

REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SUBJECT	MEETING DATE	ITEM NUMBER
Master Fund Transfer Agreement (MFTA) and Fix 5 Partnership Request for Proposals (RFP)	10/24/06	6

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Agency:

1. Receive an update regarding the Fix 5 Partnership;
2. Authorize the Executive Officer to execute a Master Fund Transfer Agreement (MFTA) and all other documents required to administer \$585,000 in State Planning & Research (SPR) Funds for Fix 5 Partnership consultant services; and
3. Authorize distribution of the attached Request for Proposals (RFP) with any minor modifications in response to stakeholder comments.

SUMMARY

The RTPA previously approved a joint effort with Caltrans to develop a study of Interstate 5 improvement needs: The Fix 5 Partnership. Caltrans secured a \$585,000 grant for the study and a Master Fund Transfer Agreement (MFTA) is proposed to shift these funds to the Shasta County RTPA for administration.

Work is now underway. The attached Request for Proposals (RFP) has been prepared to secure professional services that will develop a public involvement plan, a financial plan and a regional traffic impact fee program. The Fix 5 Partnership includes all the five cities, two counties, and two RTPAs along the Interstate 5 Corridor between the cities of Shasta Lake and Corning.

Staff recommends that the RTPA authorize administration of the grant funds pursuant to the attached resolution and distribution of the attached RFP.

DISCUSSION

The Fix 5 Partnership was first discussed with the Agency July 26, 2005. On February 28, 2006, the Agency authorized participation in the study. The RTPA made staff presentations to our three city councils and the Board of Supervisors in March and April. On August 2, 2006, the first "Executive Committee" meeting was held to discuss key issues and define the project scope for use in the RFP. The Executive Committee Agenda and draft (unapproved) minutes are attached for more detailed discussion of the Partnership.

This project is funded by a \$585,000 SPR grant awarded to Caltrans District 2. It has been agreed that the RTPA can more expeditiously administer these funds. A MFTA must be approved before consultant work on the Fix 5 project can begin. Upon Agency approval of the attached resolution, Caltrans will draft the MFTA. Once approved, staff will submit a recommendation at the December or February RTPA meeting to amend the Overall Work Program (OWP) to include these funds.

The attached RFP has been developed based on the Executive Committee input. Distribution of the RFP will allow staff to begin the consultant selection process. At the February meeting, the recommended consultant and personal services agreement will be presented to the Agency for approval.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

Caltrans District 2 has agreed to transfer SPR funds to SCRTPA to manage this study. Members of the aforementioned Fix 5 Partnership will serve in an advisory capacity. The Executive Committee - consisting of City Managers, CAOs, and interested elected officials - will continue to meet quarterly (more or less). A Technical Advisory Committee will also be formed for broader public and agency participation.

FINANCING

Funding for this project comes through a \$585,000 SPR grant received by Caltrans District 2. RTPA, Caltrans, and local agency staff time are not funded by the grant, which is intended for consultant work only. Funds to cover RTPA staff time are currently budgeted in the OWP.

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Officer

DW/jac

Attachments: Resolution 06-13
 Fix 5 Partnership Request for Proposals (RFP)
 Fix 5 Partnership Executive Committee Agenda, August 2, 2006
 Fix 5 Partnership Executive Committee Unapproved Minutes -
 August 2, 2006
 Fix 5 Partnership Website

RESOLUTION NO. 06-13
APPROVE MASTER FUND TRANSFER AGREEMENT FOR
I-5 TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE PROGRAM

WHEREAS, Caltrans District 2 received a \$585,000 grant from the State Planning and Research Program (SPR) to prepare a financial plan and traffic impact fee program for Interstate 5; and

WHEREAS, the "Fix 5 Partnership" - consisting of representatives from Caltrans District 2, local regional planning agencies, city councils, board of supervisors, city managers, and county administrative officers of the jurisdictions along I-5 in Shasta and Tehama counties - has been formed to determine necessary capacity improvements along I-5 and develop a fair-share revenue program in response to emerging and forecasted traffic demand attributable to new development; and

WHEREAS, the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency (SCRTPA), Tehama County Transportation Commission, Caltrans District 2, and other project partners agree that the subject study can best be managed by the SCRTPA; and

WHEREAS, the SCRTPA must enter in to a master fund transfer agreement between the SCRTPA and the State of California, Department of Transportation, Division of Transportation Planning (DOT). The SCRTPA has established that all necessary documentation is on file along with the SCRTPA endorsements.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the SCRTPA finds that the transportation planning process is being carried out in conformance with all applicable federal requirements.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the SCRTPA Executive Officer is hereby authorized or empowered to execute all documents, including contracts, subcontracts, agreements, extensions, renewals, and/or amendments required by the California Department of Transportation, which may be necessary to carry out and administer all obligations, responsibilities, and duties under the aforementioned Master Fund Transfer Agreement;

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 24th day of October 2006, by the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

Glenn Hawes, Chairman
Shasta County Regional
Transportation Planning Agency



Shasta County

Regional Transportation
Planning Agency

1855 Placer Street • Redding, CA 96001 • (530) 225-5661 • FAX (530) 225-5667
E-Mail shasroad@snowcrest.net • HOME PAGE www.scrtpa.org

Daniel S. Little, Executive Officer

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

INTERSTATE 5 FEE PROGRAM STUDY SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY

October, 25 2006

You are invited to review and respond to the following Request for Proposal for Consultant Services for the Interstate 5 Fee Program Study. In submitting your offer, you must comply with the instructions found herein. Please read the enclosed document carefully. The proposal due date is 5:00 PM, December 15th, 2006.

AGENCY CONTACT INFORMATION:

Daniel Wayne, Senior Transportation Planner
Shasta County RTPA
(530) 225-5486
Fax: (530) 225-5667
dwayne@co.shasta.ca.us

Dan Little, Executive Director
Shasta County RTPA
(530) 225-6819
Fax: (530) 225-5667
dlittle@co.shasta.ca.us

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

**INTERSTATE 5 FEE PROGRAM STUDY
SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY**

Table of Contents

A. General Information 1

B. Response Guidelines..... 5

C. Evaluation Information 7

D. Standard Consulting Agreement..... 9

E. Fix 5 Partnership Duties 9

Exhibits

Exhibit A – Scope of Work – Required Work Element

A. General Information

1. Introduction

The Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency (SCRTPA) in cooperation with the Tehama County Transportation Commission and Caltrans District 2 is seeking qualified providers of Consultant Services to prepare an Interstate 5 Fee Program Study for the portion of I-5 between the cities of Corning and Shasta Lake. The study will include development of a funding plan for transportation improvements, including new sources of revenue (most likely traffic impact fees) and targeted outreach and education to the public and local organizations.

This request for proposals (RFP) is intended to establish the terms and conditions governing the selection of a firm to provide consultant services as described herein. All proposals shall be in the form and format specified in the RFP section entitled "RFP Response Guidelines."

2. Background

Interstate 5 is the principal north/south facility available for both local and long distance travel in the northern Sacramento Valley. Traffic volumes on I-5 in Shasta and Tehama County are forecast to more than double during the next thirty years, creating significant congestion on the freeway between the cities of Corning and Shasta Lake. By 2030, this entire stretch of I-5 will be at Level of Service (LOS) F during peak hours, with average speeds as low as 20 mph. Developers and local agencies alike are struggling with how to mitigate cumulative project impacts now that I-5 failures are within the 20-year CEQA analysis horizon.

Early in 2006, a series of meetings with RTPAs, City Councils, Board of Supervisors, City Managers, County Chief Administrative Officers and Caltrans were held to discuss traffic growth in the I-5 corridor. The focus of these meetings was to develop a consensus that a regional study should be undertaken to evaluate capacity improvements on I-5 and to develop a fair-share revenue program. From this effort the "Five 5 Partnership" was formed, which includes: the Shasta and Tehama RTPAs; Counties of Shasta and Tehama; Cities of Corning, Red Bluff, Anderson, Redding and Shasta Lake, and Caltrans District 2. The Fix 5 Partnership Mission Statement is:

Support the regional economy, public safety and public welfare through partnerships that manage congestion on the I-5 corridor between the cities of Shasta Lake and Corning. Identify, prioritize, and deliver projects necessary to prevent I-5 gridlock through 2030. Facilitate regional cooperation and a comprehensive strategy to maximize leverage of state and federal funds. Develop a traffic impact fee (TIF) program to be adopted by all local agencies based on a fair-share responsibility as determined by a consensus of the Fix 5 Partnership.

Goals of the Fix 5 Partnership:

- Maintain an “acceptable and manageable” level-of-service standard.
- Enhance local, regional, and interregional economic opportunity by promoting access, mobility, and goods movement.
- Reduce vehicle collisions and improve safety.
- Engage the public regarding improvement needs.
- Establish a fair share funding strategy considering local, regional, state and federal resources.
- Maximize leverage of state and federal funds by showing a strong local consensus that I-5 is the backbone of our region, and a local commitment to I-5 improvements.
- Establish a framework for ongoing regional decision-making that actively involves transportation stakeholders, particularly the traveling public, development community, and civic leaders.
- Streamline and coordinate CEQA reviews regarding I-5 development impacts.
- Provide traffic data, design details, and funding information for use in several local efforts including general plans, transportation plans, redevelopment plans, the regional traffic model, CEQA studies, capital programs, blueprint studies, and performance indicators.

