

REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SUBJECT	MEETING DATE	ITEM NUMBER
Minutes of the July 27, 2010, RTPA Meeting	10/26/10	4-1

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board approve the minutes of the July 27, 2010, RTPA meeting.



Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

DSL/jac

Attachment: Minutes of the July 27, 2010, RTPA Meeting

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)

Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 4:00 p.m.

Shasta County Board of Supervisors Chambers,
1450 Court Street, Suite 263, Redding, California.

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

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

1. Call to Order

Chair Dickerson called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

2. Staff Introductions

3. Public Comment Period

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

Consent Calendar

4-1 Minutes of April 27, 2010, RTPA Meeting

4-2 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through July 2011 - Information Only

4-3 Accept Triennial Performance Audits

4-4 Rural Statewide Google Transit Implementation Project Personal Services Agreement

4-5 Accept the Shasta County 2010 Bicycle Transportation Plan and the City of Redding Bikeway Action Plan 2010-2015

4-6 Third Amendment to Personal Services Agreement (PSA) with Dowling Associates, Inc. for Travel Demand Model Support

4-7 Correspondence

By motion made, seconded, and unanimously carried (Moty/Hawes), the Consent Calendar was approved.

Regular Calendar

5. Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Dan Little noted that there are many grant opportunities for cities and counties for planning efforts. The biggest are state grants through Proposition 84, with \$60 million available in the current cycle with two more cycles to come. The RTPA will submit an application for the first cycle.

There is a new Caltrans Director – Cindy McKim. She will be the director for the duration of the current administration.

The Dana to Downtown Project is almost complete. It is anticipated there will be one more RTPA Board tour of the project in September.

6. Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the 2010 Shasta County Regional Transportation Plan

Executive Director Dan Little explained that after more than a year of work, the draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is complete. Agency projects must be in the RTP project listings to qualify for programming and receive funding. RTPA staff worked closely with the local agencies to make sure all projects were listed.

Staff member John Strahan explained that the RTP is a long-range planning document addressing transportation issues, needs, and funding levels. It must be updated every five years. Whereas \$1.3 billion in capacity-increasing project needs have been identified through 2030, only \$340 million in funding is anticipated.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared to address potential environmental effects of projects in the RTP. Several potentially significant environmental effects were identified, with accompanying mitigation measures, to avoid or reduce these impacts. Impacts determined to be significant and unavoidable included induced growth, construction noise, and cumulative impacts to visual character, agricultural lands, biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hazardous materials, and noise exposure.

For certain analysis, local agencies have the option of tiering from the EIR or doing their own studies. The RTP EIR is a Master EIR which can streamline environmental review for projects listed in the RTP. It is particularly useful in dealing with cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects.

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

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

7. Adopt Shasta County 2010 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) (Public Hearing)

Executive Director Dan Little explained that the FTIP is a four-year capital improvement program and is updated every two years.

Staff member Thomas Hays explained that the FTIP is a living document; the 2008 FTIP was amended 22 times over the last two years. The public participation process was followed with a 30 day comment period. Comments were received from Caltrans and local jurisdictions.

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

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

8. Memorandum of Agreement for the North State Super Region Collaboration

Executive Director Dan Little explained that the RTPA directors within the Caltrans District 2 Region have been meeting for years to discuss common issues and exchange information. During Proposition 1B and the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) process, a twelve-county North State "Super Region" was organized for the purpose of dividing state funding. The North State Super Region prioritized a list of recommended projects for funding. The Cottonwood Hills Truck Climbing Lanes is one of the results of that process.

The North State Super Region again nominated a joint list of projects under the federal TIGER program, but no counties in the north state received a TIGER grant.

Discussions have been held concerning a more permanent coalition. This is done in other areas of the state among transportation agencies, water agencies, and other groups. A white paper was created to explain the potential benefits of an ongoing North State Super Region, such as rallying around common issues, shaping legislation and policies, better competing for grants, and exchanging information. There are now 16 counties involved – this includes all counties north of the Sacramento and Bay area regions. The North State Super Region coalition is not big in terms of population, money, or political influence; however, it has geographic bulk in that it is 26 percent of the state land area and has 37 percent of all state and federal roads. It is envisioned that the group would meet twice a year and further develop the concept.

Currently four RTPA boards have approved the coalition; Shasta County would be the fifth. It is expected that all the approvals will happen over the summer.

Board member Watkins inquired if the group had met already.

Mr. Little answered that the group met once, mostly by telephone conference, to develop the white paper and circulate it to the group.

Board member Jones asked what the Super Region would accomplish that CALCOG could not and if there would be some duplication of CALCOG or the Rural Counties Task Force.

