

# MADERA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

## EXECUTIVE MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday, July 23, 2008

**Time:** 3:00 p.m.

**Place:** MCTC Board Chambers

**Members Present:** Chairman Sam Armentrout – Councilman, City of Madera  
Vice Chairman Max Rodriguez – Supervisor, Madera County  
Jim Kopshever– Councilman, City of Chowchilla  
Vern Moss – Supervisor, Madera County  
Frank Bigelow – Supervisor, Madera County  
Alt. Steve Mindt – Councilman, City of Madera

**Members Absent:** Robert Poythress – Councilman, City of Madera

**Policy Advisory Committee:** Above Members present and Caltrans Representatives:  
Steve Curti

**MCTC Staff Present:** Patricia S. Taylor, Executive Director  
Derek Winning, Deputy Director  
Troy McNeil, Planner I  
Sheila Kingsley, Administrative Assistant

---

MCTC sitting as the Transportation Policy Committee.

### I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

### II. PUBLIC COMMENT

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

### III. TRANSPORTATION CONSENT ITEMS

#### A. *SB 375 (Steinberg) Transportation Planning -Oppose*

**Summary:** Senate Bill 375 is being promoted under the guise of reducing greenhouse gases – a goal we can all support. But the truth is that SB 375 is a complicated measure that would put the state, not locals, in control of key local land-use decisions by mandating rigid new state growth controls. Worse, SB 375 holds transportation funds hostage for localities that don't adhere to this new state scheme. Here's why a broad based coalition is opposed to SB 375:

#### **SB 375 Mandates Stringent and Unworkable Land-Use Rules that Erode Local Control**

- SB 375 establishes sweeping changes to local land-use and transportation planning. It replaces community decision-making with state-knows-best land-use rules that dictate how and where communities are to grow – irrespective of local needs and concerns. The practical effect of SB 375's stringent requirements would be to put the state, not locals, in charge of new growth and development in California.
- The legislation would effectively force a state-controlled land-use regime upon California's 478 cities and 58 counties that prescribes what local land use plans must look like, where and how a community can grow and what areas cannot be used for growth, and which transportation projects will and will not

receive funding based on this new state regime.

- SB 375 also puts enormous power in the hands of regional councils of government – which must develop growth plans based on the very prescriptive state-imposed requirements in SB 375. If cities and counties don't agree, they are penalized with loss of transportation funding.

#### **SB 375 Holds Transportation Funds Hostage**

1. The bill claims to use transportation funding as “incentives”, but the truth is that the measure holds current and future transportation funding hostage. SB 375 would even interfere with existing and future countywide transportation sales tax funding and some state bond funds as a means of forcing cities and counties to comply with the state-imposed definition of a “sustainable communities strategy”.
2. SB 375 threatens to subject every transportation project that is designed to add capacity or relieve congestion to a legal challenge on the grounds that it encourages growth – a new and unworkable standard that will thwart needed infrastructure and traffic relief.
3. Transportation funds are spread evenly in communities throughout the state to improve safety, relieve congestion and reduce vehicle emissions through congestion relief projects. Changing the rules for existing funding sources is not an “incentive”. Californians do not want their transportation funds to be held hostage to create new state-imposed growth restrictions.

#### **SB 375 is Anti-Growth and Would Hurt Our Economy at a Time When We're Facing an Economic Crisis**

- A primary consequence of SB 375 is to remove vast areas of land from future potential transportation-related projects - thus limiting local expansion and economic growth. The measure would declare certain land off-limits, and would limit the ability of cities to expand in a manner that may be best for their local needs and economy.
- California's economy is in a serious downturn. SB 375 is intended to limit local economic growth at the worst possible time.

The San Joaquin Regional Policy Council has already taken a position of opposition to the bill. The opposition letter was included in the Commissioner's packet as well as a fact sheet and a litigation risk analysis.

