

APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)

Tuesday, February 24, 2004, 4:00 p.m.
Redding Civic Center, City 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 meeting time, place and attendance; the order and general nature of discussion; Agency deliberations; and action taken, if any.)

Agency Members Connick, Clarke, Hawes, Goekler, Mathena, and Kight were present. Agency Member Wilson was absent.

1. Call to Order:

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

2. Public Comment Period:

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

Consent Calendar

3-1 Minutes of December 9, 2003, RTPA Meeting

3-2 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through February 2005 - Information Only

3-3 Report of Activities of California Council of Governments (CALCOG) - Information Only

3-4 Accept TDA Fiscal and Compliance Audits for Year Ended June 30, 2003

By motion made, seconded and carried, the items on the Consent Calendar were approved with the correction in the minutes showing Mr. Hawes as making a remark, not Mr. Kight who was not present at the December 9, 2003 meeting. Board Member Goekler abstained, as he was not seated at the December 9, 2003 meeting.

Regular Calendar

4. Conduct Public Hearing and Adopt 2004 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

Staff member Dan Little explained the RTIP and brought the Board up to date. He stated that the RTIP is the five-year budget of projects that are funded through the State Transportation Improvement Program. The RTIP is adopted

every two years. Because of the budget situation, no new money is in this program and the adoption this year is actually an exercise to delay projects. There are three projects that will be more significantly affected by these delays. The two downtown Redding projects are the Redding mall and downtown grade separation. The third project is the Dana to Downtown project. It is hoped that this project will get approval in fiscal year 2006/07 or 2007/08.

Staff member Dan Little explained the Transportation Enhancement Program (TE). This program is Federalized money for non-motorized projects. The Agency previously gave staff the direction to spend the money as soon as possible before it is gone. There are three scenarios on how to spend these funds.

- ☐ The first priority is the Dana to Downtown project parts that are not motorized, such as walkways or bikeways over the bridge.
- ☐ The second priority is Class II bike lanes with four-foot shoulders on Old Oregon Trail, from State Route 44 to Shasta College. It has the benefit of being a safety project as well as non-motorized.
- ☐ The third project is Class II bike lanes for State Route 273. This would be money added to Caltrans State funds for the Highway 273 project.

Dan Little asked the Agency to authorize the Executive Officer to make minor changes on short notice between now and when the State adopts the RTIP.

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

5. Consider 2004/05 Transit Needs Assessment and Conduct 2004/05 Unmet Transit Needs Hearing

Executive Officer Kovacich explained the 2004/05 Transit Development Act (TDA) funding cycle begins now. In accordance with State law, a Transit Needs Assessment has been prepared, and a public hearing will be held to take testimony from the public, concerning unmet transit needs. The Board then directs staff to review and evaluate the comments, including ones received prior to this meeting, to present a recommendation to the Agency at the April meeting.

Sue Crowe showed a Power Point presentation on transportation services throughout Shasta County. She noted that both RABA and SSNP are down on ridership by 12%. Sue stated that public comments will be received through March 1, 2004 and copies of the Transit Needs Assessment are available. She then advised the audience of the various ways they could get comments to the RTPA.

Dan Kovacich explained what happens now that RABA did not meet the farebox ratio. If RABA meets the farebox ratio in 2003/04, they recoup their grace period year and no action will be taken by the RTPA. If they do not meet the farebox ratio in 2003/04, then this year will become the non-compliance year and result in reduced TDA eligibility in 2005/06. The penalty would be equal to the amount of the revenue shortfall of \$15,000. RABA would also need to demonstrate to the Agency how they would meet the farebox standard.

Dan Kovacich noted what options the Agency has concerning Consolidated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA) not meeting the performance standards set by the Agency. They can modify the performance standards by either increasing the subsidy or curtailing the service.

Dan Kovacich stated that no single factor has been identified as to why ridership is down. There is no particular route that is down; various routes are up and down. It may be various small factors adding up to the 12% drop. The farebox increase had no affect on the drop because the review period ended June 30, 2003

Board member Goekler inquired as to if the farebox has ever been at 20% and if the Agency has the ability to lower the farebox ratios in the future. Dan Kovacich stated that RABA met 20% until 1997 when the State revised the farebox ratio calculation. The cost associated with Demand Response previous to that was excluded from the calculation. Since then, it has been over 20% only one year after that.

