

MADERA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

EXECUTIVE MINUTES

Date: Wednesday, March 23, 2011

Time: 3:00 p.m.

Place: MCTC Board Chambers

Members Present: Chairman Robert Poythress – Councilmember, City of Madera
Vice Chairman Tom Wheeler – Supervisor, Madera County
Max Rodriguez – Supervisor, Madera County
Janan Hebert – Councilmember, City of Chowchilla
Alt. Ronn Dominici - Supervisor, Madera County

Members Absent: Sam Armentrout – Councilmember, City of Madera
Frank Bigelow -Supervisor, Madera County

Policy Advisory Committee: Above Members present and Caltrans Representatives:
Christine Cox- Kovacevich, Acting Deputy Director

MCTC Staff Present: Patricia Taylor, Executive Director
Derek Winning, Deputy Director
Troy McNeil, Fiscal Supervisor
Richard Poythress, Planner II
Dylan Stone, Planner I
Sheila Kingsley, Administrative Asst.

MCTC sitting as the Transportation Policy Committee.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

This portion of the meeting is reserved for person(s) wishing to address the MCTC on items within their jurisdiction but not on this agenda.

No Public comment.

III. TRANSPORTATION CONSENT ITEMS

A. *SB 325: Central California Rail Authority Letter of Support*

Short haul rail preservation has emerged as a critical issue in the South San Joaquin Valley, where freight rail infrastructure and right-of-way has been dismantled and sold. Diminishing options have forced local industry to ship by truck rather than rail, increasing congestion on vital transportation corridors like State Route 99. The San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council has taken an official position in favor of short haul rail preservation and has advocated for legislative support in Sacramento and Washington, D.C.

Upon a request from Kern COG, State Senator Michael Rubio has introduced SB 325, a bill which

would establish a Central California Rail Authority (CCRA) in the four-county South Valley region (Fresno, Tulare, Kings, and Kern). Included in the Commissioner's packet was a copy of the letter of support for SB 325 issued by MCTC staff.

Once formed, the CCRA would have the authority to purchase, own, and operate rail facilities, providing a mechanism for the preservation of short haul rail corridors. Although the initial formation of the CCRA will not include Madera County, SB 325 provides the option for future expansion of the Authority into the northern counties of the San Joaquin Valley. Eventually, the CCRA may provide the basis for the establishment of a short haul rail network spanning from the Port of Stockton to Bakersfield as envisioned by the San Joaquin Valley Goods Movement Plan.

Action: Information and Discussion Only.

B. 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Administrative Amendment No. 2

Enclosed in the Commissioner's packet for review was Amendment No. 2 (Type 1 Administrative) to the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (Interim FTIP). Amendment No. 2 updates the Route 99 Bridge Enhancements to include the required local match for FY 2012/13 and FY 2013/14. Amendment No. 2 also revises the project description for the Highway Bridge Program HBP consistent with the guidance for grouped project listings.

Amendment No. 2 meets all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450 and 40 CFR Part 93. These projects and/or project phases are consistent with the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which was adopted by the Madera County Transportation Commission on July 21, 2010 and approved by FHWA/FTA.

The MCTC Public Participation Plan does not require a public review and comment period for Type 1 Administrative Amendments. The MCTC Policy Board has delegated MPO approval of Type 1 Administrative Amendments to its Executive Director. State approval is required.

Action: Ratify 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Amendment No. 2 (Admin Modification).

Transportation Consent Calendar Action: Upon motion by Commissioner Rodriguez, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler to approve the Transportation Consent Calendar (Item III A to B.). A vote was called and the motion carried.

IV. TRANSPORTATION ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. PUBLIC HEARING: 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program – Resolution 10-12 Amendment No. 3

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON THE
DRAFT AMENDMENT #3 TO THE 2011 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Madera County Transportation Commission (MCTC) will hold a public hearing on March 23, 2011 at 3 p.m. at the MCTC Board Room at 2001 Howard Road, Suite 201, Madera, CA 93637 regarding the Draft Amendment #3 to the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). The purpose of the hearing is to receive public comments.

