

**AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES
November 1, 2018 – 9:31 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
Tim Murphy, Vice Chairman
Jon Colburn
Richard Forster
Dan Epperson (Alternate for Dominic Atlan)
John Plasse

Also Present:

John Gedney, ACTC Executive Director
Nancy Champlin, ACTC Administrative Secretary
Patricia Maggie Amarant, AT General Manager
Gregoria Ponce, Chief, Office of Rural Planning, Caltrans District 10

AGENDA:

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

PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA: Commissioner Forster commented that there will be a workshop on November 13 with PG&E at the Board of Supervisors meeting. He also noted that the Pine Grove Civic Improvement Club will be having a workshop on November 8 with PG&E.

CONSENT AGENDA:

ACTC Minutes of October 4, 2018: Commissioner Plasse requested his absence from the last meeting be corrected to show hospital discharge.

Social Services Transportation Advisory Council Minutes: Commissioner Forster asked that the spelling of his name be corrected.

Correspondence from ACTC to the California Highway Patrol: Commissioner Forster asked that a typographical error be corrected.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Vice Chairman Murphy, and unanimously carried to approve the Consent Agenda items as corrected.

REGULAR AGENDA:

Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee (RTMF) FY 2017/18 Annual Report: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report. Commissioner Plasse asked about the contribution of the Jackson Rancheria and if they were a signatory to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Mr. Gedney replied “no”, they do not sign the MOU. However, they made a contribution one year. They would be considered the same as any other developer if they have a project outside of Tribal lands.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Commissioner Plasse, and unanimously carried to elect Chairman Oneto as the ACTC representative to serve on the FY 18/19 RTMF Oversight Committee.

Vice Chairman Murphy commented that he supported making the MOU binding, but wanted clarification on the language “not related to annual budgetary and other legislative actions by their legislative bodies”. Mr. Gedney commented that the cities and County face budgetary issues annually and this language allowed them some flexibility in their decisions. Commissioner Forster commented that the other entities on the RTMF Oversight Committee wanted to change the language so that the MOU was binding. Commissioner Plasse added that there was not a way to collect funds if a jurisdiction deferred or waived fees.

Gary Reinoehl, Upcountry resident, commented that he thought it was a good idea to make the improvements to the agreement. He added that, if he understood Proposition 6 correctly, mitigation fees that are charged to developments are considered a special transportation tax and this may be a moot point if the Proposition passes.

SR 88/104 Intersection: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report. There was a lengthy discussion regarding the two options presented, in addition to other scenarios, with input also received from Caltrans Representative Gregoria Ponce and County Administrative Officer Chuck Iley. The commitment at last month’s ACTC meeting was to show the project as fully funded in order to advance the project in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to Tier 1 and make it eligible for a State-sponsored Project Initiation Document (PID). Mr. Gedney noted that \$100,000 - \$120,000 is estimated to cover the cost if the Commission chooses to advance the project under a locally-sponsored PID. Regional Surface Transportation Program, RTMF, or a commitment in Regional Improvement Program (RIP) could fund construction after completion of the Pine Grove project.

Commissioners discussed Caltrans’ responsibility as this project is on a State highway. Mr. Gedney commented that Caltrans views this project as a locally driven development issue.

Mr. Iley commented that the mitigation measures for the Buena Vista casino (approved by the State), were requested by Caltrans. An intersection improvement/signalization at SR 88/Buena Vista Road and a roundabout at SR 88/Liberty Road were identified. He suggested it may be possible to move the SR 88/Liberty Road improvements to SR 88/SR 104. There was additional discussion regarding this scenario. Vice Chairman Murphy commented that intersections along this stretch of SR 88 have been a problem for a long time even without additional development.

Mr. Gedney noted that every step in the project has decision points. A PID results in an estimate of the project's scope, schedule, and cost. It outlines the specific costs that will be required for the next phase, including a decision to move forward.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Vice Chairman Murphy, to obligate ACTC to a locally sponsored Project Initiation Document to be managed by Caltrans and estimated to cost between \$100,000 - \$120,000, to ask for a cooperative agreement to be developed, and to list the project, as it is, in the Regional Transportation Plan under Tier 1.

Under discussion, Ms. Ponce commented that Caltrans is waiting for ACTC direction. She is in support of navigating the cooperative agreement. She added that Caltrans is underway with a safety study, and with a State sponsored PID, it would be based on what is distilled from that study. A study typically takes three to five months, including data from the California Highway Patrol. Mr. Gedney noted that any construction project on a State highway would eventually need to meet Caltrans' warrants regardless of who is funding the project. A project can be developed up to the right of way phase.

