

**AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES
March 2, 2017 – 9:00 a.m.**

The Amador County Transportation Commission (ACTC) met at the Amador County Transportation Commission Offices, 117 Valley View Way, Sutter Creek, California on the above date, and the following proceedings were had, to wit:

Present on Roll Call:

Brian Oneto, Chairman
Jon Colburn, Vice Chairman
Dominic Atlan
Patrick Crew, Alternate for Richard Forster
Dave Richards
Tim Murphy

Also Present:

John Gedney, ACTC Executive Director
Allison Platt, ACTC Transportation Planner
Nancy Champlin, ACTC Administrative Secretary
Patricia Maggie Amarant, Amador Transit General Manager
Carl Baker, Office of Rural Planning, Caltrans District 10

AGENDA:

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Richards, and unanimously carried to approve the Agenda as presented.

PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA: Vice Chairman Colburn noted that the Mayors Select Committee did not meet as there were no changes being made to ACTC or LAFCO.

CLOSED SESSION:

At 9:05 a.m. the Chairman called for a closed session as noticed for Conference with Legal Counsel (Government Code §54956.9) and Public Employee Performance Evaluation (Government Code §54957). At 10:05 a.m. the Chairman resumed the regular session of ACTC and reported that direction was given to staff for both closed session items.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Commissioner Atlan requested item 8 be pulled from the Consent Agenda and voted on separately.

Commissioner Crew abstained from voting on minutes for items #1 and #6 as he was not present.

Approve Chairman's signature on letter to Assemblyman Bigelow in Support of AB 174: Vice Chairman Colburn asked about the timing on the legislation. Mr. Gedney will look into the current status of the bill.

Approve Resolution 17-00 Approving Amendments to the 2016/17 Overall Work Program: Mr. Gedney advised that action on the amendments had been taken at a prior meeting and a resolution was not presented at that time.

Motion: It was moved by Vice Chairman Colburn, seconded by Commissioner Murphy, and carried to approve the Consent Agenda items 1 and 6.

Ayes: Oneto, Colburn, Atlan, Richards, Murphy
Noes:
Abstain: Crew

Motion: It was moved by Vice Chairman Colburn, seconded by Commissioner Murphy, and unanimously carried to approve the Consent Agenda items 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7.

Approve Resolutions to Formalize Compliance with CalPERS: Commissioner Atlan asked what the employees currently contribute to CalPERS and Mr. Gedney replied two employees are at the Classic level and the other staff are PEPRA. The resolutions are to formally recognize the current policy that ACTC pays 2% of the contribution for the Classic employees plus the employer contribution. Chairman Oneto asked about longevity pay and it was clarified that instead of showing a longevity raise at 10, 15, or 20 years, the step increases reflect that timeframe. CalPERS treats longevity pay differently so that term is no longer being used. Commissioner Murphy commented that the resolutions are requirements to formalize what is currently in place. Changes would need to be agendized and discussed at a later meeting. Mr. Gedney added that this issue had been discussed with the Finance Committee and there is no impact to the budget. He added that since ACTC withdrew accounting responsibilities from the County, CalPERS is requiring ACTC to show their compliance with regulations.

Motion: It was moved by Vice Chairman Colburn, seconded by Commissioner Murphy, and carried to approve the resolutions to formalize details required for compliance with the California Public Employee Retirement System (CalPERS).

Ayes: Oneto, Colburn, Murphy, Richards, Crew
Noes: Atlan
Abstain: None

REGULAR AGENDA:

Request for Caltrans Independent Review and Comment on Potential Impacts to Interregional Travel Arising from Major Development Plans along the State Route 16 Corridor: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report.

