

**AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES
May 4, 2017 – 9:55 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
John Plasse
Tim Murphy

Also Present:

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

AGENDA:

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Vice Chairman Colburn, and unanimously carried to approve the Agenda as presented.

PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA: Mr. Gedney noted that supplemental material had been distributed to the Commissioners and the public. He requested an informational item on the status of Senate Bill (SB) 1 be added to the agenda. Commissioner Forster noted that the handout "SB 1 & ACA 5" contained quotes from emails he had received from the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and he created the handout to clarify implementation. Chairman Oneto placed the item on the agenda as 13-A.

CONSENT AGENDA:

ACTC Minutes of April 6, 2017: Commissioner Forster submitted minor corrections to staff.

Expenditures Budget vs. Actual: Commissioner Atlan noted that the Year to Date percent in the header should be 75% of the year.

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

REGULAR AGENDA:

SR 16 Relinquishment: NOTE: A written response to this staff report was received from Sacramento County Department of Transportation Director Michael Penrose via email from Mr. Dean Blank on May 2, 2017.

Copies of the letter were made available to the Commissioners and the public. ACTC Consultant Robert Naylor was available via telephone for this agenda item. Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding the SR 16 relinquishment, the letter received from Mr. Penrose, and statements made during the State Transportation Committee hearing on June 23, 2015. Commissioners expressed their frustration with Sacramento County during the relinquishment process and defended ACTC's position and staff reports. A summary of some of the comments are below.

Mr. Gedney noted that ACTC staff attended a meeting with the California Transportation Commission (CTC) staff, Sacramento County staff, and Caltrans. At this meeting, attendees were made aware that assurances that were provided by Mr. Penrose to the legislature regarding stop lights at 1/2 mile spacing, at the closest, would not be recommended as conditions in the relinquishment agreement.

Mr. Naylor summarized that the comment letter from Mr. Penrose is accurate in one respect and disingenuous in another. It is accurate in that Sacramento County has never submitted any formal additional conditions to be written into the relinquishment agreement beyond what is in the statute. However, in testimony before the Senate Transportation Committee an exchange that involved Senator Beall (Committee Chair) and Senator Gaines, Mr. Penrose said there would be "½ mile spacing at the closest" with "limited access between". In the hearing, the Senators commented they would try to be sensitive both to interregional needs and local needs. Mr. Naylor also commented that while Mr. Penrose's testimony may not have been intended to make an additional formal condition that would be written into any resolution, it was a very specific reassurance to the Senate Transportation Committee which had concerns about interregional travel. Mr. Naylor feels it would be reasonable for ACTC to argue to the CTC that it ought to be written into the agreement.

Commissioner Forster commented that there were direct statements made in the hearing by Mr. Penrose of what Sacramento County would do, and now because the verbal statements were not put into the law, Sacramento County is not going to honor the statements. In reference to the last paragraph of Mr. Penrose's letter, Commissioner Forster noted that it was a misrepresentation of what was said during the hearing. Commissioner Forster also commented that Senator Beall is going to be watching this process and agreed to maintain the interregional travel of the highway, which is Amador County's concern.

Mr. Dean Blank, County of Sacramento Department of Transportation, commented that the intent of Mr. Penrose's letter was to try and clarify what Sacramento County believes to be misrepresentations in the staff report. Mr. Blank said that after listening to the Senate Transportation Committee hearing, it was not in the context of committing any particular party to any requirement. It was describing in general terms what the improvements would be. There was never any intent that this would be language or a position that would be written into an agreement. Mr. Blank also commented that Sacramento County does intend to allow limited access between traffic signals (right-in and right-out).

Vice Chairman Colburn commented that Sacramento County has ignored the impact of the traffic signals on Amador County's regional traffic and what it will do our economy. It was a couple of years into the process before Amador County knew of Sacramento County's intent to have a section of SR 16 relinquished and Sacramento County has not been cooperative with Amador County's interregional needs. Vice Chairman Colburn expressed acute frustration and stated that he feels the testimony of Mr. Penrose regarding ½ mile spacing was to get the vote of the Senate and it should be considered in that light.

