REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SUBJECT		MEETING DATE	ITEM NUMBER
Minutes of the June 24, 2008, RTPA Meeting		10/28/08	4-1

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Board approve the minutes of the June 24, 2008, RTPA meeting.

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

/jac

Attachment: Minutes of June 24, 2008, RTPA Meeting

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)
Tuesday, June 24, 2008, 4:00 p.m.
City of Redding Council Chambers,
777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, California.

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

Board Members Comnick, Hawes, Dickerson, Palmer, Baugh, and Stegall were present. Board member Hartman was absent.

1. Call to Order

Chair Comnick called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

2. Staff Introductions

3. Public Comment Period

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

Consent Calendar

4-1 Minutes of April 22, 2008, RTPA Meeting

4-2 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through June 2009 - Information Only

4-3 Approve 2006/07 Transportation Development Act (TDA) True-Up Instructions and Amended Claims

4-4 California Consensus on Federal Transportation Authorization 2008

4-5 Request for Proposal to Prepare an Environmental Impact Report for the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan Update

4-6 Correspondence

By motion made, seconded and unanimously carried (Hawes/Baugh), the items on the Consent Calendar were approved with Board member Stegall abstaining from item 4-1, and a correction made to Board member Palmer's name on item 4-1.

Regular Calendar

5. Consider Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) Request for Temporary Farebox Ratio Reduction

Executive Director Dan Little explained that the RABA Board has requested a temporary farebox reduction. This would be in keeping with the RABA Short Range Transit Plan and their seven year financial program which would bring the farebox ratio back to 19% over a seven year period.

Discussion was held concerning the farebox reduction and its impact on the other jurisdictions, and streets and roads funding.

Executive Officer of the Redding Area Bus Authority, Barry Tippin, spoke on gas prices, fuel costs, and ridership increases.

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

6. Adopt Unmet Transit Needs Findings and Approve Claims for the 2008/2009 Fiscal Year

Executive Director Dan Little explained that this is the final culmination of the Unmet Needs process and sets the budget for next year.

Staff member Sue Crowe noted that this allows the RTPA to complete the 08/09 TDA claims process. Ms. Crowe outlined the SSTAC recommendation which noted that there are recognized unmet needs, but at this time it would not be feasible to meet them. They are hoping to look at those again in the future when the farebox can sustain itself.

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

7. Adopt 2008 Shasta County Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) (Public Hearing)

Executive Director Dan Little explained that this was a program that is prepared every two years and involves all projects with federal funding.

Staff member Thomas Hays noted that the FTIP is a four year program. The purpose is to identify all transportation related projects that require federal funding and approval from the FHWA and the FTA. This is a $456 million budget.

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

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

8. Shasta*FORWARD>>* Regional Blueprint: Project Update

Executive Director Dan Little explained that this is an update on Shasta*FORWARD>>* and also an explanation in more detail about proposed Senate Bill 375. Mr. Little informed the Board concerning focus group meetings and surveys. He noted that they are completing the initial round of gathering and synthesizing community values. The next step will be to get together with planning directors, planning staff, and planning commissioners to come up with growth scenarios.

Mr. Little explained SB 375 and how it relates to Shasta*FORWARD>>*. He noted that SB 375 is in response to AB 32, which has already passed, that requires greenhouse gas reductions to 1990 levels. That's about a 25% reduction from the carbon emissions that we have now. The Air Resources Board is looking at various ways to implement this bill and SB 375 is one way to tackle that issue. SB 375 is supposed to establish regional projects within each metropolitan area and each air quality non-attainment area that is not metropolitan. Central to SB 375 is what's called the Sustainable Community Plan. The Sustainable Community Plan is not a Blueprint Plan, although a Blueprint Plan can be a foundation for it. Mr. Little continued to explain that the RTPA would have to do a Sustainable Community Plan if it becomes law in order to get transportation funding. The jurisdictions may want to incorporate a Sustainable Community Plan into their General Plan because of the state and federal money that would come in and CEQA incentives. Regional agencies are supporting an amendment to SB 375 which would provide that if a local land use authority, such as the county, does not want land use changed as may be described in the Sustainable Community Plan; that by definition makes it unfeasible. The city or county cannot be forced to make land use changes.

Russ Mull, Director of Shasta County Resource Management noted that he has been commenting on the Blueprint process for some time. Having been around for a bit of time and around land use in California, he's a veteran of the Willy Brown years and the regional land use planning attempts by Willy Brown. He can tell the Board a number of things and they may disagree with some of them. He works with the Board of Supervisors on land use, and these are things he will be telling the Board of Supervisors regarding the Blueprint and his involvement in it. Mr. Mull continued to state that the Blueprint process is state sponsored land use control. It is being presented in a fashion that he thinks is quite clever. It is not a law and it is totally voluntarily - at least until it is adopted. You have now the Senate majority leader who is pushing legislation that will make this process mandatory. Some of the wording is changed, from Blueprint to Sustainable Communities, and there are a lot of reasons for that. But the reality is - this is state sponsored land use control. There are two issues he thinks this body needs to take a look at: (1) Do you want to lose your land use authority, or at least a portion of your land use authority, to the State of California or the legislature? (2) The Board of Supervisors, that Mr. Mull deals with, will have to make a decision whether there are impacts on land use and other impacts that might come along. Mr. Mull continued to say that as the Board knows, the regional Blueprint process is a process that has been going on for about a year or so now. Shasta County has not participated in it, and he wants to make it very clear, that unless directed to by the Board of Supervisors, they will not be participating in it. They think that the agencies that participate in it are automatically considered collaborators in the process. Mr. Mull stated that he wants to make it very clear that he believes that California has very specific land use laws, CEQA, and the Subdivision Map Act, that they've been following for approximately 30 years. Those processes are the foundation of land use approval in the State of California. AB 32, the greenhouse gas legislation, which he thinks will essentially obliterate the Blueprint process, is a law. That's the difference between local greenhouse gas legislation and the Blueprint process – it's a law. We're obligated to follow that, and that's what they will do. They will follow the law as it relates to land use regulation in