Mr. Baker commented that, as a liaison, he tries to help ACTC be effective when working with Caltrans District 10. If ACTC wants to request public records from Caltrans, he would recommend that the letter solely ask for public records. Other discussion topics should be separate from the request so that they can be addressed separately. The public record request should be as specific as possible. He added that Caltrans District 10 will not write a letter responding to an intergovernmental review (IGR) project

in a different Caltrans District unless they receive a request to make comments. District 3 can request a comment from District 10, however District 3 has the discretion of whether or not to use any comments submitted. The District where a project is located is responsible for writing a letter to the lead agency.

Chairman Oneto asked if District 10 had provided any comments to District 3 regarding the SR 16 relinquishment and Mr. Baker replied "no". He added that IGR reviews development projects that may or may not have impacts to the State highway system or transportation in general.

Mr. Gedney suggested that the request in the letter focus on the developments that have been identified, the relinquishment proposal that has been submitted by Caltrans, and ask for any related comments.

John Plasse, former commissioner, asked if District 10 is waiting for District 3 to ask them to comment, whereas this commission is requesting District 10 to comment. Mr. Baker replied that many developments are proposed and typically a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document goes to the State Clearinghouse and is requested to be routed to various State agencies. This NOP would have been submitted by Sacramento County with names of who should receive it. Caltrans District 3 would typically receive a copy and it would be up to them to forward a copy to District 10. District 10 does not have the resources to go to the State Clearinghouse to look for documents outside of their own District. As noted earlier, comments would be routed to the District where the project lies. A request from ACTC to comment on the development project can be made and District 10 comments will go to District 3.

Mr. Gedney commented that he would like to include in the letter the signatories to the petition, comments in support of the interregional functionality of SR 16, and the most recent notice of a planned United States bicycle route which would include a preferred route along SR 16 corridor which demonstrates the international functionality of SR 16 for non-motorized travel.

If that section of SR 16 is relinquished through the California Transportation Commission (CTC), any subsequent environmental impact reports for any of the land use developments will not be subject to studying impacts on interregional travel. Commissioner Colburn would like District 10 to acknowledge the impacts of interregional traffic to Amador County and District 3.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Colburn, to direct staff to revise and update the subject letters.

Fiscal Year 2017/18 Unmet Transit Need Report: Mr. Gedney explained that he is requesting a modification to the recommendations contained in the report. He is asking for additional time to study and survey a new Camanche bus service instead of implementing the service July 1, 2017. The study of this new route would be added to the recommended overall feasibility study for evening/Saturday service, a satellite Dial-a-Ride location, and expanded Sacramento commuter service. The added study of the Camanche route would not increase the amount requested to perform the overall feasibility study (\$15,000 in Local Transportation Funds).

Commissioner Atlan asked about the estimate for the Camanche service and Ms. Platt replied that the methodology could be further refined to look at a route by route measurements. The calculated percent of disabilities and percent of limited means are rough estimates. By adding this proposed route to the feasibility study, we would gain more understanding through surveys and public input. Commissioner Atlan asked about running the service once a day instead of three times and Mr. Gedney replied that we are basing the times/runs per day on projections of potential riders and destinations. We currently do not have sound results from a survey or testimony to support the route in order to meet the required fare box recovery ratio. Mr. Gedney added that the Camanche bus service will remain as the highest priority to consider and hopefully be implemented when data is available to support it. Commissioner Murphy asked if there is a possibility of completing the Camanche study and implementing the service, if indicated, this fiscal year. Mr. Gedney replied staff will begin gathering data and conducting the survey to determine the feasibility.

Motion: It was moved by Commission Murphy, seconded by Vice Chairman Colburn, and carried to allocate \$15,000 to the feasibility study of the unmet needs as identified today.

Ayes: Oneto, Colburn, Murphy, Richards, Crew

Noes: Atlan

Abstain: None

Pedestrian Crossing Improvements: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report and advised that, based on subsequent conversations with Caltrans and Amador County staff, he is recommending that the Commission authorize \$40,000 from Regional Transportation Surface Program (RSTP) funds to install a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) crosswalk in Pine Grove instead of a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (HAWK system). It was discovered that the HAWK system would need to meet signal warrants before Caltrans would authorize installation.