*Action:* Oppose SB 375

#### ***B. SAFETEA-LU Reauthorization – California Concepts - Support***

**Summary:** The current Federal Transportation Authorization Act, also known as the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA – LU), will expire after September 30, 2009. The national debate on the form, content, and funding provisions of the next authorization has already begun. California will best be able to influence the debate at all levels if it can present a unified opinion on principles for the next authorization.

The document included in the Commissioner's packet represents the consensus of a broad group of California's transportation stakeholders on statewide principles for the next federal transportation act. This document was developed through a series of open meetings and workshops that began in December 2007. The California Department of Transportation and Business, Transportation and Housing Agency led the effort with extensive input from the State's metropolitan planning organizations, regional transportation planning agencies, other transportation agencies, the private sector, and multiple public interest groups.

In general, the group reached consensus on the following seven principles:

- ***Ensure the financial integrity of the Highway and Transit Trust Funds.***
- ***Rebuild and maintain transportation infrastructure in a good state of repair.***
- ***Establish goods movement, as a national economic priority.***
- ***Enhance mobility through congestion relief within and between metropolitan areas.***

- *Strengthen the federal commitment to safety and security, particularly with respect to rural roads and access.*
- *Strengthen comprehensive environmental stewardship.*
- *Streamline Project Delivery.*

In the next several months, the adopting stakeholders will use this document to raise awareness of California's intentions for the next authorization with the State's Congressional delegation, other statewide and national organizations, and candidates for national office working on authorization policy and positions. The group is timing the release of this document to influence committee staff before they begin drafting of proposals, which is expected to begin in the middle of November 2008.

*Action:* Support California Consensus on Federal Transportation Reauthorization

**C. *San Joaquin Valley National Agricultural Goods Movement & Trade Corridor Program***

*Summary:* Included in the Commissioner's packet was a fact sheet that highlights a proposed program that would be a part of the new Federal Transportation Bill supported by all eight of the San Joaquin Valley Counties. A program is different from an earmark. Rather than looking for funding for a particular project, the San Joaquin Valley Program would be established as a part of the transportation bill, such as CMAQ is now. The program would be a comprehensive strategy outlining economic issues in the Valley and how the program would benefit the valley's economic situation while greatly contributing to nationally significant goods movement.

A similar program, the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), was created for the same purpose, citing poverty, underdevelopment, and other factors as reasons for the program. Between 1965 and 2002, \$6.2 billion was appropriated to the region for the Appalachian Development Highway System. The San Joaquin Valley is very comparable to the Appalachian region in many ways, including the unemployment rate, poverty rates, education levels, and lack of adequate infrastructure.

The SJV Program would outline a system approach to:

Improve National Goods Movement  
Improve National Farm to Market Corridors  
Produce a Lasting Economic Benefit to an Economically Distressed Region

There will be four main project components:

- SR-99; The backbone of agricultural goods movement
- Trade Corridors; Overall transportation connectivity to move goods across the nation
- Grade Separations; Reducing auto-train conflicts within communities for better quality of life and improved air quality
- Rail; Investing in rail as essential to goods movement

*Action:* Information and Discussion Only.

*Transportation Consent Calendar Action:* Upon motion by Commissioner Moss, seconded by Commissioner Bigelow to approve the Transportation Consent Calendar (Item III A-C). A vote was called and the motion carried.

**IV. TRANSPORTATION ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**A. 2009 INTERIM Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)- Public Hearing**

*Summary:*

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON THE  
DRAFT 2009 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND  
CORRESPONDING AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS**

**AND**  
**THE DRAFT 2009 FEDERAL INTERIM TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Madera County Transportation Commission (MCTC) will hold a public hearing on June 18, 2008 at 3:00PM at the MCTC Board Room at 2001 Howard Road, Suite 201, Madera, CA 93637 regarding the Draft 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and Corresponding Air Quality Conformity Analysis and the Federal Draft 2009 Interim Transportation Improvement Program (Interim TIP). The purpose of the hearing is to receive public comments.