Products and Deliverables of the Fix 5 Partnership:

- Identify current and future congestion problems on I-5 and supporting facilities through 2030 in five-year increments.
- Identify necessary improvements and associated costs on I-5 and supporting roads within the same five-year increments.
- Prioritize improvements for implementation within the five-year increments based on cost-revenue and cost-benefit analysis.
- Establish zones of benefit based on traffic contribution to needed improvements.
- Develop fair-share cost responsibilities among local agencies, the region, state and federal agencies based on the percentage of local, regional and interregional traffic. The added impact of heavy truck traffic will also be considered.
- Establish local, “self-help” funding mechanisms to meet local fair-share responsibilities.
- Develop draft TIF ordinances and/or other revenue devices as directed by the Partnership.
- Inform and educate the public through an outreach campaign including polling, stakeholder meetings, and informational and educational media.

The Fix 5 Partnership has a budget of \$585,000 to facilitate development and evaluation of the traffic impact fee program. Shasta County RTPA is the agency that has been selected to distribute this RFP and administer a contract for consultant services to prepare the necessary studies. For more details, proposers are encouraged to review the Fix 5 Partnership’s Executive Committee agenda and meeting minutes available online at www.fixfive.org/Fix5meetings.htm.

3. Procurement Schedule

Below is the time schedule for this procurement:

<u>Events</u>	<u>Date</u>
Release of RFP	10/26/06
Pre-Proposal Meeting.....	11/16/06
Questions Due to RTPA	11/21/06
Response to Questions	11/29/06
RFP Response Submission Due Date (by 5:00 PM)	12/15/06
Presentations/Interviews of top ranking firm(s).....	1/8/07
Notification of intent to award	1/25/07
Pre-award audit to be completed.....	2/25/07
Formal award and contract execution	2/27/07

4. Pre-Award Audit

Proposers are advised that an audit must be completed and that cooperation with the auditors is required before project may commence.

5. Contract Term

The term of this contract is anticipated to be a total of 20 months, beginning February, 2007. The agreement term may change if RTPA makes an award earlier than expected or if RTPA cannot execute the agreement in a timely manner due to unforeseen delays.

The resulting contract will not take effect until it is approved and signed by RTPA Contract Officer, and the selected consultant has received a signed copy of the contract. The selected consultant is hereby advised not to commence performance until an authorized contract has been issued by RTPA. Should performance commence before the contract is issued, such services may be considered voluntary.

5. Pre-Proposal Meeting

A pre-proposal meeting will be held on November 16, 2006, 1:00pm to 3:00pm, at the following location:

**Redding City Hall
Caldwell Park Conference Room
777 Cypress Avenue
Redding, CA 96001**

The meeting will consist of a presentation regarding the Interstate 5 Fee Program Study, anticipated consultant services, and project schedule. A question and answer period will follow the presentation, giving prospective consultants in attendance with an opportunity to inquire further about the project. Copies of the presentation and written responses to the questions and answers provided during the pre-proposal meeting WILL NOT BE PROVIDED so interested parties are encouraged to attend. A telephone call-in option will also be available. If the call-in option is desired, please contact Daniel Wayne, Senior Transportation Planner at (530) 225-5486 by November 14th to make arrangements and obtain instructions.

6. Consultant Questions

Prospective consultants shall notify RTPA immediately if clarification is needed regarding the RFP. Consultant shall submit their inquiry in writing and transmit it to RTPA as instructed below. Prospective consultants that fail to report a known or suspected problem with the RFP or fail to seek clarification and/or correction of the RFP shall submit an offer at their own risk.

a. What to Include in an Inquiry

- 1) Consultant name, name of firm, telephone number, fax number, email address, and RFP title – “Interstate 5 Fee Program Study”.
- 2) A description of the subject or issue in question or discrepancy found.
- 3) RFP section, page number or other information useful in identifying the specific problem or issue in question.
- 4) Remedy sought, if any.

b. Question Deadline

RTPA will accept written or e-mail inquiries received by November 21, 2006. At its discretion, RTPA may contact an inquirer to seek clarification of any inquiry received.

c. How to Submit Questions

Prospective consultants are required to submit all inquiries in writing. RTPA reserves the right not to accept or respond to verbal inquiries. Verbal remarks provided in response to verbal inquiries are unofficial and are not binding on RTPA unless later confirmed in writing.

Submit inquiries in writing either by email or fax to the RTPA contact person's email address or fax number listed on the cover of the RFP. Consultants submitting inquiries are responsible for confirming the receipt of all materials by the question deadline.

Consultants may request an email confirmation or call the RTPA contact person listed on the cover of the RFP to verify receipt of a faxed inquiry. Where appropriate, RTPA may combine similar questions and issue one collective response.

d. Responses to Questions

RTPA shall respond to inquiries in writing by issuing an addendum to all the prospective consultants who received a RFP and by posting on the project website located at www.fixfive.org.

B. RFP Response Guidelines

It is a prospective consultant's responsibility to provide all required data and any other information deemed necessary for the RTPA evaluation team to determine and verify the consultant's ability to perform the tasks and activities defined in the consultant's scope of work. Proposals must be submitted for the performance of all services described herein. Any deviation from the work specifications may cause a proposal to be rejected.

I. Proposal Requirements – Required Work Element

The consultant's response must identify how the consultant will perform the work required to accomplish the project described in Exhibit A – Scope of Work – Required Work Element. Qualifying proposals must address all of the following points, in the following order:

1. Cover/Transmittal Letter: This letter must be signed by a member of the firm with the authority to commit to a contract on behalf of the firm offering the proposal. Please acknowledge the receipt of any addenda received, if applicable.
2. Understanding of the work to be done and general approach to accomplish it.
3. Scope of Work: Provide a detailed work plan and schedule consistent with Exhibit A - Scope of Work – Required Work Element. Note any changes or additions to the scope of work in this RFP that may have been overlooked or which help clarify the work tasks. Include milestones, deliverables and public/agency involvement.
4. Responsible Personnel: List the principal-in-charge, and others who will be directly involved with the project. Provide a concise statement of qualifications and experience of each person who will be committed to the project. List the amount of time each person will contribute to the project. The experience and

role of personnel involved with Item 6, "Related Experience," shall be emphasized. Include other anticipated sub-consultants, if any, listing their names, addresses, phone numbers, key staff, and expected time to be spent on the project. Include an organizational chart of key personnel involved. In addition, Consultant, and each of the personnel employed or otherwise retained by Consultant, shall be properly certified and licensed under the laws and regulations of the State of California to provide the services solicited herein.

5. Project Management: Describe how the project will be planned and controlled.
6. Related Experience: Include all projects in progress or completed in the last five years that are comparable to this project. Include references with names, addresses, and phone numbers.
7. Corporate Documentation and Financial Information: Provide relevant information regarding organizational stability and strength. This includes a statement of organizational structure (e.g., sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, joint venture, etc.), information regarding the make-up of that structure (e.g., owner, partners, board of directors, joint venture partners, etc.), a listing of financial references, a current annual report or audited profit and loss statement and a statement of stability.
8. Provide amounts and carriers of both general liability and professional liability insurance.
9. Provide a statement of the firm's approach in respect to budget and schedule control during throughout the project. Demonstrate the project manager's experience and ability to manage others to operate within a given budget and schedule.

II. Fees

The consultant's fees for each of the services to be provided shall be submitted IN SEPARATE, SEALED ENVELOPES, mailed with the copies of the proposal. The envelopes shall be marked with the same notation as the proposals. Break down the fee into labor, subcontractor fees, if any, and expenses. Fees shall include all tax, mark-ups, overhead, and profit. The cost estimate should be broken out into time estimates and costs for each task identified. Proposals that do not include separate cost estimates for each work element will be removed from further consideration. **All proposals must include a 15% contingency plan in order to accommodate any unanticipated additions to the scope of work.**

III. Format

Pages in the proposal shall be typed and single sided with the maximum number of pages of proposal information (excepting cover sheet, index sheet, blank pages, and table of contents) to be limited to forty pages. Only that information specifically requested in this RFP should be included in the proposal. If a consultant recognizes a more efficient or effective method of accomplishing a requested work task or portion thereof, this should be included as a separate addendum to the proposal. Likewise, consultant fees shall first reflect the RTPA's specifically requested work. Any change in costs associated with recommended modifications must be noted separately.

IV. Submittal

The proposal due date is 5:00 PM, Friday, December 15, 2006. Ten (10) hard copies and an electronic copy on CD in Microsoft word and PDF should be sealed in an envelope or box clearly marked with the consultant's name and labeled "Proposal for Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency – Interstate 5 Fee Program Study" to the mailing address below. Proposals may also be hand delivered to the address listed below. All proposals must be received and date/time stamped prior to the advertised deadline.

**Shasta County RTPA
Attn: Daniel Wayne
1855 Placer Street
Redding, CA 96001-1759**

C. Evaluation Information

Evaluation and Selection will consist of two (2) phases conducted by a committee composed of the RTPA and representatives of the Fix 5 Partnership. Proposals must meet the requirements of phase one in order to be considered in phase two of the evaluation. Any deviation from the work specifications may cause a proposal to be rejected.

Phase 1 – Administrative Requirements

All proposals will be screened based on the requirements set forth in Section B: RFP Response Guidelines. Incomplete proposals will be eliminated from further evaluation. Proposals that contain false or misleading statements, or which provide references that do not support an attribute or condition claimed by the consultant, will likewise be rejected.

Phase 2 – Evaluation and Selection

a. Consultant's Proposal

Once the proposal is deemed complete, the following criteria will be used as the basis for ranking each qualifying proposal. All criteria shall be equally weighted.

