

NEVADA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
May 19, 2010

A meeting of the Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC) was held on Wednesday, May 19, 2010 in the Grass Valley City Council Chambers, 125 East Main Street, Grass Valley, California. The meeting was scheduled for 9:30 a.m.

Members Present: Nate Beason, Carolyn Wallace Dee, Sally Harris, Larry Jostes, Chauncey Poston, and Ed Scofield

Member Absent: Ann Guerra

Staff Present: Daniel Landon, Executive Director; Michael Woodman, Transportation Planner; Nancy Holman, Administrative Services Officer; Toni Perry, Administrative Assistant

Standing Orders: Chairman Dee convened the Nevada County Transportation Commission meeting at 9:35 a.m.

CONSENT ITEMS

Commissioner Scofield requested that Item #4, the Revised Findings of Apportionment for FY 2010/11, be pulled from the Consent Calendar for further explanation.

1. Financial Reports:

A. February 2010 and March 2010. *Approved.*

2. NCTC Minutes:

March 17, 2010 Meeting and April 27, 2010 Special Meeting. *Approved.*

3. Correction to Resolution 10-06 Regarding FY 2009/10 Revised Findings of Apportionment. *Accepted the "corrected" Resolution 10-06, Revised Findings of Apportionment for 2009/10 FY.*

5. Allocation Request from the Town of Truckee for Deferred Revenue. *Adopted Resolution 10-21 reallocating to the Town of Truckee \$67,623 of Local Transportation Funds (LTF), identified as deferred revenue in the 2008/09 fiscal audit, for transit operations and capital improvements for FY 2009/10.*

6. Nevada County's Request for an Extension Regarding Deferred Revenue. *Approved the request by Doug Farrell, Director of Nevada County Department of Public Works, to extend the deadline from 60 to 150 days for transfer or reallocation of the \$360,917 deferred LTF revenue identified in the fiscal 2008/09 audit for Nevada County.*

7. FTA Section 5311 FFY 2010 Program of Projects. *Adopted Resolution 10-22 approving the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010 Program of Projects..*
8. Town of Truckee's Request for NCTC's Approval of Certifications and Assurances for their FTA Section 5311 FFY 2010 Grant Application Package in the amount of \$114,537. *Adopted Resolution 10-23 attesting that NCTC certifies and assures that the Town of Truckee has met the requirements for applying for FTA Section 5311 grant funds.*
9. Nevada County's Request for NCTC's Approval of Certifications and Assurances for their FTA Section 5311 FFY 2010 Grant Application Package in the amount of \$317,150. *Adopted Resolution 10-24 attesting that NCTC certifies and assures that Nevada County has met the requirements for applying for FTA Section 5311 grant funds..*
10. Contract for Development of the Nevada County Pedestrian Master Plan. *Adopted Resolution 10-25 authorizing the Chairman to execute the contract with Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants to develop the Nevada County Pedestrian Master Plan, with an amount not to exceed \$64,780.*
11. Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee Inflation Adjustment. *Accept NCTC staff report recommending no change to the Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) Program in 2010.*

Commissioner Beason made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar excluding Item #4. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed with an abstention from Chairman Dee of the April 27, 2010 Minutes due to her absence from the meeting.

ITEM PULLED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

4. Revised Findings of Apportionment for 2010/11 FY. *Adopted Resolution 10-20 approving the Revised Findings of Apportionment for the 2010/11 FY.*

Commissioner Scofield pulled the item to ask for an explanation of the substantial drop in revenues from FY 2009/10 and how that might affect current programs. Executive Director Landon replied that each year in May the California Department of Finance sends out an updated population estimate and based on that estimate the expected money for the upcoming fiscal year is apportioned. He said that Nevada County had a slight increase in their percentage of population; however, the chart showed that the apportionment was down. The reason was that in addition to the population adjustment there was also an adjustment for the revenues that are coming in this current year. The projection is that the revenues this year will come in below the estimate, so the adjustment is downward. Mr. Landon said that he has been in contact with the Nevada County and Town of Truckee transit staff about this so they will know how much is available to claim. He stated that it highlights some of the changes Transit Services are making with regards to their operations because revenues are down. Commissioner Scofield asked if those numbers were factored in. Mr. Landon responded affirmatively. It is not an additional loss of revenues and it was anticipated.

Commissioner Scofield made a motion to approve Resolution 10-20 adopting the Revised Findings of Apportionments for FY 2010/11. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

12. Correspondence

- E. Draft SR 174 Transportation Concept Corridor Report - Available on Caltrans District 3 website: www.dot.ca.gov/dist3/departments/planning/systemplanning.html. This is a Caltrans long-term planning document that evaluates highway conditions and establishes a twenty-year planning horizon. Submit comments by email to Shannon_Culbertson@dot.ca.gov by May 21, 2010. File 1200.6.

Executive Director Landon highlighted the Draft SR 174 Transportation Concept Corridor Report and said that comments were due to Shannon Culbertson by May 21st.

13. Executive Director's Report

13.1 Adoption of 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program

Executive Director Landon noted that the 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) was scheduled for adoption on May 20th. NCTC sent the California Transportation Commission (CTC) a recommendation for Dorsey Drive to be programmed in FY 2011/12. However, the CTC staff recommended to their Commission that it be delayed until FY 2012/13. They noted that any time a project moves, they have to make adjustments throughout the program.

Tim Kiser, Grass Valley Public Works Director and City Engineer, stated that the City of Grass Valley is pursuing Transportation Investments Generate Economic Recovery (TIGER) II funding, which is being released by the federal government. He said it is only \$600 million nation-wide, but \$140,000 million is being put into rural areas, which could help Grass Valley compete for the funds. Mr. Kiser said the city had hoped the STIP funds would be left in the 2011/12 FY funding cycle so they could be used as a match towards the grant. He commented that he had not fully understood the implications in Executive Director Landon's report when the CTC made the recommendation to move the funds out. Mr. Kiser asked NCTC for their continued support of any application to move the Dorsey Drive project forward, and the importance of keeping the STIP dollars as close to the current fiscal year as possible. He said moving the STIP funds to 2012/13 puts the city in an awkward position if they receive TIGER II funds and are unable to use the STIP funds as a match, since there is a guideline to be under contract within a year from the date of receiving the grant. He apologized for not seeing the change that came through. Mr. Kiser stated the City of Grass Valley is looking at every avenue possible to get funding and move the Dorsey Drive Interchange project forward. He said a positive aspect is that Senate and Assembly staff are calling the city to get details about the project and are trying to help Grass Valley find assistance to obtain outside funds. Commissioner Beason asked Mr. Kiser if he was referring to the \$10 million in the STIP, which has been promised, but has not been allocated. Mr. Kiser replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Poston asked Mr. Landon for background of how it works when recommendations come down from the CTC staff, and questioned if they were requesting everyone to move their projects back or if it was random. Executive Director Landon replied that NCTC submitted their Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) recommendations in February and then CTC staff goes through projects state-wide lining up when they are scheduled for construction, where money is available, and trying to match the cash flow to the projects. Based on when and where the CTC staff thinks the projects are most likely to be ready, they position the projects and make their recommendations to the CTC. Mr. Landon offered to call Mitch Weiss, the staff person at CTC over

the recommendations, explain the situation, and explore if there is a way to switch a project if funding comes through. He added that with the current scenario of construction bids coming in very low, if the TIGER II funds were awarded, perhaps there would be an opportunity to use some project savings and advance the project, which they have the discretion to do if the money is available. Mr. Landon thought it would at least put the CTC on notice that there is a possibility NCTC would like this to happen.