Chairman Oneto commented that a letter of clarification could be presented to the CTC along with a transcript of the hearing, noting that what had been said is not being addressed. He also commented that if Sacramento County is worried about the ½ mile spacing due to wetlands or adverse terrain, they could put something in writing that would reference averaging ½ mile spacing.

Commissioner Plasse commented that ACTC's contention has always been that because this is a legislatively designated interregional route, Caltrans should oversee the throughput. To continue to move the urban edges outward does not address the throughput of a previously designated interregional facility. ACTC has no other choice than to address the CTC who has the power to condition relinquishments.

Commissioner Murphy commented that Sacramento County wants Amador County to accept their good intentions while Amador County wants enforceable conditions for operation of the road.

Gary Reinoehl, County resident, commented that he has supported ACTC on this relinquishment issue and that discussions should continue to try and arrive at a conclusion that doesn't affect Amador County's ability to access goods and services in Sacramento via SR 16.

Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff recommendation and noted that Caltrans is planning to bring the relinquishment agreement to the CTC this Fall and likely will produce the project report in July. At that time, ACTC will have an opportunity to review the environmental document. Staff asked for direction to prepare information to be presented to the CTC and to inform the public in Amador and Sacramento Counties of changes in traffic congestion that would occur if the relinquishment is granted.

The Commissioners agreed to staff's recommendation and that draft materials should be reviewed by the SR 16 sub-committee (Commissioners Forster and Plasse).

Local Transportation Fund (LTF) FY 17/18 Apportionment Estimates: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report. Commissioner Plasse asked if the Overall Work Program (OWP) is a timed report showing the carryover but with the expected consumption of the carryover still within the fiscal year it references. Mr. Gedney replied that staff did not expend the funds as anticipated, especially in some consultant contracts. Staff intends to continue the carryover. Commissioner Plasse asked if that would result in lower annual claims against the LTF as the carryover grows. Mr. Gedney replied that the carryover could also continue to grow with Commission discretion on when to allocate the funds held in trust.

At 10:40 a.m. Chairman Oneto left the meeting and Vice Chairman Colburn took over as Chair.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Commissioner Murphy, and carried to adopt the FY 17/18 Local Transportation Fund apportionment estimates reflecting approved ACTC and Amador Transit budgets and results of the Unmet Transit Needs process.

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

Local Transportation Fund (LTF)/Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Apportionment for Cities/County: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report.

At 10:45 a.m. Chairman Oneto returned to the meeting.

Chairman Murphy asked if the information from the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the prison infill project is the traffic impact for the entire prison population or for the infill project. Mr. Gedney replied the infill project EIR contained daily employee trip estimates in addition to the number of weekend visitors and commercial vehicles. The infill project data was extrapolated to estimate total prison population traffic impacts. The analysis shows that the prison population generates 17% of the impacts that normal populations do.

Commissioner Plasse commented that he sees this as a policy issue on how to allocate excess LTF which should be decided on by policy makers and not referred to ACTC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). He added that counting 100% of the prison's population as an impact on lone's roadway is an unfair allocation method. Commissioner Plasse also noted that many of the prison's employees are residents of lone and in one sense are double counted if given credit as an employee and as part of the population. He commented that most of the cities have approximately 20 miles or less of roads while the County has approximately 700. There needs to be some way to weight the difference in road miles.

Commissioner Forster commented that the prison EIR was performed in 2013 and projects an increase of 2.5% to lone's population. It may be reasonable to perform another traffic count to make sure the numbers are correct as used in the EIR.

Commissioner Murphy commented that some years ago the State decided to count prison population with the city population as an inducement for cities agreeing to have a prison. Some of the State monies are allocated based on this total population as a benefit to offset what some people feel is a negative impact of having a prison in their city.

Commissioner Atlan commented that lone has impacts that they cannot recover, for example, police services. He agrees that counting 100% of the prison population needs to be looked at, but he would have preferred lone receiving a report and information on the proposed formula prior to this meeting so that the City could have provided input. He noted that he could support a 2% loss in revenue from the excess amount but would like more discussion on the formula going forward.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Commissioner Atlan, and unanimously carried to approve the allocation of funds for FY 15/16 and FY 16/17 available for streets and roads under the current formula as stated in the staff report with the County receiving Local Transportation Funds and the supplemental distribution to the cities using Regional Surface Transportation Funds.