- Technical approach/understanding of the scope of work
- Technical qualifications and relevant experience of the firm
- Ability to meet project deadlines and attend technical advisory, executive committee and other meetings and site visits
- Firm's past record in performing similar projects (references)

b. Consultant Interviews

The RTPA will request a presentation/interview from the top firm(s) based on the submitted proposal and ranking as described above. The interview(s) shall be held on January 8, 2007 in Shasta County (specific location to be announced) unless other arrangements are made by the RTPA. The consultant's proposed key project staff identified in the proposal must be in attendance at the interview.

c. Combined/Final Ranking

Upon completion of the oral presentations/interviews, the committee will prepare a final ranking based on the combined results both phases.

d. Fees

Upon evaluation and ranking of all qualifying proposals, the committee will examine the fees to determine if they are reasonable. If the top ranked consultant has submitted a reasonable fee, then the committee will submit its recommendation to the Executive Director of the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency. If the Director is in agreement with the recommendation, a contract will be negotiated and submitted to the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency Board for its approval on February 27, 2007.

If the top ranked consultant submits a fee that is considered unreasonable and does not agree to lower the fee to an acceptable level, the committee reserves the right to bypass that consultant and to negotiate with the next ranked consultant. This process may be repeated until an acceptable consultant is chosen.

The RTPA is not obligated to accept any of the proposals submitted or to enter into an agreement with any of the proposers. At its discretion the RTPA may elect to award all or any portion of the project scope of work as defined in the RFP.

D. Standard Consulting Agreement

The selected firm shall be retained under the RTPA's standard consulting and professional services agreement. A sample of this agreement is available upon request. By submitting a proposal for the work, the consultant agrees to be bound by the sample agreement form for the contract. The contract shall provide payment for the work performed up to a not-to-exceed amount.

The final Scope of Work (Exhibit A to the Standard Consulting Agreement) and Schedule of Work (Exhibit B to the Standard Consulting Agreement) will be negotiated by the Consultant and RTPA.

E. Fix 5 Partnership Duties

1. RTPA will designate a representative, as Project Coordinator, authorized to act on RTPA and Fix 5 Partnerships behalf. The Project Coordinator shall examine the documents submitted by the consultant and render decisions pertaining thereto to avoid unreasonable delay in the progress of the project.
2. Provide full information about the requirements for the project including the budget limitations and scheduling.
3. Provide staff support required to conduct public outreach meetings.
4. Provide existing maps, drawings, specifications, traffic data, or any other information maintained by Fix 5 Partnership agencies that is needed by the Consultant in executing its responsibilities. The following information shall form the basis upon which the Financial Plan and Traffic Impact Fee Program are devised:
 - Existing and future traffic volumes on I-5
 - Existing and future level-of-service/operational deficiencies on I-5
 - Conceptual improvements to address mainline I-5 deficiencies
 - Preliminary cost estimates for mainline I-5 improvements
 - Available interchange improvement studies

Most documents are available online as indicated below. Documents not available online may be obtained by contacting the Shasta County RTPA.

I-5 Transportation Concept Report – Working Papers:

- Current and future traffic volumes on mainline I-5 (2005-2030, five year increments)
- Current and future LOS on mainline I-5 (2005-2030, five year increments)
- Conceptual mainline improvements
- Preliminary cost estimates

Regional Transportation Plans:

Shasta County RTP (2004): <http://www.scrtpa.org/RTplan.htm>

Tehama County RTP (2006):
http://www.tehamacountypublicworks.ca.gov/Transportation/documents/RTP/2006/rtp_all.pdf

General Plans:

Tehama County: <http://www.tehamagp.com/>

Shasta County:
http://www.co.shasta.ca.us/Departments/Resourcemgmt/drm/general_plan.htm

City of Red Bluff: <http://www.ci.red-bluff.ca.us/planning/generalplan.html>

City of Anderson: <http://www.ci.anderson.ca.us/planning.asp>

City of Redding: <http://www.ci.redding.ca.us/devserv/planning/gp.html>

City of Corning: Available from City of Corning upon request

City of Shasta Lake: <http://ci.shasta-lake.ca.us/General%20Plan.pdf>

Special Studies:

Origin and Destination Study (Caltrans, 2006)
Origin and destination study for the I-5 corridor (including SR 36/99, SR 44, and SR 299) between the Cities of Corning and Shasta Lake. The main objective of the study is to determine regional versus interregional travel patterns. Anticipated availability January 2007.

Oasis Road Specific Plan (City of Redding, 2006)
Land use plan for 762 acres of largely undeveloped land at the northerly gateway to the City. Addresses development of Redding's next major regional commercial area, including infrastructure and circulation needs for up to four million square feet of commercial space and 1,800 single-family and multiple-family residential units. The ORSP identifies numerous transportation improvements including expansion/replacement of the Oasis Road/I-5 Interchange and modification to the Market Street (SR 273)/I-5 Interchange.
<http://www.ci.redding.ca.us/devserv/envdocs/ORSP.html>

Southern Region Study (Shasta County RTPA/Shasta County, 2006)
Study identified current and future transportation needs and projects for the Southern Region of Shasta County. Study included a traffic impact fee program for improvements to the Main Street and Gas Point Road interchanges with I-5 as well as local road improvements.
<http://www.scrtpa.org/RTstudy.htm>

Shasta County Interchange Study (Shasta County RTPA, 1993)
Study identified needed future improvements under year 2020 traffic conditions at thirteen interchanges on I-5. The purpose of the interchange study was to provide the RTPA, Caltrans, Shasta County, Anderson, Redding, and Shasta Lake with a detailed description of what improvements will be needed to accommodate future growth within Shasta County.

Sun City Tehama Final Environmental Impact Report (September 2006)

<http://co.tehama.ca.us/Planning/SunCityfinalEIR.pdf>

Environmental Impact Report for Del Webb's 3,474 acre development in northern Tehama County.

Interchange Studies

Refer to Table 1 for summary of I-5 interchanges within project study area and related special studies.

Travel Demand Models:

Shasta County Traffic Model (2006)

The Shasta County Traffic Model was recently updated, including the underlying methodology needed to forecast future growth in population and travel demand.

I-5 Interchange List (Fix 5 Study Area) and Studies			
Postmile	County	Interchanges	Studies
R5.769	Tehama	Liberal Avenue	No formal document, preliminary work only
R7.486	Tehama	South Avenue	South Avenue Project Report, Caltrans (May 2005)
R8.975	Tehama	Corning Road	No current study
R10.969	Tehama	Finnell Avenue	No current study
R13.965	Tehama	Gyle Road	No current study
R19.781	Tehama	Flores Avenue	No formal document, preliminary work only
R24.897	Tehama	South Main*	No formal document, preliminary work only
R24.942	Tehama	Diamond Avenue*	No formal document, preliminary work only
R26.525	Tehama	Central Red Bluff (SR 36)	No current study
R27.472	Tehama	Adobe Road	North Red Bluff Interchange Project Report, Caltrans (June 2006) and I-5 at Adobe Road New Connection Report, Caltrans (May 1996)
R28.377	Tehama	North Red Bluff*	No current study
31.043	Tehama	Wilcox Road	No current study
32.356	Tehama	Jellys Ferry Road	No current study
36.371	Tehama	Nine Mile Hill	Sun City Tehama Draft Environmental Impact Report, Tehama County (July 2006)
38.716	Tehama	Sunset Hills	Sun City Tehama Draft Environmental Impact Report, Tehama County (July 2006)
41.525	Tehama	Bowman Road	No current study
0.909	Shasta	Gas Point Road	South Region Transportation Planning Study and Impact Fee Program, Shasta County (July 2006)
2.076	Shasta	North Cottonwood/Main Street*	South Region Transportation Planning Study and Impact Fee Program, Shasta County (July 2006)
R3.815	Shasta	SR 273*	No formal document, preliminary work only
4.289	Shasta	Deschutes Road*	No formal document, preliminary work only (City of Anderson hired consultant)
R5.294	Shasta	Balls Ferry	No current study
R5.640	Shasta	North Street*	No current study
R6.743	Shasta	Riverside Avenue	No formal document, preliminary work only (City of Anderson hired consultant)
R9.772	Shasta	Knighton Road	No current study
R12.920	Shasta	South Bonnyview Road	South Bonnyview Interchange Feasibility Study, Caltrans (Winter 2006)
R14.443	Shasta	Cypress Avenue	No current study
R15.429	Shasta	I-5/Jct 44 Separation, Central Redding	Project Study Report Central Interchange Improve Weaving Conditions, Caltrans (November 2005)
R17.303	Shasta	Jct 299E/Lake Boulevard Separation	No current study
R18.068	Shasta	Twin View Boulevard, Jct 273-N Redding Separation	Oasis Specific Plan, City of Redding (August 2006)
R19.402	Shasta	Oasis Road	Oasis Specific Plan, City of Redding (August 2006)
R20.995	Shasta	Pine Grove	No current study
R22.144	Shasta	State Route 151	No current study
R24.082	Shasta	Mountain Gate	No current study
*not full interchanges			
Tehama County=16 interchanges; Shasta=16 interchanges			

EXHIBIT A

Required Work Element:

The overall goal of the project is to ensure that the improvements necessary to serve local, regional, and interregional traffic during the next 30 years in the I-5 study corridor are identified, prioritized, funded and delivered. Key required work elements for this project include the development of an interim impact fee program, a public and agency involvement plan, financial plan, and traffic impact fee program for mainline I-5. The traffic impact fee program will focus on the through travel lanes, but may also include other improvements necessary to accommodate additional through lanes (i.e. structure widening and/or ramp modification for merge/diverge areas), select interchanges, and select parallel alternative routes.

The final scope of services required by the RTPA will be set forth in an attachment to the contract agreement between the RTPA and the consultant. The anticipated scope of work is described below.

Task 1: Prepare and Present Interim Impact Fee Program

Due to the unprecedented large-scale onset of development and subsequent demand for transportation infrastructure, first priority shall be given to the preparation of an interim fee program for presentation to the Fix 5 Partnership Executive Committee. Based on the existing 2006 Shasta County traffic model, the interim fee program will be a stop gap measure to insure that imminent developments with a traffic impact nexus to Interstate 5 contribute toward a fair and appropriate share of impact fees.

