group meeting, talk about how the TAC-1
15 meeting went regarding permitting and regulatory
16 requirements, and spend some time going over recommendations
17 from the TAC-2 meeting, which focused on bridge and roadway
18 elements.

19 Please keep in mind that I have allocated time for
20 questions right after we present on the TAC-1 and TAC-2
21 meetings.

22 From there, we will jump right into some
23 discussion and decide how things should move forward.

24 So the scope of this project is to complete a
25 feasibility study to define bridge options, identify

1 constraints, and determine costs.

2 At the end, we plan to have a bridge and aesthetic
3 package identified to carry forward into environmental
4 clearance and design. Decisions will be documented using a
5 process called "Planing and Environmental Linkages," also
6 known as "PEL."

7 Following this process helps inform decision
8 making, engages the public and stakeholders, and streamlines
9 future NEPA processes.

10 So our project process has been modeled after the
11 Virginia Street Bridge process, and includes receiving
12 public, stakeholder, and technical input.

13 Alternatives are evaluated based on ability to
14 meet project purpose and need, ability to avoid and minimize
15 impacts to the natural and built environment, construction
16 feasibility and costs, and input from the Stakeholder
17 Working Group, RTC Board, City of Reno Council, and the
18 public.

19 At the public kick-off meeting back in December of
20 2019, we got great feedback. I did just want to touch a
21 little bit on some comments that we received from that
22 public information meeting.

23 We got -- and I talked about this a little bit at
24 our first Stakeholder Working Group meeting. We looked at
25 comments in a little bit more detail and kind of put them

1 into some categories.

2 We received around 78 comments. About 35 percent
3 of those comments were focused on bridge types. Then,
4 again, about 35 percent were focused on bridge aesthetics of
5 the bridge. Then, there were, you know, some additional
6 comments just talking about the needs and additional
7 elements and miscellaneous things that should be moved
8 forward.

9 So the team has been kind of keeping an eye on
10 those public comments and making sure that we don't lose
11 sight of them, so I just wanted to touch on those comments a
12 little bit.

13 At our first Stakeholder Working Group meeting, we
14 were successful the defining environment and engineering
15 constraints and criteria associated with the project.

16 We have completed our two TAC meetings.

17 Moving forward, we will be holding one additional
18 Stakeholder Working Group meeting to address aesthetic theme
19 specifically.

20 We will present information gathered and get input
21 at one last public meeting, which we anticipate to hold
22 early next year.

23 So this slide should look familiar. It is our
24 project purpose and need. We need to address structurally
25 deficient Arlington Avenue Bridges, provide state- and

1 ADA-compliant, multimodal improvements, address hydraulic
2 capacity needs, and respond to regional and community plans.

3 So here's what kind of our project schedule is.
4 It has been adjusted a little bit due to some delays from
5 COVID.

6 So we did have our kick-off meeting back in 2019.
7 We're working on this little bar right now to identify and
8 analyze bridge and aesthetic concepts.

9 Here is our little star for our public meeting,
10 which we plan to have the beginning of next year.

11 Right now, we're looking to complete this
12 feasibility study by June of next year. Then we will kick
13 off the environment process, work through design and
14 permitting. We're still holding this construction start
15 date in 2026. That date hasn't slipped. Just some of this
16 back here has.

17 We were originally planning to have this
18 feasibility study done by the end of this year, but that is
19 not going to happen; it's going to push out a few months.

20 So this slide should also look familiar. This is
21 the list of our Stakeholder Working Group members. This
22 list was defined at the beginning of the feasibility study.

23 It's comprised of major permitting agencies,
24 groups and organizations that represent a larger component
25 of Downtown, and immediate adjacent property owners.

1 So a little recap from our Stakeholder Working
2 Group-1 meeting. These bullets here are kind of the
3 takeaways from that meeting. The team was kind of -- our
4 goal from that meeting was to organize alternative-specific
5 constraints and criteria.

6 We left that meeting knowing that we need to
7 determine who our lead agency would be; either the U.S. Army
8 Corps of Engineers or FHWA.

9 We wanted to determine and confirm whether the
10 bridges are historic. We wanted to determine the PEL
11 checklist and who would be signing it. And then we
12 developed environmental design constraints and criteria and
13 engineering design constraints and criteria.

14 These slides may look familiar. This is what we
15 filled out at that first Stakeholder Working Group meeting.
16 We had a lot of discussion, and we tried to capture
17 everything so that the team could take this and move forward
18 preparation for the TAC meetings.

19 So now I am going to go on to the TAC-1 permitting
20 and regulatory members. Here is a list of those members.
21 It's slightly different from the Stakeholder Working Group
22 member list, but also was defined at the beginning of the
23 feasibility study.

24 There are 13 agencies identified on this list, and
25 three were not present at the TAC-1 meeting. Our TAC-1

1 meeting, we did not have representation from SHIPO,
2 Reno-Sparks Indian Colony or NDOT.

3 That TAC-1 meeting was hosted by the Army Corps of
4 Engineers, and we had great participation and received some
5 really valuable feedback.

6 Our approach to this meeting was to define a list
7 of all of the permitting regulatory requirements we felt
8 were associated with our various alternatives.

9 We presented that list, identified subtle
10 differences between alternatives, and discussed permit
11 specifics, i.e., timeframes, scheduled impacts, and needed
12 coordination.

13 Then, we asked group if they agreed with our
14 assumptions or knew of anything we were missing.

15 So now, I am going to turn it over to Ken, and he
16 is going to go over the specifics of that TAC-1 meeting.

17 MR. GREENE: Thank you Judy. So just real quick,
18 a recap on the TAC-1 meeting.

19 As Judy indicated, there were a couple of things
20 that we still needed to answer that were phased out in SWG-1
21 and resolved those during TAC-1.

22 The first of which was the lead agency, whether it
23 was the Corps of Engineers or FHWA. We agreed during TAC-1
24 that it would be FHWA.

25 NDOT did confirm that the Arlington bridges are

1 not historic. So that was, again, one of the things that
2 was left kind of open-ended during SWG-1, direct and
3 indirect effects on the adjacent historic properties will be
4 determined during the NEPA process.

5 We do have -- as part of the feasibility study,
6 we're putting together various memoranda that will summarize
7 our current knowledge on historic properties adjacent to the
8 Arlington bridges, and we'll start making some preliminary
9 decisions about direct and indirect effects from the
10 different alternatives on those adjacent properties. So
11 that is a continuing process.

12 The PEL checklist -- that was another thing that
13 was kind of left open ended during SWG-1 -- we determine
14 that it would be signed by NDOT, and that PEL checklist is
15 being prepared and populated now based on just continuing to
16 move through the project. As we get more and more
17 information, we continue to update that PEL checklist.

18 We also -- from the notes during TAC-1, it was
19 determined by FHWA that DOT Section 4(f) is not applicable
20 for the bridges.

21 We can get into -- if anybody wants to, we can get
22 into a little bit more detail on Section 4(f) and what it
23 means and how it applies, but that's something we're
24 continuing to carry forward. That will be part of an
25 ongoing discussion as we move through the project.

1 We did conclude that Section 408, the local
2 sponsor is the Carson-Truckee Water Conservancy District.
3 It does require unrest modeling using their updated model
4 and river access for debris and sediment removal was key to
5 a successful bridge type from the Conservancy District's
6 perspective.

7 We've got to be able to get in -- access the river
8 to clear sediment and debris from the river as we have flood
9 events or that materials deposited either upstream or
10 downstream from the bridge structure itself.

11 This is summary of our permitting and regulatory
12 requirements. We pulled this from -- it was actually
13 initiated during SWG-1 and it was updated during TAC-1. So
14 most of these permits are identical to what we presented
15 during SWG-1, with a couple of minor differences that were
16 updated during TAC-1.

17 The first one there is the special use permit from
18 the City of Reno. It was determined during TAC-1 that the
19 SUP would not be required for this project.

20 We do need to procure a 408 permit, 404 permit,
21 the storm water permit through NDEP, the NDSL -- that's the
22 Division of State Lands -- their encroachment permit, that
23 needs to be obtained as well, along with a 401 water quality
24 certification.

25 Two additional permits that were talked about

1 during TAC-1 was the working and waterways permit from NDEP,
2 and the groundwater discharge permit also from NDEP. Those
3 two additional permits dovetailed from lessons learned on
4 the Virginia Street Bridge Project.

5 So what this table does is it checks the different
6 permits that would be needed for each one of the major
7 alternative types, whether it be a single pier clear span,
8 under deck arch, tight arch, or the elevated bridge concept.

9 Really, there's not a lot difference between what
10 permit would be required for which alternative with several
11 nuances, I guess, related to those different alternatives.

12 Those are identified by the asterisk, and if
13 you'll note in the footnote of this table, additional
14 requirements are possible during permitting and/or
15 construction for the single pier concept, the tight arch
16 concept, and the elevated bridge concept. Enough of that.

17 Permitting and regulatory requirements -- again
18 based on that previous table and discussions during
19 TAC-1 -- are similar between the alternatives, except for
20 tight arch and the elevated concepts.

21 Both of those, during TAC-1, were determined to be
22 more challenging related to permitting under section 404, as
23 well as viewshed impacts, just because of the height of the
24 structure itself, as well as required maintenance, both
25 bridge and river/park maintenance, and river access for

1 debris and sediment removal.

2 So the goal for TAC-1 was to start moving toward a
3 fewer number of alternatives that could be carried forward
4 into NEPA and design.

5 MS. TORTELLI: So with that, here is one of those
6 sections where I have time for questions.

7 So I don't know -- does anybody have any questions
8 regarding the material that we just covered on the TAC-1
9 meeting?

10 So I am assuming since I'm not hearing anything,
11 there were no questions from the material we just covered,
12 so I'm going to go ahead and continue on.

13 So on to our TAC-2 bridge and roadway meeting.

14 Again, here is the list of the TAC-2 members; slightly
15 different, but also defined at the beginning of this study.

16 There are 11 members identified on this list, and
17 9 of those 11 members participated in the meeting.

18 So our approach with this TAC-2 meeting was
19 totally different from TAC-1. We were looking at the bridge
20 and roadway elements, we got -- actually did some scoring
21 from members. So it was just a little bit different.

22 We split these two TAC groups up separately
23 because we felt like they were kind of, you know, permitting
24 and regulatory stuff and the bridge and roadway stuff, they
25 are kind of different animals, and you really can't lump

1 them all together.

2 So the team prepared an evaluation attributes and
3 scoring packet based on feedback from the Stakeholder
4 Working Group-1 meeting.

5 We took that information from those handouts and
6 we came up with some attributes and some scoring packets
7 that we could send out to the team.

8 We developed nine concepts from the three major
9 design themes. The three major design themes are single
10 pier, clear span, which includes the under deck and tight
11 arch, and then the elevated bridge concept.

12 We had included eight attributes, plus undefined
13 attributes Y and Z for user input editing, and attributes
14 were ranked on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being poor and 10
15 being excellent.

16 So we provided the TAC members with these scoring
17 sheets, and we also gave them some qualitative attribute
18 guidelines and concept evaluation summaries to help them
19 complete their scores individually.

20 So all of the members -- all nine of members that
21 participated, did their scores individually, and then they
22 provided me with those scores. We compiled those scores and
23 then we met as a group and consensus was achieved as a group
24 on those scores.

25 So this here is just the TAC scoring sheet that

1 went out to all of our TAC members. So here are these nine
2 concepts that were slit up. For single pier concept, we had
3 precast concrete girders, a cast-in-place concrete box,
4 steel I girders.

5 For the clear span concept, we had an under deck
6 arch, rigid frame, and a tight arch.

7 For the evaluated bridge concept, we had precast
8 girders, cast-in-place concrete box, and steel I girders.

9 So those attributes that I was talking about, the
10 team spent a lot of time going through these attributes and
11 trying to figure out what is the best approach.

12 We tried to come up with attributes that you could
13 score these various alternatives on. We had a construction
14 cost attribute, we also had a construction schedule and cost
15 risk attribute, existing infrastructure impacts, maintenance
16 and inspection access, long-term maintenance costs,
17 environment impacts, river recreation impacts, and bridge
18 aesthetics.

19 So when we did -- when we got our scoring sheets
20 back from our TAC members, there were some attributes that
21 were added by a couple of members.

22 One was in regards to permitting and ancillary
23 impacts to Wingfield Park. You can see on there, I have
24 scope creep.

25 So the concern was, depending on what type of

1 bridge we build and what that footprint looks like, how much
2 of the park are we going to be getting into, do we have to
3 address mitigation, and how far out do we go.

4 There were also these other two added attributes:
5 Crime prevention through environmental design, and homeless
6 camps, graffiti, illicit activity, trying to design a bridge
7 and maintain access from one side of the park to the other
8 without encouraging riffraff hanging out under the bridge.

9 So these added attributes are not included in the
10 TAC-2 scoring results, but the team did look at those scores
11 for those added attributes and added them into the list, and
12 kind of looked at them both ways.

13 I mean, if we did include the scores, it would
14 only subtly change the overall rankings.

15 Since there were only -- I think these two
16 attributes came from two members, so we didn't feel like it
17 was fair to include the scores in the overall, and even if
18 we would have, it wouldn't have really changed the
19 results -- the overall rankings.

20 So from there, I am going to go ahead and turn it
21 over to Mike Cooper. He is going to kind of go through the
22 TAC-2 scoring results.

23 MR. COOPER: Thanks, Judy.

24 I am Mike Cooper, Bridge Engineer with Jacobs. So
25 in evaluating the individual TAC member scores, each

1 attribute, we took an average score, and then those averages
2 were totaled to get to the scores you see on the screen now.

3 Again, the higher the score, the better the
4 ranking.

5 Then, the rank column shows that the rigid frame
6 came in as the highest-ranked alternative, followed by one
7 of the single pier concepts or precast concrete girders, and
8 then, pretty close, the cast-in-place box for the single
9 pier concept, as well as the under deck arch.

10 If you flip to the next view of the screen, Judy,
11 there's, individually, those bars are intended to kind of
12 give a graphic representation of the scores. You can see
13 from those, the rigid frame did very well with the rankings.

14 The under deck arch and the tight arch, not so
15 much in comparison to the rigid frame. The single pier
16 concepts were similar, though the steel I girders, lagged
17 behind just will little bit.

18 Next slide, Judy.

19 So here those same bars are flipped vertically and
20 gathered together. The single pier concept, the clear span,
21 and then the different bridge configurations in those.