- The 2011 FTIP is a listing of capital improvement and operational expenditures utilizing federal and state monies for transportation projects in Madera County during the next four years that are eligible to proceed without a conformity determination.
- The Draft Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP is a Type 3 amendment that contains project phases and/or projects that have been determined to be exempt from the requirement that a conformity determination and/or regional emissions analysis be performed per 40 CFR

93.126, 93.127, or 93.128. Because the projects are exempt, no further conformity determination is required.

A concurrent 7-day public review and comment period will commence on March 17, 2011 and conclude March 23, 2011 at 3:00pm. The draft documents are available for review at the MCTC office, located at 2001 Howard Road, Suite 201, Madera, CA 93637 and on the MCTC website at <http://www.maderactc.org/>.

Public comments are welcomed at the hearing, or may be submitted in writing by 3:00pm on March 23, 2011 to Derek Winning at the address below.

After considering the comments, the documents will be considered for adoption, by resolution, by the Madera County Transportation Commission at a regularly scheduled meeting to be held on March 23, 2011. The documents will then be submitted to state and federal agencies for approval.

Contact Person: Derek Winning, Deputy Director
Madera County Transportation Commission
2001 Howard Road, Suite 201
Madera, CA 93637
(559) 975-9465
derek@maderactc.org

Chairman Poythress opened the floor for public comment at 3:15 p.m. Being no public comment Chairman Poythress closed the floor at 3:16 p.m.

Action: Upon motion by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Rodriquez to approve 2011 FTIP Resolution 10-12 Amendment No. 3. A vote was called and the motion carried.

B. Presentation: State Route 152 Trade Corridor Study and Mobility Partnership Agreement

Presentation and invitation by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to join the SR 152 Trade Corridor Mobility Partnership. The partnership would be made up of 2 representatives from Santa Clara, San Benito, Merced, and Madera Counties and would be responsible to provide policy oversight and direction regarding SR 152 Realignment and Trade Corridor studies.

At the request of the California Transportation Commission (CTC), the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), in coordination with Caltrans, are studying an east-west Trade and Mobility Corridor on State Route 152 between US 101 and SR 99.

This report summarizes the results of the preliminary Traffic and Revenue (T&R) study conducted for the Route 152 Trade Corridor Project. The T&R Study evaluates highway improvements and financing strategies that could benefit the movement of goods in the corridor, reduce congestion, enhance travel safety, reduce travel times, and upgrade the route to access control standards.

Planning level toll transaction and revenue estimates were prepared for a number of improvement alternatives along the SR 152 Corridor. This report documents the analysis, including the historical and existing travel conditions in the corridor; provides a 20-year planning level toll traffic and revenue forecast for 10 toll alternatives; and provides an assessment of the overall financial feasibility of each toll alternative.

SR 152 is a focus route of interregional and statewide significance, and the only major east-west route between I-580 (60 miles to the north) and SR 46 (120 miles to the south) for commuter, commercial and recreational traffic. The corridor is a vital artery for goods movement serving the San Francisco Bay Area and the State's agricultural heartland of the San Joaquin Valley and Monterey County. In 2008, the value of agricultural production in Fresno, Madera, Merced and Monterey Counties was \$13.8 billion dollars with over 90 percent of goods transported by trucks.

Action: Upon motion by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez to approve the MOU to join the SR 152 Corridor Mobility Partnership with Santa Clara, San Benito, and Merced Counties. Commissioner Wheeler suggested that the Mobility Partnership consider support for HSR within the median along the SR 152 Corridor. A vote was called and the motion carried.

C. *San Joaquin Valley Blueprint Roadmap*

Staff's report was provided to the Policy Board as an information item only. No action by the Board is requested at the time. The intent of this item is to provide the Board with a status update of the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint process; and to support a discussion that will prepare Board representatives for the March 25, 2011 Regional Policy Council meeting in Fresno.