- The FTIP is a listing of capital improvement and operational expenditures utilizing federal and state monies for transportation projects in Madera County during the next four years.
- The Air Quality Conformity Analysis contains the documentation to support a finding that the 2009 FTIP and 2007 RTP meets the air quality conformity requirements for ozone and particulate matter.
- The Interim FTIP has been prepared concurrently with the FTIP and contains only the transportation projects that may proceed if the conformity analysis cannot be adopted.

A concurrent 30-day public review and comment period will commence on May 16, 2008 and conclude the day of the public hearing on these matters. The draft documents are available for review at the MCTC office, located at 2001 Howard Road, Suite 201, Madera, CA 93637 and on our website at <http://www.maderactc.org/>.

Public comments are welcomed at the hearing, or may be submitted in writing by June 18, 2008 at 3:00PM to Derek Winning at the address below.

After considering the comments, the documents will be considered for adoption, by resolution, by the Madera County Transportation Commission at a regularly scheduled meeting to be held on July 23, 2008 at 3:00PM. The documents will then be submitted to state and federal agencies for approval.

Contact Person: Derek Winning, Deputy Director  
Madera County Transportation Commission  
2001 Howard Road, Suite 201  
Madera, CA 93637  
559-675-0721  
[derek@maderactc.org](mailto:derek@maderactc.org)

3:10 p.m. Chairman Armentrout opened the floor for Public Comment.

Being not Public Comment, Chairman Armentrout closed for floor at 3:11 p.m.

**Action:** Upon motion by Commissioner Moss, seconded by Commissioner Mindt to approve Resolution 08-11 adopting the 2009 INTERIM Federal Transportation Improvement Program. A vote was called and the motion carried.

**B. *San Joaquin Valley Blueprint – Madera County Blueprint Report – Select Madera County Preferred Scenario***

***Summary:***

**San Joaquin Valley Blueprint – Circle Point PowerPoint Presentation – 10 minutes**

**Madera Blueprint Roundtable Committee Recommendation**

**The Blueprint Roundtable Committee met on July 14, 2008 in response to comments received during the recent Blueprint presentation given to the City Councils and Board of Supervisors. The Roundtable recommends that the MCTC Policy Board choose Option 5 – Conditional Selection of a Preferred Scenario. The recommendation is that the Low Change Scenario be selected for submission to the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint process under the following conditions:**

- 1. The San Joaquin Valley Blueprint explicitly recognize that local cities and counties will maintain authority and control over local planning and zoning.**
- 2. That the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint will only be “Goal Oriented” in nature, but must not be a “one size fits all” approach valley wide. Any policies, standards, or performance measures will only be considered targets for implementation.**
- 3. Each local agency may customize the implementation of the Blueprint considering the values, socioeconomic conditions, and desires of the local area and will be considered San Joaquin Valley Blueprint compliant should it include locally accepted Blueprint principles in its planning and zoning activities.**
- 4. The Madera County Blueprint Report is revised in consultation with the Roundtable prior to acceptance by the MCTC Policy Board to better reflect the Madera Region’s vision considering the Low Change Scenario recommendation for the year 2050.**
- 5. That the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint recognize and incorporate the Madera County Low Change Scenario regardless of which valley wide scenario is selected.**

Recognizing that past practices have led to urban sprawl, traffic congestion, polluted air, and the loss of prime agricultural land in metropolitan areas like Los Angeles, the eight valley counties, led by their respective Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), have embarked on the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) Blueprint planning process.

The Blueprint process is designed to assist local agencies in planning for future growth out to the year 2050, incorporating the addition of alternative modes of transportation and land uses that reflect “smart growth.” Essential to the develop of alternative modes, such as light rail, bus rapid transit and an expanded regional transit network, is the implementation of higher densities and mixed use development in both existing urban centers and prospective “new cities.”