22 So if you click to have next view, Judy.

23 The group was in agreement that the elevated --
24 all three elevated options didn't fare very well, and,
25 therefore, felt that they did not deserve to be carried

1 forward.

2 Next one, Judy.

3 As we mentioned, the rigid frame did very well.

4 So that is one we agreed as a group would be carried
5 forward.

6 In relative terms, the two other clear span
7 concepts didn't fare as well, so we decided it would be best
8 to stick with the single clear span concept, the rigid frame
9 concept for a clear span alternative.

10 And then, looking at the single pier concepts, we
11 talked about those a little bit, and, ultimately, agreed
12 that the precast concrete girders and the cast-in-place
13 concrete box were both worthy of future consideration. The
14 steel girder option was dropped.

15 So kind of the high points, if you will, the
16 single pier concept, while it still has -- appears in the
17 river, it does present fewer obstructions in the river
18 compared to the existing -- the existing bridge on the north
19 end is a three-span structure.

20 So fewer obstructions, and a possible advantage
21 for the precast concrete girders is that it does not require
22 false work or superstructure construction, which is a
23 consideration when we are building over the river.

24 The next one, the single pier, cast-in-place
25 concrete box girder, as with the precast girders, it has the

1 same single pier, although, it's fewer obstructions in the
2 river compared to the existing.

3 In this case, false work is required for the
4 cast-in-place superstructure, which will require some
5 considerations and how that would be accommodated with river
6 flows.

7 Then, the last clear span rigid frame, there is no
8 obstructions in the river on the north end -- the north
9 bridge, but it would require false work in the river to
10 build the superstructure as it would be a cast-in-place
11 concrete type of a bridge.

12 Next slide, Judy.

13 So to give you some visuals of what these three
14 recommended bridge concepts would look like, first is a plan
15 view of the single pier, precast concrete girders.

16 You can see the abutments on either end and the
17 piers are oriented to be parallel, basically, to river flow
18 through here.

19 The double hidden lines that you see, the dash
20 lines in the middle of the bridge, those represent the shape
21 of the pier wall below, as well as the pier cath that would
22 be required for erecting and setting the precast concrete
23 girders on that pier top.

24 Next slide is an elevation view of that bridge.
25 The line right there on the top of the concrete railing is

1 shown above, and then beneath on the bottom side, the bottom
2 of the precast, prestressed concrete girders, those phantom
3 lines you see horizontally, those are intended to represent
4 the shape of the precast girders. So there will be some
5 lines visible in that face of the bridge.

6 Also the cap beam that is shown there, would
7 typically be wider than the pier wall, and it provides a
8 place to set those precast girders during construction. So
9 visually, it's got that cap end.

10 In the elevation view, the face of the abutment
11 shows because those, as we showed in the plan, are at a bit
12 of an askew, to in a (Zoom audio drop) elevation, you see
13 both the face of the abutment and the face of the pier wall.

14 It's not intended to mean that's how wide the pier
15 wall is, you're just seeing the face as well as the front
16 edge.

17 Next one is a section cut through the bridge. You
18 just can see there the shape of the individual, precast
19 concrete beams or girders.

20 So, visually, under the bridge, you'd see
21 individual girder lines sitting on a pier cap out in the
22 river.

23 Similar, there would be seats for those precast
24 girders on the abutment walls on either bank.

25 The clear width there on the roadway and the

1 sidewalk, those are based on initial concepts on the
2 roadway. Those will be dialed in with the roadway
3 requirements as the project moves forward.

4 Next one, very similar in plan for the single
5 pier, cast-in-place concrete box option. There's fewer dash
6 lines in the middle because all you've got below the
7 structure is the pier wall itself; there's no need for a
8 drop cap to set the beams on. The cap beam is really
9 integral with the pier wall itself.

10 So again, the abutments in the pier are oriented
11 to be more or less parallel to river flow.

12 Next slide, here's the elevation view. Very
13 similar to what you saw with the precast girders.

14 A couple of differences that should jump out:
15 There is no pier cap, so it's a, maybe, cleaner lines, if
16 you will, to the structure. And then the face of the
17 cast-in-place box is just above the column after the bottom
18 of the CIP box.

19 That would be a smooth surface, rather than the
20 lines you would see for precast concrete beams.

21 Next slide, so under bridge, what you would
22 visually see is a smooth soffit, or bottom of the
23 cast-in-place box. You would not see the individual
24 girders. Those would be interior to the cast-in-place box,
25 so it's a smoother, maybe, cleaner-looking appearance from

1 underneath than what the precast girders would be.

2 Next slide, so this is the clear span, rigid
3 frame. See there is no dash lines in the channel. So
4 there's no pier wall in this concept.

5 The other subtle difference in plan view is the
6 bridge, we're showing right now, is more rectangular in
7 shape.

8 That has to do with how the structure actually
9 behaves and the superstructure or rigid frame being
10 connected rigidly to the abutment walls, and that is where
11 it gets its support. It's easier from a structural
12 perspective to have it be a rectangular shape.

13 If this were the concept that would be pushed
14 forward, there would be some additional work to look at
15 whether the abutment faces could be skewed to be more normal
16 or parallel to the river flow.

17 Right now, we're showing it as a more
18 conventional, what a rigid frame would look like in plan.

19 We flip to the elevation, that rigid frame would
20 be envisioned to have a kind of a parallel shape to the
21 bottom of it.

22 So what you would see is a deeper bridge section
23 at the abutments, and a thinner bridge section out at
24 mid-span.

25 Again, more smoother lines than what you might see

1 with the precast girder option.

2 Then, finally, if you look at the section cut
3 through the bridge, what you would see underneath is a
4 smooth bottom to the structure. Then, there out at
5 mid-span, as I mentioned, and the deeper section at the
6 abutment face where it's getting its support provided by the
7 abutment wall.

8 MS. TORTELLI: So, thank you, Mike. That's a lot
9 of really great information.

10 Does anybody have any questions or is there
11 something we should go back at look at?

12 MR. ADAM: I have one question. It looked like in
13 all the different bridge alternatives, we were not showing
14 flood elevation of water.

15 Was the taken into account with the different
16 alternatives as well as the depth of the superstructure?

17 MS. TORTELLI: So, Adam, we will go ahead and
18 answer your question, but I just wanted to let everybody
19 know, Adam is not a member of the Stakeholder Working Group.

20 So we will go ahead and answer his question right
21 now, but if you do have additional questions, I'll open it
22 up for kind of a public comment section at the end.

23 But, Mike, can you go ahead and kind of generally
24 answer Adam's question?

25 MR. COOPER: Yes. That's that good question,

1 Adam, and, in general, all three of those structure types
2 would be established so we can pass flood flows.

3 We haven't done any analysis at this point on
4 flood elevations versus roadway elevations to any great
5 extent, other than to kind of compare with what is there
6 today versus depth of superstructures that were shown in
7 these concepts.

8 An advantage of the rigid frame concept is there
9 is no potential for collecting debris on a pier.

10 But it does have a deeper section at the abutment
11 walls, and it may be difficult to keep the ends of the
12 bridge out of flood flow, depending on what we determine is
13 necessary for depth of structure there to support the
14 bridge.

15 The cast-in-place box and the precast girder
16 options, those, I think, will readily provide clearance over
17 the flood elevation without impacting roadway profile above.

18 Does answer your question, Adam?

19 MR. ADAM: Yes. So that's why a precast girder
20 for a clear span wasn't considered is because you guys
21 didn't want to impact roadway profile?

22 MR. COOPER: Yes. So the profile on the road is
23 pretty well constrained, given that we're tying into
24 intersections at both ends of the project, that if we start
25 elevating intersections, then we're getting into access to

1 adjacent properties and things of that nature. That is
2 going to be tough.

3 So we kind of looked at it as a goal of minimizing
4 the potential for profile adjustments on the roadway, and if
5 you look at a single span bridge that's a girder-type
6 bridge, like either of the precast girders or even the
7 cast-in-place box, the depth of those sections get too deep
8 to pass flood flow.

9 MS. TORTELLI: Does anybody else have any
10 questions?

11 MR. ERNY: Greg Erny. I know these are kind of
12 structural concepts we looked at, but in the context of
13 other things that are, I guess, come into play, have any of
14 these been evaluated for their, I guess, the graffiti factor
15 that might be an invitation on some of the ways that the
16 faces of these bridges might be presented?

17 And, then, the articulation that is evident in the
18 precast ones seems to accommodate a lot of places for
19 critters, such as birds and bats and things underneath.

20 Is that an issue of concern that we need to worry
21 ourselves about with respect to either making them homeless
22 or inviting them in?

23 MS. TORTELLI: So, Gregory, I will take a stab at
24 that. I don't know that we necessarily thought about a
25 graffiti factor.

1 I mean, we talked about what kind of maintenance
2 is going to be required on some of these different bridge
3 types, but it's definitely something that I think we need to
4 consider moving forward.

5 Then, also --

6 And, Mike, maybe you can jump in a help me with
7 that, as far bird and bats up under the bridge, I mean is
8 that something that we are concerned with or that it's kind
9 of on the table to look at?

10 MR. COOPER: So starting with the graffiti
11 question, the way the north bridge was configured, we were
12 kind of focused on trying to maintain the path that is
13 underneath the existing bridge so there will be access
14 underneath there.

15 Those abutment walls, there are some things we can
16 do for aesthetics and also kind of deter graffiti and with
17 form liner treatment that provides a rough surface that
18 doesn't lend itself well to graffiti.

19 Then the use of anti-graffiti coatings that make
20 it easier to remove any art work, if you will, things of
21 that nature.

22 As far as the birds go and potential for birds
23 roosting under there, that is potentially an issue with a
24 girder-style bridge, the precast girder bridge.

25 There are places, particularly given the shape of

1 those cross sections on those girders, even though they are
2 sloped, they may be a place where birds would want to roost.

3 There are some things we can do for, say, at the
4 pier to prevent or not include any horizontal surfaces that
5 would be roosting areas, if you will, and try to minimize
6 those kinds of areas.

7 But, yeah, birds and bugs and spiders and what not
8 are going to be something that would be, maybe, more of a
9 maintenance concern with a girder-style bridge than one
10 that's got a closed soffit.

11 MR. ERNY: Some people may consider the critters
12 to be an amenity, and others may consider them to be a
13 nuisance.

14 That is why I bring it up, as we may have some
15 differences of opinion regarding that aspect from some of
16 the folks who may offer comment and response to the project
17 as we go forward.

18 MR. COOPER: Good point. Good point.

19 MS. KOSKI: Judy, this is Kerrie Koski. Can I
20 speak?

21 MS. TORTELLI: Absolutely.

22 MS. KOSKI: Great points you brought up, Greg.
23 Thank you for brining those up.

24 Yes, there is definitely a balance, and as far as
25 the City's concerned, tipping that balance more towards less

1 maintenance is always preferred.

2 But we do understand that some of the things that
3 you described, Mike, using different shapes with the form
4 liners and such would be incorporated into the final design.

5 Also into the -- you know down the road with the
6 project itself, we could probably put some thought into
7 materials that we could use on the surface, on the exterior
8 that might be graffiti protection, that sort of thing, and
9 maybe get those incorporated into the maintenance and
10 operations manuals so the City can have that for future.

11 Theresa Jones, she keeps real good records of
12 those, I am not sure if she is on here today, but that would
13 be most helpful for our bridge program.

14 MS. TORTELLI: Thank you for that, Kerrie. We
15 will keep those notes as we are moving forward. That's
16 great feedback.

17 Does anybody else have any questions?

18 MR. ERNY: One final comment, Judy. This is Greg
19 again.

20 MS. TORTELLI: Yes.

21 MR. ERNY: Call me Greg. If you call me Gregory,
22 I will think it is my mother yelling me, and I am in trouble
23 again.

24 MS. TORTELLI: Okay. Okay, Greg.

25 MR. ERNY: Thank you.

1 MS. TORTELLI: Okay. I am not seeing or hearing
2 anything else at this point.

3 So here we go. We are at this group discussion
4 and consensus slide right now.

5 A couple of things that I just wanted to highlight
6 are we -- like I said previously, our approach for our TAC-1
7 permitting and regulatory meeting, and our approach for
8 TAC-2 bridge roadway elements meetings were different
9 because the nature of those two meetings were different.

10 But, in the end, the TAC-1 recommendations, based
11 on challenges associated with permitting, it seemed like the
12 single pier concept, the clear span concept, and the under
13 deck concept could potentially be a little bit less
14 cumbersome from a permitting perspective.

15 I am saying that correctly, Ken?

16 MR. GREENE: Yes.

17 MS. TORTELLI: Okay. And then for the TAC-2
18 recommendations, we have our three recommendations from
19 that. So we had the single pier precast, cast-in-place, and
20 then the clear span.

21 So, overall, the two were pretty similar in that
22 elevated bridge concept kind of fell off, and the tight arch
23 concept kind of fell off.

24 Right now -- and I am just going to back up.
25 Right now, what we're kind of seeing from the

1 recommendations from both TAC-1 and TAC-2, we feel like
2 moving forward with these three bridge types makes the most
3 sense.

4 I just kind of wanted to see if there's anything
5 else the group thinks we need to look at what the reasoning
6 may be behind that, or does anybody have any comments?

7 MR. GREENE: Or are we generally in agreement that
8 these three concepts are the ones that we should keep --
9 continue moving forward with?

10 MS. TORTELLI: So I am guessing no comment means
11 concurrence?

12 MS. KOSKI: That is kind of what I am hearing.
13 Tough crowd here this morning.

14 MS. TORTELLI: I know. You guys need some coffee.

15 MS. HANSON: This is Claudia. I will speak up. I
16 would go with -- I am in concurrence.

17 MS. TORTELLI: Okay. Thank you.

18 MS. JONES: In concurrence.

19 MS. TORTELLI: And I don't need you all to say in
20 concurrence or not, necessarily. I mean, like I said, I am
21 assuming that no feedback means we're in concurrence.

22 Moving forward from here, I mean, we have to
23 present this material to the public.

24 So thank you, Greg.

25 So I am going to do a similar thing as I've done

1 here for the Stakeholder Working Group meeting, which is
2 tell the public what we came up with at Stakeholder Working
3 Group-1, what the recommendations were from the first TAC
4 meeting and the second TAC, and what we came up with from
5 our second Stakeholder Working Group meeting. From there,
6 we will finalize the feasibility study.