Background:

In early 2006 the eight Regional Planning Agencies (MPOs) in the San Joaquin Valley came together in an unprecedented effort to develop a coordinated Valley vision - the San Joaquin Valley Regional Blueprint. Extensive activities have been conducted in each of the eight Valley Counties; and ultimately this work was integrated to form a preferred vision for future development throughout the Valley to the year 2050. The Blueprint has been a bottom up, voluntary endeavor that is intended to engage and guide local agencies in their pursuit of sustainable development patterns within their own jurisdictions and throughout the Valley. The Blueprint planning process has been conducted in the following four phases:

- Phase 1: Values and Vision - gathered from community input.
- Phase 2: Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures based upon Values and Vision.
- Phase 3: Evaluation of alternative "growth scenarios" in each county. This included:
 - ❖ Selection of preferred county level scenarios for Valley-wide analysis.
 - ❖ Evaluation of four Valley-wide alternative scenarios.
 - ❖ Adoption of Smart Growth Principles and the Preferred Growth Scenario for the Valley.
- Phase 4: Develop documents to memorialize the Blueprint planning process, suggest strategies for implementation and provide a toolkit to assist planners with integrating the Blueprint Smart Growth Principles into local planning processes.

On April 1, 2009, after completing discussions in each of the eight San Joaquin Valley Counties, the Regional Policy Council reviewed the Valley MPOs' collaborative work on the Blueprint and took the following actions:

- Adopted a list of Smart Growth Principles to be used as the basis of Blueprint planning in the San Joaquin Valley.
- Adopted Scenario B+ as the Preferred Blueprint Growth Scenario for the San Joaquin Valley to the year 2050. This preferred scenario will serve as guidance for the Valley's local jurisdictions with land use authority as they update their General Plans.

The Blueprint planning process has been conducted as a "bottom up and voluntary process". That approach continues as the Valley MPOs move forward in our work with our member agencies to help integrate the Blueprint Smart Growth Principles into local planning processes. To support this effort, in February 2010, the Valley MPOs entered into a contract with the firm Mintier Hamish to prepare three deliverables that comprise "the Blueprint Roadmap". **These deliverables are available for review by accessing www.maderactc.org.** The deliverables are:

- SJV Blueprint Planning Process Summary Report (September 2010)
- Draft SJV Blueprint – Planners Toolkit (web based...being developed)
- Draft SJV Blueprint Guidance Framework and Appendix B – Institutional Arrangements Whitepaper (current discussion)

The Summary report was completed in September of last year. It traced the process used by all eight Valley MPOs to April 2009. Each MPO prepared separate countywide blueprints, which were then consolidated into one single Valley-wide Blueprint. The process included three major phases: (1)

Values and Vision; (2) Goals and Objectives, and Performance Measures; and (3) Evaluation of Alternative Growth Scenarios.

The Blueprint Planners Toolkit is a work in progress. It will be a web based product that will be available to our local agencies (and many others) as they perform General Plan updates. The intent of the Toolkit is to provide a comprehensive, interactive instrument which can support local agency needs as they consider incorporating aspects of the Valley-wide Blueprint. The website is still being developed, but is being reviewed by potential users. Comments received to date indicate that the website should be a valuable and useful tool once it is launched.

The draft SJV Blueprint Guidance Framework and Appendix B- Institutional Arrangements Whitepaper have been prepared and will be presented as information items at the March 25th Regional Policy Council meeting in Fresno. These documents are attached to this staff report for Members reference. MCTC's representatives on the Regional Policy Council are Mayor Rob Poythress (current MCTC Chair) and Supervisor Tom Wheeler (current MCTC Vice Chair).

These documents have been reviewed by the Valley-wide Planners Working Group (composed of stakeholders and professional planners throughout the eight County Region) and the SJV COG Executive Directors Committee. Comments from these reviewers have been incorporated into this draft.

The Guidance Framework is: "made up of a set of 12 specific strategies intended to guide implementation of the Valley-wide Blueprint. The strategies are not an exhaustive or detailed list of prescriptions or suggestions for what could or should be done to implement the Blueprint. Instead, they set out a relatively short list of actions that will be most important in the short to mid-range (five years) to create a structure and process for carrying out the Blueprint and for translating Blueprint principles into local policy and actions". The following are the 12 strategies that have been identified:

- ❖ Explore a Regional Leadership Structure (Reference: Appendix B- Institutional Arrangements Whitepaper)
- ❖ Continue and Expand the Valley Legislative Advocacy Program
- ❖ Align SCSJ APS with the Blueprint
- ❖ Translate Blueprint into City and County Policy and Actions
- ❖ Maintain and Expand the Planners Toolkit
- ❖ Create a Greenprint Program
- ❖ Increase Technical Support and Data Sharing Capacity
- ❖ Create a Regional Technical Coordinating Committee
- ❖ Conduct an Annual Regional Event to Celebrate the Blueprint
- ❖ Create a Leadership Training and Public Outreach Program
- ❖ Monitor Blueprint Implementation
- ❖ Develop a Valley-wide Blueprint Vision Statement

