

<p><b>PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY</b>  <b>MINUTES</b>  <b>FEBRUARY 26, 2014</b></p>
--

The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency met on Wednesday, February 26, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 175 Fulweiler Avenue, Auburn, California.

<b>ROLL CALL:</b>	Tony Hesch Jim Holmes Paul Joiner Keith Nesbitt Pauline Roccucci Diana Ruslin Ron Treabess Miguel Ucovich Kirk Uhler	Celia McAdam Scott Aaron Aaron Hoyt Luke McNeel-Caird David Melko Solvi Sabol Shirley LeBlanc
-------------------	--	---

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Upon motion by Nesbitt and second by Treabess, the minutes of the January 22, 2014 PCTPA Board meeting were approved.

**AYES:** Hesch, Holmes, Nesbitt, Treabess, Ucovich, Uhler  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** Joiner, Roccucci, Ruslin

**AGENDA REVIEW**

None.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mary Jo Bittner, Auburn Interfaith Food Closet, explained that they had to move their facility and are now 1.1 miles from the closest bus stop. She is requesting public transportation closer to their new location by the Auburn Airport.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

Upon motion by Treabess and second by Roccucci the Consent Calendar was unanimously approved as submitted by the following roll call vote:

**AYES:** Hesch, Holmes, Joiner, Nesbitt, Roccucci, Ruslin, Treabess, Ucovich, Uhler  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None

**ADJOURN AS PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY**

**CONVENE AS PLACER COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

**ADOPTION OF REVISED NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS/INITIAL STUDIES AND AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLANS FOR AUBURN MUNICIPAL, BLUE CANYON AND LINCOLN REGIONAL AIRPORTS**

David Melko explained that PCTPA serves as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). A requirement of the ALUC is to prepare an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for those airports within their jurisdiction. Placer County ALUC has jurisdiction for Auburn Municipal, Blue Canyon, and Lincoln Regional Airports.

David Melko stated that Negative Declarations/Initial Studies and the ALUCP for these airports were released for public review on December 16, 2013 with comments due by January 31, 2014, which allowed for an additional 15 days of public review over the required 30 days. Each of the 57 comments were responded to in a document available to the public and where applicable, the ALUCP was revised in response to said comments. Additional attachments included the revised negative declarations and based on the comments, an addendum to the ALUCP was provided which will be incorporated into the final ALUCP.

Melko summarized the public comments in a presentation to the Commission then introduced Maranda Thompson, Mead & Hunt, who provided an overview of the responses.

Miguel Ucovich asked why noise levels and sound are mentioned in the plan if we have no authority over operations. Thompson explained that the ALUCP establishes restrictions on land uses to minimize noise levels and we do identify where those restrictions lie. The Commission looks to the respective jurisdictions airport master plan to define the area where noise impacts exist based on future operations. In response to inquiry by Tony Hesch, Thompson clarified that the effective date of the ALUCP is the adoption date so any projects that are in the planning process prior to the to the adoption date is considered an existing land use.

Keith Nesbitt acknowledged that the ALUCP is based on the City of Auburn's airport master plan however appreciated the language mentioning the City's future plans. Nesbitt inquired as to the process for changing some of the land use designations in the future. Thompson stated that once the City adopts a new master plan, it would trigger an ALUCP update for the Auburn Municipal Airport only. Thompson also clarified that that any development in the compatibility zones will be guided by the zones as they exist.

Chair Holmes opened the item for public comment.

Mary Stevens of Auburn wanted clarification on the role of the Commission and of the jurisdictions in regards to the Auburn Municipal Airport. Chair Holmes provided a brief overview and noted that operational concerns should be directed to the Auburn City Council. Additionally, he stated that her concerns be brought to the Placer County Board of Supervisors since two Supervisors represent the area in which the airport is located.

After several clarifying questions of staff, Ivan Karnesis stated his disagreement with how the compatibility zones are affected by the precision and non-precision approaches in the ALUCP.

Mother Abbas explained that she is between Auburn, Lincoln and Beale airports and have recently taken interest in aircraft overflight. Abbas suggested that the public concerns may become more of an issue down the road and development should be considered carefully.

Tony Hesch asked for clarification on Ivan Karnesis' comments. David Melko explained that Addendum 4, responds to Mr. Karnesis' comments on aircraft configuration and traffic patterns and has a recommended action. Melko clarified that the final version of the plan will incorporate the Addendum.