7 We do have our next Stakeholder Working Group
8 meeting, which is going to be focused on aesthetics of the
9 bridge.

10 I am hoping to have that meeting before Christmas,
11 if we can fit it in. I will be sending out another poll of
12 when people are available to see if we can fit in before
13 Christmas.

14 Just trying to maintain the schedule, I would like
15 to try to get all of the TAC and Stakeholder Working Group
16 meetings done by the end of year.

17 Is there anything that the group would like to see
18 us provide further, I don't know, analysis on these bridge
19 concepts? Or is there anything specific that you want to
20 see from an aesthetic perspective to maybe lead us down a
21 path?

22 The intent is -- what we've said we would do on
23 the aesthetic side is kind of look at three different
24 aesthetic themes.

25 We're going to put together something that kind of

1 matches the Downtown Reno Streetscape Master Plan.

2 We're going to put together something that just
3 kind of matches what is down there now; kind of the theme,
4 the existing theme that's down there now.

5 Then we are going to come up with something that
6 is bridge-specific. Maybe something specific to the
7 Arlington Avenue Bridges.

8 So those are kind of -- that's the direction that
9 we're moving toward on the aesthetic side. So is there any
10 input there?

11 MS. KOSKI: Judy, this is Kerrie Koski again. The
12 aesthetics is the probably the more interesting -- for
13 majority of the group, the aesthetics is probably the more
14 interesting part of this.

15 When you take this out to the public, were you
16 planning to include any aesthetics, or were you planning to
17 discuss the aesthetics packages with the Stakeholders before
18 it goes to the public?

19 MS. TORTELLI: We will go through the aesthetic
20 package with the Stakeholder Working Group prior to going
21 out to the public.

22 MS. KOSKI: Okay.

23 MS. TORTELLI: I wanted to find what kind of
24 theme -- aesthetic theme we are going to move forward with,
25 and it's going to be a pretty high-level theme at this

1 point. This is just a feasibility study.

2 I do, definitely, want to kind of vet our ideas
3 through the Stakeholder Working Group meeting before we go
4 out to the public.

5 You're right, the aesthetics and what the bridge
6 looks like is what people care about, and what I think are
7 going to be most vocal about.

8 It's a little bit more exciting for some than
9 others. Some bridge engineers like this other stuff, and
10 the rest of us like how it looks.

11 MR. L'ETOILE: Judy, I do have a question. When
12 you are thinking of the different themes, and you mentioned
13 the theme that is already existing there in the areas, I am
14 just curious what -- if you can articulate that more?

15 Maybe this is something that we can come up in the
16 working group. I didn't know if that was, maybe, venturing
17 into the art deco, historic type, or something more
18 contemporary.

19 But I just want to have more clarification on what
20 that theme would be.

21 MS. TORTELLI: Well, at this point, I'm not really
22 sure, John, unless --

23 Barb, did you want to provide any input on that?

24 MS. SANTER: Yeah, I guess from my perspective,
25 you kind of have a two-part response there, because there's

1 the Downtown Streetscape Master Plan, which doesn't really
2 talk about -- that is like a different set of standards for
3 more of the Streetscape side, and that includes, like the
4 double, candy cane lights and the paving, and those have not
5 actually been used on any of the downtown bridges so far.

6 Like, for example, Virginia Street Bridge has its
7 own unique design, and a lot of that was driven by historic
8 match, you know, historic requirements for that area.

9 Then Center Street, which we did in the 90s, that
10 does have more of an art deco flare because of all the
11 buildings that were around it at the time, one of which is
12 no longer there, the Mapes.

13 So it's kind of a two-part thing. The art deco
14 styling is not really called out in the Downtown Streetscape
15 standards.

16 So those with more -- the Downtown Streetcape
17 standards, they don't really address the bridge design,
18 specifically.

19 So it seems like those are two different types of
20 styling because the Downtown Streetscape standards are art
21 deco, is how I would answer that.

22 And I might, while I am on here, mention just a
23 couple other things that seem to typically come up from the
24 public with respect to bridge aesthetics.

25 One of them is, in the past, the public has

1 frequently commented that they like the bridge railing to be
2 see-through instead of solid, like solid concrete.

3 That has come up when we did Center Street back in
4 the 90s. It came up with Virginia Street when we worked on
5 that a number of years ago. And I know that's been a
6 comment on the Booth Street Bridge that it doesn't have
7 see-through railings.

8 So that's something I was going ask Mike, if any
9 of these bridge types would preclude having a type of
10 see-through railing design or not?

11 And I know one of the issues is you have to
12 provide the vehicle protection as well. So I might --

13 If I answered your question, John, if you don't
14 mind I might must toss that one to Mike Cooper.

15 MR. L'ETOILE: Yes. Yes. Thanks, Barb.

16 MR. COOPER: Sure, Barb. What was pictorially
17 shown on the schematics we developed were the standard,
18 solid, parapet walls, but you are absolute right, open
19 railing would be something we would want to look at.

20 There's a couple directions you could go with
21 those. You could go with an open concrete railing that
22 could be designed and detailed to also be a vehicle barrier
23 and provide the more open look.

24 What we did on Center Street with the lighter
25 aluminum railing on the edge of the deck for pedestrians was

1 not a vehicle rail. So we ended up putting a concrete
2 railing between the sidewalk and the vehicles for protection
3 there.

4 MS. SANTER: Right.

5 MR. COOPER: And we could do something similar to
6 that here as well.

7 It just becomes a matter of how to end those and
8 terminate those interior rails, if you will, with pedestrian
9 access around them and the vehicles and such. Yes, those
10 are possible.

11 MS. SANTER: And I know not to get way in the
12 weeds on this right at this particular meeting, but on both
13 the Center Street and the Virginia Street Bridge, the other
14 thing we kind of tried on purpose was have a bit of an
15 overhang, like a widening of the bridge.

16 The downfall of that is we ended up having the --
17 in the more transparent railings, we ended up having that
18 separate vehicular barrier right at the back of Walk.

19 Which in this, may not be good because we so many
20 special events down there that it seems like maybe there
21 would be a better and more desire to have things kind of
22 walkable all the way out to the edge.

23 So just a couple of things come to mind there.
24 But it sounds like none of these options would preclude a
25 more open railing, which is great.

1 MR. COOPER: So, Barb, another thought I was
2 having here on Center Street, that in the middle of the
3 river there we made the sidewalk wider for kind of
4 congregation areas, if you will.

5 I don't know if that's something here that would
6 be of interest at Arlington. The bridge is shorter, quite a
7 bit shorter than at Center Street, but something to think
8 about.

9 MS. SANTER: Yeah.

10 MR. COOPER: If that does become a desirable
11 feature, it may end up being limited to the single pier
12 option because we have a better opportunity to widen out the
13 deck with the pier out there, rather than trying to widen
14 the deck out with the rigid frame clear span option.

15 It just becomes a little bit more complicated.

16 MS. SANTER: Yeah, that is what I was trying to
17 indicate earlier by saying that we did that on the Center
18 Street Bridge, and the Virginia Street Bridge is also wider.
19 In the middle, it kind of flares out, and that was
20 purposefully done just as a congregation spot.

21 So that's good to know that that may only work
22 with a single pier type, not so much the clear span.

23 One other thing that comes to mind with respect to
24 kind of thinking about future aesthetics is the idea that
25 this is isn't the last bridge that would need to be replaced

1 Downtown. We've still got Sierra, Lake, and I think, maybe,
2 even eventually Booth.

3 So to the degree it's even possible to know this
4 now, is there a desire to have a kind of family of bridges
5 or have every one completely unique?

6 Maybe the construction type is one of those things
7 that is certain like a starting point to uniqueness or
8 family kind of style design.

9 We kind of have some pretty landmarked design, I
10 think, with Virginia Street that, to me, I don't know that
11 you would want to do that on every single one.

12 To me, that should be the main one and the others,
13 maybe, more secondary to that for sure.

14 I am not sure we can answer that right now, but
15 that is just something that comes to mind when selecting the
16 bridge types, you know, if we can even predict whether they
17 could apply to some of other bridges that have to ultimately
18 be replaced.

19 MS. HANSON: Barb, I think that is a great
20 concept. I was thinking kind of the same thing is how those
21 will all interact.

22 Like you said, we may not decide it here, but
23 somehow establishing a hierarchy with Virginia Street as
24 already kind of the grand one in the area, and I think
25 respecting that and showing that when you go out to the

1 public and coming back to the committees showing what that
2 overall, I would say, family of them where they are going to
3 have to respect each other's architecture as we move
4 forward.

5 So I think that's a great concept. I was thinking
6 the exact same thing.

7 Then just a couple of thoughts on the wider
8 portion on Virginia and Center.

9 I feel like on this one the island is wide part,
10 so I don't think -- they are shorter bridges, so I think --
11 I was going to say nature, but those are manmade islands. I
12 think wide part is already provided by the island on this
13 one.

14 And then on design -- and Kerrie, you can hit me
15 on mute if you need to -- the Downtown design concepts, I
16 don't think we've ever fully explored -- with the concept on
17 bridges, definitely, but I would say the overall concept has
18 not been revisited in quite sometime.

19 So I think, looking at that and making sure it
20 works with the rest of Downtown, but also respecting the
21 architecture with the three mid-century, modern buildings
22 nearby and then the McCarran Mansion and the Cathedral,
23 just, you know, it is quite a historic group up buildings in
24 the area.

25 I don't think we have fully explored the Downtown

1 design concepts, that we have to completely be locked into
2 that.

3 Kerrie, feel free to correct me if you think I am
4 wrong, but that's how I see it.

5 MS. KOSKI: Nope. I think you're absolutely
6 correct; spot on.

7 And I do support Barb's comments as well about the
8 family design.

9 I think within the community -- being involved in
10 the Virginia Street Bridge Project, we heard that and we
11 even looked at that, but I do think that Virginia Street
12 Bridge is unique, and, perhaps, the others should be
13 respectful of the historic nature.

14 But I think if we could somehow think about that
15 in the future -- for future of Sierra Street, Lake Street --
16 I could see it working very well. And I can see it being
17 supported within the community.

18 But that's today. Who knows; right?

19 MS. SANTER: Right.

20 MS. TORTELLI: I do like the family of bridges
21 idea for sure. We're looking at replacing all these
22 bridges, and it would be nice to move forward with something
23 similar as we replace them.

24 MS. KOSKI: Yes. And as far as a maintenance
25 aspect like I was talking about, there are maintenance and

1 operations folks, they like it when we have some similar
2 designs and not specialty items on every bridge. It would
3 be helpful for us in that respect as well.

4 MS. HANSON: I think the community's really going
5 to appreciate it also, showing that we are all looking into
6 the future, and not just piecemealing these together, but
7 showing that the group is looking at a consistent approach
8 into the future.

9 I think when this goes out to the public, I think
10 you definitely need to show the series of them.

11 I wouldn't put dates on designs or anything, of
12 course, you know, because the last one all, of us will be
13 retired by the time that last one gets replaced.

14 So we don't want to tie too many hands there. But
15 I think the public would really appreciate it.

16 MS. KOSKI: Good points, Claudia.

17 MS. SANTER: But I think just narrowing down, like
18 the -- has already been done here, that we don't have an
19 above-grade support type of design.

20 That's a big decision already that kind of helps
21 define what the family could be.

22 MS. TORTELLI: Right.

23 MS. SANTER: And maybe Virginia Street's the main
24 one that has that.

25 I think the other thing about that that's good --

1 because I remember this coming up on Virginia Street -- is
2 people wanted to maintain the view to the west of the
3 mountains, and not have above-grade structures that were
4 obstructing your view from wherever you were standing
5 because that is kind of a cherished aspect of our Downtown,
6 is to be able to look at the river and then see the
7 mountains in the background or maybe even from either
8 direction.

9 MS. KOSKI: Good points, Barb.

10 It seemed to me like the arch design, maybe we
11 could look at too. Incorporating, not necessarily the same
12 as the Virginia Street Bridge, but some sort of an offshoot.

13 I'm not an art person. I'm not professing to be
14 an expert in designs, but I was just thinking somehow tie it
15 together a little bit with the aesthetics.

16 MS. SANTER: Oh, you're talking about the railing.

17 MS. KOSKI: Yes. Excuse me. The railing, yes.

18 MS. SANTER: Oh, yeah. Okay. Yeah.

19 MS. KOSKI: And then keep that openness. And I
20 agree that view to the west is very important.

21 Well, all views are important. I mean, really,
22 they are all important. I shouldn't just say the view to
23 the west.

24 People, I see them sitting on the Virginia Street
25 Bridge, and they take in all of Downtown.

1 MS. SANTER: Yes.

2 MS. KOSKI: So I guess retract that.

3 MS. HANSON: And with this, the view to the east
4 is going to be the Virginia Street Bridge.

5 MS. KOSKI: Correct.

6 MS. SANTER: True. Yeah. But if every bridge has
7 an above-grade train, then it makes it harder to see past
8 that next block.

9 So I think that kind of supports having Virginia
10 Street be the leader in that regard, and having the
11 above-grade arch and maybe, if we don't have to have that
12 kind of design, the others don't have that.

13 MS. KOSKI: Yep. I agree.

14 MS. HANSON: Good point.

15 MS. KOSKI: I think I may have cut somebody off.
16 Was it Greg?

17 MR. ERNY: Yes. I am sorry. I didn't mean to
18 interrupt.

19 I guess -- I'm not sure what we consider the --
20 define the term "family" as. Whether it is structural sort
21 of concepts and/or kind of things that have similar
22 characteristics, or whether it is cost effectiveness or
23 means and methods for that work for time that they are done.

24 I guess I may be the one heretic in the bunch here
25 in that I think each site will have its own unique aspects.

1 I think one of the things about the Arlington
2 Bridge is, it's a big community gathering area, and those
3 bridges connect those islands that we are considering the
4 widening areas.

5 I would hate to see those bridges become the
6 throttle points between the banks on the north and the south
7 side across both bridges and the island.

8 I think having the bridges be an extension of
9 those islands to and from the north and south is something
10 worth consideration here because there is a lot of things
11 that go on where the bridges are closed off and community
12 activity happen in those areas.

13 I wouldn't want to see single file have to happen
14 crossing those bridges to get to the actives on the island
15 and things.

16 Anyway, I think we should always kind of keep an
17 eye on the context which each bridge is and respect the
18 activities and potential activities and potential for the
19 locations in each of those bridges.