Commissioner Beason asked Mr. Landon, when referring to swapping projects, if he was talking about state-wide projects. Mr. Landon replied affirmatively. Commissioner Beason questioned if the CTC would have to find another project to move behind Nevada County's project, and asked Mr. Landon his assessment for any appetite to do that. Mr. Landon replied that the low bid costs are to our advantage, and if a TIGER II grant were awarded, the State of California would probably not want to lose federal funds. He thought there could be an incentive to accommodate the funding for Dorsey.

13.3 Safety Improvement Project at SR 20/49/Uren Street Intersection

Executive Director Landon said at the March 17th NCTC meeting Commissioner Harris raised questions about the Uren Street/SR 20/SR 49 intersection and NCTC staff followed up with Caltrans Safety staff. They reviewed the location and found a pattern of accidents. Caltrans is moving forward with a project to try to alleviate the safety concerns at that intersection. Commissioner Harris voiced her appreciation of all the efforts put forth.

14. Caltrans District 3:

A. Project Status Report: Winder Bajwa, Caltrans District 3 Project Manager for Nevada County.

- *Dorsey Drive Interchange* – Mr. Bajwa reported the right-of-way (R/W) acquisition is underway and all of the first written offers have been made excluding two properties that had revisions. Sixteen parcels have been acquired and plans are to complete R/W acquisition by the summer of 2010. All the internal reviews have been completed. He said it is now up to the property owners to agree to the proposals from Caltrans. Mr. Bajwa noted that Grass Valley council members and staff, along with Caltrans, have been negotiating with several property owners and he said there would be a meeting the following day with property owners to provide them with a Caltrans first written offer. He said once Caltrans gives the go-ahead to utility companies, they will relocate their utilities. Mr. Bajwa reported that, except for the few property owners, the project is ready to go.

Commissioner Poston asked if the remaining property owners could be planned out of the project. Mr. Bajwa replied that not all of them could, but he thought they may be able to work around the pharmacy property. Because of the design standards that are required at the intersection of Nevada City Highway and Dorsey Drive, he did not think it would be possible to work around that parcel. Mr. Bajwa thought they had addressed the owner's concerns during various meetings.

Commissioner Beason mentioned there was a parcel of land adjacent to the Dorsey Drive project that had a considerable amount of contaminated soil and he questioned if Caltrans would clean it up or if the property owner would pay the state to clean it up. Mr. Bajwa said he spoke to the Caltrans Hazardous Waste Unit several months ago when this was brought up, and the portion of land that

Caltrans is going to purchase does not have any contaminated soil so there is nothing to clean up. Commissioner Beason asked if the owner of the land would only sell a sliver of land to Caltrans versus the whole parcel. Mr. Bajwa responded that he believed the portion of land mentioned was purchased already. He offered to check on that purchase to be sure.

- *SR 49 Five Lane Widening at the La Barr Meadows Road Intersection* – Mr. Bajwa reported that the construction bids opened April 1st, the bids were close, and they came in very low. The bidding environment is very favorable since the project was initially programmed for \$21 million, Caltrans requested \$16.5 million from the CTC, and the lowest bid came in around \$8.3 million. Mr. Bajwa said a lot of money will be left on the table. The construction contract will be awarded on May 28th and construction should start in June. He stated that Nevada Irrigation District relocation would be completed the following week. PG&E relocation work is in progress. AT&T underground installation is 60% done. There is joint pole use so PG&E cannot remove poles until AT&T can relocate their facility. The cell tower at the Fire Department will be relocated by early June. Mr. Bajwa reported that he, Mr. Landon, Steve Castleberry from Nevada County Public Works Department, and Commissioner Scofield met with the Ponderosa Pines Management Committee regarding their access to SR 49 from the mobile home park. They have asked Caltrans to modify the main entrance into the park, to stripe the entrance to only have right-in and right-out moves, and restrict left turns northbound from the main entrance. Caltrans will build a paved area to their back gate and that will be their secondary access. Ponderosa Pines will send a letter to Mr. Bajwa and Mr. Castleberry indicating these decisions.

Commissioner Harris questioned if the savings of funds from this project are Proposition 1B funds. Mr. Bajwa responded that Caltrans put \$2 million of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds into the project and the remainder is Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funds. He continued that Caltrans was trying to leverage Federal Stimulus II money if it was passed, so they added federal contract language into the contract. When the Stimulus II did not pass, Caltrans decided instead of taking all the extra time to change the contract they would put federal money into the project and leave the contract language the way it was. Commissioner Harris asked if there were an opportunity for Proposition 1B funds to be spent on something else. Executive Director Landon replied that in January the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopted a policy regarding cost savings on CMIA projects. Mr. Landon called the CTC to check on the status once he heard of the cost savings on the La Barr Meadows project. He found that 10% of the cost savings will remain with the project in case there are cost overruns; the remainder of the funds are going into a statewide pool, and in late 2010 or early 2011 the Proposition 1B cost savings pool funds will be open to competition for additional CMIA projects.

- *SR 89 Mousehole* – Mr. Bajwa reported they held a Project Development Team meeting on May 17th with Dan Wilkins and Becky Bucar from the Town of Truckee and their consultant. All the technical studies are complete. Caltrans released a 60% Draft Project Report review that day and the final draft report will be ready for circulation by mid-July. The comment period will be thirty days.
- *SR 20 Between Rough and Ready Highway and Deadman's Flat Overcrossing* – Mr. Bajwa said there is nothing new to report. The project is being designed and will be constructed next season around April or May of 2011.