Task 1.1 – Develop Plan and Schedule for Interim I-5 Traffic Impact Fee (TIF)

The interim fee plan must 1) identify the purpose of the fee; 2) identify the use to which the fee is to be put, including identifying the public facilities to be financed; 3) show a reasonable relationship (nexus) between the fee's use and the type of development project; 4) show the reasonable relationship between the public facility to be constructed and the type of development; 5) provide an accounting framework for monitoring and tracking revenue generated and expended; and 6) be tied to the 2006 Shasta County traffic model (for the study area within Shasta County).

Task 1.2 – Present Interim I-5 TIF program to Fix 5 Executive Committee

Task 1.3 – Prepare Interim Fee Final Plan and ordinances/resolutions

Deliverables:

- 1) Work plan and implementation schedule for interim traffic impact fee program
- 2) Executive Committee Agenda
- 3) Final Report
- 4) Ordinance and resolution language

Task 2: Fix 5 Partnership Meetings

Key to the implementation of final study recommendations is continued involvement and support from the 'Fix 5 Partnership', consisting of representatives from local regional planning agencies, city councils, board of supervisors, city managers, and county administrative officers of the jurisdictions along I-5 in Shasta and Tehama counties. Regular and effective project updates to the Fix 5 Partnership and Fix 5 Technical Advisory Committee are therefore required.

Presentation of the final project report and recommendations to each individual agency's board is likewise expected.

Task 2.1 – Coordinate Fix 5 executive committee meetings

Coordinate Executive Committee Meetings and present project update following major project milestones (5 meetings).

Task 2.2 – Coordinate Fix 5 TAC meetings

Coordinate Technical Advisory Committees (monthly meetings).

Task 2.3 – Presentation of Final Report and Recommendations

Present final project report and recommendations to respective city, county, and agency boards (8 meetings).

Deliverables:

- 1) Agenda, handouts, web-ready material, and other materials utilized during presentations
- 2) Invitations and public notices

Task 3: Public Outreach and Information

In order to assist elected officials in making timely and informed decisions regarding the imposition of impact fees, the consultant shall assess general public sentiment regarding existing and future service levels along I-5 within the project area and carry out targeted educational outreach to specific entities or identifiable groups of individuals most likely to be affected by the proposed mainline I-5 TIF program.

Methodology should allow for a statistically representative sampling of residents in affected areas and direct contact with those groups and entities most likely to be affected.

Task 3.1 – Conduct interviews

Elected officials shall be consulted prior to outreach efforts in order to ascertain which entities or associations they would like direct input from and what issues and/or obstacles must be addressed in order to back a mainline I-5 TIF program. Secondary interviews shall be performed with those stakeholders identified during elected official interviews.

Task 3.2 – Develop and share educational program materials

Develop educational materials (i.e. pamphlets, door hangers, or similar) and distribute in those areas most likely to be impacted by increased congestion and reduced level of service on Interstate 5. Develop educational presentation materials (i.e. poster board displays, handouts etc.) for presentations to boards, community groups, professional associations, technical advisory committee, web posting, and so forth. Materials shall include discussion of economic, environmental, and other impacts of I-5 congestion. Charts, tables, maps, and other graphical display options should be utilized wherever appropriate.

Task 3.3 – Pre/Post-project awareness/opinion assessment

Assess baseline general public sentiment regarding 1) existing service conditions, 2) anticipated future service conditions, and 3) attitude toward various potential strategies for meeting future demands. It is anticipated that focus groups and interviewing methods will be utilized. Following the outreach and education element, consultant

shall reassess in order to gauge change in opinion as a result of education/exposure to information.

Task 3.4 – Public workshop

Prepare and deliver public workshops. At total of two public workshops will be held; one in Shasta County and one in Tehama County.

Deliverables:

- 1) Summary report of elected official interviews and discussion of potential issues and obstacles as identified
- 2) Educational program collateral and documentation of collateral distribution, presentations, and related efforts
- 3) Technical memorandum summarizing results of public/stakeholder outreach, including pre/post outreach analysis, discussion of potential public/stakeholder issues and obstacles, and public support assessment for final recommended transportation funding program

Task 4: Situation Analysis

The consultant will not be starting from scratch, as a variety of studies related to active or recently completed development projects exist. While these projects have considerable impacts to I-5, they are being conducted independently of each other and generally do not provide resources for additional mainline capacity on I-5. A 'system' approach is needed to effectively manage this corridor, whereby existing studies are tied together, data gaps are identified and closed, and a template for a more unified regional approach is created.

Existing documentation from comparable regions elsewhere in California will likewise assist in framing the issue of how to maintain service levels on a regionally significant transportation corridor in an urbanizing area. Attitudes toward impact fees are, in part, dependant on reasonable consistency with other comparable regions. Consistency with surrounding areas will also help minimize the detrimental consequences associated with large fee variations across borders.

Task 4.1 – Summarize existing work efforts in light of overall 'system' perspective

- a) Compile, review, and summarize existing studies and projects (funded and non-funded) related to Interstate 5 within the project area (i.e. transportation plans, working papers, general plans, special studies, interchange studies, traffic model data, and so forth)
- b) Develop supplemental data necessary to fill informational gaps
- c) Analyze the overall long-term efficacy of existing traffic impact mitigation efforts viewed from a 'system' perspective

Task 4.2 – Peer comparison and analysis

Compile information regarding traffic impact fees and traffic impact fee programs from comparable regions in California. Analyze and benchmark effective policies, standards, and processes – summarized and represented via matrix analysis (or other easily discerned format) and technical memorandum.

Task 4.3 – cursory appraisal of Interstate Highway 5 interchanges

While not the core focus of the project, this task will serve as a starting point for future studies. The consultant shall take a glancing look at I-5 interchanges within the project study area, including the following elements:

- 1) Organize a reference list of existing studies for each respective interchange
- 2) Using generalized categories, denote existing interchange type
- 3) Using generalized degrees, weight the need for improvements at each interchange
- 4) Using generalized ranges, approximate the capital investment costs at each interchange
- 5) Recommend next steps

Deliverables:

- 1) Comprehensive consolidated summary of recent studies and projects performed in study area and analysis of current program effectiveness
- 2) Peer comparison matrix and analysis of impact fees and fee programs
- 3) I-5 interchange appraisal

Task 5 – Assess benefits of enhancements to alternate routes

A component of the overall strategy toward managing regional congestion on Interstate 5 may involve off-mainline improvements to parallel roadways. While not the core focus of this study, a discussion of off-mainline improvements that would significantly mitigate traffic impacts at a comparable or lower cost should be presented in broad terms, sufficient to determine if further investigation is warranted.

Task 5.1 – Alternative route appraisal

Appraise impact of complimentary off-mainline improvements as component of overall Interstate 5 traffic demand strategy and highlight those corridors where further study is warranted. Potential corridors for appraisal include 1) Airport Road, 2) SR 273, 3) the new parallel north/south over Cottonwood Creek, 4) Road 99W, 5) McCoy/Hooker Creek Rd, 6) Rawson Road, 7) and the connection between Jellys Ferry Road and Lake California Drive.

Task 5.2 – Develop system improvement alternatives

Generate a range of feasible regional system improvement strategies to address forecasted mainline deficiencies on I-5.

Deliverables:

- 1) Alternative Route Analysis technical memorandum

Task 6 – Develop project evaluation matrix and prioritize identified improvements into five year increments (i.e. 2015, 2020, 2025, and 2030)

As a basis for determining the traffic impact fee structure, a plan of projects designed to most effectively and efficiently relieve congestion is required. Final selection of projects and priorities shall be partially dependant upon cost estimates as determined in Task 7.

Task 6.1 – Identify improvement alternatives

Develop regional improvement alternatives based on a collective 'system' approach. Alternatives shall not be prejudiced by fiscal or other constraints, but rather shall be an overview of potential options/strategies.

Task 6.2 – Develop project evaluation criteria

Develop and present suitable criteria and/or measures for evaluating and prioritizing improvement alternatives to the TAC for discussion. Based on TAC input, consultant shall present selected criteria/measures to Fix 5 Partnership Executive Committee for approval.

Task 6.3 – Prioritize identified improvements

Prioritizations shall be based on selected project evaluation criteria and Caltran's Life Cycle Benefit/Cost Analysis Model. For ease of evaluation and comparison, consultant shall develop project selection and prioritization matrix (or other easily discerned format).

Task 6.4 – Regional program of projects and priorities report

Develop preferred regional improvement program and schedule. Present findings to Fix 5 Partnership Executive Committee for review and consent.

Deliverables:

- 1) Overview of improvement alternatives
- 2) Project evaluation criteria/methodology
- 3) Project Priority report, including condensed evaluation matrix

Task 7: Develop final cost estimates for selected improvement projects

Based on preliminary work performed by Caltrans, refine and finalize project cost estimates.

Task 7.1 – Comparison of current year project costs

Compile and present cost estimates for all projects identified in Task 6 *based on current year construction dollars*, broken down by phases of project development and delivery (i.e. environmental review/mitigation, design, right of way, construction).

Task 7.3 – Construction year project costs

Adjust cost for all projects identified in Task 6 *based on proposed construction year*, broken down by phases of project development and delivery (i.e. environmental review/mitigation, design, right of way, construction, etc). For each respective calendar year, include best approximated cost index multiplication factor so that individual project costs can be recalculated based on updated construction year.

Deliverable:

- 1) Report on existing and construction year project cost estimates, including technical description of methodology/formulas utilized.

Task 8: Develop Financial Plan

Evaluate potential funding programs/sources for identified improvements, considering both existing and new programs/sources

Task 8.1 – Forecast existing funds

Develop revenue forecasts from existing transportation funding programs and identify potential levels from each program that may be available for identified improvements.

