

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)

Tuesday, February 24, 2009, 4:00 p.m.

Shasta County Board of Supervisors Chambers,
1450 Court Street, Suite 263, Redding, 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 Cornnick, Dickerson, Stegall, Palmer, Baugh, and Moty were present. Board member Hawes was absent.

1. Call to Order

Chair Cornnick 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 December 9, 2008, RTPA Meeting

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

4-3 Correspondence

By motion made, seconded, and unanimously carried (Baugh/Stegall), the items on the Consent Calendar were approved.

Regular Calendar

5. Elect Chair and Vice-Chair for 2009/10

Agency member Stegall nominated Dick Dickerson for chair and Gracious Palmer for vice-chair. Agency member Baugh seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

6. Consider 2009/10 Transit Needs Assessment and Conduct 2009/10 Unmet Transit Needs Hearing (Public Hearing)

Staff member Sue Crowe gave a PowerPoint presentation on the annual transit needs assessment. Local agencies receive Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding for public transportation. Before funds can be allocated to local agencies, transit needs within the region must be evaluated to determine if there are any unmet needs. A public hearing must also be conducted. Findings are presented to the Social Services

Transportation Advisory Council for review and a recommendation. A TDA budget is then prepared and claims are allocated in April with the Board's consent.

Ms. Crowe noted that ridership on RABA has dropped on the fixed route, but that demand response has increased. Last year the RTPA Board approved a temporary minimum farebox ratio reduction that corresponds with RABA's seven year financial plan. It will return to the 19% farebox requirement by FY 2014/15. Ms. Crowe continued to note that Proposition 1B funds were received this year, including \$1.6 million that went to expand RABA's maintenance facility. RABA was successful in receiving 5310 funding to purchase four demand response coaches, as well as Shasta County Opportunity Center receiving \$50,000 for one modified van.

Ms. Crowe explained that as of January 31, there has been a huge decrease in revenue compared to what was budgeted a year ago when the projections were made. State Transit Assistance is down \$800,000. As of January 31, sales tax revenue received to date is \$258,000 less than last year; this month it is \$170,000 less than at this time last year. Proposition 1B funds have also been suspended. This decrease in revenue is creating short-term restricted cash flow for both the RTPA and the jurisdictions. Staff is unable to disburse the 06/07 True-up as there is no fund balance at this time.

Ms. Crowe ended by stating that all transit systems met or exceeded their established performance criteria in 2007/08. RABA's farebox ratio requirement was 15.5%, CTSA has a \$15.00 TDA subsidy per passenger trip, and Burney Express has a 10% farebox requirement.

Chair Dickerson opened the floor for public testimony. One citizen spoke.

Isabelle Cordoba stated that because she is in a wheelchair she relies on RABA's demand response to get around. Although demand response is a great service, it could benefit with longer hours and Sunday service. If there is any way possible to extend RABA's hours during the week to 10:30 p.m., and run on Sundays until 3:00 p.m., it would give many people the opportunity to live a more abundant life.

The public hearing was closed. Staff will prepare unmet needs findings and 2009/10 TDA claims allocations for approval at the April RTPA meeting.

7. Federal Economic Stimulus Update

Executive Director Dan Little explained that the Federal Economic Stimulus dollar amount directly sub-allocated to all California regions is \$771 million. Shasta County's portion is expected to be about \$3.7 million. The total stimulus that would be coming to the Shasta County region, if some pending state legislation passes, is about \$7.7 million. About \$231 million dollars in Transportation Enhancement (TE) money will also come to the region. The use-it-or-lose-it provisions have been extended from 90 days to 120 days, but for only \$1.7 million of the \$7.7 million total.

There is additional money coming in for transit through the 5307 and 5311 programs. The 5311 amount to Shasta County for transit capital is \$400,000. Half of that would have to be obligated within 180 days. 5307 funds in the amount of \$1.7 million would go to the three cities, with half of the amount being use-it-or-lose-it with a 180 day

deadline. Dan is encouraging the agencies to have some overlay projects go through the NEPA process as a back up plan, in case their original projects fall through. If an agency is not able to use their portion of the funds, another agency may then use the funds without delay.

8. **Amendment #5 to the 2008 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)**

Staff member Thomas Hays explained that on June 24, 2008, the current FTIP was adopted. The FTIP requires regular maintenance because of the large number of projects and a budget that exceeds over \$400 million. It requires Board approval to move money around or bring new money in. Mr. Hays noted the following elements need to be amended: 1) Federal Transit Administration programming of 5310 awards, 2) State Highway Operation and Protection Program funds for collision reduction, and 3) Lassen Volcano National Park's request for Federal Highway Administration advancement of one year's funding for a project that has already been programmed.

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

9. **ShastaFORWARD>> Regional Blueprint: Final Three Alternative Growth Scenarios for Modeling**

Staff member Dan Wayne did a PowerPoint presentation on the final three alternative growth scenarios being proposed for modeling. Mr. Wayne noted that each scenario is the result of an extensive community values and priorities assessment. During community workshops a range of possible concepts or potential scenarios were developed. Over the last several months, after working with the community, the range of possibilities was condensed to three distinct scenarios proposed for modeling. Community feedback was obtained, individual presentations were given to each of the city's planning commissions, individual presentations were given to each city council, and meetings were held with city and county planning staff to discuss the details of the proposed alternatives. Their feedback was also incorporated into the scenarios. Mr. Wayne explained what the current scenario looks like; he then explained the three alternative scenarios. Alternative A is the Rural and Peripheral Scenario, Alternative B is the Urban Core and Corridors Scenario, and Alternative C is the Distinct Cities and Towns Scenario.