Under discussion Vice Chairman Colburn commented that he does not have a problem with ACTC TAC being involved.

Mr. Gedney will do more research on a revised formula and speak with the City of lone. The goal being to have one consistent formula that can be used in all of the allocations.

Mr. Baker commented that he does not know what the State and region agreed to regarding the traffic impact mitigation fee. Caltrans' recommendation at the time was that because of the uncertainty with the bed to inmate ratio, the State did not have an idea of the actual occupancy. The recommendation was that traffic counts be taken after the prison was in place to verify that the number of trips calculated for the regional traffic mitigation fee would be appropriate.

Commissioner Atlan thanked the Commissioners and staff for giving this topic further consideration.

Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Fund Allocation: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report. He added that he has worked with Caltrans District 10 Local Assistance regarding the eligible use of funds and noted that a claim form will be used for local jurisdictions requesting funds. This form asks that a separate fund be set up to receive RSTP funds and identify their use. This will help in the event there is a spot audit. Commissioner Forster asked if all of the signal pre-emption lights have been added using this funding source. Mr. Gedney replied that \$18,000 remains for this project as additional signals are constructed.

Commissioner Plasse commented that he would like a reserve retained for projects such as Martin Lane which allowed for construction at a significant savings due to an existing Caltrans project in the area. He was also in favor of using some of the funding for local jurisdictions.

Commissioner Murphy commented that it is important to be able to use some of the funds for road repair, but it is not as important as ACTC being able to help other projects.

Staff was directed to bring this item back for additional discussion.

Final FY 17/18 Overall Work Program (OWP): Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report. Commissioner Forster asked for the Caltrans comment letter to be included with the staff report in the future.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Commissioner Plasse, and unanimously carried to approve the FY 17/18 Overall Work Program and associated resolution.

Roadway Departure Safety Workshop: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report and gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding a regional Systemic Safety Analysis Report Program (SSARP).

After discussion, staff was directed to earmark \$75,000 - \$150,000 in RSTP funds for a study, receive input from ACTC's Technical Advisory Committee, and bring back specific recommendations.

ACTC Commissioner Reports:

Commissioner Atlan reported that because of passage of Senate Bill (SB) 1, garbage rates have increased \$1.00/week. When gas/diesel prices are raised, the cost of goods also increase.

Chairman Oneto reported that road failures are still showing up in the County and will be an ongoing issue. He also noted that the County approved a contract with Drake Haglan for engineering services on Shakeridge Road. Commissioner Forster added that if the project can be completed within 180 days, 100% funding could be received from Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) rather than 75%.

ACTC Reports: Mr. Gedney noted that with approval of SB 1, there may be additional funding that ACTC could use on safety measures identified in the proposed SSARP study.

He also commented that the Plymouth roundabout should be having a groundbreaking ceremony in the near future. Commissioner Colburn noted that three bids were received and the low bid was \$300,000 over the engineering estimate. He also commented that Plymouth will need bids on destruction caused by the

Sand Fire. Also, an estimate from the engineers on flood damage to the Arroyo Ditch was \$2.7 million. The City of Plymouth will have to contribute \$187,000 in matching funds for FEMA.

SB 1 & ACA 5 (Agenda Item 13A): Commissioner Forster commented that he had provided clarification due to the implementation schedule. Full funding is expected in 2018 with \$1.2 million for Amador County and \$1.2 million to be divided among the cities.

Caltrans Report by Carl Baker:

- There is a safety investigation being performed at SR 124 and SR 16.
- The tree mortality removal project on the State highways is expected to start in the fall in 2017.
- Information on the construction contract on SR 88 is available for Commissioner Plasse.
- The process for SB 1 will be given at next month's meeting.
- Chairman Oneto commented that he had heard the Forest Service was going to start taking out dead trees along SR 88 and if they don't he would like Caltrans to start in that area.

Claims:

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Commissioner Plasse, and unanimously carried to approve the revised claims.

Adjournment:

At 12:00 p.m. the Chairman adjourned the meeting until 9:00 a.m. Thursday, June 1, 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.)