Included in the Commissioner’s packet was a copy of the Madera County Blueprint Report, Final Alternative Scenario Maps, SJV Blueprint process overview chart, and a list of proposed Valley-wide alternative scenarios.

#### **What is the Blueprint?**

The eight San Joaquin Valley MPOs have agreed to embark on the Blueprint planning process as the result of an increased focus on the need for cooperation at the regional level, especially in the pursuit of finite transportation funding that is frequently allocated to other regions of the state. In recent years, this approach has become manifest in a number of new regional initiatives and committees such as the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley and the San Joaquin Valley Policy Council.

Funded by a Caltrans planning grant, the goal of the SJV Blueprint is to develop a 2050 vision for the valley that is created and shared by its residents. The vision should be realistic and include the policy and program tools that will be incentives to local governments, business, and agriculture to implement the vision, not leave it on a shelf.

The Blueprint scenario planning MCTC staff has conducted so far offers several options for new housing densities and upgraded transportation networks based on key performance indicators such as carbon dioxide emission levels, population density, and water and energy consumption. All four scenarios are based on the general plan data provided by city and county planning departments and are conformed to the zoning, land use and sphere of influence boundaries contained in those local agency plans.

Fundamentally, the Blueprint does not override or supersede existing general plans or local agency land use decision-making authority. While MCTC would expect local agencies that sign on the Blueprint to adopt the higher densities and smart growth principles embodied in the Madera Region selected scenario, local agencies will retain control over the implementation of the Blueprint and all decision making power over the planning techniques used to achieve the desired densities by 2050. Since smart growth planning is already being embraced by local agency planning departments, current planning exercises such as the City of Madera’s Vision 2025 project are likely to implement many of the same ideas included in the Blueprint.

#### **What have we done?**

The first phase of the Blueprint planning process took place in Fall 2006 and early 2007 as MCTC staff conducted surveys and held Vision and Values workshops in the Madera, Chowchilla and Oakhurst. All elected officials were interviewed and over 500 surveys were collected at the Madera County Fair. The workshops gave Madera County residents the opportunity to articulate a vision statement for the Madera County Blueprint process and rank the values most important for Madera County as it grows to the year 2050. A summary of the vision and values developed through these workshops can be found on pages 4-5 of the Madera County Blueprint Report. In all, 105 residents participated in these workshops.

Phase 2 of the Blueprint process involved the development of goals, policies, and performance indicators based on the values articulated in the Phase 1 workshops. Phase 3 followed immediately after with the development of the four alternative scenarios before you today.

During the months of March and April 2008, a series of five Blueprint public outreach workshops were again conducted in Madera, Chowchilla, and Oakhurst. MCTC staff presented the four alternative scenarios to the workshop attendees and had them vote on a preferred scenario via clicker technology. While the 48 participants in these workshops are not necessarily representative of the county as a whole, a plurality of attendees chose the moderate change scenario.

#### **What are we doing today?**

In this phase of the SJV Blueprint process, the MCTC Policy Board will select one alternative scenario from four options developed over the past year by MCTC staff in consultation with local agency planning professionals and the general public.

The action of “selecting” a preferred scenario for the valley-wide Blueprint does not constitute an adoption of the Blueprint itself. Rather, the selection of a preferred scenario will feed into the larger Valley-wide Blueprint and be incorporated into a “quilted” Valley-wide Blueprint, which will include the locally identified scenarios from each of the eight SJV counties. By selecting a preferred scenario for Madera County, the MCTC is indicating to the Valley-wide group what land use densities and transportation options we would like to see included in the Valley-wide Blueprint for the year 2050.

#### **Where are we going?**

In addition to the eight county “quilted” scenario, the Valley-wide group is concurrently developing three regional scenarios in consultation with professional modelers at UC Davis, the Blueprint project managers from each MPO, and the Blueprint Regional Advisory Committee (BRAC). These regional scenarios will not simply replicate the eight locally selected inputs as the “quilted” version does, but are designed to model regional concepts like High Speed Rail and goods movement. A summary of these three regional scenarios is included in your package.

