REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SUBJECT		MEETING DATE	ITEM NUMBER
Minutes of the December 8, 2009, RTPA Meeting		2/23/10	4-1

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Board approve the minutes of the December 8, 2009, RTPA meeting.

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

/jac

Attachment: Minutes of the December 8, 2009, RTPA Meeting

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)
Tuesday, December 8, 2009, 4:00 p.m.
City of Anderson Council Chambers,
1887 Howard Street, Anderson, California.

(Note: These minutes are not intended to serve as a transcript or verbatim record of the proceedings of the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency, but rather as a record of the meeting time, place, and attendance; the order and general nature of discussion; Board deliberations; and action taken, if any.)

Board Members Dickerson, Stegall, Watkins, Baugh, Moty, Comnick and Hawes were present.

1. Call to Order

Chair Dickerson called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

2. Staff Introductions

3. Public Comment Period

There was no one who wished to speak during the Public Comment Period.

Consent Calendar

4-1 Minutes of October 27, 2009, RTPA Meeting

4-2 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through December 2010 - Information Only

4-3 Amendment #12 to the 2008 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)

4-4 Appoint Members to the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC)

By motion made, seconded, and unanimously carried (Stegall/Hawes), the Consent Calendar was approved, with Board member Comnick abstaining from item 4-1.

Regular Calendar

5. Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Dan Little noted the vice-chair, Gracious Palmer, is no longer on the Board. Mr. Little stated that nobody is more enthusiastic and energetic about the RTPA than Gracious and she will be missed on the Board.

Gracious Palmer expressed her appreciation to Dan Little, staff, RTPA Board members, and all the citizens of Shasta County for allowing her to serve them.

Chairman Dick Dickerson and Executive Director Dan Little presented a certificate of appreciation to Gracious Palmer.

6. **Adopt the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) (Public Hearing)**

Executive Director Dan Little explained the RTIP is the five year capital improvement program for the use of STIP funds. The RTIP is our region's recommendation to the CTC of what projects the state should program. STIP funds are typically limited as the program is over-committed.

Last year, the environmental review for the South Redding Six-Lane Project and funding for the Cottonwood Truck Climbing Lanes Project were finished. Mr. Little noted that although there is technically no new funding available this year through the STIP, a small amount may be available.

Mr. Little provided details of the RTIP contents, noting there are no new projects. The most important project is the South Redding Six-Lane Project. Now that the environmental phase is finished, it is important to complete the design work and get the project shovel-ready. Possibilities for funding include, but are not limited to, the TIGER grant and High Priority Project (HPP) funding. Statewide, unspent funding left over from projects in the same corridor – like the Cottonwood Hills Truck Climbing Lanes - might be available. The RTPA will be applying for these funds as well.

Chair Dickerson opened the public hearing with no one wishing to speak.

Board member Baugh noted that it is important to have projects ready and take the positive approach that the money will come. Without shovel-ready projects, there is no opportunity.

Board member Watkins requested information concerning the irrigation plan for the Dana to Downtown Project landscaping.

By motion made and seconded (Baugh/Hawes), the staff recommendation passed unanimously.

7. **Comment Letter for Knighton & Churn Creek Commons Retail Center**

Executive Director Dan Little explained that the Board adopted a policy last April about providing comments on projects with regionally significant transportation impacts. A stipulation was added by the Board that sensitive items would be brought before the Board. The draft comment letter is the first EIR document brought before the RTPA. Mr. Little noted that there is an alternative in the staff report in which the Board may determine that comment letters on EIRs could be done without Board action.

Board member Hawes stated that he would not support the letter.

Chairman Dickerson suggested they discuss the alternative before they discuss the letter itself.

Board member Comnick noted it is a good idea to come to the Board. Board member Baugh agreed it is a good idea, because it gives opportunity for discussion.

Chairman Dickerson noted that the purpose of the letter is not to bring judgment on the merits of the project. When the lead agency receives the comments they will address them.

By motion made and seconded (Baugh/Stegall), the staff recommendation passed by a vote of six to one with Board member Hawes dissenting.

8. <u>SB 375 Implementation Work Plan</u>

Staff member Dan Wayne re-clarified the limitations of SB 375 in comparison to the larger legislation - AB 32, which is the climate change legislation. SB 375 represents only a small slice of the State's overall climate change strategy. It applies only to automobiles and light truck greenhouse gas emissions as a function of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) attributable to land use patterns. It's about how regional land use patterns have an affect on VMT.

Mr. Wayne explained that the challenge to the RTPA is - by the next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update in 2014 – to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that effectively reduces the VMT in our region to levels unknown until September 2010. At that time, the targets will be assigned by the California Air Resources Board. The SCS must be incorporated into the updated 2014 RTP in a way that it's internally consistent with the policy, action, and financial elements. It must also be consistent with all local general plans in our region. If all of these constraints are met, then the SCS stands alone. Should any of the greenhouse gas reduction actions and strategies fall outside of these constraints, then those strategies will comprise the Alternative Planning Strategy (APS).