Task 8.2 – Identify and estimate potential new funds

Identify a comprehensive list of potential additional funding mechanisms that may be used to implement the identified transportation improvements. It is anticipated that programs considered will include, but not necessarily be limited to, traffic impact fees, sales tax measures, local bond measures, assessment districts, and direct developer mitigation. Include anticipated level of revenue generation

Task 8.3 – Analysis of funding options

Compare the relative advantages and disadvantages of the measures identified in Tasks 8.1 and 8.2.

Deliverable:

- 1) Financial plan for preferred mainline I-5 traffic impact fee program

Task 9 – Formulate methodology for quantifying and assigning development impacts to specific jurisdictions

Determine 'fair share' of traffic impact costs attributable to each municipality within the region (by individual project and total combined). Fair share formula must be consistent with traffic models.

Task 9.1 – Zones of benefit map

Determine zones of benefit or other legally accepted method for delineating distribution of traffic impacts/project benefits.

Task 9.2 – Fair share determination

Identify share of cost for each improvement for each Fix 5 Partnership member agency based on zones of benefit and trip distribution or other legally acceptable methodology.

Task 9.3 – Non-eligible improvements

Identify portion of improvement costs that are not attributable to Fix 5 Partnership member agencies and/or new development, such as existing deficiencies and costs attributed to interregional traffic.

Deliverable:

- 1) Zones of Benefit Map
- 2) Fair Share Formula technical memorandum, including discussion of eligible and non-eligible improvements

Task 10: Develop Recommended Funding Strategy, Including Traffic Impact Fee Program

Task 10.1 – Develop Traffic Impact Fee Program consistent with the requirements of California AB 1600 (Government Code 66000-66025).

Task 10.2 – Present funding strategy and traffic impact fee program to governing bodies of the Fix 5 Partnership agencies.

Task 10.3 – Develop public notices and authorizing resolutions for each jurisdiction

Deliverables:

- 1) Traffic Impact Fee Program: Final Report and Recommendations
- 2) Presentation materials for final report and findings
- 3) Public notices and resolutions for each jurisdiction

FIX FIVE

Partnership



"Enhancing Capacity and Mobility along the Interstate 5 Corridor"

AGENDA

FIX 5 PARTNERSHIP

Executive Committee Meeting #1

Wednesday, August 2, 2:00-3:30 p.m.
City of Redding Community Room



Table of Contents	
Introductions	1
Summary	1
Grant Funding	1
Background	2
Fix 5 Partnership Goals	2
Fix 5 Partnership Grant Study Scope	4
Participation Structure	7
Public Outreach	7
Study Schedule	8
Next Steps	9
Other Comments and Feedback	9
Adjourn	9
Figures, Maps, Appendices	
Figure 1 – Interstate 5 Speed Trends During Peak Hour	
Figure 2 - Shasta County Model 2004 Model Validation	
Figure 3 – Shasta County Model 2040 Initial Traffic Forecast UNADJUSTED	
Figure 4 – Conceptual Relationship of LOS to Operating Speed and Flow Rate	
Figure 5 – Decades of Under-Investment	
Figure 6 – Fix 5 Partnership Organizational Chart	
Map 1 – Future Development	
Appendix 1: SPR Grant	
Appendix 2: Shasta Fact Sheet – Strategic Growth Plan Bond Package	
Appendix 3: Selected Articles	

This page blank

1. INTRODUCTIONS

2. SUMMARY

Congestion: Congestion on Interstate 5 through our region is growing at a rate of 10-percent a year, while funding has remained flat. Recent and unprecedented developments in South-Central Shasta and North-Central Tehama Counties will further accelerate this rate of decline. Interstate 5 is projected to fail within the next ten years, meaning we will experience stop-and-go traffic in the morning and evening commute hours. This has serious implications across many “quality of life” indicators such as economic development, goods movement, air quality, access, mobility, safety and community satisfaction in general.

CEQA: The development community has also been impacted. Developers and local agencies have been struggling with how to mitigate cumulative project impacts now that I-5 failures are within the 20-year CEQA analysis horizon (see Appendix 3).

Traffic Impact Fee (TIF): The most realistic local revenue source for I-5 improvements at this time is traffic impact fees levied on new development. The time to act is now because it may take 10 or more years to amass funds to design and build any major improvements. Also, once I-5 fails, the window of opportunity to adopt a full-share traffic impact fee program has closed. We cannot legally make new development responsible for existing deficiencies. Finally, a traffic impact fee program will help to resolve some of the CEQA issues now faced by local jurisdictions and developers.

Other Revenue Programs: A TIF is only part of the solution. Experience in larger urbanized areas shows that voters will eventually support a local sales tax measure for transportation in addition to a TIF when congestion becomes intolerable. TIFs and local sales tax revenue can also be used to leverage state and federal dollars. The proposed State Infrastructure Bond is a good example. If approved in November, \$1 billion will be available for congestion relief projects where local agencies provide a 50% match. The \$4.5 billion corridor mobility program may also include local match in the project selection criteria (see Appendix 2).

Fix 5 Partnership: A series of meetings with the RTPAs, City Councils, Board of Supervisors, City Managers, and CAOs of the jurisdictions along I-5 in Shasta and Tehama counties has taken place. The focus of these meetings was to develop a consensus that a regional study is needed to look at capacity improvements on I-5, and develop a fair-share revenue program. To date, there has been unanimous support in moving forward with this study. State grant funds are now in place and this meeting is the first step in developing a regional and comprehensive improvement strategy.

3. GRANT FUNDING

Funding for this study is through the State Planning and Research (SPR) program. SPR grants are awarded to Caltrans Districts and headquarters divisions to fund transportation-planning activities of interregional or statewide interest that fall outside normal work activities. Emphasis is placed on collaboration between transportation agencies and other public and private stakeholders. Program funding is 80% federal, 20% state and may be used for contract services only. The RTPAs, Caltrans, cities and counties will provide staff support for this effort.

Total grant funding available for the I-5 study is \$585,000. Consultant work will begin this fall and must be completed by June 30, 2009. The lead agencies for this project will be Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency (SCRTPA) and the Tehama County Regional Transportation Planning Agency (TCRTPA).

The approved SPR Grant Application is attached.

4. BACKGROUND

Traffic: North of Red Bluff, I-5 is the principal north/south facility available for both local and long distance travel. Traffic volumes on I-5 are forecast to more than double during the next thirty years, creating significant congestion on the freeway between the cities of Corning and Shasta Lake. Traffic flow will be erratic, often “stop-and-go.” By 2030, this entire stretch will be at LOS F with peak hour average speeds as low as 20 mph. Figure 1 shows average travel speeds between Corning and Shasta Lake over time. Figures 2 and 3 show LOS on Shasta County roadways today and at 2030 based on the SCRTPA traffic model.

Compounding the issue, as the level of service declines, the number of vehicles that can pass through diminishes at peak demand times as shown in Figure 4.

A critical question that must be addressed if we are to find a solution to traffic congestion is, “who is driving on I-5?” I-5 carries a mixture of local, regional and interregional auto and heavy truck trips serving diverse purposes. Without knowing where projected traffic is coming from or going to we cannot develop a fair-share funding solution. Caltrans plans to perform an origin and destination (O&D) study on I-5 and key intersecting State Routes that will be used for the Fix 5 Partnership study. The O&D study will identify how much traffic is local versus how much is passing through.

Funding: There are no revenue streams on the horizon to address this problem. Federal and state gas tax revenue is flat while the needs for new facilities grow (Figure 5). Since 1990, travel on California’s Interstates has increased at five times the rate that capacity has been added. In Shasta County, State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding is likely committed through 2015 and any new funding will be limited to less than \$5 million annually, even in robust economic times. In Tehama County, limited STIP funds are committed to the South Avenue Interchange project. While some jurisdictions within the District 2 area have local traffic impact fee programs, none of these address I-5 mainline needs.

TIF programs are becoming more widely accepted by the public and development community in our region. Based on City of Redding surveys, recent election results in Tehama County, and current levels of congestion, the region does not appear ready to approve a “self-help” sales tax measure.

Senate Bill 1266, the state’s Strategic Growth Plan Bond Package on the November ballot (Proposition 1B), and Federal earmarks hold some promise; however, these address only a small portion of the needs and typically rely on significant local matching funds. I-5 is not only the backbone for the region, it is the backbone of the state and West Coast. Local, state and federal governments all have a vested interest in the corridor. There will be opportunities to leverage state and federal funds, but only if we can raise our fair share of local revenue. The attached Shasta County fact sheet (Appendix 2) concerning the Strategic Growth Plan Bond is one example of significant funding that can be leveraged for I-5 with local partnerships and revenue programs.

5. FIX 5 PARTNERSHIP GOALS

Fix 5 Partnership Mission Statement: Support the regional economy, public safety and public welfare through partnerships that manage congestion on the I-5 corridor between the cities of Shasta Lake and Corning. Identify, prioritize, and deliver projects necessary to prevent I-5 gridlock through 2030. Facilitate regional cooperation and a comprehensive strategy to maximize the leverage of state and federal funds. Develop a traffic impact fee (TIF) program to be adopted by all local agencies based on a fair-share responsibility as determined by a consensus of the Fix 5 Partnership.

Executive Committee Question: Does the mission statement encompass our basic need?