In the coming year, after a careful evaluation of the five Valley-wide scenarios (status quo, eight county “quilted”, and the three regional scenarios), the San Joaquin Valley Policy Council will select a Blueprint scenario. At this point, staff will return to the MCTC Policy Board and local agency Councils and Board of Supervisors to request the approval and adoption of the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint. A summary of this process in flow chart format is included in your package.

### ***A. Description of Madera County Alternative Scenarios***

#### **1. Status Quo**

The status quo scenario projects growth in Madera County out to 2050 based on recent trends in land use, housing densities, and transit options. The densities of new residential developments and intensity of employment uses were kept at the levels of prevailing trends. The status quo offers a “worst case scenario” of the level of sprawl and loss of prime agricultural land that Madera County could expect in the year 2050.

The selection of the status quo scenario represents the opinion that current growth trends in Madera County are desirable and will not adversely affect the quality of life in the county out to the year 2050. Since Madera County is still small relative to other counties in the San Joaquin Valley and is unlikely to reach the level of sprawl found in other valley counties by the year 2050, this may be an attractive option

if the MCTC desires to continue participation in the Blueprint process while making no commitments to changing land uses or transportation patterns.

## **2. Low Change**

The low change scenario assumes that Madera County desires to implement some aspects of “smart growth” by the year 2050 without radically changing housing densities or transportation mode choices. The demand for different housing types would shift slightly toward higher densities and the sizes of lots would decrease by 15-20% for single family and multi family parcels. An enhanced regional transit system based upon the existing transit network is also included in this scenario. Preservation of agricultural lands and environmentally sensitive areas is given more consideration than in the Status Quo scenario.

The MCTC may conditionally select the Low Change as its preferred scenario if it desires to embrace some of the elements of the Blueprint planning process without diverging completely from recent trends in land use and transportation planning. Conditional selection means the concept of “low change” is acceptable; however the elements of the Blueprint process acceptable to all the jurisdictions in Madera County will be refined in a concise policy context in the Madera County Blueprint Report prior to acceptance by MCTC. This option may give MCTC the opportunity to “test the waters” of the Blueprint, and wait to see what the state of California does vis-à-vis the Blueprint before making a greater commitment to the process.

## **3. Moderate Change**

The moderate change scenario is designed to fully implement the principles of “smart growth” promoted in the Blueprint planning process while maintaining the unique character of Madera County out to the year 2050. Housing densities are increased by 42% over the status quo compared to the 12% increase over the status quo in the low change scenario. Additional transit options in this scenario include bus rapid transit connecting the city centers of Chowchilla and Madera to the Rio Mesa area and a light rail transit line along the Highway 41 corridor from Ave 12 into Fresno.

The moderate change scenario was designed to fully implement the concepts and “smart growth” prescriptions of the Blueprint planning process and is consistent with other regional planning activities like the Metro Rural Loop Study. Selection of moderate change as a preferred scenario would indicate a “buy-off” on the Blueprint and “Smart Growth” principles and the changes that are required in order to implement it over the next 42 years.

## **4. Major Change**

The major change scenario offers the most radical change in densities for Madera County out to the year 2050, increasing the percentage of county residents in high density housing from the 13% of the status quo to 30%. While overall housing densities remain similar to the moderate change, there is a considerable decrease in the percentage of residents living in rural residential and agricultural residential housing. Public transit is further developed through an extension of light rail transit to Ave 15 and the expansion of bus rapid transit routes in Madera and Chowchilla. The preservation of agricultural land and environmentally sensitive land is given the highest consideration in the major change scenario.

The major change scenario represents a shift in land use planning that goes above and beyond the baseline set by the Blueprint. The selection of this scenario by the MCTC board would indicate that Madera County is ready to fully embrace the Blueprint and radically change the way that new development will be planned.