20 MS. SANTER: Good points.

21 MS. TORTELLI: Well, I think all of that is
22 excellent feedback, and it helps give us kind of a starting
23 place to put together material for our next Stakeholder
24 Working Group meeting.

25 Is there anybody else that would like to have any

1 comments or questions from the group?

2 MS. DOWTY: Hi, everyone. This is Kayla Dowty,
3 and I am the District Engineer for the Carson-Truckee Water
4 Conservancy District. I apologize because I had to join
5 late today, so this may have already been discussed.

6 Typically, Ron Penrose or Lori Williams are on
7 this call, and I am filling in for them today.

8 I know they've mentioned this on previous working
9 groups, but I just want to reiterate that for District and
10 then also, probably, for the City of Reno, access from the
11 bridge to the river is really, really important.

12 Obviously, in the design of the Virginia Street
13 Bridge, that wasn't made possible.

14 So we're hoping that during engineering this time
15 that is considered as one of the priorities, access both
16 from the bridge deck and then possibly also some sort of
17 ramp so that we can access the river to keep the channel
18 clear.

19 MS. KOSKI: Kayla, thank you for joining the
20 meeting. I am with the City. I appreciate your comments.

21 I think we did talk about -- we have been
22 discussing the access and, yes, we are in support of access
23 from the top of the bridge to the river.

24 As you well know, the City does oftentimes have to
25 pull materials out of the river. I believe this

1 group -- and Mike or Judy, somebody, correct me if I am
2 wrong.

3 I think we were looking at access not to the
4 river, not necessarily directly from the bridge, but from
5 the banks, other options or other alternatives; that is
6 correct, Judy?

7 MS. TORTELLI: Yes, that is correct. I mean, kind
8 of leading in from our first TAC-1 meeting, that was a big
9 point that was brought up was access to the river for
10 maintenance.

11 As we forward I think with these designs, we'll
12 continue to keep that up on the priority list and pop
13 through how that's going to work out.

14 MS. DOWTY: Perfect. Thank you both so much. And
15 thank you for updating me since I was late.

16 MS. TORTELLI: Okay. Well, thanks so much for
17 joining us, Kayla. Sorry that you had a conflict. We can't
18 ever be in two places at once; right?

19 MS. DOWTY: That's right. Yep. Lori is actually
20 on the river now right behind the Reno Police Department
21 doing some debris removal on the river as we speak.

22 She apologizes that she couldn't make it.

23 MS. TORTELLI: Okay.

24 MS. JONES: I mentioned this very early on too.
25 Maintenance access is, obviously, very important, but -- and

1 I am sure NDOT will provide comment on this as well as the
2 design moves forward -- access for bridge inspection as well
3 is very important.

4 I was team leader for the bridge inspection for
5 NDOT for nearly five years and Center Street Bridge and
6 Virginia Street Bridge, those large UBT trucks that they use
7 could not get underneath those bridges, and those bridges
8 are inspected every two years, at a minimum; a number them
9 are inspected more frequently.

10 The inspection this last spring on Virginia Street
11 Bridge, they were able to -- oh, I can't remember the name
12 of the vehicle that they used, but they were able to get
13 underneath to inspect all the girders.

14 That needs to be considered in the design as well
15 somewhere down the line.

16 MR. COOPER: Hi, Theresa, it's Mike. That is a
17 very good point.

18 MS. TORTELLI: That access will be something that
19 we'll key in on as we continue to move forward.

20 But I think it's something that, as the team, we
21 want to make sure that we're highlighting as we go through
22 the feasibility study, so it's something that is carried
23 forward when we get into design and NEPA.

24 MR. GREENE: Yes.

25 MS. TORTELLI: And not just lost in the --

1 MR. GREENE: Actually, that's for both maintenance
2 and inspection and debris removal.

3 MS. TORTELLI: Yes.

4 Okay. Is there anything else? And is there
5 anybody on the call that is not Stakeholder Working Group
6 member that would like to say something. I am going to
7 open up it now for that, if there are.

8 Like I said, if there is anybody on the call that
9 is not specifically a Stakeholder Working Group member, if
10 you want to throw something in there, now is an opportunity.

11 MS. HARSH: Yes. This is Toni Harsh.

12 MS. TORTELLI: Oh, hi, Toni. Glad you made it.

13 MS. HARSH: Yeah, we've got lots of worker bees
14 out here doing other things.

15 In no particular order, I did write down some
16 question marks and some information. Do you mind if I just
17 do it with no pre-thought of having it organized? I am just
18 going to shoot out some thoughts.

19 MS. TORTELLI: That's fine. That's fine.

20 MS. HARSH: Okay. What came to mind is the
21 possibility of Ralston, and I do not know what the situation
22 is with Stevenson being closed. I don't know if that has an
23 impact on our traffic studies, but just throwing that out.
24 Sometimes we forget that streets close up.

25 Then, going back to the Downtown Streetscape --

1 maybe Claudia can help me on this -- I think it was even
2 before this century. I think that was in the 1990s. And it
3 might be included in putting it all together, I am not sure.
4 I'm old on these strategic plans.

5 So Claudia's correct, there has not been a review
6 of that particular street scape in a long time. I applaud
7 the thinking of the concept of how we kind of put this all
8 together with the other bridges, especially the ones that
9 are Downtown that are within sight of each other; Booth sits
10 off by itself.

11 So I think that's getting ahead. If we look at
12 one project at a time and not the how it's going to fit into
13 the total aesthetics of the Downtown.

14 Also, when are you planning -- and this gets
15 confusing -- to discuss -- bring up to date the Council
16 people that are involved in this? And I believe that's
17 Council Ward 5 and Ward 1, and I would include the
18 Councilperson at-large.

19 The reason being, Council people seem to hear an
20 awful lot from the public, and when you get to the
21 presentation to the public, a lot of times what I hear is
22 that we didn't look at this.

23 Because the public has all sorts of ideas, as they
24 should. It's their money. So, just, I would be curious
25 when you're going to be doing that.

1 Also, let's see. I think those are all my
2 comments and questions. I'm looking and, yes, I think
3 that's it. Those are all my comments and questions.

4 MS. TORTELLI: So, Toni, thank you for that. We
5 will definitely make a note of Ralston and Stevenson
6 potentially being closed and keep that on our radar, as we
7 look at traffic and projected volumes and all of that stuff.

8 I'll get on the aesthetics. I mean, we'll get
9 with Barb and the team and see if it makes sense to, rather
10 than just sticking to our three hardcore ideas -- you know,
11 one being the Downtown Streetscape Master Plan and another
12 one being matches the same theme and then another being
13 something separate -- maybe we go outside that a little bit
14 in light of the fact that the Downtown Streetscape Master
15 Plan doesn't really cover it.

16 So we will work on that with the team.

17 Your question on the City of Reno Council. So
18 you're absolutely right, the process that we have defined
19 for this project is to update City of Reno Council and RTC
20 Board prior to going out to the public.

21 So before we have this public meeting, we'll go to
22 City of Reno Council and the RTC Board.

23 So once we get done with our third Stakeholder
24 Working Group Meeting, which is going to address aesthetics,
25 we will compile everything together, then take that to the

1 City of Reno Council and the RTC Board, and then we will go
2 to the public.

3 Then we will be following back up with the City of
4 Reno Council and RTC Board after the public meeting to kind
5 of update them on what feedback we got from the public prior
6 to finalizing the feasibility study.

7 So there is a lot of involvement in there with
8 City of Reno Council, if that answers that question.

9 MS. HARSH: Thank you.

10 MS. TORTELLI: Yes.

11 MS. KOSKI: And I would like to just add to that.

12 Hi, Toni, thank you for joining our meeting today.

13 MS. HARSH: Thank you.

14 MS. KOSKI: You had some great comments there. I
15 appreciate those.

16 I just wanted to add to what -- the question about
17 the Stevenson, actually pointing that out. We are aware of
18 that abandonment. We have spoken to the developers and they
19 have been advised that, basically, that we need to work
20 together on these projects.

21 So we are not working in a vacuum. We are during
22 to communicate to everyone, actually, that comes to the City
23 that has a development in the surrounding area and point
24 them toward this project and make sure that we address
25 specific project needs, such as traffic.

1 So that was great point.

2 I am not sure what the plan is going to be for
3 Riverside Ralston quite yet.

4 There's still a lot of speculation, but I do
5 believe that something may come out of that. Fingers
6 crossed; right?

7 Then we also have Council updates internally. RTC
8 staff and City staff do meet with our respective Council
9 members, and we do update them as well.

10 So that does help get the message to them as well.

11 MS. HARSH: Thank you.

12 MS. KOSKI: You bet.

13 MS. TORTELLI: Okay. So are there any other
14 questions? All right. Hearing none, I'm going to go ahead
15 and just thank everybody for your participation.

16 I know sometimes these meetings are a little, I
17 don't know, uncomfortable, but we really did get some great
18 feedback today, and I think things are moving forward, so I
19 am really happy about that.

20 Like I said, I'll be getting out an email to the
21 group here so that we can get that next Stakeholder Working
22 Group meeting scheduled, hopefully, before Christmas and
23 talk about some aesthetics.

24 So thank you again, everybody. I really
25 appreciate your participation.

1 MR. SAEMAN: Judy, this is Brian. Real quick,
2 there was a request through the chat for the slide
3 presentation.

4 So I don't know if you can make that available for
5 others with respect to that.

6 MS. TORTELLI: Yeah, Brian. I will post the
7 presentation on our website at rtcwashoe.com. I also need
8 to update our website with kind of a recap from Stakeholder
9 Working Group I and our TAC meetings.

10 So all of that information will be on our website
11 at rtcwashoe.com, it's just not up there yet.

12 MR. SAEMAN: Thank you.

13 MS. TORTELLI: Um-hum.

14 All right. Thank you, everybody. We will be in
15 touch, and we will talk about aesthetics.

16 (Meeting concluded at 10:28 A.M.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF NEVADA)
) ss.
2 COUNTY OF WASHOE)

3

4 I, BRANDI ANN VIANNEY SMITH, court reporter, do
5 hereby certify:

6 That I was present via Zoom audio visual on
7 November 5, 2020, at the RTC Stakeholder Working Group
8 Meeting-2, and took stenotype notes of the proceedings
9 entitled herein, and thereafter transcribed said proceedings
10 into typewriting as herein appears.

11 That the foregoing transcript is a full, true, and
12 correct transcription of my stenotype notes of said
13 proceedings consisting of 55 pages.

14 DATED: At Reno, Nevada, this 17th day of
15 November, 2020.



18 BRANDI ANN VIANNEY SMITH

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 HEALTH INFORMATION PRIVACY & SECURITY: CAUTIONARY NOTICE
2 Litigation Services is committed to compliance with applicable federal
3 and state laws and regulations ("Privacy Laws") governing the
4 protection and security of patient health information. Notice is
5 hereby given to all parties that transcripts of depositions and legal
6 proceedings, and transcript exhibits, may contain patient health
7 information that is protected from unauthorized access, use and
8 disclosure by Privacy Laws. Litigation Services requires that access,
9 maintenance, use, and disclosure (including but not limited to
10 electronic database maintenance and access, storage, distribution/
11 dissemination and communication) of transcripts/exhibits containing
12 patient information be performed in compliance with Privacy Laws.
13 No transcript or exhibit containing protected patient health
14 information may be further disclosed except as permitted by Privacy
15 Laws. Litigation Services expects that all parties, parties'
16 attorneys, and their HIPAA Business Associates and Subcontractors will
17 make every reasonable effort to protect and secure patient health
18 information, and to comply with applicable Privacy Law mandates,
19 including but not limited to restrictions on access, storage, use, and
20 disclosure (sharing) of transcripts and transcript exhibits, and
21 applying "minimum necessary" standards where appropriate. It is
22 recommended that your office review its policies regarding sharing of
23 transcripts and exhibits - including access, storage, use, and
24 disclosure - for compliance with Privacy Laws.

25 © All Rights Reserved. Litigation Services (rev. 6/1/2019)

-	4	A	access 13:4,7 14:25 17:16 18:7 26:25 28:13 38:9 47:10,15,17, 22 48:3,9,25 49:2,18	9:1 Adam 4:2 25:12,17,19 26:1,18,19 Adam's 25:24
---o0o--- 1:7 2:1,3	4(f) 12:19,22	A.M. 2:2 55:16		
1	401 13:23	abandonment 53:18	accommodate 27:18	add 53:11,16
1 16:14 51:17	404 13:20 14:22	ability 7:13, 14	accommodate d 21:5	added 17:21 18:4,9,11
10 16:14	408 13:1,20	able 13:7 44:6 49:11,12	account 25:15	additional 8:5,6,17 13:25 14:3,13 24:14 25:21
10:28 55:16	5	above 22:1 23:17 26:17	achieved 16:23	address 3:18 8:18,24 9:1 18:3 36:17 52:24 53:24
11 15:16,17	5 1:11 2:2 51:17	above-grade 43:19 44:3 45:7,11	across 46:7	adjacent 9:25 12:3,7,10 27:1
13 10:24	6	absolute 37:18	actives 46:14	adjusted 9:4
15 5:22	681225 1:25	absolutely 29:21 42:5 52:18	activities 46:18	adjustments 27:4
1990s 51:2	7	abutment 22:10,13,24 24:10,15 25:6,7 26:10 28:15	activity 18:6 46:12	advantage 20:20 26:8
2	9	abutments 21:16 23:10 24:23	actually 13:12 15:20 24:8 36:5 48:19 50:1 53:17,22	advised 53:19
2019 7:20 9:6	78 8:2		ADA- COMPLIANT	
2020 1:11 2:2	9			
2026 9:15	9 15:17			
3	90s 36:9 37:4			
35 8:2,4	9:00 2:2,6			