Mr. Wayne explained that the state has not clarified what they are going to do with the APS. There is a general assumption that they will provide some level of support to individual regions to undertake those actions included in the APS. Strategically, therefore, such actions should be grant-ready type projects.

Mr. Wayne noted that staff has developed a basic SB 375/sustainable communities strategy public outreach workplan for the Board to consider. Between SCS specific outreach and that done in conjunction with the RTP update and the EIR process, there will be extensive opportunities for anyone who wants to be involved in the process or comment on it.

Mr. Wayne requested that the Board give feedback to staff in regard to requesting local agency participation; recommended that letters, signed by the Chair of the Board, be prepared and sent to each of the local agencies outlining the public outreach strategy; and to request a response regarding their respective participation moving forward with the SCS process.

Board member Baugh asked where staff envisions Proposition 84 funds would go to.

Mr. Wayne explained that there are a couple different programs under Prop 84, the first one being the $400,000 already received for a specified scope of work. The other is a new program with a broad definition for use. It is unknown at this point how the

Strategic Growth Council is going to refine or adjust their grant criteria for this program. However, a portion of that money is expected to be available to regional agencies such as the RTPA, and a portion to local agencies for projects that are determined to be consistent with that region's SCS.

Board member Baugh suggested the Board consider sending a letter to the Strategic Growth Council requesting a split between the RTPA and the agencies. Board member Hawes added that all agencies are hurting in these times and could use the help. Everyone needs to provide input, not just one agency.

Chairman Dickerson noted that the money has to be utilized in such a manner that it advances SB 375 implementation and the SCS process. It would be in the best interest of all agencies to participate in the process regardless of opportunities for funding.

Mr. Wayne noted that the sticky point is whether or not all jurisdictions can successfully come together and agree on a SCS. Good promise and progress has been shown with the Regional Blueprint Process. In the coming months, there will be some strategies and recommendations that will help to get the region closer to this goal. The Board will be instrumental in encouraging local agencies to come together, work on, and agree upon a SCS that meets the goals and requirements of SB 375.

Chairman Dickerson noted that there can't not be participation, cooperation, and planning. The targets will be there regardless, and the state will have specific goals relative to transportation. The way to keep control is to come together, work together, to meet those goals.

Executive Director Dan Little noted that before we become too concerned about regional versus local splits of funding, the first hurdle is getting a stable source of adequate funding. Right now, there are just one-time shots of funding. Legislation was passed for a permanent source of funding and his thoughts were that half would pass through to local agencies for implementation and half would be for RTPA implementation. Unfortunately, the legislation was vetoed by the Governor. The local agencies need to get a share if they are expected to participate.

Board member Baugh added that in his research he has discovered that some RTPA Boards are coming together and saying it is their intention to do some form of split. Some boards are sending letters confirming that they have an intention to split, and getting that information to the Strategic Growth Council.

Mr. Baugh noted that the time has come to participate; the county will join in and participate in this process.

Board member Watkins asked about the State's ability to sell bonds for promised grants. Executive Director Little noted that the State has a bond sale every three or four months. They are selling some each time, but they're not selling enough to meet existing commitments.

Chairman Dickerson noted that if this is approved by the Board he would be signing letters to each agency requesting participation and stating the intention of the RTPA

Board to pass through funding to member agencies once the funding sources and amounts are identified.

Mary Machado of Shasta Voices suggested that regarding notifying the public, most have no clue what SB 375 is. When the public is notified that there is going to be a public hearing, it needs to be broken down in very simple terms that the average person can understand so they will participate.

By motion made and seconded (Baugh/Comnick), the staff recommendation passed unanimously.

9. <u>Caltrans Antlers Bridge Project Presentation</u>

Executive Director Dan Little explained that this was the second in a five-part series with today's presentation being on the Antlers Bridge Project. Mr. Little noted there was a groundbreaking ceremony for this project last month.

Erik Akana from Caltrans District 2 explained that the Antlers Bridge was built in 1941 and is being replaced because of its age, condition, and high maintenance costs. By the time Caltrans is finished, the bridge will be 71 years old, which is 45% longer than what it was designed to last. It's about a 110 mile detour to get around I-5 if it were shut down. The project is about 1½ miles long with some of the curves being realigned and the bridge itself being replaced. The new bridge is about 650 feet longer and includes a third lane southbound. The first working day is today with expected completion in four to five years. The engineer estimate was around $200 million, the contractor bid the job at $125 million. FHWA is paying 90% of the project and the state paying 10%. The old structure will be completely removed.

Board member Moty asked about straightening out the bridge approach curves. Mr. Akana answered that the current alignment reduced the earthwork quantity significantly and also the length of the structure, cutting the cost quite a bit. There was also trouble getting underneath the railroad with a straighter curve.

Board member Watkins noted that, in the past, old structures have been left standing. Is there any value in leaving the current Antlers Bridge standing, and what is the cost of tearing it down?

Mr. Akana answered that there is value in the foundations themselves; however, there is liability, as there is lead in the paint. The State has also discovered that, in keeping bridges in their inventory, they become a liability due to maintenance costs. The cost to tear down the current bridge is around $9 million.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Dickerson adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

____

Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

/jac