In response to inquiry by Ron Treabess, Melko clarified the staff recommendation includes no changes to the map, and that the responses to comments were made available to the public, including those who those who commented during the comment period.

Miguel Ucovich asked further details on plane movements and noise contours in the C1 zone. Keith Nesbitt disagreed with land uses on precision approaches and how they affect the C1 and C2 zones. In response to inquiry by Pauline Roccucci, David Melko clarified that a jurisdiction can make the requirements of airport operations and development more stringent than what is shown in the ALUCP.

Upon motion by Joiner and second by Uhler, the Commission 1) Adopted Resolution 14-02 for the Revised Negative Declaration/Initial Studies for Auburn Municipal Blue Canyon and Lincoln Regional Airports and 2) Adopted Resolution 14-03 for the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans for Auburn Municipal, Blue Canyon, and Lincoln Regional airports by the following vote on roll call:

- AYES: Hesch, Holmes, Joiner, Roccucci, Ruslin, Uhler
- NOES: Nesbitt, Treabess, Ucovich
- ABSTAIN: None

**ADJOURN AS PLACER COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

**CONVENE AS PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY**

**FY 2013/14 UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**  
**FINAL REPORT FOR FY 2014/15**

David Melko provided an overview of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds and the Unmet Transit Needs process. Melko noted that we received 138 comments during this year's process, most commonly regarding the need for additional transit including nights, weekends, and a unified bus system in the Tahoe area. After analysis it was determined that there were no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet. The analysis and recommendation were reviewed by Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC), Transit Operators Working Group (TOWG) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) who all concurred with the draft report.

Melko noted that the report continues the recommendation on a conditional basis that pertains to year round service on 267 that has been carried forward since 2004/05. Melko also noted there

was a letter received by Supervisor Weygandt regarding pursuing grant funding for Sheridan, and that PCTPA has applied for a rural planning grant from Caltrans that would address this funding issue.

Miguel Ucovich complemented David Melko his on community outreach effort. Tony Hesch stated that he recently became aware that there is no longer public transportation between Colfax and Grass Valley / Nevada City, yet realizes that the lack of ridership warrants resources going from Colfax to the more urbanized areas.

Jim Holmes noted that with Auburn Interfaith move and the potential move of the senior center, transit will undoubtedly be requested to these facilities.

Tink Miller, Placer Independent Resources of Auburn and member of the SSTAC, stated her support of the findings. Miller wanted to highlight that new shopping areas, such as those at Sierra College Boulevard, warrant amendments to the Short Range Transit Plans that would facilitate future findings to address this need. David Melko suggested bringing this issue to the Transit Operators Working Group (TOWG) and Board for discussion to address these and other needs, such as the senior center and Auburn Interfaith.

Ron Treabess appreciates the SR 267 comment remaining in the plan. He also requested that Highway 89 be regarded in the same manner taking ridership into account. Will Garner, Placer County Transit, stated that ridership on SR 267 is slightly down from last year but Highway 89, which is referred to in the report, is actually up 42%. Due to the timing of the report, the increase in ridership was not reflected.

Upon motion by Treabess and second by Nesbitt and second by Ucovich the Board unanimously adopted Resolution 14-15 making finding and recommendations regarding unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet as required by the Transportation Development Act (TDA).

**AYES:** Hesch, Holmes, Joiner, Nesbitt, Roccucci, Ruslin, Treabess, Ucovich, Uhler  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None

#### **PRELIMINARY DRAFT FY 2014/15 OVERALL WORK PROGRAM (OWP) AND BUDGET**

Celia McAdam explained the preliminary draft FY Overall Work Program (OWP) and Budget for FY 2014/15 must be provided to Caltrans by March 1. The work program largely focuses on a continuation of the significant efforts that were taken on in the current FY 2013/14, such as the widening of SR 65, the I-80/SR65 Interchange, the auxiliary lanes on I-80, Transportation Funding Strategy, and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update. Base tasks such as Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) and Transportation Development Act (TDA) also continue to be part of the work program for FY 2014/15. McAdam highlighted the budget numbers, noting that the budget balances.

Upon motion by Joiner and second by Ruslin the Board unanimously authorized the Executive Director to submit the preliminary draft of the FY 2014/15 Overall Work Program and Budget to Caltans.