Mr. Wayne stated that the ShastaFORWARD>> steering committee recently met. The committee reviewed and discussed the three alternative scenarios and recommended that the Board approve the scenarios for modeling on the condition that another steering committee meeting is held to review and provide feedback during the early stages of modeling. Once the first round of modeling is done and the performance measures are applied, then additional input and direction will be requested from the TAC and steering committees.

Executive Director Dan Little added that once the modeling outputs are done, a very intensive public involvement campaign will be done to look at the three alternatives and vote for one of them.

Discussion was held concerning population growth, a hybrid scenario, a state university, high speed rail, general plans, the steering committee, SB375, and the KIXE partnership.

Mr. Wayne explained that later this year they will present the recommendations and findings first to the Board for consideration and approval, then go out to the local agencies individually, explaining the outcome of the process and get some collective input from the region on how to address the results of the process. Then individually, local agencies will have to go through an interpretation process themselves on how to take the objectives and overall regional growth vision, and translate that into local plans, programs, and efforts.

Executive Director Dan Little explained that the jurisdictions will decide how they want to use the information gathered. They will decide on how they want to incorporate the information, public input, and data into their general plan updates, specific plans, etc. Mr. Little noted that the RTPA will use it for the Regional Transportation Plan and as a beginning point to work on the new mandate - SB375. It does not mean the scenario out of Shasta*FORWARD>>* is going to be the Sustainable Communities Plan, because they have two completely different goals.

Chairman Dickerson stated that Shasta*FORWARD>>* is a process of gathering information from people who live within Shasta County. It will be presented to the decision makers in a certain format after it's modeled. Those decision makers can accept it, reject it, modify it, completely ignore it, or do whatever they want with it. This process in no way compels any city or county to do anything with their general plans.

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

10. Fix 5 Update

Executive Director Dan Little explained the status of the Fix 5 program. City managers met three years ago to discuss Interstate 5 and the impact of projected growth and development. Six main problems were identified. RTPA staff was directed to work on these problems. Over the last 2 ½ years, there have been multiple outreaches for what is essentially a traffic impact fee and funding program. It was determined that interchanges and other local needs off the mainline were important and there needed to be more of a complete system view besides just focusing on the mainline. It was determined that there was a strong desire for local control among the jurisdictions; that a JPA was not desirable; and that the individual city councils and Board of Supervisors wanted to have control over any type of Fix 5 fee program. RTPA staff will now be doing a series of workshops to the city councils and Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Little noted the jurisdictions were asked what they would like to do with the added RTIP share (\$100 million) for projects complimentary to the mainline improvements. The California Transportation Commission would like to see the RTIP funds - which are state derived - used on I-5. So it is being proposed that the \$100 million in funds be used on the mainline. The net effect is that 90% of the fees collected by each local agency would go toward local improvements and 10% would be set aside in a separate account for the mainline improvements.

Mr. Little continued to state that there would be a memorandum of understanding allowing flexibility of RTIP funds for leveraging, but that RTIP funds wouldn't necessarily be used for the mainline. For example, RTIP money could be used for local improvement should state and federal matching funds fail to materialize.

Mr. Little recapped by stating that the modifications made to the original Fix 5 program stay true to the original goals of the Fix 5 mainline emphasis while giving flexibility to the RTIP funds. It also gives better leveraging ability with state and federal agencies, fills holes in existing local traffic impact fee programs, offsets fees in some existing programs, and reduces fees in others.

Mr. Little ended by stating that, after the workshops are done, public hearings will be conducted with each council and board to make a decision about the program. Mr. Little noted that they will be asked to take action on the program. Fee implementation would be delayed while the economy is down. They don't look to implement the fee until two years after action is taken, thereby giving people plenty of notice of the fee program, and gaining early CEQA and leveraging benefits. If after two years Shasta County exceeds a one percent population growth threshold, 25% of the fee will be implemented; then 25% annually thereafter for three years until full implementation of the \$1697 fee.

11. RTPA Bylaws

Executive Director Dan Little explained that this item was to amend the bylaws so that the RTPA Board could have input concerning the performance of the RTPA executive director and, to some extent, the performance of agency staff. Mr. Little proposed a sub-committee consisting of the chair, vice-chair, and if need be, a third member. This sub-committee would work with the executive director on the evaluation to provide input, followed by closed-session review.

Board member Moty moved that the item be approved with the change that the evaluation be held prior to the February meeting, or some time that is not right after a new chair and vice-chair are put in place. It was further recommended that the outgoing chair serve as the optional third member.

Board member Stegall seconded the motion, followed with discussion from the Board.

Board member Baugh noted that there was a discrepancy in the bylaws (Article 11, Section 1) concerning Board members receiving at least 10 days written notice before a special or regular RTPA meeting, before an amendment could be made to the bylaws.

Discussion was held concerning the 10 day written notice requirement.

Board member Moty changed his motion and moved that the executive director evaluation be conducted as suggested for this year, and the revisions to the bylaws be reviewed by RTPA staff and brought back to the Board.

Board member Stegall seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

12. Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Dan Little informed the Board that the one-cent increase in sales tax includes the sales tax on gasoline. The sales tax on gasoline is what funds the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), so there will be an increase by about 15% in RTIP revenues. However, the state continues to raid certain transit funds through Public Transportation Account (PTA) spillover of the gasoline tax. Mr. Little continued to state that the Dana to Downtown project, that was in danger of being shut down, is now in good shape for the construction to continue. Mr. Little noted that, a couple of weeks ago, Board members Stegall, Dickerson, and Palmer, along with himself went to Sacramento for a CALCOG Legislative day - "Capital Day" event. Board members Stegall, Dickerson, and Palmer gave a short review of the event.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Dickerson adjourned the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

/jac