

**AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
June 1, 2017 – 9:30 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  
Richard Forster

**Absent**

John Plasse  
Tim Murphy

**Also Present:**

John Gedney, ACTC Executive Director  
Allison Platt, ACTC Transportation Planner  
Nancy Champlin, ACTC Administrative Secretary  
Carl Baker, Office of Rural Planning, Caltrans District 10

**AGENDA:**

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Commissioner Atlan, and carried to approve the Agenda as presented.

Ayes: Oneto, Colburn, Forster, Atlan  
Noes: None  
Absent: Plasse, Murphy

**PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:** None

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

**ACTC Minutes of May 4, 2017:** Vice Chairman Colburn reiterated his “acute frustration” over mischaracterizations made by Sacramento County representatives regarding Caltrans’ plans to relinquish SR 16 to Sacramento County. Commissioner Forster submitted minor corrections to staff.

**Social Services Transportation Advisory Council Minutes from March 20, 2017:** Commissioner Forster commented that he tries to attend the monthly Camanche community association meetings and offered his assistance for contacts.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Atlan, seconded by Vice Chairman Colburn, and carried to approve the Consent Agenda as discussed.

Ayes: Oneto, Colburn, Forster, Atlan

Noes: None

Absent: Plasse, Murphy

**REGULAR AGENDA:**

**SR 16 Relinquishment:** NOTE: A written response to this staff report (dated May 30, 2017) was received from Sacramento County Department of Transportation Director Michael Penrose. Copies were made available at the meeting. Copies of a written response back to Mr. Penrose from Mr. Gedney (dated May 30, 2017) was also made available at the meeting. Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report. He added that ACTC's argument is not with Sacramento County, but with Caltrans and the decision to relinquish SR 16 with no protections to interregional travel. Mr. Gedney requested that the video testimony provided by Mr. Penrose on June 23, 2015 to the State Senate Transportation Commission be part of the record. An excerpt of that testimony was played. Mr. Penrose states that "...we call it a thoroughfare which would be a six lane road that would have signals spaced at about ½ mile spacing at closest, limited access between those signals...". Mr. Gedney noted that Mr. Penrose argues that was not a promise to include ½ mile spacing as a condition, but in response to the State Transportation Committee questions, he was able to assuage their concerns which resulted in passage of AB 652 out of Committee.

Commissioner Forster commented that he believes that State Senator Beall's committee did a more thorough job than the State Assembly Committee of trying to make sure that assurances were made, even though they were not included in the bill. Commissioner Forster and others from Amador County did testify at the hearings. Senator Beall stated in the hearing that they will be watching what happens. Commissioner Forster believes the Senate Transportation Committee took their obligation to protect interregional travel seriously. Commissioner Forster would like ACTC to talk with its consultant, Robert Naylor, and write letters to Assemblymember Cooley, Assemblymember Frazier, and Senator Beall. Mr. Penrose made a statement to the Committee and we take those assurances of ½ mile signal spacing with limited access at face value. It's time to give the Committee an update. Commissioner Forster also advised that Mr. Paul Smith, Vice President of Governmental Affairs for Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC) has agreed that RCRC will write a letter in support of ACTC's position. This relinquishment could impact all rural and urban counties where Caltrans may want to relinquish portions of roadways. Mr. Penrose's letter should be an attachment to the letters to the legislative representatives to show them that Sacramento County is not standing by their verbal statements in Committee.

Vice Chairman Colburn commented that, after viewing the video, it is obvious that Mr. Penrose's testimony was used in the State Senate to get the vote. If Sacramento County is not going to abide by what was said, they misled the State Senate Committee. Vice Chairman Colburn noted that the cc's on the letter from Mr. Penrose are to Sacramento County Supervisors and that the letter is directed more to them than ACTC.

Commissioner Atlan asked if members of the State Senate Committee were asked what their perception was of the statement that traffic signals would be no closer than ½ mile. It would be helpful to know if Committee members voted the way they did because of the testimony.

Mr. Gedney noted that at the Caltrans meeting on March 9, 2017, ACTC commented that they supported Mr. Penrose's testimony regarding ½ mile spacing and limited access as a condition of the relinquishment agreement. Mr. Penrose told those at the meeting that he did not support his testimony to be included as a condition. He cited the uncertainty of development and mitigation.

The date of the relinquishment request before the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has not yet been determined.

Gary Reinoehl, County resident, commented that he agreed that writing letters to legislators and making sure the Supervisors of Sacramento County know our position is useful. After hearing the testimony of Mr. Penrose, there was some commitment on his part made to the Committee. Mr. Reinoehl added that over the length of time being proposed for this development, the testimony may be forgotten. Conditions of approval are important to the relinquishment.

Vice Chairman Colburn believes this would be a dangerous precedent for the State. He questioned if the gridlock and development that would occur on SR 16 would generate more pollutants.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Vice Chairman Colburn, and carried that, after consultation with ACTC's consultant Mr. Naylor, the ACTC Executive Director write a letter to the State Transportation Committee Chairs and enclose a clip or transcript of the testimony of Mr. Penrose with a copy of the letter to RCRC, California State Association of Counties (CSAC), Sacramento County Supervisors Nottoli and Frost, in addition to any others deemed appropriate by ACTC Commissioners Forster and Plasse.