Advisory 5:8	45:13	also 2:17 4:12,19,21 5:8 7:5 9:20 10:22 12:18 14:2 15:15 16:17 17:14 18:4 22:6 28:5,16 30:5 37:22 39:18 41:20 43:5 47:10,16 51:14 52:1 54:7 55:7	analysis 26:3 33:18	25:10 27:9 30:17 32:6 46:25 50:5,8
aesthetic 7:2 8:18 9:8 33:20,23,24 34:9,19,24	agreed 11:13, 23 20:4,11		analyze 9:8	anything 11:14 15:10 31:2 32:4 33:17,19 43:11 50:4
aesthetics 8:4 17:18 28:16 33:8 34:12,13,16, 17 35:5 36:24 39:24 44:15 51:13 52:8,24 54:23 55:15	agreement 19:23 32:7		ancillary 17:22	
after 2:6 6:20 7:10 23:17 53:4	ahead 2:6 15:12 18:20 25:17,20,23 51:11 54:14		and/or 14:14 45:21	Anyway 46:16
again 3:5 6:11 8:4 12:1 14:17 15:14 19:3 23:10 24:25 30:19, 23 34:11 54:24	all 3:7 4:5 5:12 6:9,10 11:7 16:1,20 17:1 19:24 23:6 25:13 26:1 32:19 36:10 38:22 40:21 42:21 43:5,12 44:21,22,25 46:21 49:13 51:3,7,23 52:1,3,7 54:14 55:10, 14	alternative 14:7,10 19:6 20:9	Andrea 3:24, 25	apologize 47:4
agencies 9:23 10:24	allocated 6:19	alternative-specific 10:4	animals 15:25	apologizes 48:22
agency 10:7 11:22	along 3:5 4:16 13:23	alternatives 5:6 6:1,4 7:13 11:8,10 12:10 14:11,19 15:3 17:13 25:13, 16 48:5	Ann 1:24	appearance 23:25
agenda 6:6	already 35:13 40:24 41:12 43:18,20 47:5	although 21:1	another 12:12 33:11 39:1 52:11,12	appears 20:16
ago 37:5		aluminum 37:25	answers 53:8	applaud 51:6
agree 44:20		always 30:1 46:16	anti-graffiti 28:19	applicable 5:19 12:19
		amenity 29:12	anticipate 8:21	applies 12:23
			anticipated 5:19	apply 40:17
			anybody 12:21 15:7	appreciate 43:5,15 47:20 53:15 54:25

approach 11:6 15:18 17:11 31:6,7 43:7	35:14	15 19:1	7:19 9:6,16 17:20 25:11 31:24 37:3 38:18 41:1 50:25 53:3	31:10
arch 14:8,15, 20 16:11 17:6 19:9,14 31:22 44:10 45:11	articulation 27:17	attributes 5:19 16:2,6, 12,13 17:9, 10,12,20 18:4,9,11,16	background 6:8 44:7	basically 21:17 53:19
architecture 41:3,21	askew 22:12	audio 22:12	balance 29:24,25	bats 27:19 28:7
area 36:8 40:24 41:24 46:2 53:23	aspect 29:15 42:25 44:5	August 5:24	Ball 3:23	beam 22:6 23:8
areas 29:5,6 35:13 39:4 46:4,12	aspects 45:25	available 33:12 55:4	bank 22:24	beams 22:19 23:8,20
Arlington 1:5 2:13 8:25 11:25 12:8 34:7 39:6 46:1	assist 2:14 3:9	Avenue 1:5 2:13 8:25 34:7	banks 46:6 48:5	become 39:10 46:5
Army 10:7 11:3	associated 5:16 8:15 11:8 31:11	average 19:1	bar 9:7	becomes 38:7 39:15
around 8:2 36:11 38:9	assuming 15:10 32:21	averages 19:1	Barb 3:22 35:23 37:15, 16 39:1 40:19 44:9 52:9	bees 50:13
art 28:20 35:17 36:10, 13,20 44:13	assumptions 11:14	avoid 7:14	Barb's 42:7	before 33:10, 12 34:17 35:3 51:2 52:21 54:22
articulate	asterisk 14:12	aware 53:17	barrier 37:22 38:18	beginning 9:10,22 10:22 15:15
	at-large 51:18	awful 51:20	bars 19:11,19	behaves 24:9
	attendance 3:21	awhile 6:9	based 5:11 6:3 7:13 12:15 14:18 16:3 23:1	behind 19:17 32:6 48:20
	attribute 16:17 17:14,	back 5:15,23		being 12:15

<p>16:14,15 24:9 39:11 42:9,16 50:22 51:19 52:6,11,12</p> <p>believe 47:25 51:16 54:5</p> <p>below 21:21 23:6</p> <p>beneath 22:1</p> <p>best 17:11 20:7</p> <p>bet 54:12</p> <p>better 19:3 38:21 39:12</p> <p>between 6:4 11:10 14:9,19 38:2 46:6</p> <p>big 43:20 46:2 48:8</p> <p>bird 28:7</p> <p>birds 27:19 28:22 29:2,7</p> <p>bit 3:5 4:22 7:21,23,25 8:12 9:4 12:22 15:21</p>	<p>19:17 20:11 22:11 31:13 35:8 38:14 39:7,15 44:15 52:13</p> <p>block 45:8</p> <p>Board 7:17 52:20,22 53:1,4</p> <p>Booth 37:6 40:2 51:9</p> <p>both 14:21,24 18:12 20:13 22:13 26:24 32:1 38:12 46:7 47:15 48:14 50:1</p> <p>bottom 22:1 23:17,22 24:21 25:4</p> <p>box 17:3,8 19:8 20:13,25 23:5,17,18, 23,24 26:15 27:7</p> <p>Brandi 1:24 3:22</p> <p>breaking 3:16</p> <p>Brian 3:21</p>	<p>55:1,6</p> <p>bridge 2:12 3:9 5:4,5,24 6:17,25 7:2, 11 8:3,4,5 9:8 13:5,10 14:4, 8,16,25 15:13,19,24 16:11 17:7,17 18:1,6,8,24 19:21 20:18 21:9,11,14, 20,24 22:5, 17,20 23:21 24:6,22,23 25:3,13 26:12,14 27:5,6 28:2,7, 11,13,24 29:9 30:13 31:8,22 32:2 33:9,18 35:5,9 36:6, 17,24 37:1,6, 9 38:13,15 39:6,18,25 40:16 42:10, 12 43:2 44:12,25 45:4,6 46:2, 17 47:11,13, 16,23 48:4 49:2,4,5,6,11</p> <p>bridge-specific 34:6</p> <p>bridges 1:5 2:13 8:25 10:10 11:25 12:8,20 27:16</p>	<p>34:7 36:5 40:4,17 41:10,17 42:20,22 46:3,5,7,8,11, 14,19 49:7 51:8</p> <p>bring 29:14 51:15</p> <p>brining 29:23</p> <p>broader 5:12</p> <p>brought 29:22 48:9</p> <p>bugs 29:7</p> <p>build 18:1 21:10</p> <p>building 20:23</p> <p>buildings 36:11 41:21, 23</p> <p>built 7:15</p> <p>bullets 10:2</p> <p>bunch 45:24</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <p>call 2:21 4:7 30:21 47:7 50:5,8</p> <p>called 7:5 36:14</p> <p>came 16:6 18:16 19:6 33:2,4 37:4 50:20</p> <p>camp 18:6</p> <p>can't 4:17 15:25 48:17 49:11</p> <p>candy 36:4</p> <p>cane 36:4</p> <p>cap 22:6,9,21 23:8,15</p> <p>capacity 9:2</p> <p>capture 2:22 10:16</p> <p>care 35:6</p> <p>Carmazzi 4:3</p>
--	---	---	---	--

<p>carried 2:13 5:6 6:1,5 15:3 19:25 20:4 49:22</p> <p>carry 7:3 12:24</p> <p>Carson-truckee 4:21 13:2 47:3</p> <p>case 21:3</p> <p>cast-in-place 17:3,8 19:8 20:12,24 21:4,10 23:5, 17,23,24 26:15 27:7 31:19</p> <p>categories 8:1</p> <p>cath 21:21</p> <p>Cathedral 41:22</p> <p>Center 36:9 37:3,24 38:13 39:2,7,17 41:8 49:5</p> <p>century 51:2</p> <p>certain 40:7</p>	<p>certification 13:24</p> <p>challenges 31:11</p> <p>challenging 14:22</p> <p>change 18:14</p> <p>changed 18:18</p> <p>channel 24:3 47:17</p> <p>characteristics 45:22</p> <p>chat 55:2</p> <p>checklist 10:11 12:12, 14,17</p> <p>checks 14:5</p> <p>cherished 44:5</p> <p>Christmas 33:10,13 54:22</p> <p>CIP 23:18</p>	<p>City 7:17 13:18 30:10 47:10,20,24 52:17,19,22 53:1,3,8,22 54:8</p> <p>City's 29:25</p> <p>clarification 35:19</p> <p>Claudia 3:23 32:15 43:16 51:1</p> <p>Claudia's 51:5</p> <p>cleaner 23:15</p> <p>cleaner-looking 23:25</p> <p>clear 13:8 14:7 16:10 17:5 19:20 20:6,8,9 21:7 22:25 24:2 26:20 31:12, 20 39:14,22 47:18</p> <p>clearance 7:4 26:16</p> <p>click 19:22</p>	<p>close 19:8 50:24</p> <p>closed 29:10 46:11 50:22 52:6</p> <p>coatings 28:19</p> <p>coffee 32:14</p> <p>collecting 26:9</p> <p>Colony 11:2</p> <p>column 19:5 23:17</p> <p>come 17:12 27:13 34:5 35:15 36:23 37:3 38:23 54:5</p> <p>comes 39:23 40:15 53:22</p> <p>coming 3:2 41:1 44:1</p> <p>comment 25:22 29:16 30:18 32:10 37:6 49:1</p> <p>commented</p>	<p>37:1</p> <p>comments 3:15 7:21,25 8:2,3,6,10,11 32:6 42:7 47:1,20 52:2, 3 53:14</p> <p>COMMISSION 1:4</p> <p>committees 5:8 41:1</p> <p>communicate 53:22</p> <p>community 9:2 42:9,17 46:2,11</p> <p>community's 43:4</p> <p>compare 26:5</p> <p>compared 20:18 21:2</p> <p>comparison 19:15</p> <p>compile 52:25</p> <p>compiled</p>
---	---	---	---	--

5:20 16:22	32:8 33:19 41:15 42:1 45:21	conflict 4:23 48:17	46:3	convey 5:7
complete 6:24 9:11 16:19	concern 17:25 27:20 29:9	confusing 51:15	consistent 43:7	Cooper 2:17, 19 3:21 18:21,23,24 25:25 26:22 28:10 29:18 37:14,16 38:5 39:1,10 49:16
completed 8:16	concerned 28:8 29:25	congregation 39:4,20	constrained 26:23	
completely 40:5 42:1	conclude 13:1	connect 46:3	constraints 5:16 7:1 8:15 10:5,12,13	coordination 11:12
complicated 39:15	concluded 55:16	connected 24:10	construction 7:15 9:14 14:15 17:13, 14 20:22 22:8 40:6	Corps 10:8 11:3,23
component 9:24	concrete 17:3,8 19:7 20:12,13,21, 25 21:11,15, 22,25 22:2,19 23:5,20 37:2, 21 38:1	consensus 16:23 31:4	contemporary 35:18	correct 3:25 4:1 42:3,6 45:5 48:1,6,7 51:5
compromised 9:23	concurrence 32:11,16,18, 20,21	Conservancy 4:22 13:2 47:4	context 27:12 46:17	correctly 31:15
concept 14:8, 15,16 16:11, 18 17:2,5,7 19:9,20 20:8, 9,16 24:4,13 26:8 31:12, 13,22,23 40:20 41:5, 16,17 51:7	configuration s 19:21	consider 28:4 29:11,12 45:19	continue 12:17 15:12 32:9 48:12 49:19	cost 17:14 45:22
concepts 2:12 3:10 5:4 9:8 14:20 16:8 17:2 19:7,16 20:7, 10 21:14 23:1 26:7 27:12	configured 28:11	consideration 20:13,23 46:10	continuing 12:11,15,24	costs 7:1,16 17:16
	confirm 10:9 11:25	considered 26:20 47:15 49:14	conventional 24:18	Council 4:15 7:17 51:15, 17,19 52:17, 19,22 53:1,4, 8 54:7,8
		considering	Conversancy 13:5	Councilperso n 51:18

couple 11:19 13:15 17:21 23:14 31:5 36:23 37:20 38:23 41:7	46:14	decision 7:7 43:20	delayed 3:5	11 44:14 48:11
course 43:12	crowd 32:13	decisions 7:4 12:9	delays 9:4	desirable 39:10
court 2:21 3:22	cumbersome 31:14	deck 14:8 16:10 17:5 19:9,14 31:13 37:25 39:13, 14 47:16	Department 48:20	desire 38:21 40:4
cover 3:8 6:6 52:15	curious 35:14 51:24	deco 35:17 36:10,13,21	depending 17:25 26:12	detail 7:25 12:22
covered 15:8, 11	current 12:7	deep 27:7	deposited 13:9	detailed 37:22
COVID 3:6 9:5	cut 22:17 25:2 45:15	deeper 24:22 25:5 26:10	depth 25:16 26:6,13 27:7	details 5:11
creep 17:24	<hr/> D <hr/>	deficient 8:25	described 30:3	deter 28:16
Crime 18:5	dash 21:19 23:5 24:3	define 6:25 11:6 43:21 45:20	deserve 19:25	determine 5:5 7:1 10:7,9,10 12:13 26:12
criteria 5:16 8:15 10:5,12, 13	date 9:15 51:15	defined 9:22 10:22 15:15 52:18	design 5:15 6:2 7:4 9:13 10:12,13 15:4 16:9 18:5,6 30:4 36:7,17 37:10 40:8,9 41:14,15 42:1,8 43:19 44:10 45:12 47:12 49:2, 14,23	determined 5:18 12:4,19 13:18 14:21
critters 27:19 29:11	dates 43:11	defining 8:14	designed 37:22	developed 10:12 16:8 37:17
cross 29:1	debris 13:4,8 15:1 26:9 48:21 50:2	definitely 28:3 29:24 35:2 41:17 43:10 52:5	designs 43:2,	developers 53:18
crossed 54:6	December 7:19	decide 6:23 40:22		development 53:23
crossing	decided 20:7	degree 40:3		

dialed 23:2	5:15 11:10 47:5	double 21:19 36:4	during 11:21, 23 12:2,4,13, 18 13:13,15, 16,18 14:1, 14,18,21 22:8 47:14 53:21	either 10:7 13:9 21:16 22:24 27:6,21 44:7
difference 14:9 24:5	discussing 47:22	dovetailed 14:3	<hr/> E <hr/>	elements 5:24 6:18 8:7 15:20 31:8
differences 11:10 13:15 23:14 29:15	discussion 2:22 6:23 10:16 12:25 31:3	down 30:5 33:20 34:3,4 38:20 43:17 49:15 50:15		elevated 14:8,16,20 16:11 19:23, 24 31:22
different 10:21 12:10 14:5,11 15:15,19,21, 25 19:21 25:13,15 28:2 30:3 31:8,9 33:23 35:12 36:2,19	discussions 14:18	downfall 38:16	each 14:6 18:25 41:3 45:25 46:17, 19 51:9	elevating 26:25
difficult 26:11	distinction 6:4	downstream 13:10	earlier 39:17	elevation 21:24 22:10, 12 23:12 24:19 25:14 26:17
direct 12:2,9	District 4:22 13:2 47:3,4,9	downtown 9:25 34:1 36:1,5,14,16, 20 40:1 41:15,20,25 44:5,25 50:25 51:9,13 52:11,14	early 8:22 48:24	elevations 26:4
direction 5:12 34:8 44:8	District's 13:5	Dowty 4:21 47:2 48:14,19	easier 24:11 28:20	email 54:20
directions 37:20	dive 5:11	driven 36:7	east 45:3	encouraging 18:8
directly 48:4	Division 13:22	drop 22:12 23:8	edge 22:16 37:25 38:22	encroachmen t 13:22
discharge 14:2	documented 7:4	dropped 20:14	editing 16:13	end 7:2 9:18 20:19 21:8,16 22:9 25:22 31:10 33:16
discuss 5:4 34:17 51:15	done 5:5 9:18 26:3 32:25 33:16 39:20 43:18 45:23 52:23	due 9:4	effectiveness 45:22	
discussed	DOT 12:19		effects 12:3,9	
			eight 16:12	