Chairman Oneto asked who would maintain an RRFB and Mr. Baker replied it would be the jurisdiction. Caltrans would need to evaluate where the system would be installed if it were to replace or be near any existing equipment.

Motion: It was moved by Commission Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Richards, and unanimously carried to authorize up to \$80,000 for two Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) systems, one at Mel's crosswalk in Jackson and one for the Pine Grove town hall location.

Transportation Funding Proposal: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report. Commissioner Atlan commented that he would be in favor of a ½ cent sales tax as the County has one of the lowest sales tax in the area. He is against supporting AB 1 or SB 1 because there is no guarantee any of the money raised would be returned to Amador County even if designated as such. Chairman Oneto commented that he is also less supportive of legislation. Commissioner Richards commented that he considered a 20 cent increase in diesel too much. Chairman Murphy commented that some form of increase for funding will probably be approved by the legislature and any bill that increases gas tax or fees will hurt the chance of passing a local sales tax initiative. Vice Chairman Colburn also does not believe a local sales tax measure for roads would pass if legislation increases taxes.

Vice Chairman Colburn commented that it is his understanding that Federal Emergency Management Act (FEMA) funds are going to be available for flood damage. Ms. Platt noted that Amador County roadway damage estimates from the January storm was approximately \$1.8 million and February the estimate is \$2.066 million and rising. This estimate does not include city roads or State highways. Many of the problems from the February storms resulted in roads that previously only needed overlays now need complete rehabilitation. She believes that residents are becoming more aware of road conditions.

Mr. Plasse commented that State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds are not available for roadway repairs, but is for complete reconstruction or rehabilitation. He had previously proposed trying to allocate a portion of STIP funding to local road rehabilitation. He believes that this Commission should consider proposing projects for rehabilitation and utilizing some of the STIP funding. Mr. Gedney noted that Caltrans does not deny STIP funding be used on roadway rehabilitation, but they do discourage the use of Regional Improvement Program funds for off-system projects. If the County uses the money for that purpose, they are implying that there are no problems on the State highway system and therefore Caltrans may not spend State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) money in the county.

Regarding a sales tax measure, Mr. Gedney commented that staff could look at recommendations in the Pavement Management Condition reports and work with local jurisdictions, city managers, and County CEO to identify high priority projects. Options could be a formula distribution of revenue or identify and prioritize projects. Commissioner Atlan commented that when there is a restricted fund, such as Measure M for fire, it is easier to support and doing a feasibility study is a good idea. The Commission directed staff to begin talks with the County and cities.

Motion: It was moved by Vice Chairman Colburn, seconded by Commissioner Murphy, and unanimously carried to table sending letters at this time.

Potential Project Submission for United States Bicycle Route (USBR) 50: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report. Chairman Oneto commented that this subject has also been discussed with the Amador County Public Works committee.

There was a discussion regarding development projects and mitigation requirements if a roadway is owned by a local jurisdiction or Caltrans. Mr. Baker commented that when Caltrans reviews a development project, they look for impacts to the State highway system. They make recommendations to the lead agency on what they think needs to be done. It is up to the lead agency on how they condition the project. Not all of Caltrans' recommendations become conditions of approval for a project.

Vice Chairman Colburn commented that if Caltrans were to keep the portion of SR 16 being considered for relinquishment, improvements would be made before the traffic is generated. If Sacramento County owned the roadway the improvements would be funded through impact fees and traffic would be generated before the improvements were put in place. Mr. Blank from Sacramento County Department of Transportation agreed that projects would be financed through impact fees. When a development occurs and drops the level of service to an unacceptable level, then that is the trigger for improvements.