Ayes: Orfeto, Colburn, Forster, Atlan  
Noes: None  
Absent: Plasse, Murphy

**Amador Transit Claim for FY 17/18 STA Funds:** Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Commissioner Atlan, and carried to approve the resolution for the Amador Transit claim for State Transit Assistance funding in the amount of \$149,378.

Ayes: Oneto, Colburn, Forster, Atlan  
Noes: None  
Absent: Plasse, Murphy

**Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Fund Allocation:** Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report. Chairman Oneto asked about the Federal-aid highway system. Mr. Gedney replied that in 1991 when the Federal ISTEA legislation was passed, if roadways were designated at that point, they are eligible for expenditures of those monies. Mr. Baker commented that there are functional

classifications for roadways. Local roads are not eligible, only roads that are designated appropriately as Federal-aid eligible (arterials and major collectors such as Latrobe Road, Shakeridge, and Fiddletown Rd). When applications are submitted for Federal funding, the applicant would need to make sure it is designated as a Federal-aid road. Commissioner Forster commented about the funding not being eligible for use on important County roads. Mr. Baker noted that there are two parts of the RSTP. The County receives its own RSTP which is separate from what is allocated to ACTC and each funding has separate rules. The County funds are more flexible than the regional ACTC funds. The intention of the funding is that they are used for preventative maintenance or better for the Federal-aid roads. Commissioner Forster commented that roads are in need of complete overhauls, not preventative maintenance.

Commissioner Forster asked about the combined percentage on the chart and Mr. Gedney replied that it was 50% population and 50% road miles.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Atlan, seconded by Vice Chairman Colburn, and carried to approve distribution of Regional Surface Transportation Program funds to Amador County and its incorporated cities pursuant to the current Local Transportation Fund "Streets and Roads" distribution formula and that jurisdictions use ACTC's claim form when requesting funds and establish a separate account when depositing the funds.

Ayes: Oneto, Colburn, Forster, Atlan

Noes: None

Absent: Plasse, Murphy

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan Update:** Ms. Platt reviewed the Plan. She reiterated that the Plan does not commit funds to projects. However, if projects are not on the list, it would preclude a jurisdiction from obtaining planning and project development funds and grants. Like the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), it has a list of all the projects that would make Amador County safe for bicyclists and pedestrians. Having a project on the list will help jurisdictions to negotiate with a project proponent regarding right of way, easements, etc. Ms. Platt noted that the Lone WIRIS project has the old project estimate (\$108.2M) instead of the revised estimate of \$6.2M reducing the total estimate of 114 projects to \$419M. A Pine Grove project was added to the list which would connect Community Christian baseball park to downtown Pine Grove with a side walking path or improved shoulders. One of the most crucial components of the Plan is the Rural and Low Cost Solutions section. The Plan will help in preparing Active Transportation Program (ATP) grants.

Commissioner Forster provided the following comments:

- Page 14, first paragraph, referring to millennials and their desires. Ms. Platt noted that the sentence can be revised and she also tried to reiterate in the Plan that Amador County's population is above average in age.
- Page 20, CalEnviroScreen tool. Commissioner Forster advised that both RCRC and CSAC held joint hearings regarding CalEnviroScreen, however, they did not take many of the suggestions. Ms. Platt noted that she has been in conversations with the Rural Counties Task Force (RCTF) regarding CalEnviroScreen and its limitations. However, it is one of the funding criteria for the ATP.

- Page 101, Enforcement Policies. He would like more emphasis to support active enforcement of bicycle use and safety laws. People may not have as many problems with bicycle riders if they would adhere to the rules of the road, e.g., ride single file. He also suggested having a fourth bullet point “No operator of any bicycle or pedestrian shall stop, stand...”. Ms. Platt will include that in the Plan.

Chairman Oneto provided the following comments:

- Page 101, Bicycle Policies, second bullet - add the words “Work to...”
- Page 102, first bullet. Roads cannot be adequately maintained and it is important that the public knows that the projects in the Plan are not required to be constructed and are part of a “wish list”.
- Page 102 under Land Use Policies, would like the first sentence removed or edited.
- There was too much emphasis on millennials which are only 14% of the population.

Commissioner Colburn asked about the liability of designating a road as a bicycle route. Mr. Baker commented that he had recently met with the Board of Supervisors and discussed liability associated with designating a route. Amador County Counsel’s summation was that liability comes from the state of the facility (roadway) and the fact that it is a legal place to ride, walk, drive, etc. Liability generally does not come from designation or putting a route on a map. However, there may be different responses from different lawyers.

Maureen Funk, Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee Co-Chair, commented that the committee made an effort to preserve and bring forward what had been done in the 2006 plan. Many of the components of the update were already in place. Much of the language in the update is a requirement toward being able to apply and qualify for future grants. She thanked the Commissioners for their comments. The Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee is excited to move to the next step and to bring back public comment.