38:7 39:11	Erny 3:23 27:11 29:11 30:18,21,25 45:17	43:2 45:6 49:8	34:4 35:13	familiar 8:23 9:20 10:14
ended 12:13 38:1,16,17	especially 51:8	everybody 2:5,10,16,20 3:12 4:25 25:18 54:15, 24 55:14	expert 44:14	family 40:4,8 41:2 42:8,20 43:21 45:20
ends 26:11, 24	established 26:2	everybody's 2:23 3:13	explored 41:16,25	far 18:3 28:7, 22 29:24 36:5 42:24
engages 7:8	establishing 40:23	everyone 47:2 53:22	extension 46:8	fare 19:24 20:7
Engineer 18:24 47:3	evaluated 7:13 17:7 27:14	everything 10:17 52:25	extent 26:5	feasibility 6:25 7:16 9:12,18,22 10:23 12:5 33:6 35:1 49:22 53:6
engineering 5:15 8:14 10:13 47:14	evaluating 18:25	evident 27:17	eye 8:9 46:17	
engineers 10:8 11:4,23 35:9	evaluation 5:19 16:2,18	exact 41:6	face 22:5,10, 13,15 23:16 25:6	feature 39:11
Enough 14:16	even 18:17 27:6 29:1 40:2,3,16 42:11 44:7 51:1	example 36:6	faces 24:15 27:16	February 5:15
environment 7:15 8:14 9:13 17:17	events 13:9 38:20	excellent 16:15 46:22	fact 52:14	feedback 7:20 11:5 16:3 30:16 32:21 46:22 53:5 54:18
environmenta l 3:8 5:16 7:3, 5 10:12 18:5	eventually 40:2	except 14:19	factor 27:14, 25	feel 18:16 32:1 41:9 42:3
envisioned 24:20	every 40:5,11	exciting 35:8	fair 18:17	fell 31:22,23
erecting 21:22		Excuse 44:17	false 20:22 21:3,9	
		existing 17:15 20:18 21:2 28:13		

felt 11:7 15:23 19:25	first 5:14 6:11,13 7:24 8:13 10:15 11:22 13:17 21:14 33:3 48:8	29:16 43:1	frequently 37:1 49:9	25 22:21 25:1 26:15,19 28:24
few 9:19		followed 19:6	front 22:15	
fewer 15:3 20:17,20 21:1 23:5	fit 33:11,12 51:12	following 7:7 53:3	fully 41:16,25	girder-style 28:24 29:9
FHWA 3:25 10:8 11:23,24 12:19	five 49:5	footnote 14:13	further 33:18	girder-type 27:5
figure 17:11	flare 36:10	footprint 18:1	future 7:9 20:13 30:10 39:24 42:15 43:6,8	girders 17:3, 4,8 19:7,16 20:12,21,25 21:15,23 22:2,4,8,19, 24 23:13,24 24:1 27:6 29:1 49:13
file 46:13	flares 39:19	forget 50:24	G	
filled 10:15	flip 19:10 24:19	form 28:17 30:3	gathered 5:18 8:20 19:20	give 5:4 6:13 19:12 21:13 46:22
filling 47:7	flipped 19:19	forward 2:13 5:6 6:1,5,23 7:3 8:8,17 10:17 12:24 15:3 20:1,5 23:3 24:14 28:4 29:17 30:15 32:2,9, 22 34:24 41:4 42:22 48:11 49:2,19,23 54:18	gathering 46:2	given 26:23 28:25
final 30:4,18	flood 13:8 25:14 26:2,4, 12,17 27:8		gave 16:17	Glad 50:12
finalize 33:6	flow 21:17 23:11 24:16 26:12 27:8	frame 17:6 19:5,13,15 20:3,8 21:7 24:3,9,18,19 26:8 39:14	general 26:1	goal 5:25 10:4 15:2 27:3
finalizing 53:6			generally 25:23 32:7	goes 34:18 43:9
finally 25:2	flows 21:6 26:2	free 42:3	get all 33:15	good 2:19 25:25 29:18 30:11 38:19
find 6:3 34:23	focused 5:23, 24 6:17 8:3,4 28:12 33:8		getting 18:2 25:6 26:25 51:11 54:20	
fine 50:19			girder 20:14,	
Fingers 54:5	folks 2:14			

<p>39:21 43:16, 25 44:9 45:14 46:20 49:17</p> <p>graffiti 18:6 27:14,25 28:10,16,18 30:8</p> <p>grand 40:24</p> <p>graphic 19:12</p> <p>great 3:13 7:20 11:4 25:9 26:4 29:22 30:16 38:25 40:19 41:5 53:14 54:1,17</p> <p>Green 2:15</p> <p>GREENE 2:16 11:17 31:16 32:7 49:24 50:1</p> <p>Greg 27:11 29:22 30:18, 21,24 32:24 45:16</p> <p>Gregory 3:23 27:23 30:21</p> <p>groundwater 14:2</p>	<p>group 1:6 5:13,14 6:12, 14 7:17,24 8:13,18 9:21 10:15,21 11:13 16:23 19:23 20:4 25:19 31:3 32:5 33:1,5,7, 15,17 34:13, 20 35:3,16 41:23 43:7 46:24 47:1 48:1 50:5,9 52:24 54:21, 22 55:9</p> <p>Group-1 10:2 16:4 33:3</p> <p>Group-2 1:10</p> <p>groups 5:10 9:24 15:22 47:9</p> <p>guarantee 4:17</p> <p>guess 14:11 27:13,14 35:24 45:2, 19,24</p> <p>guessing 32:10</p> <p>guidelines 16:18</p>	<p>GUTIERREZ 4:1</p> <p>guys 26:20 32:14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>handle 3:7</p> <p>handouts 16:5</p> <p>hands 43:14</p> <p>hanging 18:8</p> <p>HANSON 32:15 40:19 43:4 45:3,14</p> <p>happen 9:19 46:12,13</p> <p>happy 54:19</p> <p>hardcore 52:10</p> <p>harder 45:7</p> <p>Harsh 4:3 50:11,13,20 53:9,13 54:11</p> <p>hate 46:5</p>	<p>having 37:9 38:16,17 39:2 45:9,10 46:8 50:17</p> <p>hear 2:8 4:9 51:19,21</p> <p>heard 42:10</p> <p>hearing 15:10 31:1 32:12 54:14</p> <p>height 14:23</p> <p>held 5:15,22</p> <p>help 16:18 28:6 51:1 54:10</p> <p>helpful 30:13 43:3</p> <p>helping 3:8</p> <p>helps 7:7 43:20 46:22</p> <p>here 2:12,15 3:22 5:7 9:9, 16 10:2,20 15:5,14 16:25 17:1 19:19 21:18 30:12 31:3 32:13,22</p>	<p>33:1 36:22 38:6 39:2,5 40:22 43:18 45:24 46:10 50:14 54:21</p> <p>here's 6:6 9:3 23:12</p> <p>heretic 45:24</p> <p>hidden 21:19</p> <p>hierarchy 40:23</p> <p>high 20:15</p> <p>high-level 34:25</p> <p>higher 19:3</p> <p>highest-ranked 19:6</p> <p>highlight 31:5</p> <p>highlighting 49:21</p> <p>historic 10:10 12:1,3,7 35:17 36:7,8 41:23 42:13</p> <p>hit 41:14</p>
--	--	--	--	--

hold 8:21	13:14	16:12 18:9 51:3	5:18 7:22 8:20 12:17 16:5 25:9 50:16 55:10	interest 39:6
holding 8:17 9:14	identified 3:16 7:3 10:24 11:9 14:12 15:16	includes 7:11 16:10 36:3		interesting 34:12,14
homeless 18:5 27:21	identify 3:1 6:25 9:7	incorporated 30:4,9	infrastructure 17:15	interior 23:24 38:8
hopefully 54:22	illicit 18:6	Incorporating 44:11	initial 23:1	internally 54:7
hoping 33:10 47:14	immediate 9:25	Indian 11:2	initiated 13:13	interrupt 45:18
horizontal 29:4	impact 26:21 50:23	indicate 39:17	input 5:7 7:12,16 8:20 16:13 34:10 35:23	intersections 26:24,25
horizontally 22:3	impacting 26:17	indicated 11:19	inspect 49:13	into 3:6 5:11 6:1,22 7:3 8:1 12:21,22 15:4 18:2,11 25:15 26:23,25 27:13 30:4,5, 6,9 35:17 42:1 43:5,8 49:23 51:12
hosted 11:3	impacts 7:15 11:11 14:23 17:15,17,23	indirect 12:3, 9	inspected 49:8,9	
hydraulic 9:1		individual 18:25 22:18, 21 23:23	inspection 17:16 49:2,4, 10 50:2	
I				
i.e. 11:11	important 44:20,21,22 47:11 48:25 49:3	individually 16:19,21 19:11	instead 37:2	invitation 27:15
idea 39:24 42:21	improvement s 9:1	individuals 5:11	integral 23:9	invite 4:14
ideas 35:2 51:23 52:10	include 18:13,17 29:4 34:16 51:17	inform 7:7	intended 19:11 22:3,14	inviting 27:22
identical	included	information	intent 33:22	involved 42:9 51:16
			interact 40:21	involvement

53:7	Judy 2:11 4:12,14 11:17,19 18:23 19:10, 18,22 20:2 21:12 29:19 30:18 34:11 35:11 48:1,6 55:1	Ken 2:15 3:8 4:20 11:15 31:15	kinds 29:6	Lands 13:22
island 41:9, 12 46:7,14			knew 11:14	large 49:6
islands 41:11 46:3,9		Kerrie 4:4,14, 18 29:19 30:14 34:11 41:14 42:3	knowing 10:6	larger 9:24
issue 27:20 28:23	July 5:22	key 13:4 49:19	knowledge 12:7	last 8:21 21:7 39:25 43:12, 13 49:10
issues 37:11	jump 6:22 23:14 28:6	kick 9:12	known 7:6	late 47:5 48:15
items 6:10 43:2	jumping 4:22	kick-off 7:19 9:6	knows 42:18	later 4:23
<hr/> J <hr/>	June 9:12	kind 2:23 3:17 4:24 7:25 8:9 9:3 10:2,3 12:2, 13 15:23,25 18:12,21 19:11 20:15 24:20 25:22, 23 26:5 27:3, 11 28:1,8,12, 16 31:22,23, 25 32:4,12 33:23,25 34:3,8,23 35:2,25 36:13 38:14,21 39:3,19,24 40:4,8,9,20, 24 43:20 44:5 45:9,12,21 46:16,22 48:7 51:7 53:4 55:8	Koski 4:4,14 29:19,22 32:12 34:11, 22 42:5,24 43:16 44:9, 17,19 45:2,5, 13,15 47:19 53:11,14 54:12	Lauren 3:23
	<hr/> K <hr/>			lead 10:7 11:22 33:20
Jacobs 2:15, 18 18:24	Kayla 4:21 47:2,19 48:17			leader 45:10 49:4
job 1:25 3:13			<hr/> L <hr/>	leading 48:8
John 4:8,10, 11 35:22 37:13	keep 3:18 6:19 26:11 30:15 32:8 44:19 46:16 47:17 48:12 52:6		L'ETOILE 4:8, 10 35:11 37:15	learned 14:3
join 4:16 47:4			lagged 19:16	left 10:6 12:2, 13
joining 47:19 48:17 53:12	keeping 8:9		Lake 40:1 42:15	lend 28:18
Jones 3:24 30:11 32:18 48:24	keeps 30:11		landmarked 40:9	less 23:11 29:25 31:13
	Kelly 3:22			lessons 14:3

let 2:11,20 25:18	24:3,25	27:3,12 42:11	maintain 18:7 28:12 33:14 44:2	41:22
light 52:14	Linkages 7:5	looking 9:11 15:19 20:10 41:19 42:21 43:5,7 48:3 52:2	maintenance 14:24,25 17:15,16 28:1 29:9 30:1,9 42:24,25 48:10,25 50:1	manuals 30:10
lighter 37:24	list 4:20 9:21, 22 10:20,22, 24 11:6,9 15:14,16 18:11 48:12	looks 3:12 18:1 35:6,10	major 9:23 14:6 16:8,9	many 38:19 43:14
lights 36:4	little 2:6 3:5 4:22 6:13 7:21,23,25 8:12 9:4,7,9 10:1 12:22 15:21 19:17 20:11 31:13 35:8 39:15 44:15 52:13 54:16	Lori 47:6 48:19	majority 34:13	Mapes 36:12
like 2:10 3:11, 13 15:23 18:1,16 21:14 24:18 25:12 27:6 31:6,11 32:1,20 33:14,17 35:6,9,10 36:2,3,6,19 37:1,2 38:15, 20,24 40:7,22 41:9 42:20,25 43:1,17 44:10 46:25 50:6,8 53:11 54:20	local 13:1	lose 8:10	make 3:14 28:19 48:22 49:21 52:5 53:24 55:4	marks 50:16
limited 39:11	locations 46:19	lost 49:25	makes 32:2 45:7 52:9	Master 34:1 36:1 52:11,14
line 2:18 3:21, 23 4:6 21:25 49:15	locked 42:1	lot 10:16 14:9 17:10 25:8 27:18 36:7 46:10 51:20, 21 53:7 54:4	making 7:8 8:10 12:8 27:21 41:19	match 36:8
liner 28:17	long 51:6	lots 50:13	Malloy 4:3	matches 34:1,3 52:12
liners 30:4	long-term 17:16	lump 15:25	Manager 2:11	material 6:8 15:8,11 32:23 46:23
lines 21:19,20 22:3,5,21 23:6,15,20	longer 36:12	M	manmade 41:11	materials 5:20 13:9 30:7 47:25
	looked 7:24 18:12 25:12	made 39:3 47:13 50:12	Mansion	Matt 4:12,13
		main 40:12 43:23		matter 38:7
				may 2:25 3:2, 15 4:16,22 10:14 26:11 29:2,11,12,