Fix 5 Partnership Goals:

1. Maintain an “acceptable and manageable” level-of-service standard.
2. Enhance local, regional, and interregional economic opportunity by promoting access, mobility, and goods movement.
3. Reduce vehicle collisions and improve safety.
4. Engage the public regarding improvement needs.
5. Establish a fair share funding strategy considering local, regional, state and federal resources.
6. Maximize leverage of state and federal funds by showing a strong local consensus that I-5 is the backbone of our region, and a local commitment to I-5 improvements.
7. Establish a framework for ongoing regional decision-making that actively involves transportation stakeholders, particularly the traveling public, development community, and civic leaders.
8. Streamline and coordinate CEQA reviews regarding I-5 development impacts.
9. Provide traffic data, design details, and funding information for use in several local efforts including general plans, transportation plans, redevelopment plans, the regional traffic model, CEQA studies, capital programs, blueprint studies, and performance indicators.

Executive Committee Question: Are these appropriate goals?

Fix 5 Partnership Products and Deliverables:

1. Identify current and future congestion problems on I-5 and supporting facilities through 2030 in five-year increments.
2. Identify necessary improvements and associated costs on I-5 and supporting roads within the same five-year increments.
3. Prioritize improvements for implementation within the five-year increments based on cost-revenue and cost-benefit analysis.
4. Establish zones of benefit based on traffic contribution to needed improvements.
5. Develop fair-share cost responsibilities among local agencies, the region, state and federal agencies based on the percentage of local, regional and interregional traffic. The added impact of heavy truck traffic will also be considered.
6. Establish local, “self-help” funding mechanisms to meet local fair-share responsibilities.
7. Develop draft TIF ordinances and/or other revenue devices as directed by the Partnership.
8. Inform and educate the public through an outreach campaign including polling, stakeholder meetings, and informational and educational media.

Executive Committee Question: Are there any other desired deliverables?

6. FIX PARTNERSHIP GRANT STUDY SCOPE

Geographic: The approved grant application describes the study area as the City of Corning to the City of Shasta Lake. This section of I-5 currently has the highest traffic volumes and is anticipated to have the highest level of growth through 2030. This section also has a number of connections to significant local and state facilities including State Routes 36, 44, 99, 151, 273, and 299. The elected officials of the cities and counties throughout this area have indicated support and a willingness to participate.

Facilities: A key consideration in keeping the project scope manageable and the grant within budget is the roads to be studied and included in the TIF. The study can focus on I-5 mainline improvements, or broadened to look at all interchanges, or further broadened to look at support local streets and roads. A broad scope will increase the study's complexity, schedule and cost. It would also result in a higher traffic impact fee that could be unacceptable to the community.

Executive Committee Question: To what extent should we limit the facilities studied in order to achieve our project goals?

Supporting Roads

Discussion: Parallel facilities like Airport Road, SR 273, SR 99W, and future general plan roads could be more cost-effective to widen than I-5. Some roads will be improved regardless of this effort, consistent with existing capital plans or general plans.

Recommendation: To the extent these roads are a substantial part of the solution to I-5 congestion, they should be factored into the traffic projections.

Interchanges

Discussion: Interchanges are also part the I-5 mainline problem and solution, mostly at the on- and off-ramp merge points with the mainline, not the ramp intersections with surface streets. Most interchanges have been studied at a conceptual level and some at a detailed engineering level. Including full interchange evaluations as part of this study would more than double the work effort. In addition, interchanges are less ripe for study since specific development proposals can significantly change long-range improvement plans making traffic conditions at interchanges more difficult to forecast.

Recommendation: Interchanges should only be studied to the extent that they impact mainline operations and/or opportunities to add additional lanes on I-5. Examples would be lengthening merge lanes, adding auxiliary lanes, ramp metering, and lengthening overcrossings for mainline widening. Key considerations for this recommendation include:

- o Level of grant funding available
- o Complexity of effort
- o Complexity of potential funding options
- o Likely level of benefit to I-5 mainline relative to cost
- o Existing TIF programs, and other programs, that already include interchange improvements

Executive Committee Question: Should the fees collected from the TIF be spent on supporting roads and interchanges?

Discussion: The follow-up question to, “what should be studied as part of this effort?” is “what should be funded as part of this effort?” The Fix 5 Partnership began because certain improvements “slipped through the cracks” of local funding. This has happened either because an improvement was on the state system and was thought to be a 100% state/federal responsibility; or, because an improvement straddles more than one jurisdiction and no one took responsibility.

Existing local TIFs, redevelopment plans, or mitigation requirements include local roads but not state highways. A few local TIFs include interchanges. Including local roads in the fee program would increase the total program cost and corresponding TIF fees. It would also crossover with projects and purposes of existing TIF programs. To the extent local agency TIFs reduce peak hour traffic on I-5 through improvement of their local roads, their fare-share responsibility for the I-5 TIF would be reduced in direct proportion. Finally, local TIF program fees vary by jurisdiction resulting in different degrees of congestion “deficits” in different jurisdictions.

Recommendation: The Fix 5 Partnership TIFs should predominantly be dedicated to I-5 mainline improvements with the following additions:

- Interchange improvements should only be funded where they relieving I-5 mainline congestion (i.e., merge lanes, auxiliary lanes, ramp metering, and lengthening overcrossings). Full interchange improvements may be considered when connecting two major state routes (i.e., Central Interchange or the SR 99 Interchange).
- In limited cases, as determined by the Partnership, funds may be used on other roadways where the road: (1) serves regional traffic; (2) will substantially alleviate I-5 traffic; and (3) would not typically be included in local funding programs (i.e., a bridge for a parallel collector road over Cottonwood Creek or improvements to SR 273 or 99W).

Congestion relief needs that are local in nature, including interchanges at local roads, should be addressed in local TIF programs. If the initial Fix 5 Partnership is successful, the study can be broadened in a subsequent phase to include other facilities.

Financing Options: As stated in the proposed Mission Statement, the goal of this study is to develop a funding strategy. By necessity, this strategy will be comprehensive, including both new and existing funding programs as well as all local, state and federal sources. Only a multi-faceted strategy will provide sufficient revenues to deliver needed improvements. Selected improvements will emphasize cost-effectiveness and the best “fit” of the improvement to the funding program.

State and federal fund sources, although limited, include:

- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (portions are controlled by RTPAs)
- State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)
- State Bond Measures
- Federal Demonstration Projects and Earmarks

As stated earlier, there are no existing local fund sources for I-5. Potential sources include:

- TIFs
- Developer Mitigation
- Redevelopment
- Assessments
- Local Sales Tax

In the short-term, a TIF is the most feasible option to begin generating local revenue. The TIF will not include maintenance needs. This is prohibited under the State Mitigation Fee Act. Other “self-help” revenue sources, such as a local transportation sales tax, will be explored as part of a future, long-term solution. The Partnership will gauge public support through extensive outreach efforts.

The first phase of improvements will likely feature the “easy” fixes. These would be lower-cost facilities that maximize existing I-5 capacity (i.e., ramp metering, collision reduction, and other interchange merge/diverge efficiencies). Many of these improvements may be SHOPP-eligible and will yield significant congestion relief benefits while other revenue sources to accumulate (i.e., TIF, STIP, etc.).

The Partnership TIF will not be in place for two to three years. In the interim, several “mega-projects” – unprecedented in size for this region – are proposed throughout the corridor (see Map 1). The five largest developments alone are along I-5 in Shasta and Tehama counties. They total 15,000 homes and 3.5 million square feet of commercial area. These and other projects, using vesting tentative maps, will likely avoid payment of the Fix Five Partnership TIF.

Executive Committee Question: Should an interim traffic impact fee program be developed?

Discussion: City and county elected bodies have expressed support for this effort. During discussion of this item, a few individual council and board members spoke in favor of a traffic impact fee program. For example, a \$1,000 EDU interim I-5 TIF could generate \$15 million in the 2 to 3 years it takes to develop full grant study. The \$15 million could, in turn leverage SHOPP or state bond projects totaling \$30 million or more (see Appendix 2).

Interim developments (whether small or “mega”) represent a missed opportunity to collect some minimum fair share contribution. Because the interim TIF is less detailed, it would be more conservative (a smaller fee) pending final study results. A simplified and expedited TIF program – based on existing traffic models and basic lane additions to I-5 – could be developed in the next six months to capture development projects now in the pipeline. If we are all in agreement that the study is moving in the direction of a Partnership TIF, would it be prudent – and equitable for future development – to adopt an interim fee?

An interim TIF may also assist sponsors of larger developments in addressing I-5 cumulative impact mitigation. Currently, this is a major sticking point (see Appendix 3).

Recommendation: The idea of an interim fee should be brought before each city council and board of supervisors; however, the question should not be dropped on them “cold.” A thorough staff analysis is needed. Support information would need to be coordinated by Shasta and Tehama RTPAs. The first question to the elected officials should be, “would you like to see the RTPAs present support information regarding an interim fee?” rather than asking outright “are you in favor of an interim fee?” In the spirit of this Partnership, there would need to be incentives for equal participation across all jurisdictions. Offering other matching funds such as STIP, SHOPP or the Governor's bond would be some examples.

7. PARTICIPATION STRUCTURE

This will be a two- to three-year process. To the extent possible, it is important to keep the same individuals involved throughout the process. We propose the following organizational structure (see Figure 6):

Shasta and Tehama County RTPAs: The governing boards will receive periodic updates and provide policy guidance every three months (approximately). The RTPAs will also approve the study and facilitate consensus among the member agencies.

City Councils and Board of Supervisors: Councils and Boards will receive updates as recommended by the RTPAs or Executive Committee. Cities are: Shasta Lake, Redding, Anderson, Red Bluff and Corning. Counties are Shasta and Tehama. Fostering consensus among all local agencies in the Partnership is vital since they ultimately approve the TIF program.

Executive Committee: This consists of the CAOs and City Managers, or their designees having authority to make determinations on their behalf. If elected officials are interested, we should also consider their participation. The Executive Committee will meet approximately every three months depending on project milestones. With respect to your time, our goal is to limit meetings to 1.5 hours each.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC): The Executive Committee would determine membership of the TAC. As the name implies, work will include review of technical data and recommendations to the Executive Committee. Meetings will be every one- to two-months lasting two to three hours. It is recommended that the TAC be open to all interested public and private stakeholders. Experience has shown that interest and participation wanes over time. Therefore, it is important not to limit participation, as all perspectives are important.