Mr. Gedney commented that ACTC staff would request Caltrans host and develop the Project Development Team, assign a Project Manager, and be the lead. ACTC would fund the studies, but they would be conducted by Caltrans staff.

Vice Chairman Murphy commented that this is the most that ACTC can do to move the project forward and is consistent with the RTP. This timeframe is sooner than anticipated, but we have to go forward with good faith. Commissioner Colburn commented that he could support local participation up to a certain degree, but this project is two State highways intersecting and there are still issues on SR 16 that need to be pursued. However, if Caltrans' study will be complete in three months, he does not support it. Chairman Oneto commented that ACTC would not be saving much time. He doesn't see how jump-starting this will get Caltrans to move any faster. Mr. Gedney clarified that if ACTC chooses not to support a locally sponsored PID, then the project would need to wait until there are results from the safety investigation. Commissioner Forster asked if the recent fatality and accident were in the warrant determination. Mr. Gedney replied that would need to be determined. He added that action today to support local development of a PID does not commit ACTC to construct the project.

Ayes: Forster, Murphy, Epperson

Noes: Oneto, Plasse, Colburn

Absent: None

Discussion continued with Mr. Gedney commenting that the vote today would initiate a team that would study the broad parameters of the project, outline how long it would take, what the project would look like, and general costs. The team would have a report in approximately nine months. A cooperative agreement would designate if the County or ACTC would be lead agency and to use Caltrans' staff or hire a consultant.

Ms. Ponce noted that the intersection ultimately has to meet warrants before it can be constructed. Moving forward with the PID, whether done by Caltrans or a local agency, is the first step where Caltrans evaluates roles, responsibilities, and standards and is part of the project development process. In the past, when a PID is completed and Caltrans accepts the document, post-PID can start (PA&ED -

Project Approval and Environmental Document). That phase includes environmental design alternatives, purpose & needs, etc. Ms. Ponce agrees that there is an advantage to starting a locally sponsored PID. She added that a PID document is usually viable for three to five years before it becomes dated. What occurs when a PID does come forward, such as the roundabout project, until the warrants are met, the PID can be completed and Caltrans can accept the PID. Then, with a completed PID, Caltrans moves into post-PID; PA&ED and the later stages of project development (PS&E and ROW) so that when warrants are met the project can be ready to go to construction.

Commissioner Plasse asked how long it takes Caltrans do a PID that they have initiated. Ms. Ponce stated she would have to look at timelines for Amador County. Commissioner Forster commented that ACTC staff and Caltrans are behind this project, it is a matter of which path to choose. Mr. Gedney noted that if a locally sponsored PID is initiated and completed without warrants being met, work can continue to advance and the PA&ED phase completed. If warrants are still not met, the Plans, Specifications and Estimate (PS&E) phase can also be advanced and completed and right-of-way acquisition initiated. The project can be advanced to ready-to-bid for construction without warrants being met. As soon as warrants are met, Caltrans has to initiate a project. However, having a local agency involved in the planning process from the beginning allows them to have more input into a final design. A locally-sponsored PID would produce a general scope of the project and general schedule. The only project cost information would be an estimate for the environmental studies in the next phase.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Commissioner Plasse, and unanimously carried to reconsider the motion.

Vice Chairman Murphy asked to have to motion re-stated.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Commission Plasse, and unanimously carried to ask for a locally-sponsored Project Initiation Document with an estimated cost to ACTC not to exceed \$120,000 for the establishment of a cooperative agreement with a Regional Transportation Plan project listed in Tier 1 and with the understanding that Caltrans staff will be assigned to the Project Development Team and ACTC would defer to their management of the Project Initiation Document.

Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Call for Projects: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report.

At 11:15 a.m. Commissioner Colburn briefly left the meeting.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Forster, seconded by Vice Chairman Murphy, and carried to direct staff to issue a Call for Projects for federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funding for fiscal years 18/19 through 21/22.

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

Caltrans Adaptation Planning Grant Award: Mr. Gedney reviewed the staff report. Ms. Engel, ACTC GIS Coordinator, gave a PowerPoint presentation. Commissioner Forster asked if staff cost is covered under the grant amount. Mr. Gedney replied that the scope of work has most of the funding going to consultant services and staff time is not covered.

At 11:20 a.m. Commissioner Colburn returned to the meeting.