<p>14,16 32:6 38:19 39:11, 21 40:22 45:15,24 47:5 54:5</p> <p>maybe 23:15, 25 28:6 29:8 30:9 33:20 34:6 35:15,16 38:20 40:1,6, 13 43:23 44:7,10 45:11 51:1 52:13</p> <p>Mccarran 41:22</p> <p>mean 18:13 22:14 28:1,7 32:20,22 44:21 45:17 48:7 52:8</p> <p>means 12:23 32:10,21 45:23</p> <p>meet 7:14 54:8</p> <p>meeting 1:10 2:15,22 4:16 5:4,14 6:11, 12,14,15,17 7:19,22,24 8:13,18,21 9:6,9 10:2,3, 4,6,15,25</p>	<p>11:1,3,6,16, 18 15:9,13, 17,18 16:4 31:7 33:1,4,5, 8,10 35:3 38:12 46:24 47:20 48:8 52:21,24 53:4,12 54:22 55:16</p> <p>meetings 3:7 5:22 6:3,21 8:16 10:18 31:8,9 33:16 54:16 55:9</p> <p>member 10:22 18:25 25:19 50:6,9</p> <p>members 4:15 9:21 10:20 15:14, 16,17,21 16:16,20 17:1,20,21 18:16 54:9</p> <p>memoranda 12:6</p> <p>mention 36:22</p> <p>mentioned 20:3 25:5 35:12 47:8 48:24</p>	<p>message 54:10</p> <p>met 6:9 16:23</p> <p>methods 45:23</p> <p>Michael 4:3</p> <p>Michon 4:2</p> <p>mid-century 41:21</p> <p>mid-span 24:24 25:5</p> <p>middle 21:20 23:6 39:2,19</p> <p>might 24:25 27:15,16 30:8 36:22 37:12, 14 51:3</p> <p>Mike 2:17 3:9, 21 18:21,24 25:8,23 28:6 30:3 37:8,14 48:1 49:16</p> <p>mind 6:19 37:14 38:23 39:23 40:15 50:16,20</p> <p>minimize</p>	<p>7:14 29:5</p> <p>minimizing 27:3</p> <p>minimum 49:8</p> <p>minor 13:15</p> <p>minute 2:24</p> <p>miscellaneous 8:7</p> <p>missing 11:14</p> <p>mitigation 18:3</p> <p>model 13:3</p> <p>modeled 7:10</p> <p>modeling 13:3</p> <p>modern 41:21</p> <p>money 51:24</p> <p>months 9:19</p> <p>more 5:10</p>	<p>7:25 12:16,22 14:22 23:11 24:6,15,17,25 29:8,25 34:12,13 35:8,14,17,19 36:3,10,16 37:23 38:17, 21,25 39:15 40:13 49:9</p> <p>Moreno 4:3</p> <p>morning 2:19 32:13</p> <p>most 13:14 30:13 32:2 35:7</p> <p>mother 30:22</p> <p>mountains 44:3,7</p> <p>move 6:23 10:17 12:16, 25 34:24 41:3 42:22 49:19</p> <p>moved 8:7</p> <p>moves 23:3 49:2</p> <p>moving 3:5 4:16 8:17 15:2 28:4</p>
--	--	---	--	---

30:15 32:2,9, 22 34:9 54:18	NDSL 13:21	new 6:8	nuisance 29:13	old 51:4
much 18:1 19:15 39:22 48:14,16	nearby 41:22	next 8:22 9:10,12 19:10,18,22 20:2,24 21:12,24 22:17 23:4, 12,21 24:2 33:7 45:8 46:23 54:21	number 15:3 37:5 49:8	once 48:18 52:23
multimodal 9:1	nearly 49:5		<hr/> O <hr/>	one 8:17,21 12:1 13:17 14:6 15:5 17:22 18:7 19:6 20:2,4, 24 22:17 23:4 25:12 29:9 30:18 36:11, 25 37:11,14 39:23 40:5,6, 11,12,24 41:9,13 43:12,13,24 45:24 46:1 47:15 51:12 52:11,12
must 37:14	necessarily 27:24 32:20 44:11 48:4	nice 42:22	obstructing 44:4	
mute 3:12 41:15	necessary 26:13	nine 4:23 16:8,20 17:1	obstructions 20:17,20 21:1,8	
<hr/> N <hr/>	need 6:8 7:14 8:24 10:6 13:20 23:7 27:20 28:3 32:5,14,19 39:25 41:15 43:10 53:19 55:7	none 38:24 54:14	obtained 13:23	
name 2:23 49:11	needed 11:11,20 14:6	normal 24:15	obviously 47:12 48:25	ones 27:18 32:8 51:8
names 4:5	needs 8:6 9:2 13:23 49:14 53:25	north 20:18 21:8 28:11 46:6,9	off 9:13 31:22,23 45:15 46:11 51:10	ongoing 12:25
narrowing 43:17	Negrete 4:12	note 3:14 14:13 52:5	offer 29:16	only 18:14,15 39:21
natural 7:15	NEPA 6:1 7:9 12:4 15:4 49:23	notes 2:22 12:18 30:15	office 2:15	open 12:13 25:21 37:18, 21,23 38:25 50:7
nature 27:1 28:21 31:9 41:11 42:13	Nevada 1:12 2:2 56:1	November 1:11 2:2	offshoot 44:12	
NDEP 13:21 14:1,2		nuances 14:11	oftentimes 47:24	open-ended 12:2
NDOT 11:2,25 12:14 49:1,5				

openness 44:19	others 29:12 35:9 40:12 42:12 45:12 55:5	packet 16:3	33:21	5:19,23 6:15 9:14,23 10:19 11:7 13:11 14:14,17,22 15:23 17:22 31:7,11,14
operations 30:10 43:1	ourselves 27:21	packets 16:6	paving 36:4	
opinion 29:15	outside 52:13	parallel 21:17 23:11 24:16, 20	pedestrian 38:8	person 44:13
opportunity 39:12 50:10	over 3:4 6:16 11:15,16 18:21 20:23 26:16	parapet 37:18	pedestrians 37:25	perspective 13:6 24:12 31:14 33:20 35:24
option 20:14 23:5 25:1 39:12,14	overall 18:14, 17,19 31:21 41:2,17	park 17:23 18:2,7	PEL 7:6 10:10 12:12,14,17	phantom 22:2
options 6:25 19:24 26:16 38:24 48:5	overhang 38:15	part 12:5,24 34:14 41:9,12	Penrose 47:6	phased 11:20
order 50:15	overview 5:5	participated 15:17 16:21	people 2:25 29:11 33:12 35:6 44:2,24 51:16,19	phonetic 4:3, 4
organizations 9:24	own 36:7 45:25	participation 11:4 54:15,25	percent 8:2,4	pictorially 37:16
organize 10:4	owners 9:25	particular 38:12 50:15 51:6	Perfect 48:14	piecemealing 43:6
organized 50:17	P	particularly 28:25	perhaps 42:12	pier 14:7,15 16:10 17:2 19:7,9,15,20 20:10,16,24 21:1,15,21,23 22:7,13,14,21 23:5,7,9,10, 15 24:4 26:9 29:4 31:12,19 39:11,13,22
oriented 21:17 23:10	package 7:3 34:20	pass 26:2 27:8	permit 11:10 13:17,20,21, 22 14:1,2,10	
originally 9:17	packages 34:17	past 36:25 45:7	permits 13:14,25 14:3,6	
other's 41:3		path 28:12	permitting	piers 21:17

place 22:8 29:2 46:23	Police 48:20	precast 17:3, 7 19:7 20:12, 21,25 21:15, 22 22:2,4,8, 18,23 23:13, 20 24:1 25:1 26:15,19 27:6,18 28:24 31:19	11:9 13:14 27:16	processes 7:9
places 27:18 28:25 48:18	poll 33:11		prestressed 22:2	procure 13:20
plan 7:2 9:10 21:14 22:11 23:4 24:5,18 34:1 36:1 52:11,15 54:2	poor 16:14		pretty 19:8 26:23 31:21 34:25 40:9	professing 44:13
Planing 7:5	pop 48:12	preclude 37:9 38:24	prevent 29:4	profile 26:17, 21,22 27:4
planning 9:17 34:16 51:14	populated 12:15	predict 40:16	prevention 18:5	program 30:13
plans 9:2 51:4	portion 41:8	preferred 30:1	previous 14:18 47:8	project 1:5 2:11,13 3:4 5:4,11,17 6:7, 24 7:10,14 8:15,24 9:3 12:16,25 13:19 14:4 23:3 26:24 29:16 30:6 42:10 51:12 52:19 53:24, 25
play 27:13	possibility 50:21	preliminary 12:8	previously 31:6	projected 52:7
plus 16:12	possible 14:14 20:20 38:10 40:3 47:13	preparation 10:18	prior 34:20 52:20 53:5	projects 53:20
point 26:3 29:18 31:2 35:1,21 40:7 45:14 48:9 49:17 53:23 54:1	possibly 47:16	prepared 12:15 16:2	priorities 47:15	properties 12:3,7,10 27:1
pointing 53:17	post 55:6	present 6:20 8:20 10:25 20:17 32:23	priority 48:12	property 9:25
points 20:15 29:22 43:16 44:9 46:6,20	potential 26:9 27:4 28:22 46:18	presentation 3:3,12,14 4:25 51:21 55:3,7	probably 30:6 34:12,13 47:10	
	potentially 28:23 31:13 52:6	presented 5:20 6:10	process 5:25 6:7 7:5,7,10, 11 9:13 12:4, 11 52:18	
	pre-thought 50:17			

protection 30:8 37:12 38:2	39:20	55:1	18:14,19 19:13	31:10,18 32:1 33:3
provide 8:25 26:16 33:18 35:23 37:12, 23 49:1	push 9:19	quite 39:6 41:18,23 54:3	rather 23:19 39:13 52:9	recommende d 21:14
provided 5:12 16:16,22 25:6 41:12	pushed 24:13	<hr/> R <hr/>	readily 26:16	records 30:11
provides 22:7 28:17	put 7:25 30:6 33:25 34:2 43:11 46:23 51:7	radar 52:6	real 11:17 30:11 55:1	recreation 17:17
pubic 51:20	putting 12:6 38:1 51:3	rail 38:1	really 11:5 14:9 15:25 18:18 23:8 25:9 35:21 36:1,14,17 43:4,15 44:21 47:11 52:15 54:17,19,24	rectangular 24:6,12
public 6:11 7:8,12,18,19, 22 8:10,21 9:9 25:22 32:23 33:2 34:15,18,21 35:4 36:24,25 41:1 43:9,15 51:21,23 52:20,21 53:2,4,5	<hr/> Q <hr/>	railing 21:25 37:1,10,19, 21,25 38:2,25 44:16,17	reason 51:19	reduce 5:25
pull 47:25	qualitative 16:17	railings 37:7 38:17	reasoning 32:5	referring 5:9
pulled 13:12	quality 13:23	rails 38:8	recap 6:13 10:1 11:18 55:8	regard 45:10
purpose 5:3 6:7 7:14 8:24 38:14	question 25:12,18,20, 24,25 26:18 28:11 35:11 37:13 50:16 52:17 53:8,16	Ralston 50:21 52:5 54:3	received 5:7 7:21 8:2 11:4	regarding 6:15 15:8 29:15
purposefully	questions 3:15,17,18 6:20 15:6,7, 11 25:10,21 27:10 30:17 47:1 52:2,3 54:14	ramp 47:17	regards 17:22	regional 1:4 9:2
	quick 11:17	range 6:1	receiving 7:11	regulatory 5:23 6:15 10:20 11:7 13:11 14:17 15:24 31:7
		rank 19:5	recommendat ions 6:16	reiterate 47:9
		ranked 16:14		
		ranking 19:4		
		rankings		

related 14:11, 22	3:22	40:25 41:20	rigidly 24:10	28:17
relative 20:6	represent 9:24 21:20 22:3	respective 54:8	risk 17:15	RTC 1:10 2:12 7:17 52:19,22 53:1,4 54:7
remember 44:1 49:11	representatio n 11:1 19:12	respond 9:2	river 13:4,7,8 14:25 17:17 20:17,23 21:2,5,8,9,17 22:22 23:11 24:16 39:3 44:6 47:11, 17,23,25 48:4,9,20,21	rtcwashoe. com 55:11 rtcwashoe. com. 55:7
removal 13:4 15:1 48:21 50:2	request 55:2	responded 2:9 5:2		ruing 13:13
remove 28:20	require 13:3 20:21 21:4,9	response 29:16 35:25	river/park 14:25	run 3:3
Reno 1:12 2:2 7:17 13:18 34:1 47:10 48:20 52:17, 19,22 53:1,4, 8	required 13:19 14:10, 24 21:3,22 28:2	rest 35:10 41:20	Riverside 54:3	<hr/> S <hr/>
Reno-sparks 11:2	requirements 5:20,23 6:16 11:7 13:12 14:14,17 23:3 36:8	retired 43:13	road 26:22 30:5	SAEMAN 55:1,12
replace 42:23	resolved 11:21	retract 45:2	roadway 5:24 6:17 15:13, 20,24 22:25 23:2 26:4,17, 21 27:4 31:8	said 31:6 32:20 33:22 40:22 50:8 54:20
replaced 39:25 40:18 43:13	respect 27:21 36:24 39:23 41:3 43:3 46:17 55:5	review 6:7 51:5	Ron 47:6	same 19:19 21:1 40:20 41:6 44:11 52:12
replacing 42:21	respectful 42:13	revisited 41:18	roost 29:2	
Reported 1:24	respecting	riffraff 18:8	roosting 28:23 29:5	SANTER 35:24 38:4,11 39:9,16 42:19 43:17,23 44:16,18
reporter 2:21		rigid 17:6 19:5,13,15 20:3,8 21:7 24:2,9,18,19 26:8 39:14	rough 3:20	