Appendix B – Institutional Arrangements Whitepaper and Directive to staff from MCTC Policy Board to outline issues of concern

This document has been prepared by the consultant team as part of its work on the Blueprint Roadmap. The intent of the paper was to research different existing regional institutional arrangements (in other words, how other regional planning areas are structured, how they operate and how they are managed by an oversight governing body). Additionally, the consultant was also asked to identify options for effective institutional arrangements for the Valley that would facilitate implementation of the Valley-wide Blueprint. In conjunction with this work product, the MCTC Policy Board at its January 2011 meeting also asked MCTC staff to provide an evaluation of the options with issues of concern (handout).

"The Whitepaper includes nine profiles of regional planning agencies, illustrating different types of organizational structures with varying levels of responsibilities, authority, and resources. The profiles include California agencies as well as agencies in Washington, Oregon and Colorado. The document

also identifies three conceptual institutional "options" for the San Joaquin Valley to implement the Valley-wide Blueprint and further Valley-wide programs and initiatives. The options are described in terms of organizational type; legal authority; membership and representation; voting structure; responsibilities and functions; staffing; and potential revenue sources. Each option also includes a set of conclusions". The following are the three conceptual options:

- ❖ **Option 1: Maintain the existing MOU and Regional Policy Council.**
This option maintains the current governance structure within the eight San Joaquin Valley MPOs. Each MPO's functions, staff and independent Policy Boards remain unchanged. The Policy Council (composed of two Policy Board members from each MPO and one representative from the SJV Air District) also remains unchanged. The Policy Council, as an MOU formed body, has no authority over the eight MPOs and cannot receive (independently) State or Federal funds. The Policy Council would continue to speak as the "One Voice" for the Valley before State and Congressional legislative delegations; and would continue to promote Valley-wide unity on items of common concern and interest among the eight MPOs .

- ❖ **Option 2: Regional Joint Powers Agreement**
This option also maintains the current governance structure within the eight San Joaquin Valley MPOs. Each MPO's functions, staff and independent Policy Boards would remain unchanged. However, this option would change the eight County Regional approach to governance. The option would create a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) among all eight Counties and create a two-tiered regional representation system. The system would be composed of a Regional "General Assembly" and an "Executive Committee". This governance approach is used by regions such as the "Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)" and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)". The General Assembly would only meet annually; and would set Regional Policy for all eight Counties, approve the Regional Work Program and Budget, set policy priorities and decision-making guidelines for the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee would meet more frequently than the General Assembly (say quarterly); and it would direct and approve day-to-day affairs at the eight County Regional level. The General Assembly would be composed of one representative from each of the eight Valley City Councils and one representative from each of the Valley Board of Supervisors. The Executive Committee would be composed of representative from each of the eight MPO governing Boards as well as representation from each City Council and Valley Board of Supervisors. The JP A would require additional staffing; however as a JP A the new Regional system would be eligible to receive and/or apply for State or Federal grant funds. Additionally the JP A could also create an additional dues assessment structure for its member agencies.

- ❖ **Option 3: Policy Board/Sub-Regional MPOs**
This option proposes changes to the current governance structure within the eight San Joaquin Valley MPOs. As with Option 2, this option would also create a Joint Powers Agreement (JP A) among all eight Counties; but it would form a single Policy Board. Regional programs and committees and the Policy Board would have a dedicated staff and be funded at the eight County Regional level via member assessments; and State and Federal funds. This governance approach is used by regions such as the "Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)" and the "Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)". The eight County Valley would also define three sub-Regions (perhaps, north, central and south). The MPOs within each sub-Region would enter into an MOU to consolidate MPO duties and functions. One such example of this could be the preparation of the "Regional Transportation Plan" at one MPO in each sub-Region. MPO funding would be distributed to and administered according to the MOU. The Regional Policy Board would be composed of representatives from each Regional Planning Agency, all Valley Cities and County Board of Supervisors. Sub-Regional MPOs would have a governance structure to include two representatives from each of the Regional Planning Agencies from that sub-Region. The Regional Policy Board would discuss and approve policy matters, committee structures, the annual Work Program and Budget; conduct and direct day-to-day affairs, authorize expenditures, and appoint and direct staff.

