

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)

Tuesday, April 28, 2009, 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 action taken, if any.)

Board members Cornnick, Dickerson, Palmer, Baugh, and Moty were present. Alternate Board member Jones was present. Board members Hawes and Stegall were absent.

1. Call to Order

Chair Dickerson called the meeting to order at 4:00 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 February 10, 2009, Economic Stimulus Special RTPA Meeting

4-2 Minutes of February 24, 2009, RTPA Meeting

4-3 Minutes of March 9, 2009, Dana to Downtown Project Tour RTPA Meeting

4-4 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through April 2010 - Information Only

4-5 Approve Unmet Transit Needs – 2009/10 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Unmet Needs Findings, Allocation Instructions, and Claims Budget

4-6 Approve 2007/08 Revised (True-Up) Transportation Development Act (TDA) Allocation and Claims

4-7 Accept Transportation Development Act (TDA) Fiscal and Compliance Audits for Year Ended June 30, 2008

4-8 Award Audit Engagement for Fiscal and Compliance, and Performance Audits

4-9 RTPA Bylaws Amendment

4-10 Amendment #8 to the 2008 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)

By motion made, seconded, and unanimously carried (Baugh/Moty), the items on the Consent Calendar were approved with Board member Baugh abstaining from item 4-1, and Board member Jones abstaining from items 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3.

Regular Calendar

5. **ShastaFORWARD>> Regional Blueprint: Project Update, OWP Amendment, and Second Amendment to Vestra Resources Agreement**

Senior Planner Dan Wayne gave an update on ShastaFORWARD>> noting that they have proceeded with the technical modeling of the three community driven alternative growth scenarios, as directed by the Board. Mr. Wayne also explained that a third grant from the California Regional Blueprint Planning Program was awarded to the Agency in the amount of \$200,000. The grant funds will not be expended in the current 08/09 fiscal year, but because the award is from the FY 08/09 grant cycle, it must be included in the current year OWP. Mr. Wayne also brought to the Board a second and final amendment to the Agency's agreement with Vestra Resources to add an additional \$30,000 for continuing GIS and modeling work necessary to complete technical development of the alternative scenarios.

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

6. **SB 375 Update and Coordination of Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)**

Executive Director Dan Little noted that the California Air Resource Board (CARB) is charged under SB 375 with determining regional green house gas (GHG) emission reduction targets related to vehicle and light truck vehicle miles traveled (VMT). It is not yet known what Shasta County's GHG reduction target will be. A Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) is currently formulating recommendations to CARB on factors to be considered and methodologies to be used in the target setting process. CARB must consult with regional agencies before setting the targets. Regions are encouraged to propose what they believe to be appropriate reduction targets.

Mr. Little explained that the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process in Shasta County is performed by local agency planning departments in conjunction with the Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD). Updated every five years, the RHNA process is intended to insure adequate zoning and regional distribution of land for low income housing. SB 375 includes provisions for aligning the timing and planning cycle of the RHNA process with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) cycle. Because Shasta County is in federal attainment for air quality purposes, the RTP is currently updated every five years instead of the four-year cycle typical of other MPO regions. In Shasta County the RTP and RHNA process are presently on concurrent five-year cycles.

Mr. Little continued to explain that Shasta County has the option to update their RHNA every eight years (vs. the current five-year requirement). The RTPA likewise has the option to update the RTP every 4 years (vs. the current five-year requirement). Under this option, the RTP and RHNA updates would occur concurrently every eighth year and be on the same cycle as other California MPOs. Regions have until June 1, 2009 to opt into the four-year RTP/eight-year RHNA cycle. Although the RHNA process would be less frequent under this option, the RTP would have to be performed every four years. Furthermore, the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) process required by SB 375 would have to be completed by 2012 rather than 2015. As such, Shasta County would

be at the front end rather than the back end of California regions undergoing the SCS process. For these reasons, Mr. Little recommended that the Board abstain from opting into the four year RTP cycle.

Discussion was held concerning air quality attainment.

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

7. **Agency Policy for Commenting on Regionally Significant Projects & Shasta County Courthouse Comment Letter to the Administration Office of the Courts (AOC)**

Executive Director Dan Little explained that the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is seeking a new courthouse location. Two sites in downtown Redding and one in the City of Anderson have been proposed for AOC consideration. Chairman Dickerson requested a letter advocating for a downtown Redding site, which was done. However, this is obviously a divisive issue so Chairman Dickerson and Executive Director Little decided to bring it to the Board for their consideration. Mr. Little continued to note that this gives rise to a larger issue of what type of projects the Agency should be commenting on. There are four alternatives given in the staff report. Alternatives one and two represent the status quo: letters are provided as directed by the Chair or the Board, comments are provided in support of grants, and at times comments are provided for projects outside of Shasta County that would have significant affects on Shasta County.