Mr. Gedney noted that staff's role will be to gather information that is already available from other agencies. A Request for Proposals (RFP) for consultant services will be issued. Vice Chairman Murphy commented that the safety factor information would be useful when ACTC prioritizes projects. Chairman Oneto and Commissioner Plasse commented that they had heard positive feedback from the mapping provided by Ms. Engel for the tree mortality project. Ms. Engel thanked the Commissioners and noted that the process the tree mortality committee is using to document and seek reimbursement from the Office of Emergency Services (OES) has been of such a high quality that the State considers Amador County an example of how to do it right.

Claims: Chairman Oneto asked about the claim for Boulder University Inn and Mr. Gedney replied that Ms. Engel will be attending a conference related to the Extreme Weather grant effort. Commissioner Forster asked about the reimbursement to the cities of Sutter Creek, Plymouth, and Jackson. Mr. Gedney replied it is their claim for the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) allocation.

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

ACTC Commissioner Reports: Commissioner Colburn commented that the Amador County Vintner Association is very interested in having a meeting with their members, grape growers, and others who might be interested in discussion of the SR 16 relinquishment. Commissioners were invited to attend and will be notified of the date.

Commissioner Plasse asked if the new Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee Memorandum of Understanding (RTMF MOU) addresses situations of development project approvals such as the Jackson Rancheria event center in Jackson. Mr. Gedney will follow-up.

Commissioner Epperson noted that the development project on Foothill Blvd in Lone has money allocated for developer improvements. There are about 267 homes to be built and 100 have been completed. The developer should be making road improvements in the next one to two years. Commissioner Epperson also commented that he has spoken with Caltrans and developers regarding the railroad crossings at SR 124 and SR 104 that need repair.

Commissioner Colburn asked if the City of Lone was working on recovering RTMF funds that were deferred. Commissioner Epperson does not believe the City has any legal recourse. Commissioner Forster asked about the \$180,000 in RTMF that the City borrowed. Commissioner Epperson replied it will be paid back from the City's General Fund.

Commissioner Forster noted that the scoping session on the environmental portion of the motocross track in Lone that is being proposed by US Mines is going to be heard by the Amador County Planning Commission on November 13.

ACTC Report: None

Caltrans Report by Gregoria Ponce:

- Eric Chin, project manager at Caltrans District 10, will be asked to provide a fact sheet concerning SR 88/Buena Vista Road. It is Caltrans' understanding that there are some obligations for improvements along that route. A Caltrans improvement has been identified at SR 88/Liberty Road in San Joaquin County.
- Commissioner Forster will be provided with information on how the safety analysis for SR 88/SR 104 was established and the timeframe for the review period.
- Grant award notice to proceed will be forthcoming.
- Contract information, bidder information, and small business request questions have been forwarded to Chairman Oneto.
- Commissioner Plasse commented on the response received at the last meeting to road work at the railroad crossing and his comments were about the roadway $\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ mile west of the crossing at SR 104. Ms. Ponce will have maintenance review the area.
- Commissioner Forster asked if there was a schedule for the improvements to SR 88/Buena Vista Road. Ms. Ponce replied the improvements are held by the Tribe. Commissioner Forster noted that, through the Intergovernmental Services Agreement, the Tribe is to complete the improvements before the casino is opened. The opening is projected to be the end of April 2019. Ms. Ponce noted that Caltrans also wants to have a discussion with the Tribe. Commissioner Forster commented that Amador County is not responsible for making sure the improvements are completed before the opening. Ms. Ponce will pull the schedule information. Mr. Iley noted that the Tribe has communicated that they do not believe the stop light at that location will be installed prior the proposed opening.
- Vice Chairman Murphy asked if there was an update on the safety analysis at SR 49/Sutter Lone Road. Ms. Ponce replied that she anticipates the report no later than mid-November and will send it to Ms. Champlin to share with the Commissioners.
- Commissioner Forster asked that Caltrans either work with Amador County, or on their own, to put up speed reducing signs at upper Jackson Valley Road once road improvements begin at the SR 88/Buena Vista Road intersection to make it safer for the traveling public.
- Chairman Oneto had a request from a constituent to have the turn pocket striping made longer at SR 16/Willow Creek Road.

Future Agenda Items:

- Presentation by ACTC's new legal counsel.

Adjournment:

At 12:10 p.m. the Chairman adjourned the meeting until 9:00 a.m. Thursday, December 6, 2018, 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.)