45:1,6 46:20	25 19:2,12	51:19	22:4,18 24:7, 12,20 28:25	shown 22:1,6 26:6 37:17
Satner 3:22	scoring 15:20 16:3,6,16,25 17:19 18:10, 22	seemed 31:11 44:10	shapes 30:3	shows 19:5 22:11
saw 23:13		seems 27:18 36:19 38:20	sheet 16:25	side 3:9 18:7 22:1 33:23 34:9 36:3 46:7
say 29:3 32:19 41:2, 11,17 50:6	screen 2:24 4:6,25 19:2, 10	selecting 40:15	sheets 16:17 17:19	
saying 31:15 39:17	Seaman 3:21	send 16:7	SHIPO 11:1	sidewalk 23:1 38:2 39:3
scale 16:14	seats 22:23	sending 33:11	shoot 50:18	Sierra 40:1 42:15
scape 51:6	second 4:20 33:4,5	sense 32:3 52:9	shorter 39:6, 7 41:10	sight 8:11 51:9
schedule 6:8 9:3 17:14 33:14	secondary 40:13	separate 38:18 52:13	should 5:6 6:4,23 8:7,23 9:20 23:14 25:11 32:8 40:12 42:12 46:16 51:24	signed 12:14
scheduled 11:11 54:22	section 12:19,22 13:1 14:22 22:17 24:22,23 25:2,5,22 26:10	separately 15:22	shouldn't 44:22	signing 10:11
schematics 37:17		series 43:10	show 43:10	similar 14:19 19:16 22:23 23:4,13 31:21 32:25 38:5 42:23 43:1 45:21
scope 6:7,24 17:24	sections 15:6 27:7 29:1	set 22:8 23:8 36:2	showed 22:11	since 6:9 15:10 18:15 48:15
score 17:13 19:1,3	sediment 13:4,8 15:1	setting 21:22	showing 24:6,17 25:13 40:25 41:1 43:5,7	single 14:7, 15 16:9 17:2
scores 16:19, 21,22,24 18:10,13,17,	see-through 37:2,7,10	several 3:16 14:10		
	seem 36:23	shape 21:20		

19:7,8,15,20 20:8,10,16,24 21:1,15 23:4 27:5 31:12,19 39:11,22 40:11 46:13	Smith 1:24	somewhere 49:15	43:2	staff 54:8
site 45:25	smooth 23:19,22 25:4	sorry 4:9 45:17 48:17	specific 33:19 34:6 53:25	stakeholder 1:6,10 4:15 5:13,14 6:11, 14 7:12,16,24 8:13,18 9:21 10:1,15,21 16:3 25:19 33:1,2,5,7,15 34:20 35:3 46:23 50:5,9 52:23 54:21 55:8
sits 51:9	smoother 23:25 24:25	sort 30:8 44:12 45:20 47:16	specifically 3:17 8:19 36:18 50:9	stakeholders 4:15 7:8 34:17
sitting 22:21 44:24	soffit 23:22 29:10	sorts 51:23	specifics 3:10 11:11,16	standard 37:17
situation 3:6 50:21	solid 37:2,18	sounds 38:24	speculation 54:4	standards 36:2,15,17,20
skewed 24:15	somebody 4:6 45:15 48:1	south 46:6,9	spend 6:16	standing 44:4
slide 8:23 9:20 19:18 21:12,24 23:12,21 24:2 31:4 55:2	somehow 40:23 42:14 44:14	span 14:7 16:10 17:5 19:20 20:6,8, 9 21:7 24:2 26:20 27:5 31:12,20 39:14,22	spent 17:10	star 9:9
slides 10:14	something 12:23 25:11 28:3,8 29:8 33:25 34:2,5, 6 35:15,17 37:8,19 38:5 39:5,7 40:15 42:22 46:9 49:18,20,22 50:6,10 52:13 54:5	speak 3:1 29:20 32:15 48:21	spiders 29:7	start 9:14 12:8 15:2 26:24
slightly 10:21 15:14	sometime 41:18	speaker 3:12	split 15:22	started 2:7
slipped 9:15	sometimes 50:24 54:16	special 13:17 38:20	spoken 53:18	starting 28:10 40:7 46:22
slit 17:2		specialized 5:10	sponsor 13:2	
sloped 29:2		specialty	spot 39:20 42:6	
small 5:10			spots 3:16	
			spring 49:10	
			stab 27:23	

State 13:22 56:1	51:6	53:6	superstructur es 26:6	17:1,20 18:25 33:3,4,15 55:9
state- 8:25	Street's 43:23	stuff 3:7 15:24 35:9 52:7	support 24:11 25:6 26:13 42:7 43:19 47:22	TAC-1 5:22 6:14,20 10:19,25 11:3,16,18, 21,23 12:18 13:13,16,18 14:1,19,21 15:2,8,19 31:6,10 32:1 48:8
steel 17:4,8 19:16 20:14	Streetcape 36:16	style 40:8	supported 42:17	
Stevenson 50:22 52:5 53:17	streets 50:24	styling 36:14, 20	supports 45:9	
stick 20:8	Streetscape 34:1 36:1,3, 14,20 50:25 52:11,14	subtle 11:9 24:5	surface 23:19 28:17 30:7	TAC-2 5:24 6:17,20 15:13,14,18 18:10,22 31:8,17 32:1
sticking 52:10	structural 24:11 27:12 45:20	subtly 18:14	surfaces 29:4	
still 9:14 11:20 20:16 40:1 54:4	structurally 8:24	successful 8:14 13:5	surrounding 53:23	TACS 5:9,10, 21
storm 13:21	structure 13:10 14:24 20:19 23:7,16 24:8 25:4 26:1,13	such 27:19 30:4 38:9 53:25	SWG 2:9 5:2	take 10:17 27:23 34:15 44:25 52:25
strategic 51:4	structures 44:3	summaries 16:18	SWG-1 11:20 12:2,13 13:13,15	takeaways 10:3
streamlines 7:8	structures 44:3	summarize 12:6	T	
street 7:11 14:4 36:6,9 37:3,4,6,24 38:13 39:2,7, 18 40:10,23 42:10,11,15 44:1,12,24 45:4,10 47:12 49:5,6,10	studies 50:23	summary 13:11	table 14:5,13, 18 28:9	taken 25:15
	study 6:25 9:12,18,22 10:23 12:5 15:15 33:6 35:1 49:22	superstructur e 20:22 21:4, 10 24:9 25:16	TAC 6:3 8:16 10:18 15:22 16:16,25	talk 2:12 6:14 36:2 47:21 54:23 55:15
				talked 7:23

13:25 20:11 28:1	themes 16:9 33:24 35:12	27:24 30:6 39:1	44:14	took 16:5 19:1
talking 8:6 17:9 42:25 44:16	therefore 19:25	thoughts 41:7 50:18	tight 14:8,15, 20 16:10 17:6 19:14 31:22	top 21:23,25 47:23
team 2:12 3:4 5:18 8:9 10:3, 17 16:2,7 17:10 18:10 49:4,20 52:9, 16	Theresa 3:23 30:11 49:16	three 10:25 16:8,9 19:24 21:13 26:1 31:18 32:2,8 33:23 41:21 52:10	time 6:16,19 15:6 17:10 36:11 43:13 45:23 47:14 51:6,12	Tortelli 2:5, 10,11,17,20 4:2,9,11,13, 18 5:3 15:5 25:8,17 27:9, 23 29:21 30:14,20,24 31:1,17 32:10,14,17, 19 34:19,23 35:21 42:20 43:22 46:21 48:7,16,23 49:18,25 50:3,12,19 52:4 53:10 54:13 55:6,13
technical 5:8 7:12	thing 12:12 30:8 32:25 36:13 38:14 39:23 40:20 41:6 43:25	three-span 20:19	timeframes 11:11	
term 45:20	things 3:5,9 6:23 8:7 11:19 12:1 27:1,13,19 28:15,20 29:3 30:2 31:5 36:23 38:21, 23 40:6 45:21 46:1,10,15 50:14 54:18	throttle 46:6	times 51:21	
terminate 38:8		through 2:24 3:3,11,14,20 4:16,24 5:25 9:13 12:16,25 13:21 17:10 18:5,21 21:18 22:17 25:3 34:19 35:3 48:13 49:21 55:2	tipping 29:25	
terms 20:6		throw 50:10	today 2:22 3:3 6:7 26:6 30:12 42:18 47:5,7 53:12 54:18	toss 37:14
than 22:7 23:19 24:1,25 26:5 29:9 35:8 39:7,13 52:10	thinking 35:12 39:24 40:20 41:5 44:14 51:7	throwing 50:23	today's 5:3	total 51:13
their 13:3,22 16:19,21 27:14 51:24	thinks 32:5		together 12:6 16:1 19:20 33:25 34:2 43:6 44:15 46:23 51:3,8 52:25 53:20	totaled 19:2
theme 8:18 34:3,4,24,25 35:13,20 52:12	thinner 24:23	Thursday 1:11 2:2	Toni 4:3 50:11,12 52:4 53:12	totally 15:19
	third 52:23	tie 43:14		touch 7:20 8:11 55:15
	thought			tough 27:2 32:13
				toward 15:2

34:9 53:24	33:15	<hr/> U <hr/>	40:7	53:21
towards 29:25	trying 3:6 17:11 18:6 28:12 33:14 39:13,16	U.S. 10:7	unless 35:22	valuable 11:5
track 3:18		UBT 49:6	unrest 13:3	various 11:8 12:6 17:13
traffic 50:23 52:7 53:25	turn 11:15 18:20	ultimately 20:11 40:17	update 12:17 52:19 53:5 54:9 55:8	vehicle 37:12, 22 38:1 49:12
train 45:7	two 2:14 5:22 8:16 13:25 14:3 15:22 18:4,15,16 20:6 31:9,21 36:19 48:18 49:8	Um-hum 55:13	updated 13:3, 13,16	vehicles 38:2, 9
transparent 38:17		uncomfortabl e 54:17	updates 54:7	vehicular 38:18
TRANSPORT ATION 1:4	two-part 35:25 36:13	undefined 16:12	updating 48:15	venturing 35:16
Travis 4:4		under 14:8,22 16:10 17:5 18:8 19:9,14 22:20 23:21 28:7,23 31:12	upstream 13:9	Vern 4:3
treatment 28:17	tying 26:23		use 13:17 28:19 30:7 49:6	versus 26:4,6
tried 10:16 17:12 38:14	type 13:5 17:25 21:11 35:17 37:9 39:22 40:6 43:19	underneath 24:1 25:3 27:19 28:13, 14 49:7,13	used 36:5 49:12	vertically 19:19
trouble 30:22			user 16:13	vet 35:2
trucks 49:6	types 8:3 14:7 26:1 28:3 32:2 36:19 37:9 40:16	understand 30:2	using 7:4 13:3 30:3	Vianney 1:24
True 45:6		unique 36:7 40:5 42:12 45:25	<hr/> V <hr/>	view 19:10,22 21:15,24 22:10 23:12 24:5 44:2,4, 20,22 45:3
Truhill 4:4	typically 22:7 36:23 47:6	uniqueness	vacuum	views 44:21
try 3:20 29:5				

viewshed 14:23	23:7,9 24:4 25:7	website 55:7, 8,10	width 22:25	worked 37:4
Virgina 39:18	walls 22:24 24:10 26:11 28:15 37:18	weeds 38:12	will 3:3,8,9,18 5:8 6:3,22 7:4 8:17,20 9:12 12:3,6,24 19:17 20:15 21:4 22:4 23:2,16 25:17,20 26:16 27:23 28:13,20 29:5 30:15,22 32:15 33:6,11 34:19 38:8 39:4 40:21 43:12 45:25 49:1,18 52:5, 16,25 53:1,3 55:6,10,14,15	worker 50:13
Virginia 7:11 14:4 36:6 37:4 38:13 40:10,23 41:8 42:10,11 43:23 44:1, 12,24 45:4,9 47:12 49:6,10	want 6:7 7:20 26:21 29:2 33:19 35:2, 19,23 37:19 40:11 43:14 46:13 47:9 49:21 50:10	welcome 2:5, 10 went 6:15 17:1 west 44:2,20, 23 wherever 44:4 whether 10:9 11:22 14:7 24:15 40:16 45:20,22	Williams 47:6	working 1:6, 10 5:13,14 6:12,14 7:17, 24 8:13,18 9:7,21 10:1, 15,21 14:1 16:4 25:19 33:1,2,5,7,15 34:20 35:3,16 42:16 46:24 47:8 50:5,9 52:24 53:21 54:21 55:9
virtual 3:6	wanted 2:20 8:11 10:9,10 25:18 31:5 32:4 34:23 44:2 53:16	while 20:16 36:22	Wingfield 17:23	works 41:20
visible 22:5	wants 12:21	wide 22:14 41:9,12	within 42:9, 17 51:9	worry 27:20
visually 22:9, 20 23:22	Ward 51:17	widen 39:12, 13	without 18:8 26:17	worth 46:10
visuals 21:13	water 4:21 13:2,21,23 25:14 47:3	widening 38:15 46:4	work 4:24 9:13 20:22 21:3,9 24:14 28:20 39:21 45:23 48:13 52:16 53:19	worthy 20:13
vocal 35:7	waterways 14:1	wider 22:7 39:3,18 41:7		write 50:15
volumes 52:7	way 28:11 38:11,22 44:22			wrong 42:4 48:2
W	ways 18:12 27:15			Y
Walk 38:18				year 8:22 9:10,12,18 33:16
walkable 38:22				
wall 21:21 22:7,13,15				

years 37:5
49:5,8

yelling 30:22

yet 54:3 55:11

yourself 3:1

Z

zoom 22:12