- *SR 49 Passing Lane Extension Project from Combie Road North* – Mr. Bajwa reported that construction has started and the project should be completed in June or July.
- *SR 89 Mousehole/Donner Creek Underpass Interim Improvements Project* – Mr. Bajwa noted this project has been awarded to a local Penn Valley company for \$245,000. The work should start in June or July and be completed in one month. Work includes upgrading flashing beacons, installing pedestrian-activated tunnel lighting, remove the existing metal beam guardrail in front of the tunnel, install a concrete transition barrier at the entrance and exit of the tunnel, install crash cushions in front of the new concrete barrier, and miscellaneous concrete work.
- *SR 89 Mousehole Maintenance Project Inside the Tunnel*

Chairman Dee reported that she was able to get Jody Jones, Caltrans District 3 Director, to sign an emergency order because the road bed inside the tunnel was floating with water under it and there was a large hole in the surface. She said the response was terrific with a bid going out on a Monday, awarded Thursday afternoon, and the project started the following Monday May 17th. Chairman Dee said twelve inches of the roadbed in the tunnel will be removed, as well as twenty-five feet either side of the tunnel. They will grind 100 feet south and 300 feet north down four inches and repave it so the road will be safe and able to hold cars again. SR 89 was closed from Deerfield Drive to West River and the traffic was detoured through town. It was estimated the project would be completed the following day. Mr. Bajwa said when there is an emergency project, the normal processes do not have to be carried out. Chairman Dee stated she had gone inside the tunnel to take pictures and a California Highway Patrolman came along and told her she had to leave the tunnel because it was unsafe. Commissioner Beason commended Chairman Dee for her initiative to get the job done.

- *SR 49 Minor A Operational Projects*

Chet Krage, member of Citizens for Highway 49 Safety, noted he attended a Task Force meeting for the SR 49 Safety Corridor on February 17th and Jim Brake of Caltrans Traffic Operations presented four possible minor improvement projects along SR 49 to improve safety. Each project cost about \$250,000 to \$300,000. He asked for the status on the work for those potential projects. Winder Bajwa said Caltrans developed an estimate of costs and a conceptual scope of work for the February meeting. The Project Initiation Document (PID) is being prepared by Caltrans Traffic Department to eventually go out to bid. Once that work is completed, the projects will be included in the Caltrans Minor A Program, they will be put on a list, and work will begin when funding becomes available. Mr. Bajwa noted that these are not really safety projects since they do not fit into the Caltrans criteria for accidents in those areas; they are technically operational improvements projects, so they will have to compete with safety projects for funding. Caltrans is hoping to construct the projects within the next one to two years. Mr. Krage clarified that the four projects may not qualify as safety projects against the Caltrans criteria for the number of severe accidents or fatalities, but it was agreed that there are accidents that occur in these four locations, therefore it was discussed to add turn lanes to reduce the probable cause for accidents. Mr. Bajwa replied that was exactly why Caltrans was working on projects for the four areas identified. The process to prepare operational and safety projects is the same. A PID is prepared, and then design, environmental, and R/W work is done. Once the PID is complete, the projects are authorized to move forward.

Mr. Krage asked Mr. Bajwa to regularly report an updated status on these four projects at each NCTC meeting. He did not want the projects to get lost, since it was agreed that incremental

improvements would be made to SR 49. Mr. Bajwa agreed to add these to his Caltrans report. Executive Director Landon said he had talked to Jim Brake the previous day on the four projects and Mr. Brake indicated that their concept is complete, they are on a master list, and are slated for construction in the 2012/13 year. Depending on the bidding environment, they may be able to move one or more projects up if cost savings become available, but they are in position and on the list.

Chairman Dee asked if the funding is provided under the Minor A Program. Mr. Bajwa said there are different program types in Caltrans such as State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP), STIP, safety projects, and emergency projects. Projects are put in certain categories and certain project types get greater priority than others. Mr. Bajwa said the reason these four projects were put under the Minor A Program was because District 3 has more control over the Minor A Program and projects can be shuffled around. If it were a regular SHOPP project, then Caltrans Headquarters and program advisors would get involved, and then it becomes a lengthy process which they would like to avoid.

Commissioner Beason said he was at several meetings with Rick Helman of Caltrans and it was represented that the four projects were going to be considered as safety improvements on SR 49. Winder Bajwa said that most projects improve safety whether it is resurfacing a roadway or putting up a metal beam guard rail. What he meant was that a Caltrans safety project must meet certain criteria. Commissioner Beason stated that Rick Helman understood there was a certain urgency associated with SR 49 safety improvement projects. Mr. Bajwa assured the Commission that the four projects would have Caltrans full attention. The projects are on a list and they will be moved up when possible.

Commissioner Scofield said the area at Lady Bird Lane poses a scary situation if you have to make a left turn from the highway. He thought that area had more safety issues than the extension of the passing lane from Wolf/Combie Road up to Brewer Road. Mr. Bajwa said he would talk to Robert Peterson, Caltrans Safety Engineer, and see if the projects can be moved forward quickly.

Mr. Krage said there were two very valuable sources of safety information: the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and the Fire Departments; particularly Jerry Good, Battalion Chief at the Higgins Corner. He said the Nevada County Consolidated Fire Department also has a lot of information about what happens on SR 49 in Nevada County.

Debbie Porter, President of Golden Oaks Homeowners Association, said that two of the four projects are ways to get into the Golden Oaks community. She would like names of people to contact to help put the projects on a priority list. Mr. Bajwa said she could talk to him, Mr. Landon, or Caltrans District 3 Director Jody Jones. He reassured her that Caltrans is working with all the stakeholders as a team to get the projects done as soon as possible. The projects must be designed and the areas surveyed first. Ms. Porter said she does not want to step on toes, but if there is something the citizens can do to help expedite the projects she would like to know. She receives many phone calls from the people who live in Golden Oaks asking if there is anyone they can contact. Mr. Bajwa said he will provide status of the projects to NCTC staff and at Commission meetings, and he believes progress has been made to get four projects on the Minor A Program list. He offered to do a presentation to their association on the projects. Chairman Dee invited Ms. Porter to attend future NCTC meetings to get updated information.

Commissioner Scofield asked that considering the huge savings on the La Barr Meadows project, would it make sense to try one more time to connect the four projects to that project. He sees the

four projects as almost an emergency situation. Executive Director Landon said when the appropriate time comes to apply for the additional CMIA fund savings, NCTC staff can submit projects and see how they compete with other projects statewide. The criteria for CMIA projects is they are looking at corridor operations issues and they look at delay and time savings associated with the improvement. Commissioner Scofield said that was the normal process to compete with everyone and the odds would be not to get it. He thought perhaps right now, before the savings gets thrown into the bigger pot, to try one more time. Mr. Landon said he would do that again. When he heard the bid came in low, he called Maura Toomey, the staff person over CMIA, asking if there would be an opportunity to use the funds within the corridor. Her response was that all the extra funds from every CMIA project is going into the statewide pot. Commissioner Scofield said he heard at that week's meeting that other projects had been extended, and maybe a chip seal could be done from the La Barr Meadows project down to the projects being proposed. Commissioner Harris suggested that with the 10% reserve, as the project goes along and it is seen that there are no overruns, possibly a change order could be done that might extend the project and use some of the reserve on one of the four small projects. Mr. Landon responded that the problem with a change order is that the other projects are a few miles away from the La Barr Meadows project, so it is a stretch to make that connection.