## **Other Options**

Although staff has come before the MCTC board requesting the selection of a preferred scenario for Madera County, participation in the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint remains entirely voluntary, and the board may wish to reconsider its commitment to the process.

## **5. Conditional selection of a preferred scenario**

As indicated above, the preferred scenarios selected by the policy board of each valley MPO will together constitute only one of five valley-wide scenarios currently being developed by the valley-wide group. The

first of these five scenarios represents a “quilting” of each county’s status quo scenario. The second of these scenarios represents a “quilting” of each county’s locally selected preferred scenario. The final three scenarios are “regional” in the sense that they are being developed independently of the county-level Blueprint processes.

If one of these “regional” scenarios is selected by the San Joaquin Valley Policy Council instead of the “quilted” scenario, it is possible that little or none of Madera County’s preferred scenario will be included in the final San Joaquin Valley Blueprint. Essentially, the valley-wide Blueprint that comes back to the MCTC board and local agencies for approval, could bear little or no resemblance to the Madera County Blueprint that has been developed over the past year and half with the input of citizens, local elected officials, and local agency planners.

The MCTC may choose to submit a locally selected scenario to the valley-wide group on the condition that the final San Joaquin Valley Blueprint incorporate Madera County’s preferred scenario and implementation plan, regardless of whether the “quilted” scenario or one of the three “regional” scenarios is ultimately selected by the SJV Policy Board. In essence, the MCTC would be requesting an exemption from any extra-county constraints imposed by the three regional models.

It is not clear what the response would be from the valley-wide group if the MCTC insisted upon this condition. As the smallest and least urbanized county in the San Joaquin Valley, Madera has a strong argument for eschewing any “one size fits all” approach imposed by the regional model. On the other hand, this option could effectively end MCTC’s participation in the Blueprint process if the valley-wide group refuses to include Madera County’s preferred scenario in the valley-wide Blueprint.

#### **6. Withdrawal from the Blueprint planning process**

As a final option, the MCTC board could choose to end its participation in the Blueprint process at this time. The Blueprint planning process is voluntary and could be resumed in the future once all of the ramifications of the Blueprint are known. A number of bills concerning Blueprint planning are currently under debate in the California legislature, and it may be advantageous to wait and see how they wash out before committing to the Blueprint.

There are a few potential downfalls to this option. First of all, the state has taken an interest in the Blueprint process, and it may reflect badly on Madera County from a state perspective if it is the only county in the San Joaquin Valley to cease participation. The county could lose out on Blueprint associated “One Voice” state funding for transportation infrastructure designated for the San Joaquin Valley or if legislation (SB 375) is passed requiring a Blueprint for consideration of certain state fund sources (STIP). Ultimately, it is local buy-off on the Blueprint process that will make it a worthwhile endeavor. If that local support is weak or nonexistent, there is little incentive for the MCTC to continue in the process.

#### ***Summary of comments from local elected officials***

##### ***City of Madera***

On July 2, MCTC staff gave a brief presentation on the four Blueprint scenarios to the Madera City Council, seeking their input. Discussion was sparse, however, some support was expressed for the Low Change scenario.

##### ***B. Madera County***

On July 8, a similar presentation was given to the Board of Supervisors. The Supervisors expressed concerns over losing local land use planning authority and being held responsible for the funding of highway and other infrastructure improvements included in the Blueprint. It was also expressed that many of the Blueprint principles are not applicable to the Eastern Madera County foothills area. County Staff indicated that the Blueprint offered the county little in the way of benefits to current planning activities as compared to the possible intrusion on local land use authority.