Gary Reinoehl, County resident, commented that he attended a number of the meetings and thought the group was hard working with a good vision of what needed to be done to update the plan. He believes it is a good document needing minor edits.

Chairman Oneto asked how the project costs were sourced and Ms. Platt replied that they are planning-level costs developed with limited staff time at this point.

Commissioner Forster asked about the range of estimated costs on page 92. Ms. Platt explained that this is an example of the cost range between some possible low cost solutions up to a full-build project.

Ms. Platt ensured that she will incorporate the Commissioners edits before the document is distributed for public comment. She also wanted to thank ACTC GIS Coordinator Cindy Engel for her work on the maps.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Commissioner Atlan, and carried to approve the Draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan text and project list to be made available for a 45 day public review and comment period.

Ayes: Oneto, Colburn, Forster, Atlan

Noes: None

Absent: Plasse, Murphy

**ACTC Commissioner Reports:** Commissioner Forster asked when the Plymouth roundabout project would start and Vice Chairman Colburn replied it is expected to be the end of June.

**ACTC Reports:** Mr. Gedney commented that the scope of work for the Systemic Safety Assessment Report is still in progress. ACTC staff will be meeting with Calaveras Council of Governments staff to share some ideas on the cost and steps going forward.

**Caltrans Report by Carl Baker:**

- Senate Bill 1 was passed and signed. The CTC has produced an early implementation plan that can be found on their website. Outreach workshops will be held June 8 and 9. It appears the most immediate change is that Senate Bill 1 will almost double the Active Transportation Program (ATP). There are plans for a Call for Projects in August to try to allocate an available \$100 million in the next couple of fiscal years. It is not yet clear if this would be for new projects or to accelerate projects. When the funding is available, projects will need to have their environmental documents complete and ready to move forward. Commissioner Forster commented that while the ATP was almost doubled, it is still a low percentage of the overall funding amount.
- CalSTA (Caltrans' parent agency) has scheduled a Design Flexibility workshop at District 10.
- Botts Dots (ceramic dots on lane lines) are being phased out. They have become a maintenance problem and are not reflective. They don't meet the newer specifications for lane delineations. Striping will be changing from 4" to 6" and the material is more reflective. Rumble strips will also be used where warranted.
- The pavement contract for work on SR 88 that was carried over to another season had flexible start dates because of three pavement jobs in the same area needing coordination. There are not different contracts based on elevation. Caltrans assesses liquidated damages in the special provisions for each contract. Mr. Baker noted that the problem he noticed was the drainage was going down the middle of the highway and leading to some of the worst erosion. It is up to the contractor to correct the work and for Caltrans' engineers to make sure the work is done properly.
- Chairman Oneto asked if there was any further information regarding the SR 16/49 merge issue. Mr. Baker commented that the issue was taken to Caltrans management and can be followed-up at the upcoming partnership meeting. Vice Chairman Colburn commented that if there were minor accidents at this intersection there would be no CHP reports regarding safety. Chairman Oneto commented that there shouldn't be much cost involved with changing signage.
- Commissioner Forster asked if Caltrans was using transportation money on the tree mortality program. Mr. Baker replied that it was the Director's order that was authorized by the Governor's office. More research would be needed for specifics. The nexus for the work Caltrans is doing is only on trees that are close enough to actually fall into the highway. That would be the connection for using transportation monies to keep the highway safe and cleared for fire. Mr. Gedney added that the funding would be through SHOPP funds and not planning. Commissioner Forster commented that the tree issue of impacting the road is different than fixing the roads.
- Chairman Oneto asked when Caltrans would be starting to remove trees along SR 88 and Mr. Baker replied that it is expected to happen in the fall of 2017 at the earliest. Caltrans is currently working on Highway 4 and 108. Work started with agencies who had the planning in place.

- Commissioner Forster commented on a pothole along SR 16 in District 3. A work order had been filed and some minor work was done with the warning signage removed. It is still a problem when vehicles go through it and veer toward the center or fog line to miss the pothole. Mr. Baker will pass the information on to District 3. Ms. Platt offered to fill out a maintenance service request.
- Commissioner Atlan asked for the status of the speed check on the Sutter Creek bypass. Mr. Baker will follow up.
- Commissioner Atlan asked if Caltrans had approved the egress and line of sight for a methadone clinic scheduled to be next to the hospital. Mr. Baker advised that the property was purchased with entitlements in place and Caltrans has been contacted regarding the encroachment permit. Caltrans did not view the project as a new approval process.

**Claims:**

**Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman Colburn, seconded by Commissioner Atlan, and carried to approve the revised claims.


Ayes: Oneto, Colburn, Forster, Atlan

Noes: None

Absent: Plasse, Murphy

**Adjournment:**

At 11:20 a.m. the Chairman adjourned the meeting until 9:00 a.m. Thursday, July 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.)