Executive Director Landon said there was a CTC Town Hall Meeting the previous week and Jim Earp, current CTC Chairman, rode on a bus up SR 49 with himself and others. They stopped at Foothill Community Church and the roadmap of the project was shown to Mr. Earp. He was very impressed and told NCTC staff he would like to find a day when he is not busy so he could come up to Nevada County and hear about other local projects. Mr. Landon said if that opportunity occurs he would present the other SR 49 projects to him then.

Commissioner Beason said a change order had been discussed several months ago with things that were within the proximity of the La Barr Meadows project and he wondered about that idea. Executive Director Landon replied that it had been considered to extend the frontage road to the front entrance of the Ponderosa Pines Mobile Home Park, but they decided they want to use their back gate as their egress so it was not necessary to pursue the change order.

Commissioner Poston asked about how the four projects were going to get designed to be shovel ready when the funds become available. Mr. Bajwa said for small projects the design work is relatively quick, within four to six months. Law and regulations require environmental clearance and an environmental document be prepared, a Project Report is prepared, and then if there is any acquisition of R/W and utility relocation, that will also take some effort. He said the way the Minor A Program works is Caltrans does environmental clearance, design, and acquires R/W the first year and then the second year the project is constructed. Commissioner Poston asked if there is funding left over from the La Barr Meadows project, theoretically, at that point would the design work, R/W acquisition, and utility relocation start or would it have a head start. Mr. Landon said the CMIA funds require that the projects have to be constructed by December 2012, but these projects have to fit into the Caltrans workload and the willingness of the director to put resources into the work. Mr. Bajwa said there is a lot of work to be done up front to secure the Proposition 1B bond money such as submitting an application, the adoption, etc. He said that first Nevada County would have to convince the CTC that they could use the savings on the La Barr Meadows project. Then the application would be submitted to get approval to use the money toward the four projects. The design effort takes money and money has to be put into construction capital, and potentially into R/W acquisition. Mr. Bajwa thought the best way to handle things would be to use the Minor A Program money to design and develop the projects and then propose using the bond money for

construction because the CTC is more open to using CMIA money for construction rather than support costs.

Commissioner Beason asked how long it would take to get a turn pocket shovel ready. Mr. Bajwa said it depended if there was electrical work for a signal, but if there were no signal, it would take about one year to do the design work, prepare an environmental document, get environmental clearance, acquire any R/W, and have the project ready to advertise. Commissioner Beason commented that several years previously, while working with Caltrans, the county got a crosswalk moved on SR 174 within three months time of talking about it. Mr. Bajwa said there are ways to speed up the process, but it is usually for emergency projects. A regular project has to follow normal procedures. Mr. Bajwa is in favor of looking for ways to accelerate any of the minor projects. Commissioner Beason said the ARRA projects had to be shovel ready to construct within one year. Chairman Dee said the current tunnel improvements on the Mousehole that will be constructed this summer took two years to process. Mr. Bajwa reaffirmed that “shovel ready” is when all the constraints are clear and you are ready to advertise the project.

B. SR 49 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP): Shannon Culbertson and Aaron Cabaccang, Caltrans District 3 Transportation Planners for Nevada County

Executive Director Landon handed out a letter to the Commission that the City of Grass Valley staff had just given to him from Assemblyman Dan Logue. The letter requested assistance from the NCTC to secure funding for the Dorsey Drive Interchange project and to extend the boundaries of the SR 49 CSMP to Nevada City to include the interchange portion of SR 49.

Shannon Culbertson presented information on the proposed Draft Boundary Line Amendment to the SR 49 CSMP on behalf of Rick Helman who was unable to attend the meeting. She provided history of the SR 49 corridor planning process and the sequence of events leading up to the draft CSMP amendment that was included in the memo to the Commission. The SR 49 CSMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on October 27, 2009 to discuss the amendment. The group consisted of staff from NCTC, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA), Auburn, Grass Valley, Nevada City, the counties of Nevada and Placer, CHP, Caltrans District 3, and representatives from the Citizens for Highway 49 Safety. It was the consensus of that group to present the CSMP amendment to the NCTC to determine if it was something the Commission wanted to pursue. The amendment proposed expanding the corridor boundaries north on SR 49 to the SR 20/49 junction in Nevada City and to list the key highway projects on SR 20 under “Other Non Phased Projects” in Table 10 of the CSMP. Ms. Culbertson reported that it was also the general consensus at that meeting that the list of “Phased Projects 1-8” in Table 10, which contain smaller, less costly safety and operational projects, have higher priority over larger, more costly projects. She noted that the safety projects were not prioritized within the list, but the safety projects as a category would have a higher priority over other discretionary projects. Ms. Culbertson asked the Commission if the amendment to the CSMP was something they wanted to pursue or did they want to discontinue processing the amendment.

Commissioner Poston asked if the recommendation of the CSMP TAC was to list the extension or any of the projects within the extension as Non Phased. Ms. Culbertson directed the Commission’s attention to Table 10 where the projects were broken out. Commissioner Beason said he did not recall the TAC giving the Commission a “recommendation”; he said the word “consensus” was used. Ms. Culbertson said they agreed as a group to “present” the proposed amendment to the NCTC, not that it was approved or they felt it should move forward. Commissioner Harris asked if

anyone was in attendance at that meeting that could characterize what took place. Winder Bajwa said he was at the meeting and the team felt it was the place of the NCTC to decide whether or not to take action to modify the CSMP. He stated if the Commission decides not to pursue the amendment, then Caltrans will go back to the original approved CSMP.

Commissioner Jostes asked what the impetus was for the amendment to extend the corridor if there was no formal recommendation given, and since the Commission was satisfied with not having the extension included in the 1992 SR 49 corridor plan until one year ago. Caltrans said it “could” be added, but Commissioner Jostes asked for the “reason why” it would be added. Winder Bajwa replied he thought the main reason was because of the Proposition 1B bond CMIA funds. He said if new funds are available in the future, there would be a larger pool of projects to look at. He added that there may be bond money to capture and there would be projects ready to construct. Executive Director Landon said that at the adoption of the original CSMP in May 2009, there was a request from the Commission to bring back a proposal to consider the extension.