The RTPA is a responsible agency under the California Environmental Quality Act and may provide comments on planning level documents within the county as is noted in alternative three. Alternative four includes certain regionally significant projects. The TAC recommended comments be provided on all four alternatives at the discretion of the Executive Director. The intent would not be to comment on every single project, but only those projects that are determined to have significant impact on regionally significant roadways. It is envisioned that all comment letters would be included in the RTPA packets under the correspondence section so the Board could see all such comments. Should the Board choose all four alternatives Mr. Little estimated that about five to ten letters a year would be sent.

Discussion was held concerning the difference between the alternatives, getting approval from the Board before letters go out, and politically sensitive items.

A motion was made and seconded (Moty/Jones) that the Board adopt a policy authorizing the RTPA Executive Director to send comment letters as specified under all four alternatives, with the addition of language noting that politically sensitive items be brought to the Board before the letter goes out. The motion passed unanimously.

Board member Dickerson noted that the subject of the letter to the Administrative Office of the Courts is not pitting Board members against each other. They are the Regional Transportation Planning Agency. He doesn't sit on this board as a representative from the City of Redding; he sits as a representative from RABA. His interest in making this suggestion is not on behalf of the City of Redding, but rather the region as a whole.

Discussion was held concerning the new court house location including: increased vehicle trips up and down I-5, air quality attainment, SB 375, RABA buses adjustments to schedule, making decisions as a RTPA Board not jurisdiction members, I-5 coming to a standstill, traffic issues, and court employees traveling and moving files between locations.

Butch Schaefer, City of Anderson Mayor, stated that traffic is already out there, it doesn't matter whether they drive to Anderson or Redding. If there is a trial for someone coming from Burney, they are still going to make a trip whether it's to Redding or Anderson. The same thing with police vehicles, they are already on the road. Mr. Schaefer noted that he believed the RTPA Board should remain neutral on the subject of the courthouse location. The majority of people that come to the courthouse drive, they don't necessarily take RABA. Not all the traffic would be on I-5, there are three main thoroughfares that the traffic would be on, including the Highway 273 corridor and the Airport Road corridor.

A motion was made and seconded (Jones/Moty) that the Board submit the letter. The motion passed by a vote of 5-1. (Dickerson, Palmer, Jones, Baugh, Moty in favor; Comnick opposed).

8. Adopt the 2009/10 Overall Work Program (OWP) (Public Hearing)

Executive Director Dan Little explained that the OWP is the annual budget for the RTPA. The annual budget includes RTPA administration funds and includes pass through funds to the agencies for RTPA support activities and to RABA. Mr. Little noted that the RTPA staff received a letter from the City of Anderson asking that a harder look be taken at how Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues are spent. The City of Anderson has asked if the RTPA and RABA could spend less. The RTPA spends about 3% for administration costs of the total TDA funds available. The cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake are receiving more funds from the TDA for streets and roads than before, mostly because of reduced service hours associated with the new changes in RABA routes.

Staff member Sue Crowe stated that the OWP is a document that provides funding for the RTPA to do their job. This year \$1.9 million is being programmed. All labor costs are budgeted even though they are not necessarily charged to the OWP. \$834,000 is passed through to the cities, county, and RABA. There is also \$287,000 in carry over funds, which is money that was not used last year or the year before. The OWP also includes Federal Certifications and Assurances that the RTPA is in compliance with federal planning regulations.

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

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

9. Fix 5 Partnership Update

Executive Director Dan Little stated the update went to the City of Anderson first for a vote. They voted 4-1 to not support the Fix 5 Partnership. It went to the City of Shasta Lake second, and they voted 4-1 in support of the Fix 5 Partnership. The City of Redding is scheduled to vote on the update one week from today. Shasta County is not planning to hold a hearing on the Fix 5 Partnership at this time.

Board member Palmer urged any member of the Board of Supervisors to bring the Fix 5 Partnership forward, because the public has a right to hear from the Board of Supervisors and has a right to have their input; not only the Board members but the public who live in the county as well.

10. Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Dan Little noted that the Riverside/Ox Yoke program is essentially finished and will be turned over to the City of Anderson. Mr. Little continued to state that, at the last California Transportation Commission meeting, the City of Redding received an environmental enhancement mitigation grant for River Trail improvements in the amount of \$350,000. Regarding Economic Stimulus funds: the East Redding Bike Lanes Project received its NEPA approval a few days ago; the County Rehabilitation Projects are hoping to receive NEPA approval in a few weeks; the City of Redding is still pursuing the Oasis Interchange Project, and have a plan B if they can't get the NEPA approval or full funding. An application has been submitted for the next Transportation Authorization for the South Redding Interstate 5 Project. Anderson has submitted an application for the Deschutes Road Interchange and the City of Redding has submitted an application for the Oasis Road Interchange. Mr. Little ended by stating that RTPA legal council Liz Johnson has submitted her resignation, and this is her last meeting. Mr. Little and the Board thanked Ms. Johnson for her service to the RTPA.

Closed Session

11. Executive Director's Evaluation

By motion made and seconded (Palmer/Moty) the Board voted unanimously to resign to a closed session to perform the Executive Director's evaluation.

Open Session

Chair Dickerson reconvened the RTPA Board meeting noting that an evaluation was performed of the Executive Director.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Dickerson adjourned the meeting at 5:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

/jac