Staff reminded the MCTC Policy Board Members that these options are conceptual. They will be discussed as part of the Blueprint Guidance Framework at the March 25th Policy Council meeting in Fresno. All documents listed above are available at www.maderactc.org

Action: Information and Discussion Only.

V. REAFFIRM ALL ACTIONS TAKEN WHILE SITTING AS THE TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE

Action: The Commission unanimously approved to reaffirm all actions taken while sitting as the Transportation Policy Committee.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE CONSENT ITEMS

A. Executive Minutes of February 23, 2011

Included in the Commissioner's packet was a copy of the February 23, 2011 Executive Minutes.

Action: Approve Executive Minutes of February 23, 2011.

Administrative Consent Calendar Action

Action: Upon motion by Commissioner Dominici, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler to approve the Administrative Consent Calendar (Item A). A vote was called and the motion carried.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. 2010/11 OWP Budget Amendment No.2

Included in the Commissioner's packet was a copy of the letter to Caltrans requesting the amendment, copy of the amended budget, amended OWP spreadsheet, and amended work elements. The revised Budget is \$1,050,526 (increased \$542 from amended budget). The amendment reflects changes in carryover amounts, higher unemployment insurance costs, higher Traffic Model Support costs, and some WE budget changes to adjust for actual expenditures.

The amendment is recognized in the following:

Revenues – (Increase \$542)

- FHWA PL Carryover – decrease \$65,07
- FTA 5303 Carryover – increase \$4,525
- STIP Carryover – decrease \$9,224
- SJV Blueprint Carryover – increase \$3,479
- TDA Planning – decrease \$5,510

Salaries and Benefits – (Increase \$42)

- Unemployment Insurance – increase \$42

Other Direct Costs – (Increase \$500)

- Traffic Model Support – increase \$500

The amendment is reflected in the following OWP Work Elements: Work Element 100 – Regional Transportation Plan; Work Element 110 – Regional Planning Database; Work Element 111 – Traffic Monitoring Program; Work Element 112 – Traffic Modeling; Work Element 113 – Air Quality Transportation Planning; Work Element 120 – Streets & Highways Planning; Work Element 122 – Project Coordination & Financial Programming; Work Element 130 – Public Transportation; Work Element 140 – Other Modal Elements; Work Element 151 – Transportation Demand Management; Work Element 200 – Transportation Program Development; Work Element 901 – Local

Transportation Funds Administration; Program Work Element 902 – OWP & Budget; Work Element 904 – Valley-wide Coordination; Work Element 905 – SJV Regional Planning Blueprint; Work Element 907 – Board Costs & Other Expenses; Work Element 910 – MCTA Administration.

Action: Upon motion my Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Dominici to approve FY 2010-11 Overall Work Program and Budget – Amendment No. 2. A vote was called and the motion carried.

MCTC Sitting as the Madera County 2006 Transportation Authority

VIII. AUTHORITY - ADMINISTRATIVE CONSENT ITEMS

No Authority - Administrative Consent Items

Authority Administrative Consent Calendar Action

No action needed.

IX. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. 2011/12 Measure T Allocation Estimate

The 2011-12 Measure “T” Allocation Estimate is included in the Commissioner's packet. The estimate provides a not to exceed budget allocation for each Measure “T” program for each agency.

Staff requested that each agency prepare their Annual Expenditure Plan (AEP) identifying how each agency anticipates spending the funds in FY 2011-12 for each category, including the subcategories. The AEPs will then be incorporated into the Annual Work Program which will be presented as a draft document at the June Board meeting.

Action: Information and Discussion only.

X. Miscellaneous

A. Items From Caltrans

Caltrans gave a brief report on local projects in Madera County.

B. Items from Staff

Staff reminded the Board of the upcoming "Unmet Needs Hearing" which is to be held at the next meeting of the Commission April 20, 2011.

C. Items from Commissioners

No comments from the Commissioners.

XI. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Next MCTC meeting set for Wednesday, April 20, 2011.

Respectfully Submitted,

Patricia S. Taylor, Executive Director
Madera County Transportation Commission