Commissioner Harris stated that her understanding was there has been an evolutionary process that started in 1992 with a vision of five lanes along SR 49. It was learned over time that financially it was unlikely to have the funds to construct five lanes in the near future or even stretched out ten or twenty years. She noted that the Commission considered putting the SR 49 projects into the Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) Program, but it drastically raised the amount of fees that would be collected for new construction so it was not done. Commissioner Harris said what she has learned being on the Commission was that maybe the perception eighteen years ago, and even ten years ago, is something that is not feasible and maybe it is not even desirable because safety is a more important aspect rather than just a broad view that it has to be five lanes. She recalled that two years ago at the NCTC meeting in Truckee when the Commission was being asked to approve the CSMP, the question came up as to why it only went to McKnight Way, given the regional nature of what the Commission does and the issues that occur all along the corridor. She thought the CSMP stopped at McKnight Way because of the old idea of the five lanes. Commissioner Harris said she has been given the understanding, and she referred to the letter they just received from Assemblyman Dan Logue, that now to be included in the CSMP it gives weight to many different possible sources of funding over time. She felt that was a new and different aspect and by excluding the main population centers of Grass Valley and Nevada City, the county may be missing out on competitive funds at the federal or state level. She asked for comment from a Caltrans person regarding this new idea. Winder Bajwa said he thought Commissioner Harris was correct that the CSMP opens up other avenues and could attract other sources of funds over and above bond money. He stated that the Route Concept Report Caltrans prepares does not go into details like in the CSMP, so when decision makers look at the CSMP they can actually pick and choose projects because of the cost information and limited scope detailed. He added that the four Minor A projects being developed came out of the CSMP, so it does not have to be bound by bond funds only.

Commissioner Beason said his memory was that the Commission was looking for ways to make SR 49 safer because of the lack of funding to do the five lane widening project. However, there is a phased segmentation of the highway widening. He asked if there was a project planned to be built after the La Barr Meadows Road project. Winder Bajwa said there was a project in the CSMP, but due to the high cost to develop the project that strategy is on the lower end of the priority. He stated there is a Project Study Report that is already approved to put in five lanes at the northern section of SR 49 from the La Barr Meadows project north to McKnight Way, but there are no funds to start work on the design of it. In the interim Caltrans will do smaller projects like the ones discussed.

Commissioner Beason brought attention to the Non Phased projects listed in Table 10, and asked how they would not “starve” the funding that might be put into improving SR 49. He thought the next step might be for Caltrans to make them Phased projects over time, and that was the problem he was having with adding the projects to the CSMP. He noted that some of the Non Phased projects had earlier completion dates than the Phased projects, and asked how that worked. Shannon Culbertson responded that Non Phased projects are those that are only identified in the delivery phasing plan; they are not prioritized; it is a listing of the projects as a whole. She thought that some having earlier completion dates was just an anomaly or coincidence. Commissioner Beason said what starts out as an anomaly, with his experience at NCTC, has a way of getting legs. He asked the source of information used to come up with the list of projects since the Crestview project was listed and NCTC does not recognize it as a viable project; it is strictly a project driven by proposed development projects. Ms. Culbertson replied that Caltrans looks at all the different local planning documents such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Grass Valley General Plan. Caltrans is not responsible for how projects get on local planning documents, but it is the only source of information they can go by and they cannot leave a project off when it is listed on a locally generated document. Mike Woodman, NCTC Transportation Planner, said the Crestview Interchange was included in the 2005 RTP. It was included in the unconstrained project list, which means the funding was not available for that project, and it was identified as developer funded at that point. He said Crestview was included in the RTP because it is in the Grass Valley General Plan as something that could occur in the future. Commissioner Beason asked why it was included in the CSMP if it is developer funded. Mr. Woodman said when Caltrans created the table they pulled all of the projects listed in the RTP and included them all in the list. Commissioner Beason asked if NCTC staff looked at the list before it was finalized. Mr. Woodman replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Beason said he was curious about the letter given them from Assemblyman Logue that talked about giving priority to the Dorsey Drive Interchange since it is the number one project for NCTC in the RTMF Program and has been for sometime. His question was how would the Dorsey Drive project gain stature by putting it in a Non Phased project category if it is already number one in the RTMF category. Commissioner Beason again referred to Assemblyman Logue’s letter to the Commission and said it was really curious that Mr. Logue has not tried to make Dorsey Drive Interchange a state project, as it is a locally generated project. He thought if Mr. Logue was really interested in the project he would do something other than write a letter. He reminded everyone that Congressman McClintock has made public statements that he is opposed to earmarks.

Commissioner Jostes asked if a project is put into the CSMP and then prioritized in whatever category, and the Commission continues to place their first emphasis on safety for the two lane portions of SR 49, and if these other projects like Dorsey Drive and Gold Flat Interchange are in the CSMP, could they not be pushed off because we might want to always do the safety projects first. So, these projects in fact lose status because they are on a new prioritization list. He would not want to find the Commission in a trap where they put projects into the CSMP, only to find that they lose status because of the stated prioritization of the SR 49 corridor.

Commissioner Harris asked Executive Director Landon to address these projects – some being in RTMF, some in the CSMP, some for CMAQ funding, and there is quite a bit of overlap in them. She asked if there is any jeopardy to that and how do these things interplay with each other. She also asked if it matters that we have what is a high priority project in Dorsey Drive as a Non Phased project in the CSMP, and is that going to harm us with other sources. Mr. Landon responded that it all depends on the funding source and he thought the best example, as Commissioner Beason pointed

out, is that Dorsey Drive has been the number one high priority project with the NCTC for a number of years, but when the CMIA Program came out it did not meet the qualifications or the criteria for that funding source, therefore the Commission pursued securing funds for SR 49. He added that the jeopardy depends on two things: 1) The funding criteria for the particular program you are considering; if there were a funding program that came out and two projects were eligible, they would be competing; 2) the other thing depends on the political decisions made by the Commission itself as to where they want to prioritize things and what they decide is best for the community. Commissioner Harris asked if it would be okay for a project to appear on all three lists and not jeopardize anything. Mr. Landon said it would not jeopardize anything, if it was the Commission's desire to do that, but if a funding program comes out that SR 49 and Dorsey Drive are both eligible for, then the priority that is given in the CSMP could potentially jeopardize one or the other project, depending on where they are placed.

