STAFF REPORT

Shasta County
Regional Transportation Planning Agency

MEETING DATE:	**2/28/12**
SUBJECT:	**Minutes of the January 24, 2012, Special RTPA Meeting**
AGENDA ITEM:	**4-2**
STAFF CONTACT:	**Janie Coffman**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the board approve the minutes of the January 24, 2012, special RTPA meeting.

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

Attachment: Minutes of the January 24, 2012, Special RTPA Meeting

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY
SPECIAL MEETING
Tuesday, January 24, 2012, 4:00 p.m.
City of Redding Council Chambers,
777 Cypress Avenue, 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 actions taken, if any.)

Board members Dickerson, Jones, Watkins, Moty, Hawes, Comnick and Hartman were present. Board member Baugh was absent.

1. **Call to Order**
   Chair Moty called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

2. **Public Comment Period**
   There was no one who wished to speak during the public comment period.

3. **Consider Approval of Independently Staffed RTPA and Related Actions**
   Board chair Moty explained that a subcommittee consisting of past-chair Dickerson, vice-chair Watkins and himself met on two occasions to work on a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the RTPA and the county. At the last subcommittee meeting, which included county personnel, the majority of the committee concluded that an independent RTPA should be pursued because it appears that the issue of conflict of interest between the RTPA and the county is not going to be resolved.

   Executive director Little explained that the subcommittee asked him to prepare budgets comparing the cost of an RTPA going forward with county supported services, as is currently the case, and an independent RTPA. Three budget scenarios were created for comparison – the current adopted budget; next year's draft budget including support costs from the county; and next year's draft budget for an independent RTPA.

   To clarify the use of planning funds, Mr. Little explained that about 98 percent of the funds the RTPA receive can only be used for planning purposes. There is a misunderstanding that if there are reduced or increased costs, money for streets and roads are impacted. Of all the types of funds the RTPA receives, only one type – Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds – can be used for transit or streets and roads.

   If the board approves an independent RTPA, the staff recommendation would be to prepare a detailed transition plan by February 2012 that outlines the details necessary for a July 1 target date. And to form a new ad hoc subcommittee of the board with the same three board members of the current subcommittee.

Board member Comnick asked questions concerning workers compensation; leave accumulation; operating expenses and startup costs.

Executive director Little answered that because the RTPA is a planning agency and the injury risk is low, the workers compensation rate should be the same or lower than the current 3.5 percent. What happens to leave accumulation would be a detail that would have to be worked out in the transition plan. As far as operating expenses, there is only one vehicle owned by the RTPA and the RTPA owns all of its computers. The only thing the RTPA doesn't own is a server. Startup costs have not been explored yet; that would be part of the transition plan. Startup costs will likely be over $50,000.

Board members Jones asked questions concerning the current estimates of an independent RTPA compared to earlier indications.

Executive director Little answered that the main difference is the county support costs. However, those costs get paid by the RTPA either way going forward, whether the RTPA is independent or not. The cost of providing those services either through private vendors or the county is the main difference in the budgets.

Board chair Moty noted that Mr. Little was presenting a cost estimate, not a budget. What was used for employee and benefit costs is a number moved from one budget to another. This does not indicate that's what it will be. That will be incumbent upon the board and through labor negotiations to come to some kind of agreement.

Board member Watkins noted that he didn't have any questions about the cost of an independent RTPA because he thinks it's a mute point. There is no alternative except to go to an independent RTPA.

A motion was made, seconded (Dickerson/Jones) and passed unanimously to:

- Establish an independent RTPA with the target date of July 1, 2012
- Direct staff to prepare a detailed transition plan for board approval in February 2012
- Establish a new ad hoc RTPA board subcommittee consisting of the current chair, vice-chair and past-chair

Various board members voiced their support of the RTPA going independent.

There being no other business to discuss, chair Moty adjourned the meeting at 4:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

/jac