Shasta County. As the Air Pollution Control Officer for Shasta County, they have a lot of responsibility and the implementation of the greenhouse gas laws - they will live up to those. They are working right now on provisions that can be included in the general plans that will assist local jurisdictions in complying with those laws. The thing that you have to realize is that they have set over time; they have set California up to be a very specific process for community involvement, business involvement, and government involvement in making land use decisions. None of that exists in this Blueprint process. Mr. Mull noted that frankly, 250 people that participated in the Blueprint process – if he said they were going to amend the General Plan they would get 250 people in one meeting – that's the difference. They have huge constituencies in the agriculture, mining, and timber industries. None of which, in his opinion, have participated in any meaningful fashion in this process. And so, you've got a system that, in a lot of respects, is an agency-driven land use process that could very well circumvent the CEQA process. At best it will be a parallel process hanging out there. Let's say that the RTPA adopts this Blueprint process, Sustainable Communities process, then, if a city or a county does not adopt that, then you've got two land use processes in your community. And if you want to talk about making litigation complex, it's going to be very complex. It's very difficult now to get through a land use process because we've litigated virtually every one. This will make it doubly complex if we have two separate land use processes running around out there. Another significant component he thinks is the impacts on Shasta County. They know that, and he knows better than anyone, that they are not going to have, in the foreseeable future, a tax exchange agreement with the cities, and probably not have an impact fee agreement with the cities either. If you develop a land use plan, and certainly the Blueprint process is a very clearly defined process, as much as you might think you have control over it, you don't. The California Planning Association has made 375 their number one priority for legislative approval. The reason they have is because it has a very specific land use agenda, and has compact urban form and smart growth. That's the agenda here, and that's okay, he's not telling you that's wrong. But if the county buys that program today, the tax revenue from sales tax and from property tax will significantly diminish and it will make the ability to provide services to city residents as well as county residents impossible to do. So, by following the Blueprint process, the county is essentially cutting its own throat. And so regardless of whether you think smart growth is the greatest thing in the world or compact urban form is the greatest thing, there are financial problems with this process that make it frankly impossible, he thinks, for the county to support. He thinks you have what he would consider the tar baby of land use – once you touch this, it isn't going away. He can't honestly tell you what he would do if he was on the RTPA right at this point. He knows what he is going to tell the Board of Supervisors, and what he's going to recommend that the Board do. They are going to start next year, right after the first of the year, to do a major revision on their General Plan for Shasta County. They are going to be incorporating significant components of greenhouse gas laws and they think that will address roads in the unincorporated area for the next 20 years, or guide it in the next 20 years. Mr. Mull noted that he has about ten other smaller issues with it, in terms of how it's fashioned and how it works. But he thinks those are kind of the overview issues – it's a financial issue and a land use control issue. Mr. Mull ended by saying that he's not trying to tell this Board what they ought to do, this is a regional board and they have different responsibilities than he does in that regard.

Mr. Mull responded to Mr. Hawes statement, saying that the government's intervention in land use is greatly overrated. He thinks that despite all their great attempts at telling people what they ought to do, market forces typically are the ones that actually do that. He thinks the price of fuel has reached that price point where land use is going to be dramatically impacted by the cost of fuel and local greenhouse gasses are going to dramatically impact where people live and how they live. He thinks this sort of side process that's been created by the state is actually a detriment to accomplishing an orderly road into the future.

9. Concur with Caltrans District 2 Intelligent Transportation System Architecture and Strategic Plan

Executive Director Dan Little explained this is similar to the Interstate 5 Transportation Concept Report, in that Caltrans is looking for Agency concurrence with the Plan so they can qualify for funding.

Michelle Millette, from Caltrans District 2, explained that this is the Caltrans District 2 Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Architecture; it is very similar and compliments the one that was done for Shasta County that the Agency has already approved. Ms. Millette gave the definition of ITS and explained that federal regulation requires that the state and MPOs have an ITS Architecture in place.

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

10. Presentation of 2008 Caltrans Construction Projects

Phil Baker and Chris Harvey from Caltrans District 2 reviewed Caltrans projects including the five most prominent projects:

1. Dana to Downtown
2. Pit River Bridge
3. Cottonwood Hills Truck Climbing Lanes
4. Antlers Bridge Replacement
5. South Redding Six Lane

11. Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Dan Little noted that it's time to start thinking about requests for earmarks. A letter will be sent to our congressional representatives to start this process.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Comnick adjourned the meeting at 5:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

____

Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

/jac