Mr. Little answered that there are some issues that CALCOG or the Rural Counties Task Force (RCTF) can't speak for. CALCOG is more influenced by the big four metropolitan planning agencies in the state. The RCTF could not, for example, get behind a shared distribution of Stimulus funding (ARRA). The geography of the north state also makes it

unique on certain issues. It is a goal not to duplicate the efforts of other groups but to coordinate with them.

Board member Jones asked about having more local control as opposed to the super region, and if some local control might be lost on funding issues.

Mr. Little answered that no power is given to the super region. No decisions will be made that wouldn't otherwise require approval from the individual RTPA boards. It doesn't delegate any decision-making authority.

Board member Jones asked if the super region coalition would make recommendations to the RTPAs.

Mr. Little answered yes.

Board member Moty thought it would be a great collaboration, and that it's a positive thing anytime a large group can come together, particularly in the north state, to demonstrate regional collaboration to state and federal levels. The super region gives the north state a stronger voice and the possibility of pulling in more funds.

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

9. **Senate Bill 375 (SB 375): Draft Targets for Regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Executive Director Dan Little reminded the Board of the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) bottom-up approach to setting regional greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) targets. Based on current trends and RTP assumptions, Shasta County is projected to increase per capita GHG emissions by 8 percent over the 2005 base year. Staff is recommending to the CARB a range of 0 to +8 percent as an interim target that will be updated in four years. It is anticipated that CARB will not accept a positive number. The RTPA board could go with a fixed number, which Mr. Little recommends be 0 or -1 percent. The interim target is important for CEQA purposes on project reviews.

Board member Dickerson asked what the process is going forward.

Mr. Little answered that a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) element must be developed and incorporated into the 2015 RTP update. The SCS will outline how the region intends to meet the regional target. Realistic options for achieving this target will focus primarily on more transportation-efficient land use patterns and characteristics.

Board member Dickerson asked how the SCS direction will be developed.

Mr. Little answered that modeling and GIS capabilities will be bolstered to help develop the SCS. A beta version of the SCS is proposed for testing by local agencies.

Board member Watkins asked if there was an advantage to going with a fixed number, such as +4 percent, or if there would be a ramification and a loss of grant funding in the future to do so.

Mr. Little answered that there would not be any advantage, and odds are that CARB will come back and want the target to be at 0 or -1 percent. There are, however, negative consequences to having a plus target under CEQA.

Mr. Little answered that CARB will take the recommendation and then make a decision, which will probably be a zero or negative number.

Board member Watkins noted that it would seem good for the RTPA to push the limit and let CARB come back and say it won't be accepted.

Board member Watkins also noted that there is a voter initiative on the ballot for November which negates AB 32 and its derivative SB 375. Mr. Watkins wonders if the initiative passes in November how it would affect implementation here.

Mr. Little stated that AB 32 does not repeal SB 375 and does not repeal CEQA, so it remains to be seen how AB 32 would indirectly affect SB 375.

Board member Dickerson noted that the ballot initiative only delays the implementation of AB 32 until unemployment drops to 5 percent. It doesn't directly address SB 375.

Board member Jones asked what the problem would be with just asking for a zero target.

Mr. Little answered this would not be a problem and that zero is an option available to the Board.

By motion made and seconded (Hawes/Moty), the staff recommendation passed unanimously that a target range of 0 to +8 percent be recommended to CARB.

10. Develop Public Workshop on Regional Agencies

Executive Director Dan Little explained that at the last CALCOG meeting, the director of CALCOG, Rusty Selix, offered to meet with every RTPA board. In talking to Chair Dickerson, Mr. Little thinks this is a good opportunity to have a workshop. Mr. Little noted that there is uncertainty among the average citizen about who the RTPA is and what the RTPA does. Even among local elected officials who are not on the RTPA board there is limited understanding. The concept of a workshop has been discussed with the County Administrative Officer and the city managers. Mr. Little noted that he would like a committee to be established that would meet once or twice. This committee would be comprised of at least two RTPA board members, and could include people from outside the RTPA to work out the agenda and workshop details. The workshop would be in the fall. Other speakers could be at the workshop too, such as a League of Cities representative, California State Association of Counties (CSAC) representative, or Director Heather Fargo from the Strategic Growth Council.

Chair Dickerson noted that he had discussed a workshop with Redding's City Manager, Kurt Starman – who spoke with the other city managers – it was decided that as far as being in compliance with the Brown Act, the workshop would have to be a joint meeting of all the agencies.

Board member Cornick stated that she thinks workshops are always informative and this is a great idea.

Board member Watson noted that he trusts Mr. Little to put the workshop together without a committee.

Board member Hartman stated that a workshop would be a good idea.

Board member Moty noted that he is in favor of a workshop.