Bruce Jones, Citizens for Highway 49 Safety, referred to Commissioner Harris' comments regarding what she thought had changed over time as to what a safety corridor is. He passed out a letter from Tom Woods, Chief of Traffic Operations at Caltrans, and he read the first paragraph defining what a safety corridor is. According to the Caltrans definition, the SR 49 corridor north of McKnight Way does not meet the criteria or qualify as a safety corridor. Mr. Jones stated that their position has not changed regarding the extension of the SR 49 Safety Corridor. He said it was a major block to getting the long overdue attention to SR 49 five years ago. Meetings he attended discussed which projects should receive the most funding while people were dying at an alarming rate on SR 49. The fatal accidents were crossover accidents, which is not a factor in the proposed extension section where there is a K-rail and lower speed limits. The CSMP Amendment does not include the number of fatalities and serious accidents in the area of the proposed extension to the corridor. He would like to see any additional funding go toward safety projects along the SR 49 corridor. Commissioner Beason stated there have been three hundred accidents in the past five years on SR 49 between Combie Road and Newtown Road, twenty of them occurred in the freeway area of Grass Valley/Nevada City, and there may have been one fatality in that area. Commissioner Beason said he heard that the CHP was not in favor of extending the corridor, and wondered if Mr. Jones had that information. Mr. Jones said he spoke to Officer Lawrence the previous day and he said they were not in support of the extension. He said he knew the CHP received additional funding for safety corridors, but they have to have statistics to get the funding. If you add a section of the highway and it waters down the statistics, they cannot get the funding. He stated it took the CHP two years to get the additional funding they have now for increased enforcement of the SR 49 corridor. Mr. Jones believes the additional enforcement on SR 49 helped to lower the fatality rate, and their group does not want to see the statistics watered down by adding the northern portion of SR 49 to the corridor.

Tim Kiser, Public Works Director and City Engineer for the City of Grass Valley, noted that the issue of a safety corridor was not what was in front of the Commission at the meeting. He said the Corridor System Management Plan encompasses safety with all other factors. He noted that the city was not interested in competing for safety funds on SR 49. Mr. Kiser said the City of Grass Valley recognizes there are safety issues on SR 49 and they should have top priority. He stated the city was interested in the Dorsey Drive Interchange and getting onto every type of list possible and in every program, so when they submit applications they have the most diverse project as possible with the most support possible. He said one of the criteria for TIGER I funds that they scored on was whether you were a part of a CSMP or a master plan for your corridor. At that point in time the city had to say no. They are looking for noncompeting "congestion relief" funds. He said SR 49 is not looking for congestion relief funds; they are looking for funds to add left turn pockets to improve safety and he thinks that all citizens of Grass Valley appreciate that as much as everyone else

because they drive those roads also. The city would like to have opportunities to get funds through other future means without competing with safety/access improvement projects along SR 49. Mr. Kiser said he was at the CSMP TAC meeting when the list of projects was brought forward; they only wanted Dorsey Drive listed for visibility on the federal and state levels and to show collaboration with other jurisdictions and regions to have it benefit the city on applications.

Chet Krage, Citizens for Highway 49 Safety, said he has commented in several of the Task Force meetings over the past eight months that he believes they are attempting to make a decision that does not need to be made. By making a decision to extend the corridor right now, he feels it would dilute the emphasis. Mr. Krage told of an incident the previous Saturday where emergency vehicles were trying to get through the intersection of SR 49 and Combie/Wolf Road – he said that intersection is the busiest intersection in western Nevada County with 55 mph speeds southbound and 65 mph speeds northbound, which makes it additionally hazardous. Two drivers did not see or adhere to the sirens and flashing lights and there almost was a serious injury there. Mr. Krage said Higgins Corner Fire Department should have control of that signal so they can stop traffic and safely go through the intersection. He said it is not a big money ticket, but it is about the focus and the emphasis. He thought there have been some real improvements with the accident and fatality rate in 2005-06 and previous years, and he believes that making a decision now to extend the corridor is only going to dilute the emphasis that is needed to continue to save lives.

Commissioner Harris noted that it has been said very clearly that a safety corridor and a CSMP are two different things and questioned if that was true. Ms. Culbertson said the CSMP is used to identify a corridor, discuss everything on the corridor as defined within the parameters of the corridor, and list all of the projects within the corridor that could potentially improve it over a period of time that are based on local planning documents. That could be operational improvements, safety improvements, long term developer projects that come in when there is local development; it is an all encompassing document used to manage the corridor. Commissioner Harris asked if the safety corridor concept was tangible to give priority to those projects or was it just a description. Executive Director Landon said the safety corridor is a specific designation for a specific area. Commissioner Harris asked if the safety corridor could be codified and then have a CSMP that meets the broader definition. Mr. Landon said that is possible. Commissioner Scofield said if you would look at a “safety project” in the upper portion of SR 49, what would it be; it is not Dorsey Drive. He added if those type of projects would be added, then add the intersection of SR 49 and Combie Road, which is a big issue with ingress and egress onto the highway. That is a project that the county has to deal with and is included in the mitigation fees.

Commissioner Beason asked if there is some way through the legislature and the help of Assemblyman Logue, or otherwise, that the Dorsey Drive Interchange project could be made a state project. Winder Bajwa responded that Mr. Logue could help, and the project could be taken to the CTC since they are the body that would actually allocate funds. Commissioner Beason thought that is what would give the project stature. Mr. Bajwa said the project is locally initiated, but the RIP funds are state funds, so in reality the state is funding the project. There is also a component of local funds like RTMF and CMAQ. He would recommend that somehow the project needs to be elevated to the highest level of decision makers because that is how projects get funding around the state. Mr. Bajwa said the CSMP is a broader perspective planning document that addresses more than one type of funding; it is a corridor management document that identifies safety issues and potential funding to resolve the issues. However, there are different issues on the town freeway system like capacity enhancement, or building a new interchange like Dorsey Drive, so it could handle those issues as well. Safety money does not have to be designated to an operational or capacity

enhancement, and extending the CSMP limits does not mean it will impact funding for the safety corridor portion of SR 49. He agreed with Mr. Kiser that extending the CSMP could open up different avenues of funding for the upper portion of the freeway.

Commissioner Beason asked if the Dorsey Drive Interchange were to become a state project, not a locally initiated project, but a project that Caltrans wanted to do, would it have a higher status in the big scheme of things. Winder Bajwa said that was a tough question, but he noted that Caltrans is the lead on the Dorsey project and NCTC is the sponsor. He added that he did not think it would change anything. Caltrans has gone so far and if the people at the CTC are not aware that the project is ready to go, then something needs to be done. Commissioner Beason said the funds will compete because politically decisions will be made. He agreed with Commissioner Jostes that putting Dorsey Drive on a list as a Non Phased project could possibly reduce its stature. Winder Bajwa added that he is having Caltrans staff redo the estimate for the Dorsey Drive Interchange, based on the very low bids that are coming in on other projects. Caltrans had an \$18-19 million estimate, but he thinks that estimate will drop down to possibly \$15 million because costs have come down. Mr. Bajwa said it is in the favor of the project to go to construction soon in order to take advantage of the down-turn in costs. If they wait for two years to construct the Dorsey Drive Interchange, prices could escalate if the economy improves. Commissioner Beason asked Mr. Bajwa if he was sure the \$10.5 million would be there. Mr. Bajwa referred to Executive Director Landon's comment that if the remainder of the funds can be identified, then the state may look seriously at accelerating the STIP portion of the project.