Core Staff: This group will consist primarily of Public Works and Planning Department staffs of the cities and counties, plus RTPA and Caltrans staffs. The Core Staff will work closely with the consultant team to organize and summarize data and recommendations for use by the TAC and Executive Committee. This group will also coordinate and conduct the public outreach campaigns, presenting results to the committees.

Public Meetings: This is the most important component of the study. Public meetings will be held in different forms and jurisdictions early and often. We will experiment with different meeting formats such as open houses, breakout groups with facilitators, and presentations with Q & A (also see Section 8 below).

Executive Committee Questions: Are the various individual, group, and agency stakeholders given ample opportunity to participate at appropriate levels?

Would one of your elected officials be interested in participating on the Executive Committee?

8. PUBLIC OUTREACH

A major effort in this project will be to engage local and regional decision-makers, community and trade organizations, and the general public in development and implementation of a comprehensive funding plan for I-5 within the study area. A number of outreach strategies will be used including:

advisory committees (i.e., TAC), public workshops, polling, surveys, mailings, newsletters, an Internet site, presentations to community organizations, and development of media information.

The goals of the outreach effort will be to:

- Identify existing awareness and opinion regarding traffic conditions and transportation funding constraints for I-5.
- Gauge support for various transportation funding mechanisms and the proposed funding strategy/programs.

There will also be coordination opportunities with parallel public involvement efforts tied to the Regional Blueprint Study, the Regional Transportation Plan, and other local plans.

Executive Committee Question: Are there any suggestions for improved public outreach? This has been a challenge in our region. We would appreciate all ideas.

9. STUDY SCHEDULE:

Full Study and TIF:

Period	Activities
Fall 2006	Release RFP, award contract, assess existing plans and studies, ID needs
Winter 06/07	Identify potential improvements, determine existing public opinion
Spring 2007	Prioritize improvement projects
Summer 2007	Develop cost estimates for improvements and “fair share” by agency
Fall 2007	Evaluate potential funding strategies/programs, determine public support
Winter 07/08	Develop preferred funding strategy/programs, determine public support
Spring 2008	Present funding strategy/programs to agencies for adoption
Winter 08/09	Jurisdictions adopt TIF and/or other “self-help” funding mechanisms

Basic Interim TIF (If Directed by Partnership):

Period	Activities
Summer 2006	Conservatively identify basic, known improvement needs (i.e., lane additions)
Fall 2006	Determine “fair share” responsibilities based on existing traffic model/studies
Winter 06/07	Present TIF ordinance to agencies for adoption
Spring 2007	Jurisdictions adopt TIF and/or other “self-help” funding mechanisms

10. NEXT STEPS

Between now and the next Executive Committee meeting in October, we will:

- Gather existing data and studies relevant to the effort
- Plan the first public meeting and TAC meeting
- Ongoing Core Group meetings
- Develop and circulate the RFP

At the next Executive Committee meeting, we will:

- Review public meeting and TAC participation plans
- Review summaries of new information gathered
- Approve detailed, proposed scope of work and schedule
- Recommend approval of a consultant agreement to the RTPA/LTC
- Approve any assumptions needed to proceed

11. OTHER COMMENTS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FEEDBACK

12. ADJOURN

**FIX 5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2006
2:00 P.M.
CITY OF REDDING COMMUNITY ROOM**

MEETING NOTES

The following Executive Committee members were present:

Scott Morgan	City of Anderson
Kurt Starman	City of Redding
John Blacklock	City of Red Bluff
Gary Antone (for Bill Goodwin)	Tehama County Public Works
Dan Kovacich (for Larry Lees)	Shasta County
Dennis Daily (for Carol Martin)	City of Shasta Lake Public Works
Steve Kimbrough	City of Corning

The following people were present:

Dan Little	Shasta County RTPA
Dan Wayne	Shasta County RTPA
Janie Coffman	Shasta County RTPA
Patrick Minturn	Shasta County Public Works
Glenn Hawes	Shasta County Board of Supervisors/RTPA Chair
John Mathena	Redding City Council
Barry Tippin	City of Redding
Brian Crane	Caltrans District 2
Tim Huckabay	Caltrans District 2
Scott White	Caltrans District 2
Kathy Grah	Caltrans District 2
Mark Barthel	City of Red Bluff
Robert Christianson	City of Tehama
John Brewer	City of Corning

The meeting was called to order at 2:07 p.m.

Introductions were made all around the room.

Dan Little explained the history of the Fix 5 Partnership. Meetings were held in Shasta County with the City Managers and CAO, and presentations were made to the City Councils and Board of Supervisors. Dan noted that the grant has been secured and that this was the first meeting moving forward.

Dan continued to explain that the agenda has background information reflecting earlier discussions that RTPA staff has had with Caltrans. It also has questions that this committee can help answer. Dan noted that the Executive Committee consists of the City Managers and CAOs within Shasta and Tehama Counties.

Dan explained there has been a climate change of conditions that has brought us to where we are with Interstate 5 (I-5). The congestion on I-5 is building and if you drive it you can start to see it – not only on I-5 but on local roads as well. Dan continued to note that there are major building projects that will be adding to the change and accelerating the congestion on I-5.

There are also California Environmental Quality Acts requirements for projects concerning I-5 and litigation is becoming more common when there is no real comprehensive program in place. In addition, there are funding issues to address. Dan continued that I-5 is important to the state and federal government as it is the backbone of California and goods movement.

Dan explained that Caltrans applied and secured a \$585,000 grant to be used over two years. There was a lot of competition for the grants; however, Caltrans was able to get the grant because of the partnership developed between agencies in Shasta and Tehama counties.

Brian Crane noted that I-5 is the backbone of interregional travel and goods movement on the west coast. State and federal interest is high. It has become a regional and local tool of mobility in this area. Congestion is being experienced in a number of different areas and it is going to get worse. Traffic volumes south of Red Bluff is somewhere in the neighborhood of 29,000 cars a day. North of Red Bluff it jumps to 38,000, Cottonwood is 45,000, Anderson is 50,000, Bonneyview is 59,000, Cypress jumps up to 70,000 cars a day then starts to drop down at Oasis with 50,000 and 24,000 north of Shasta Lake. Brian continued to note that interregional travel is a big part of what is happening on I-5. With development happening and on the horizon it is just going to get worse. As development progresses it is estimated that more than 100,000 cars a day will travel on I-5.

Brian continued to state that the level of service is being affected. Sometimes the speed limit drops to 10 miles below the speed limit largely because of congestion. More than that, if a truck pulls into the fast lane, it slows everyone down. There are level of service problems between Bonneyview and downtown Redding.

Brian explained level of service (LOS) A, B, C, D, E and F. Level A, people are driving at 70 mph with plenty of capacity. As there are more vehicles the speed starts to slow down. When capacity is reached it gets to service of level E. When the speed decreases, the capacity also decreases. Once a point is reached of stop and go traffic the whole system backs up as the speed and capacity drops to zero. LOS F will be experienced in Shasta and Tehama counties within the next 20 years.

Dan Little provided background information on funding and how things got to where they are today. He explained the flat gas tax, highway maintenance costs, escalated project costs, construction costs, lack of local dedicated revenue sources for I-5, local growth, and changes in commute patterns. All of this added together contributes to the present condition on I-5.

Dan explained the mission statement and asked the Executive Committee if it was the direction that the study should go.

Dan Kovacich asked about traffic impact fees (TIF) in the mission statement.

Dan Little explained that they are trying to develop a fee that everyone is on board with, to have full participation.

Steve Kimbrough noted that it would help if everyone would buy into the traffic impact fees.

Dan Little reviewed the goals: Level of service, economic opportunity, safety, engage the public, fair share funding, leverage of state and federal funds, framework for partnership, CEQA reviews, and data gathered from the study. Dan asked if there were any comments or anything needing to be added.

Kurt Starman inquired about the public sector being involved.

Dan Little answered that the public sector would be involved at several levels, such as the Technical Advisory Committee.

Dan Little explained the grant study scope and asked two questions – what to be studied and what to be funded. He noted that obviously the mainline of Interstate 5 needs to be studied. It was suggested to limit the scope, by not studying all the interchanges, just the areas that impact I-5 mainline traffic. Local roads also need to be looked at, such as Airport Road, Hwy. 273 and 299; these are part of the solution in reducing congestion on I-5.

Dan continued to state that in the recommendation for funding, it is recommended that interchange improvements that help the mainline be the only ones funded. If a financial plan were done including traffic impact fees and state and federal funding – it would focus on I-5 mainline improvements and interchange improvements to reduce mainline congestion.

Dan continued to state that another question is what to fund as far as local roads, such as Airport Road, Highway 99 West, and Highway 273. It is recommended to keep the scope of study manageable and keep any kind of traffic impact fee amount manageable. This program is meant to fund projects that slip through the cracks of local transportation impact fees. None of the local impact fees address I-5 mainline improvements - they address local roads. Dan suggested that local roads not typically covered by a local TIF could be included in the I-5 TIF. A test was suggested to determine if something should be funded with the I-5 TIF. It should be funded if 1) it substantially alleviates I-5 mainline congestion, 2) it serves regional traffic and is not strictly a local road and 3) the improvement would not typically be funded by local programs.

Steve Kimbrough stated that as they get closer to an understanding on what supporting roads would fit these criteria, it would be good to look at the same kind of share basis that we have with the state and feds and see what the local governments are doing to alleviate problems on that road.