**AYES:** Hesch, Holmes, Joiner, Nesbitt, Roccucci, Ruslin, Treabess, Ucovich, Uhler  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None

**2014 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP)**

**AMENDMENT**

Celia McAdam explained the Third Track project which supports additional passenger rail to Placer County and currently funded in the State Transportation Improvement (STIP), is now in the environmental process. Through this process, alternatives were narrowed down to those in the Union Pacific right-of-way. Unlike road projects, rail projects entirely within railroad right of way are automatically considered 'design-build', so design needs to be consolidated with programming for construction.

Upon motion by Treabess and second by Nesbitt and second by Joiner the Board unanimously adopted Resolution 14-14 amending the 2014 RTIP for Placer County to move \$3 million from design in FY 2014/15 to construction in FY 2017/18.

**AYES:** Hesch, Holmes, Joiner, Nesbitt, Roccucci, Ruslin, Treabess, Ucovich, Uhler  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None

**PCTPA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN / SACOG METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

Aaron Hoyt provided background on the roles and responsibilities for PCTPA as a state designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Placer County and SACOG's state designation RTPA for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties and their federal designation as a Metropolitan Transportation Organization (MPO) for the six county region. Hoyt explained that PCTPA, as an RTPA is required to prepare and adopt an Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and how this process integrates into SACOG's Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) which is a requirement of serving as the MPO. Hoyt described the 'bottom-up' approach for developing Placer County's RTP, looking at local jurisdictions general plans, bicycle master plans, and short range transit plans, as well as Caltrans' input on state highways. These are filtered into the regional planning level and incorporated into the RTP. These are then incorporated in SACOG's MTP which ties federal dollars to specific projects and allows the project to proceed. He stated that the RTP and MTP flow into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) which is the first four years of each of the respective transportation plans. The state also looks at these plans and how they are coordinating with SB 375, Sustainable Communities Strategy, and long terms goals of the state's mobility needs. Hoyt noted that PCTPA's RTP will be 21 years with the horizon year of 2036 and provided information on considerations in developing the plan including the goals, objectives, policies, funding revenues / constraints, and mobility needs.

Matt Carpenter thanked the Board for the opportunity to be a part of PCTPA's RTP kickoff. Carpenter noted that SACOG's MTP has the same horizon year of 2036, with adoption scheduled for spring, 2016, and includes many of the same requirements that are incorporated in PCTPA's RTP. Carpenter explained that clean air attainment goals and the preparation of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) are unique requirements to SACOG's plan. Carpenter noted that these are structured through a process of economic forecast, land use, transportation budget, transportation investments, performance outcomes, policies & strategies. He explained that SACOG works closely with PCTPA in this planning process with forecasting revenues, transportation investments and connecting the performance outcomes. Finally, Carpenter noted that SACOG's plan includes building on the past successes, accelerating the plan / investment timing to realize benefits as soon as possible, maintaining the current system, economic viability, the impacts on people, as well as moving people between the major job centers.

Tony Hesch thanked Hoyt and Carpenter and appreciates the 'fix it first' approach to SACOG's MTP. Keith Nesbitt asked if transit will play a larger role in the plans between now and 2036. Hoyt explained that finding the balance of transportation infrastructure and improving mobility is both the challenge and goal of the plan. Carpenter noted that it's increasingly important to have mobility options. Nesbitt supported the concept of moving people not just cars.

Aaron Hoyt discussed the two planning exercises of the RTP and MTP and their unique goals, objectives and policies, funding mechanisms, and performance measures. Hoyt explained that we will be coming back to the Board in the summer for the selection Environment Impact Report (EIR) with an adoption in the fall.

Miguel Ucovich stated his support of the Placer Parkway. Paul Joiner asked that emerging technologies be kept in mind for increasing capacities on roadways.

### **DRAFT GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) DISCUSSION**

Aaron Hoyt stated that PCTPA is looking to reaffirm the vision of the 2010 RTP, the goals, objectives and policies of the plan, and the how we can best provide clarity within the plan. Hoyt stated the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) has reviewed and their comments have been incorporated.

Tony Hesch suggested that goal six, policy 1 regarding bike and pedestrian plans could consider a safety component. Celia McAdam noted for the record that there was consensus from the Board to move forward with the goals, objectives and policies as outlined.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Celia McAdam explained the Washington, D.C. trip scheduled in February was rescheduled to March and noted the timing may be beneficial in that there is discussion of reauthorization of MAP 21.

**DIRECTION TO STAFF**

None.

Meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

---

Celia McAdam  
Executive Director

---

Jim Holmes, Chair