Board member Jones stated that he is not 100 percent sold on the idea of a workshop. A RTPA meeting is a public meeting and what better place to discuss the RTPA other than a RTPA meeting itself.

Chair Dickerson noted that the goal is to get as many elected officials from all agencies together for a workshop. When you get more than two elected officials from the same agency together discussing things, the Brown Act must be complied with. If a workshop is scheduled as a meeting of that agency in combination with other agencies, then Brown Act issues can be avoided.

Board member Hawes supported the idea of a combined meeting.

Citizen Gary Cadd discussed some of the problems that are going on with governance and some agencies within the state. Mr. Cadd stated that he wanted to make sure there was not an expansion in what the RTPA is getting into as far as total governance in the state, and the workshop will cover nothing but RTPA and RTPA-related issues.

Chair Dickerson stated that it is not the intent of the RTPA to expand to the entire state of California. The workshop is intended to inform the elected officials of the role and the history of RTPAs, MPOs, and CALCOG.

Chair Dickerson asked for input from the Board and if a couple board members would be able to work on the design of the workshop – e.g. where, when, what speakers, and what topics.

Board member Hawes noted that staff is capable and whether the Board has input or not doesn't matter to him.

Board member Jones also stated that staff is capable.

Board member Moty noted that he wouldn't mind having input, but he wondered what staff would like.

Executive Director Dan Little stated that at a minimum staff intends to work with the chair and vice chair, since that is their role, regardless of whether there is a committee or not.

Board member Cornick noted that she serves on the League of California Cities Transportation Committee who has some good speakers.

Board member Watkins stated that he thinks Mr. Little should work with just the chair and vice chair, additional people are not needed.

Mary Machado of Shasta Voices stated that she thinks it's a good idea. She would like to see something that is not so complex that only elected officials can understand it. If you want the public to come, it needs to be made easier for them to understand. Mrs. Machado thinks the public would come and participate if the public understood better what was going on.

Chair Dickerson noted that it is the general consensus that the workshop will be organized by staff with input from the chair and vice chair.

By motion made and seconded (Moty/Hawes), it was unanimously voted to have a public workshop with input from the chair and vice chair in forming the workshop.

11. Interstate 5 South Redding Six Lane Project Update

Executive Director Dan Little reported that there is now full funding for construction of the South Redding Six Lane Project. Normally funding would have come out of STIP shares through state formulas, which would have taken 10 or 15 years worth of funding that can now be committed elsewhere. This is a credit to people like Phil Baker of Caltrans District 2, his staff, and the RTPA board.

Phil Baker from Caltrans District 2 explained that the project will add a third lane in the northbound direction on I-5 from just south of Bonnyview to just north of the central Redding interchange (I-5/44). It will also add a third lane in the southbound direction of I-5 from just south of Bonnyview to just south of the central Redding interchange. The widening will occur to the median in order to minimize cost. The project is now fully funded through construction. Most of the funding came through the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA). This is part of a bigger concept which is to eventually widen I-5 to three lanes in each direction in a much bigger area than just the South Redding Six Lane Project.

Mr. Baker noted that environmental work is completed and design work is under way. There are a lot of people working on the project to get it done in a specific time frame. Projects of this type normally take from 1 to 1½ years; however, the design work for this project is being done in about six months. The project is expected to be advertised in December of this year and construction underway in the spring of 2011. Scheduled completion is in the fall of 2012.

Board member Jones asked what the reason was for moving so fast on this project.

Mr. Baker answered that the CMIA money acquired came with the expectation that the job proceed quickly to stimulate the economy. A selling point of this project was that Caltrans would move fast and get the project out to construction in a short time frame.

Board member Jones asked if this was because the environmental work was already underway and progressing.

Mr. Baker answered that there was some forethought to jump start the environmental work prior to even knowing there were leftover funds as a result of savings on earlier CMIA projects.

12. City of Redding Transportation Projects

Brian Crane, City of Redding Public Works Director, noted that any project in the City of Redding has a benefit to the region.

Mr. Crane explained various City of Redding Projects, including the Bonnyview Widening Project, which won the American Public Works Association transportation project of the year for the Sacramento chapter. Mr. Crane also reported on the Cypress Bridge Replacement Project; Oasis Road Interchange; Buenaventura Turn Lanes; Placer Widening; and Shasta View Roundabout.

Mr. Crane briefly reviewed various projects that will be starting construction soon, including the Benton Safety Runway Extension; Quartz Hill Road Realignment; Twin View Bridge Replacement, Oasis/Akrich Intersection; Dieselhorst Pedestrian Bridge; Mistletoe Pedestrian Improvement; and Hilltop Overcrossing over I-5 Safety Rail.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Dickerson adjourned the meeting at 5:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

/jac