Commissioner Poston said he was the person who requested the Commission look at the extension of the SR 49 corridor in the CSMP about one year previously. He stressed that it was never the intention of the extension to compete for funding to fix safety issues on SR 49. He concurred that it is a huge safety issue to drive up and down SR 49 and he reassured the safety advocates that there is no intention to compete with safety projects for funding. He felt too much had been made of the issue of competing for funds. Commissioner Poston said that safety issues versus congestion and correct future planning issues are two different things. He noted that he asked NCTC staff to pursue the four smaller safety projects. Commissioner Poston stated the proposed amendment to the CSMP is a natural extension of the corridor. He encouraged Commissioner Scofield to request the Combie Road intersection be included since the CSMP is about long term planning. He feels the inclusion of Dorsey Drive in the CSMP would help the City of Grass Valley compete for additional funding and it would show that the NCTC supports the Dorsey Drive Interchange funding. He believes the interchange is key for economic growth of the region. Commissioner Poston's understanding was the TAC did make the recommendation to include but not schedule the upper section of SR 49.

Commissioner Poston said if Dorsey Drive receives TIGER II funding from the federal government that would release committed RTMF funds for other projects. Commissioner Beason asked how alternative sources of funding free up RTMF funds that have a nexus to Dorsey Drive. He noted that development has to fund part of the Dorsey Drive Interchange. Commissioner Poston agreed. Commissioner Beason said that is RTMF funds, unless the city puts a condition of approval on the project. Commissioner Poston said they may. Executive Director Landon said in order to fulfill the commitment made with the RTMF, a portion of the project would need to be funded, or the program would have to be amended and changed, and an analysis done to bring in other regional projects to replace Dorsey Drive if it is removed.

Commissioner Jostes said he fully accepts Commissioner Poston's position on not competing for safety funds, but he asked the question if the amendment happens then one of the highest priority

projects in the county, Dorsey Drive Interchange, is in the Non Phased section. In order for it to move forward, does it have to be moved on Table 10 to a Phased project with a higher listed priority, or can it stay in the Non Phased section and gain the status that is desirable. Executive Director Landon said he could not answer the question about how putting Dorsey Drive in the Non Phased list would impact its status, but prioritizing the document would be subject to the NCTC's approval and it could be prioritized as the Commission saw fit. Commissioner Jostes said he is a huge fan of Dorsey Drive, but the Commission would need to be careful of unintended consequences.

Commissioner Scofield said if you need to have a CSMP for the entire corridor than let it run from I-80 all the way up to the junction of SR 49/20, but do not dilute the safety corridor plan that was designed for the specific purpose of reducing fatalities on SR 49 south of Grass Valley. He emphasized the need for a left turn lane at Ladybird Lane and the importance of lives saved versus the impact Dorsey Drive Interchange would make. He also mentioned Cameo Drive and the difficulty of making left hand turns across numerous lanes once the roadway is widened. He apologized to Commissioners Poston and Harris, but he believes there is a difference in adding the extension to the corridor.

Commissioner Harris said it has been stated definitively that the CSMP is not the same thing as a safety corridor, and it has also been stated that including projects in the CSMP may give them a little boost when it comes to potential new funding sources that the Commission is not even aware of today. She asked if there was some way to have the power and authority of a safety corridor that gives the best opportunity for funding safety, and at the same time do the CSMP as a planning document that is broader and more regional and has aspects to it that have nothing to do with safety; couldn't both be done to make them both powerful for Nevada County. Executive Director Landon responded that the designations are separate and distinct of a CSMP versus a safety corridor. The members of the NCTC have to determine the priorities that are given to the two plans and to the projects within those plans, and address concerns of some of the commissioners regarding dilution of the emphasis on the SR 49 corridor. Commissioner Harris said she sees the CSMP as a physical document that may help in ways that are not understood yet, in terms of funding sources for all projects possibly from I-80 all the way to the county line along SR 49. She stated that whoever is on the Commission over time will be the ones to decide to keep or change the priorities, whether it is in the CSMP or not. She would like to see the Commission go forward with expanding the CSMP at the same time as determining whatever needs to be done to make the safety corridor more concrete, clear and specific, and possibly consider extending the SR 49 corridor down further.

Chairman Dee agreed that the safety corridor needs to be protected before anything else. She was concerned about placing the Dorsey Drive Interchange into the Non Phased project list. She does not understand why the Commission would take their number one priority project with funding committed, and place it on the Non Phased CSMP list. She continued that if the project is that important why has it taken this long to bring it into the CSMP. Executive Director Landon replied that the CSMP is separate and distinct from the county's own Corridor Management Plan that was done previously. The CSMP was a requirement to create as a result of obtaining Proposition 1B funding for the La Barr Meadows Road project. The CSMP was strictly looking at the segments adjoining the SR 49 project. Commissioner Beason said that the idea was to improve SR 49 where it was two lanes over time. Chairman Dee said she questioned why some of the other projects were added as an extension of the corridor. There are some projects that are development driven and they should be handled as a separate issue. She said, whether there is a way or not to formally memorialize the safety corridor and make that the Commission's number one priority, the Commission cannot commit projects and plans and direction for future Commissions. Chairman

Dee said what the current Commission needs to take on are things they believe in and want to work toward delivering. Her thought was to possibly stay with the current plan, put more emphasis on the safety issues, and prioritize them more than in the past. Chairman Dee said it is great to pursue money for Dorsey Drive; however, she questioned what the Commission is doing to prioritize and fund projects on the safety corridor. These projects help prevent accidents by improving road conditions. She questioned if the Commission has been putting enough emphasis and focus on the safety corridor.

Commissioner Poston thought there were two separate sources of funding being discussed. Safety issues are paid for with safety money. However, what happens if funding becomes available for other types of projects. He questioned if Placer County was expanding their corridor. Executive Director Landon replied that Placer County had some CMIA savings on the first phase of the Lincoln Bypass and they submitted to the CTC that their savings go to the next phase of the Lincoln Bypass. However, the CTC staff recommendations did not support that. He said there was also a change on the SR 49 designations being moved from its current location to Elm Street. Commissioner Poston said that was essentially extending the corridor in Placer County, which is what was proposed in the amendment for Nevada County. Commissioner Beason did not agree. Commissioner Beason questioned if STIP money could be used on SR 49. Mr. Landon replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Poston made a motion to extend the CSMP through Grass Valley and Nevada City. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Commissioner Beason voted no; Commissioner Poston voted yes; Chairman Dee voted no; Commissioner Jostes voted no; Commissioner Harris voted yes; Commissioner Scofield voted no. The motion failed with four no votes and two yes votes.