##### ***C. City of Chowchilla***

On July 8, the Blueprint presentation was also brought before the Chowchilla City Council. City Staff and Council members engaged in a detailed discussion. Council members expressed their concern with State or

Regional usurpation of local land use authority. Staff indicated that the Madera County Blueprint text as written placed MCTC in a role of land use and resource planning that it is not authorized to engage in land use planning activities as it is not a Council of Governments. Doubt was expressed as to the usefulness of the language and rhetoric in the Blueprint. The City of Chowchilla is already engaged in “smart growth” planning activities and supports expanded cooperation and communication toward implementing those principals on a countywide basis in an appropriate policy context. Inquiries were made as to the ramifications of not participating in the Blueprint and the Council and Staff seemed to indicate only begrudging acceptance of the Madera Blueprint Report in its current writing should Blueprints ever become a legislative requirement.

**Action:** Upon motion by Commissioner Moss, seconded by Commissioner Mindt to chose Option 2 –Low Change Scenario with conditions as amended by Commissioner Kopshever to address the gross density issue in the Madera County Blueprint report. A vote was called and the motion carried.

**C. *MCTC FY 2008/09 Disadvantage Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal***

**Summary:** The MCTC is required to establish a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program in accordance with regulations of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), 49 CFR Part 26. MCTC is eligible to receive federal financial assistance from the DOT and as a condition of receiving this assistance, MCTC is required to sign an assurance that it will comply with 49 CFR Part 26.

The proposed policy of MCTC to ensure that DBEs, as defined in part 26, have an equal opportunity to receive and participate in DOT-assisted contracts is as follows:

- To ensure nondiscrimination in the award and administration of DOT-assisted contracts;
- To create a level playing field on which DBEs can compete fairly for DOT-assisted contracts;
- To ensure that the DBE Program is narrowly tailored in accordance with applicable law;
- To ensure that only firms that fully meet 49 CFR Part 26 eligibility standards are permitted to participate as DBEs;
- To help remove barriers to the participation of DBEs in DOT-assisted contracts; and
- To assist the development of firms that can compete successfully in the market place outside the DBE Program.

MCTC Staff has developed an AADPL consistent with Caltrans and U.S. DOT guidance. The AADPL for FY2008/09 for DOT assisted contracts is proposed to be set at 3.56%, which is based upon the percentage of DBE firms available to perform work in Madera County.

**Action:** Upon motion by Commissioner Mindt, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez to approve MCTC FY2008/09 DBE Overall Goal. A vote was called and the motion carried.

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

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

**VI. ADMINISTRATIVE CONSENT ITEMS**

**A. *Executive Minutes of June 18, 2008***

Included in the Commissioner’s packet was a copy of the June 18, 2008 Executive Minutes for review.

**Action:** Approve Executive Minutes of June 18, 2008.

***Administrative Consent Calendar Action***

**Action:** The Commission unanimously approved the Administrative Consent Calendar. A vote was called and the motion carried.

**VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**A. MCTC Policy Board - Stipend**

**Summary:** MCTC Staff conducted a survey of the San Joaquin Valley MPOs regarding stipend rates for Policy Board members which was included in the Commissioner's packet. Staff recommends a stipend of \$100 per attendance for MCTC Policy Board members for the following reasons:

1. Encourage attendance and active participation.
2. Provide for a more consistent direction to staff.
3. Minimize the inherent transportation planning learning curve for new members and alternates.
4. Reimburse members for the costs in time and mileage for service.
5. Foster a commitment to the regional nature of the Madera County Transportation Commission.

**Action:** Staff was directed to bring this back at the next meeting of the Commission for further discussion and as a Public Hearing Item.

**VIII. Miscellaneous**

**A. Items From Caltrans**

Steve Curti handed out a status report to the Commissioners regarding the State Route 41 projects from Fresno County Line to Oakhurst.

**B. Items from Staff**

No Items from Staff.

**C. Items from Commissioners**

No Items from Commissioners.

**IX. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Next meeting set for Wednesday September 17, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,

Patricia S. Taylor, Executive Director  
Madera County Transportation Commission