



DATE: August 31, 2009

MEMO TO: North County Corridor TAC, JD Hightower

FROM: Matt Machado

SUBJECT: North County Corridor Technical Advisory Committee (NCC TAC) Meeting
Minutes for August 4, 2009

In Attendance:

JD Hightower, City of Riverbank
Dave Myers, City of Oakdale
Brent Sinclair, City of Modesto
Matt Machado, Authority Manager

The NCC TAC was called to order at 1:00 p.m. on August 4, 2009 in the Room 3555/3772, 3rd floor, 1010 10th Street, Modesto, CA.

The minutes of June 30, 2009 meeting were approved. Motion by Brent Sinclair/second by Dave Myers. All in favor.

Vice Chair Hightower stated that the Committee would take items 4a and 4b out of order and place them ahead of item 3.

Item 4a: Presentation of Staff Report on Revised Corridor. Jim Robinson asked about the northern extension of the western terminus of study corridor, the "hump" in the study area. Matt Machado explained that the northern extension was provided as to allow future flexibility of the alignment study area in conjunction with the non-state project west of McHenry Avenue. Mr. Robinson stated his concern that the "hump" adversely impacts Modesto Feed, Chenault residents, agricultural operations within existing walnut orchards and Crawford area residents. Mr. Machado explained that the hump was necessary as to not preclude areas from the next steps of the project because if during design development stage, it is necessary to extend north of the boundary area beyond the Caltrans acceptable distance, then the project would have to go through another round of environmental studies with the result of delaying a needed project. Mr. Machado explained that next stage of the project would provide project alternative analysis and off-ramp alignment alternatives that would attempt to minimize these impacts. Mr. Robinson expressed his concern about the overall route adoption without taking into account the western corridor. His opinion is that the interchange on McHenry Avenue is highly dependent of the alignment of the west corridor. Mr. Machado explained that some alternatives have already been briefly evaluated and dismissed as not being feasible, like an Amy or Crawford Avenue alignment, but that more analysis is needed for other alternatives.

Item 4b: Presentation of Staff Report on Project Updates. Kris Balaji gave an update on the status of work items and future hearing dates. Mr. Balaji explained that there are two schedules,

early and standard, based upon Caltrans review of the project. Mr. Balaji explained that as the consultant Jacobs was confident of their ability to meet the early schedule, but recognized that there are time constraints on Caltrans staff ability to review the project and meet the early schedule. Mr. Balaji noted that even with the standard schedule, the project work items would be completed by the deadlines set by the California Transportation Commission. Landowners towards the eastern limits of the project explained that they recognize the need for the project and have met regarding the project. As a result of these meetings they propose an alternative to the project eastern terminus at State Route 120. A map has been prepared showing this alternative and they plan to digitize the map and forward it to Mr. Machado and Mr. Balaji.

Item 3: Presentation on Environmental Process by Christine Cox-Kovacevich, Office Chief, Caltrans Central Region. Areas covered:

- 1) Route Adoption process needed due to fact that we are looking at a new route alignment. This phase includes alternatives for study. This is a planning process to determine a general corridor. Looking at 2000' widths, keeping in mind that the future project level area will most likely be 240' ROW. This study corridor provides flexibility for future project level analysis. This current analysis includes traffic forecasting for the years 2030 and 2050. This is a long-range plan. These projections use adjacent Cities General Plans growth projections. Acknowledge that the future project level discussion can vary approximately 900' beyond the study area in the rural areas if there is a good reason. i.e. - reduced impacts.
- 2) Areas studied within the current EIR effort - air quality, noise, paleontology, hazardous materials, traffic, any direct impacts, farmland impacts, residential impacts, wetland impacts, vernal pools, and archeology.
- 3) Public Outreach - EIR includes 45-day circulation for review and comment, this will include two public hearings. The format of the public hearing will be: start at 5:30 p.m. with info boards and individual discussions, at 6:30 p.m. will give presentation of project, followed by opportunity for public to comment at microphone or by written comment. At end of 45-day review period, PDT will gather all comments and make a recommendation of preferred alternative. Alternatives will be screened based upon purpose and need. District 10 and Office Chief (Christine Cox) will sign final EIR as Notice of Determination. This document will then go to state clearinghouse. Route adoption map will be drafted to take to CTC for adoption vote. Finally, EIR with route adoption will go to individual local agencies for approval. Notice of Determination and then to be adopted into each jurisdiction General Plans.

Item 5: Members Closing Comments – None.

Item 6: Public Comment regarding the North County Corridor. Mr. Robinson stated his concerns over neighborhood impacts of the northerly alignment and that because of these impacts he favors an alignment that closely follows the existing Kiernan Avenue alignment.

Next TAC meeting will be on September 1, 2009 at 1:00 p.m. in conference room 3555/3772 (3rd floor) at the City/County Administration Building at 1010 10th Street, Modesto, CA.

Adjourned at 2:00 p.m.