ACTION ITEMS

15. Final FY 2010/11 Overall Work Program (OWP)

Executive Director Landon explained that the Draft OWP was brought before the Commission in March and was then circulated among the member jurisdictions and agencies. The principal comment that was incorporated into the Final OWP came from the Town of Truckee who requested some funding to assist with implementation of the Performance Audit recommendations. NCTC staff increased the budget to reflect that request.

Commissioner Jostes asked if the issues the Commission plans to address regarding airports will be outside of the OWP or would there be an amendment. Executive Director Landon replied that the principle source of funding for any work that would be done with the Airport Land Use Commissions (ALUC) would be funded by the applicants, so it will not impact the OWP. Chairman Dee asked if NCTC staff would be fully paid back for the work performed. Mr. Landon said that would be the intent of the fees that would be adopted.

Commissioner Beason made a motion to adopt Resolution 10-26 approving the Final FY 2010/11 Overall Work Program. Commissioner Scofield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

16. Responses to Recommendations Presented in the 2009 Triennial Performance Audit for the Western and Eastern Nevada County Transit Operators

Executive Director Landon explained that at the March meeting the Commission reviewed the Performance Audit for the NCTC and responses from the two transit operators were provided at the current meeting. He said the Transit Services Commission earlier that day reviewed and accepted the Performance Audit for western Nevada County. The Town of Truckee also reviewed the Performance Audit for eastern Nevada County, accepted the Performance Audit, and desired to move forward with implementation of the recommendations as evidenced in their request for OWP funding.

Chairman Dee noted that Jim Moore of Moore and Associates, Inc. made a presentation in Truckee to the Council and directed the corrections of the item on his report.

Commissioner Harris made a motion to adopt Resolutions 10-27 and 10-28 accepting the Triennial Performance Audits for the western and eastern Nevada County transit operators for FY 2006/07 through 2008/09. Commissioner Beason seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

17. Approve Designation of NCTC to be the Airport Land Use Commission for Nevada County Airport

Executive Director noted that the item came before the NCTC in March 2009 and the Sierra Economic Development District (SEDD) Corporation is anxious to be relieved of the responsibility. The necessary process has been accomplished through the Nevada County Board of Supervisors, as well as the City Selection Committee, recommending the designation of NCTC as the ALUC for Nevada County Airport.

Commissioner Scofield commented that as a member of SEDD Corp. this item comes up very seldom, but it gives the county more control over the airport. Commissioner Jostes said there is an Airport Commission and asked how that interfaces with the ALUC. Commissioner Beason replied that the Airport Commission advises the Nevada County Board of Supervisors on airport matters. Issues would probably get to them through the airport manager. The Airport Commission has no authority, but they could make a recommendation on a project. Executive Director Landon said as an ALUC any application that was approved or denied by the ALUC is appealable to the Board of Supervisors as the ultimate decision maker. Chairman Dee clarified that the NCTC would adjourn from their meeting and convene as the ALUC. Commissioner Scofield verified that this subject pertained to the Nevada County Airport, and the Truckee Airport would be handled separately since the airport is located in both Nevada and Placer Counties.

Commissioner Scofield made a motion to adopt Resolution 10-29 accepting the designation of the NCTC as the ALUC for the Nevada County Airport. Commissioner Beason seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

At 11:39 a.m. Chairman Dee adjourned the Nevada County Transportation Commission and convened the Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission.

18. Nevada County ALUC Proposed Fee Schedule

Chairman Dee said the proposed fee schedule will provide payment of staff time and will be totally self-supporting. Executive Director Landon noted that the proposed fees have worked for the Foothill ALUC and it was recommended that the fees be reviewed annually to insure that is the case.

Commissioner Beason asked if the fees under consideration were the 2006 Fee Schedule or if the numbers had been updated. Mr. Landon replied that it was the 2006 fees, but Mr. Smith from the Foothill ALUC noted that those amounts were adequate to cover costs.

Commissioner Beason made a motion to adopt Resolution 10-01 establishing the Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission Fee Schedule. Commissioner Scofield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

At 11:41 a.m. Chairman Dee adjourned the Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission and reconvened the Nevada County Transportation Commission.

19. Approve Designation of NCTC Staff to Support the Truckee Tahoe ALUC

Executive Director Landon noted that because the Truckee Tahoe Airport is an inter-county airport under California Public Utilities Code Section 21670.4 designation, the NCTC staff would provide staff support to this ALUC, which is a bi-county body. If a Placer County application was appealed, it would be appealed to the Placer County Board of Supervisors. Conversely, if an issue was a part of the airport that resides in Nevada County, it would be appealed to the Nevada County Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Harris asked if staff will also be reimbursed for any work done for the Truckee Tahoe ALUC. Executive Director Landon said the ALUC would adopt a set of fees that would go to defray staff expenses in the same manner as for the Nevada County Airport. This action will come in the future when the body is fully formed. Chairman Dee found it interesting that three of the seats went to Nevada County and one to Placer County. Commissioner Beason asked if the airport had a board of directors. Mr. Landon said they do and it is a separate district.

Commissioner Beason made a motion to adopt Resolution 10-30 authorizing NCTC staff to provide support to the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Commission. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Dee asked for any public comment before the Commission moved into Closed Session. There were no public comments.

COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Dee asked how many attended the Amgen Race in Nevada City on May 16th. Commissioner Harris said the estimates ranged from 10,000 to 40,000 attendees. She said the organizers did an exceptional job.

CLOSED SESSION

20. Employee Performance Evaluation of the Executive Director, Daniel B. Landon

Chairman Dee asked for any public comment on the closed session. There were none. The Commission left the council chambers at 11:45 a.m. to hold the closed session in a conference room adjacent to the chambers.

Chairman Dee reopened the meeting at 11:57 a.m. from closed session and reported that the Commission took no reportable action.

SCHEDULE FOR NEXT MEETING

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Nevada County Transportation Commission is on July 21, 2010 at the Nevada City Council Chambers, 317 Broad Street, Nevada City, CA.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Commissioner Beason moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. Chairman Dee adjourned the meeting at 11:57 a.m.

Respectfully submitted: _____
Antoinette Perry, Administrative Assistant

Approved on: _____

By: _____
Carolyn Wallace Dee, Chairman
Nevada County Transportation Commission