Mr. Baker commented on the original routing of the bicycle route and any alternative routes. Caltrans does support the idea and it is designated as the western express route with the bulk of the route on SR 88 through Amador County. He confirmed that US 50 and 80 are not available as bicycle routes as they are freeways. Adventure Cycling chose SR 88 because it is open all winter and the altitude isn't as high as other routes. In the long term, Caltrans would look at ways to widen some shoulders where possible. Vice Chairman Colburn commented on the jurisdictional liability if a route is officially designated and uses a local road. Ms. Platt noted that there were two options presented to Amador County Public Works and one of them stayed on SR 49.

This item was tabled to a later date.

ACTC Commissioner Reports:

- Commissioner Richards commented that this is his last meeting and he has enjoyed his term on the Commission. Chairman Oneto thanked Commissioner Richards for his many years of service and presented him with a plaque and ACTC polo shirt.
- Chairman Oneto commented that part of Pioneer/Volcano Road slid away but is still passable and Shake Ridge Road (Fiddletown Road) about 2 miles from SR 88 is closed indefinitely. Amador Pines has several routes closed.

ACTC Reports: Mr. Gedney reported that staff is working with the Calaveras COG and Tuolumne Transportation Commission to try and initiate a regional forum for mountain county issues. The forum would discuss policy and project issues and have a consensus on how to approach state legislators. It is anticipated the first forum will be held in September and hopefully consist of Amador, Alpine, Calaveras, El Dorado, Mariposa, and Tuolumne Counties.

Caltrans Report by Carl Baker:

- Commissioner Richards asked why Caltrans no longer blows snow from SR 88 into the canyon and instead it is stacked up along the road. Mr. Baker will report on what practice Caltrans maintenance uses.
- District 10 received a letter from Supervisor Forster regarding the crosswalk in Pine Grove and a response will be sent which includes action from today's meeting regarding a RRFB.
- Ms. Demetras met with Commissioner Atlan regarding the lone ditch issue.
- The vehicle code states that the speed limit on a two-lane highway is 55 mph. There can be a speed survey to increase the speed. The reason it was supported on SR 104 in 2003 was due to the road being mostly straight and flat with good sight lines. This would less likely be supported on the Sutter Creek/Amador City bypass due to the curves and terrain. However, a request can be made to Caltrans' Chief of Traffic Safety.
- There are liability issues with Caltrans maintenance giving away waste materials such as guardrails.
- Caltrans does not have any indication that there is a maintenance agreement with the City of Jackson for the vista point so Caltrans is responsible. If there is a particular problem, Mr. Baker can be contacted or the District 10 website can be used to submit a maintenance request.
- Caltrans is cooperating with the County on an application for the Pine Grove project using the Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) grant process. Deadline is May 12.

- The Collaborative Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRTP) is the same branch of FHWA for programs like the FLAP. Mr. Baker introduced a new planner that has just been hired to work with him and they are working with federal agencies on needs that are represented in plans.
- The statewide pedestrian/bicycle plan is out for review.
- District 10 is putting together an Active Transportation Plan (ATP) for the District. They are developing their projects by how they address complete streets, whether there are needs for sidewalks, bicycle lanes, transit, etc. They look through other agencies regional plans to try and identify those needs. This would be part of an internal Caltrans grant, but is not yet authorized for funding. Vice Chairman Colburn asked that the ATP include interregional travel.
- Vice Chairman Colburn asked to have an estimate from Caltrans on the roadway damage to the State highways in Amador County.
- Chairman Oneto asked about the yield at SR 16/49 and Mr. Baker advised that it has been referred to management. He will follow-up.
- Rumble strips and their placement was briefly discussed.

Claims:

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Richards, seconded by Commissioner Murphy, and carried to approve the revised claim list.

Adjournment:

At 12:05 p.m. the Chairman adjourned the meeting until 9:00 a.m. Thursday, April 6, 2017, at the Amador County Transportation Commission Offices, 117 Valley View Way, Sutter Creek, California.



Brian Oneto, Chairman
Amador County Transportation Commission

ATTEST:



Recording Secretary

(Note: Copies of referenced documents are available at the ACTC office.)