Steve noted that he would not want to see local roads or collectors or arterials built in the county areas, like Tehama County, where right now they have no fees at all. Steve stated that in Corning their economy is dependent on I-5. I-5 is the key economic feature for the local government in Corning. It gives them the highest per capita sales tax in the north state.

John Mathena noted that he found it hard to charge an impact fee to a new house that may not impact I-5.

Dan Little noted that there will be zones of benefit that will rely on the traffic model. Some areas would have lower fees and other areas would have no fee.

Discussion was held concerning traffic impact fees.

Steve Kimbrough noted that an advantage is each of the agencies has a set development fee that helps cover the cost of the impact of development. The nice thing about this process is that they are not expecting to foot the full bill for I-5 improvements. They have the ability of using this money to leverage state and federal funding.

Patrick Minturn noted that he envisioned each jurisdiction collecting the fees that would be

dedicated for use on the I-5 corridor. They could only be used for that purpose, otherwise it would not be lawful to collect the fee. Once the fee is collected, it stays in the pocket of that agency, so there would have to be some negotiation beyond that. Patrick continued to note that this is only a way to collect these fees initially. Maybe there would be negotiated agreements whereby the Bonnyview interchange would be proposed as a project and perhaps the City of Redding would step up and say we have two million dollars in our traffic impact fee for I-5. We are willing to put in a million dollars of our local traffic impact fee, and we think the county may have some benefit out of this and perhaps even the City of Anderson. Patrick noted that he does not see this going into a single pot and does not see the local agencies giving up all control. Local agencies would just be saying in effect that they acknowledge there is this need. It is a way the local agencies can resolve the issue in their environmental documents for each project to say the money is being set aside. But the actual nuts and bolts of exactly what will get built is deferred to another day and would still be under the control of each elected body.

Dan Kovacich asked what the current view is on the statewide perspective on funding interchange improvements.

Brian Crane answered that has to do with interregional STIP dollars. A small amount of money is for congestion improvements – 25% of it is for Caltrans. There are so many needs statewide. Using that money to solve mainline congestion problems when the interchange is more for access to our local facilities becomes a local problem not a statewide interregional problem. The state is in a position where it is not using that 25% to do interchange improvements unless it can be shown to benefit some interregional needs.

Dan Little noted that there are jurisdictions now that have programs for interchanges or are developing programs for interchanges.

Barry Tippin discussed smoothing the CEQA review process. He noted that anytime you have a development that may trip the threshold on a ramp or impacts, not because they added substantial volume, but because they took a threshold by litigation perspective, they would have to do fairly substantial improvements to an interchange. There is no mechanism for reimbursement without a fund source. Otherwise, it would fall through the cracks because there is a huge infrastructure cost and most development won't be able to swallow that.

Dan Little stated that given limited funding from the grant, staying within the budget is one of the big considerations.

Barry Tippin asked if there could be a mechanism by which they could attach the general fee to interchange usage within a jurisdiction. A specific interchange would have to be used throughout that jurisdiction for uses to improve the interchange. Barry noted that the I-5 corridor does not matter if they cannot improve the interchanges so that when a project gets approved they can get the traffic on I-5.

Tim Huckabay noted that one of the things that is needed in the nexus study is to define what the improvement is and how much the improvement would cost. To do that for all the interchanges is very heavily tied to what kind of development and how intense development is going to be to trigger the need. He noted that if you go into a very detailed study on the interchanges; that could take up most of the grant resources available.

Barry Tippin noted that the fee does not necessarily have to cover the entire cost of the improvement. It could be established as a match or a portion of an improvement, providing other sources come forward - such as other development monies.

Steve Kimbrough noted that other counties have been successful in addressing the issue of the freeways and the interchanges. They used consultants and did a lot of work in-house. Steve continued to note that the interchanges need to be included in the study. Whether or not to be able to afford to fund them is another issue that will be for the part of the study that includes the financial experts.

Dan Little noted that there is no harm in including the studying of the whole interchange if it can fit in under the price tag of the grant.

Steve Kimbrough noted that at least it would be known that if there is no longer going to be STIP funding, what could be done about it? Can it be addressed by other means? Can enough money be collected to at least be able to attract and leverage state and federal money? A little bit of money might go a long way.

Patrick Minturn noted that on the Cottonwood study Gas Point, Main Street and Deschutes interchanges were done. Between the three, \$50,000 or more was spent on each one to study. Patrick stated that there was some question in his mind if the study can broaden out to encompass more than one or two specific, strategic interchanges.

Tim Huckabay stated that he thought it was not to necessarily include the interchanges in the study or do the detail work, but get the consultant on board and ask how to include the interchanges - not necessarily to do the studies, because all the interchanges cannot be studied.

Dan Little noted that the study will try to do as much as possible given the grant money that they have.

Tim Huckabay noted that staff would do the technical studies, like traffic volumes. The consultant would be doing public awareness, polling and helping to put together the funding side of the packet. Traffic projections and similar things would be done in-house including the engineering work required to come up with some reasonable estimates.

Dan Little discussed the financing plan, a quick overview of the state and federal funding sources – STIP, SHOPP, state bonds and federal earmarks.

John Mathena asked about lobbying the federal government. He noted there is a lot of money to be had that is being missed out on.

Dan Little discussed needing local sources for leveraging. The local options for funding are TIF's and sales tax.

Dan Kovacich stated that he raised the possibility of a sales tax measure at an RTPA meeting a few years ago and it got thrown out for a lack of a motion.

Dan Little noted that TIF's cannot be used for maintenance, etc, however, sales tax could be. However the reality is a sales tax won't pass until congestion gets bad enough.

Dan Little stated that a traffic impact fee program is the best immediate solution. Traffic impact fee fair shares will vary by jurisdiction. TIF is only one part of the whole funding strategy; it is not the end all. The TIF shows a partnership, a commitment to participate in Interstate 5. Dan continued to note that the timing is good for a TIF – congestion is high, the economy is turning around creating funding opportunities and large projects are being proposed. The Governor's bond has money for a Corridor Mobility Improvement Program. Shasta and Tehama County have a good chance to compete for that money. Dan continued to note that there is talk about not funding the environmental component. The TIF would be needed to help fund environmental work.

Dan Little discussed an interim fee. He noted that one issue that he has run into when developing local traffic impact fee programs is interim development happening in the meantime. The developers themselves are struggling with how to pay for their fair share. A simple traffic impact fee program could be adopted in nine months based on the traffic model. Dan continued to state that the interim fees could help with leveraging right away. If we waited three years, the economic pendulum could shift and the leveraging opportunity would be missed.

Dan Kovacich asked if the interim fee would just apply to the mega projects or to an individual house being built as well.

Dan Little answered that it would be for all in order to be fair and equitable.

Steve Kimbrough noted that it's unfair to the larger developers if you don't apply to all.

Discussion was held concerning vesting maps.

Discussion continued concerning an interim fee.

Dan Little noted that if interim fees are to be pursued, it cannot just be thrown on the elected officials laps cold turkey. More information would need to be provided. Dan suggested that it be presented to the RTPA to see if they are interested in pursuing it.

John Mathena stated that the developers are going to look at it as just another fee and balk at it.

Scott Morgan noted that there has to be something in it for the developers.

Steve Kimbrough asked at what point does the development industry come into the process so the building industry is included. If elected officials balk at it right now, saying they're not ready for it, the answer for staff members would be that they don't have all the answers yet. If they had the answers, they would be able to sell it.

Dan Little noted that it is a gradual process and it's possible to back out of an interim fee if it's not working and pursue the long-term fee.

Steve Kimbrough asked if instead of wanting it in place by 2007, set a date when they want to reach an objective, when there is enough information for the executive committee to consider an interim fee and at that point to take the show on the road and see if it can sell.

Patrick Minturn stated that even if the interim fee was implemented, it does not raise an instant \$10

million dollars.

Discussion continued concerning an interim fee.

Steve Kimbrough stated that the interim fee would at least be a start.

Scott Morgan noted that if the Governor's bond does pass, the interim fee would enable us to compete for funding. He noted that it is worth putting in the RFP.

Dan Little concluded that they would take it a step at a time and there would be more information at the next executive committee meeting.

Dan Little discussed the organizational chart showing the roles of the city councils, Board of Supervisors, RTPAs, executive committee, TAC and core staff. Dan asked if this was giving stakeholders enough opportunity to participate, if elected officials should be on the executive committee, and if the private sector should be on the executive committee or at the TAC level.

Steve Kimbrough stated that the private sector should be at the TAC level.

Dan Little discussed public outreach, noting that a little bit of everything would be tried, including some polling efforts. There are some parallel efforts like the blueprint grant coming up in both Tehama and Shasta Counties; there are some coordination opportunities there.

Steve Kimbrough asked what the purpose of polling was if there is not going to be a public vote.

Tim Huckabay answered that it targets some of the public awareness that needs to be done. When it goes to the elected bodies to vote on a TIF then they need to know that.

Dan Little noted that we won't walk away from the sales tax completely. We are always going to try to keep it in the public eye, so they are aware of it. The polling is to see how the public feels about the TIF and the sale tax measure.

Dan Little reviewed the study schedule, noting it will be a 2 ½ to 3 year study.

Dan Little noted there would be an assembly of this core group of public works and planning staff to plan future meetings and develop and circulate the RFP based on the input given here. Dan continued to note that at the next executive committee meeting there will be a review of the participation plans, TAC, public meetings, a more detailed scope of work to show and, hopefully, a consultant on board.

Steve Kimbrough asked if the RFP was going to have both a transportation planning engineering element and a finance plan element.

Tim Huckabay answered that staff would do the planning engineering side. The financial side and public involvement would be done by contract.

There being no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Fix 5 Executive Committee Meeting
August 2, 2006
Page 8

Janie Coffman, Recording Secretary