



County of Yolo

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

292 West Beamer Street, Woodland, CA; 95695-2598; (530) 666-8775; FAX (530) 666-8156; www.yolocounty.org

MEMBERS:

DISTRICT 1 Samuel Bivins
DISTRICT 2 Bruce Eldridge
DISTRICT 3 Kevin Spesert
DISTRICT 4 Steve Zehner
DISTRICT 5 Hans Strandgaard
AT LARGE Olin Woods

County Staff: Jim Campbell

Members Present: Bivins, Eldridge, Zehner, Woods, Spesert, Strandgaard

Meeting Minutes

Yolo County Transportation Advisory Committee

Cache Creek Conference Room; Thursday, April 27, 2017, **4:00 – 5:30 PM**

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Assign minute taker for meeting
 - a. Sam will take minutes.
2. Public Comments
 - a. John Whitehead: Contacted Don Saylor regarding email alerts, which haven't been sent out as expected. Tara Thronson (Saylor's deputy) will be looking into it.
3. Approval of Minutes of March 23, 2017
 - a. Minutes unanimously approved with no corrections.
4. Review TAC attendance requirements
 - a. The ordinance that formed the TAC states that any committee member who misses three consecutive meetings may be terminated at the discretion of the Board of Supervisors. Commissioners should let the Committee Chair know if they can't make the meeting.
5. Posting of Agendas and Minutes(Follow-up)
 - a. Agenda for this meeting and final minutes from February were posted in advance of this meeting.
6. 2016 Activities Report and 2017 Workplan Approval

- a. Final report and workplan were approved last month.
7. Chiles Road Closure and Flooding Update(County)
 - a. No update with Caltrans, but County Administrator's office is aware of the problem and will seek to include it when DWR does any levee improvement work for the bypass. This is primarily a Caltrans problem, but involving other state agencies may be helpful in the long term.
 - b. Staff will provide the right-of-way relinquishment agreement to the TAC for review to help determine whether Caltrans is responsible for drainage. The material will be provided by Jim prior to the next meeting so that the TAC has time to review it. Olin hoped that the County would have only accepted the relinquishment on the basis that Caltrans would not flood the roadway-but the language of the agreement needs to be reviewed.
 8. Issue: Congestion and high speed traffic on Mace Blvd. in South Davis
 - a. Olin noted that the high speed of northbound traffic on Mace Blvd just outside City limits requires people making the turn from Montgomery to be very careful. A friend of Olin's got t-boned there. This is the normal course of events. It's imperfect, but not a huge issue. Speed limit south of Montgomery is 55 mph.
 - b. Between Vacaville and Dixon, Google Maps and other traffic aps will take you off on I-80 at Midway and short-cut people to Mace Blvd through the County roadways. Once they arrive at Mace Blvd, at around 2.5 miles south of freeway, the traffic can get very heavy.
 - c. There was one night during a rainstorm when Chiles flooded and traffic was really bad.
 - d. Staff agrees that Google Maps/Ways is contributing to the problem. Some people are asking for a stop sign at Montgomery and Mace, but that's a City of Davis issue. There's a plan by City of Davis to cut Mace Blvd north of Montgomery from 4 lanes to 2. This "Road diet" as proposed by City of Davis may affect Google's algorithms so that they don't route folks through this area to avoid freeway traffic. "Your Speed Signs" that show cars' speed may be helpful to slow down traffic. However, those signs cost approximately \$25,000.
 - e. A possible solution is to put a speed detecting sign near Montgomery and split the cost with the City. The County will have a discussion with Bob Clark about the City's plans for their part of Mace Blvd and he believes Panos may know more about it. He also noted that the City has a traffic advisory committee that could be approached. This item will be continued at the next meeting.
 9. County Transportation Budget - Full Budget Report, including explanation of what trucks will be purchased for \$620,000 (line item in the proposed DPW budget)
 - a. Hans asked what the plan is for utilizing new SB 1 funds that will be coming to the County.
 - b. Jim noted the money doesn't kick in immediately, but it looks like County will get \$5.4 million by 2020. Next fiscal year the County expects to receive approximately \$1.6 million out of the total of \$5.4 million. Jim noted that this is a prediction since the actual revenue will depend on gas sales that could go up or down. He also noted that most of this money would be earmarked for

- roadway paving and rehabilitation projects similar to the way excess HUTA funds are already used.
- c. RMRA in the spreadsheet is road maintenance and restoration account; loan repayment is the other category of funds.
 - d. SB 1 money is not in the 2017/2018 Roads Budget because that was finalized before passage, but County will be looking for items to update budget based on SB 1 revenue.
 - e. SB 1 revenue estimates are based on current gas sales; if people buy less gasoline, the revenues may not be as high. Also, with influx of new money, the cost of construction will likely go up since there will be more projects and fewer contractors will likely bid on the County's projects.
 - f. Hans: who made the decision to use this for road maintenance and how was it made? Jim: we have a huge deficit for road maintenance and the gas tax funds must be spent in specific ways as mandated.
 - g. There are strings on use of SB 1 revenue. For example, County cannot purchase new equipment with the money.
 - h. Could the money be used to add shoulders to roads that don't have them now? Jim noted the County typically doesn't have the right-of-way to add shoulders to roads; this new money will not go to shoulders.
 - i. The \$620,000 for vehicle replacement will go to two new Ford F350 trucks, one an asphalt patch truck, and one semi-trailer, and one auxiliary engine for the painting truck. The State negotiates the price for the Ford trucks and the County gets the same price as the State.
 - j. Everything on the budget is broken out into three categories (admin, engineering (capital projects and permitting) and road maintenance (RDM)).
 - k. Staff presented an overview of the budget. A big chunk of services and supplies is money paid to other county departments (for example, IT, auditing, legal, etc.). Fees to other county departments are largely non-negotiable.
 - l. There is approximately \$6.3 million in money coming in from the federal government. There will also be \$1.5 million in general funds.
 - m. The County has reached a new agreement with Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation regarding impact fees for the planned Cache Creek Casino expansion. Hans thought some of the money would go to roads, but staff doesn't think any money will go toward the County's roads. Staff will follow up on tribal funds. Jim noted that Transportation staff were not consulted about the planned agreement. (SIC-the agreement has no money toward roadways but some money for transit-see the following link for more information on what was included:
http://yoloagenda.yolocounty.org:8085/agenda_publish.cfm?id=&mt=BOS&get_month=4&get_year=2017&dsp=agm&seq=6176&rev=0&ag=1751&ln=57668&nseq=&nrev=&pseq=5603&prev=0#ReturnTo57668)

10. Public Works Update (County)

- a. Project updates: The CR 99W bridge over Buckeye Slough is bidding next week since the County received the Army Corps permit just in time.
- b. The County Road crews have been using the new paver they received a couple of weeks ago. There have been a few hiccups figuring out how to run it.
- c. There are four sites in the County which are eligible for federally reimbursable

- storm damage funding.
- d. Olin moved for TAC to recommend staff take budget for approval by the board. Sam seconded. Unanimously carried.

11. Next Meeting Agenda Items

- a. Chiles Rd follow-up.
- b. Mace Blvd follow-up.

12. Next Meeting Date, Time and Location- May 25, 2017 4:00pm

Field trip to the Chiles Road flooding area. Meet at the entrance to the Vic Fazio Yolo Wildlife Area on the levee.