The Agency can take the farebox as low as 15%. If it wants to go lower, there are also other standards that can be applied, such as performance standards. The farebox is the generally accepted methodology for fixed routes service.

Chairman Kight opened the floor for public testimony. The following people spoke:

Name/Address	Comments
Max Tonkinson 5485 Millpond Lane Redding, CA 241-6314	\$ Believes RABA is a poorly run bus system compared to others in the U.S. \$ Should improve bus system to increase ridership. \$ Route #3 habitually late getting into transit center, causes domino effect so misses the transfer. Has to leave a few hours early to make doctors appointments. If eliminate Turtle Bay stop, would take care of always being late to transit center. \$ Since drivers always running late on route #3, they are always speeding to catch up.
Jeffrey Gale 15420 Black Bart Road Shasta, CA 241-7715	• Would like bus service after 6:30 p.m. or on Sundays. • Need to stop building homes and condos to limit growth and keep air and water clean. • Transit workers work very hard, are under paid and very underappreciated.
Larry Scarborough, Transportation Coordinator, Far Northern Regional Center 1906 Bechelli Lane Redding, CA 223-3304 222-4791 ext. 3461 Chairman Shasta County SSTAC, Co-Chair Butte County SSTAC, and member Lassen County SSTAC.	\$ SSTAC recently made recommendation to RTPA to do survey of unmet needs and consideration of two hour extended service instead of four hour that was recommended last year. Response from RTPA staff was that last years' survey was adequate and the landscape of ridership has not changed. If there is a 12% drop in ridership, combined with eight routes being changed this year, then the landscape of ridership has possibly changed. \$ Need to find out why ridership is down 12 percent. \$ Asked Board for permission to have survey of unmet needs. It's too late for this year, but would like to be done aggressively for next year.

Name/Address	Comments
	\$ Contrary to Sue Crowe's report, Butte County's ridership for the last three years has run basically flat. \$ Tehama County is up over 10% in ridership. \$ Shasta County has only one meeting today, with no attempt to solicit input from the public. \$ Butte County had five meetings in five different locations at different times. They ran newspaper and television ads, had survey cards and posters in every bus promoting the unmet needs process. They aggressively sought unmet needs in Butte County. \$ Tehama County had meetings in different towns and advertised in newspapers. \$ Shasta County spends approximately 60% TDA money on transit, 40% for roads. Butte County spends 76% on transit, 24% on roads; Tehama spends 74% on transit, 26% on roads. \$ Of the TDA funding, Shasta County spends less than 18% (\$403,000) on transportation; that includes the Burney Express, Van Pool Subsidies and Life Line services. They spend \$1,932,000; more than 80% of TDA funding on streets and roads. \$ Butte spends 24% on streets and roads; Tehama spends 40% on streets and roads. \$ Propose challenges to RTPA - the farebox ratios are too low. Aggressively seek improvement in farebox by appealing to riders by their comments and suggestions. \$ Tehama County dropped their farebox ratio completely and went to an alternative performance measure. Maybe Shasta County should do

Name/Address	Comments
	something similar. \$ Asked RTPA to approve aggressive survey methods. Propose SSTAC include actual riders of the system, not just advocates. None of the members of SSTAC ride public transportation. \$ Public transit provides independence and it's good for our economy. Gas prices going up is a good incentive for public transportation. \$ Ask RTPA to look at public transportation from slightly different perspective. The needs for Shasta County's future require very aggressive public transportation system.
Michael Gomes/Jeff Lewellyn 14673 Spring Branch Road Redding, CA Mountain Gate Community 275-0215	\$ Would like extended transit services. Had petition with over 250 signatures of advocates who would appreciate the transit services in Mountain Gate area. \$ Petition says from Shasta Dam Blvd. up to Fawndale, would like to change that from Shasta Dam Blvd. to Bridge Bay. A lot of youth in the summer could ride the bus to their jobs.

Chairman Kight noted that RTPA staff would review comments and present its analysis, with recommendations, to Agency in April.

Dan Kovacich stated that the comments will also be forwarded to the SSTAC who will make a recommendation in April as well.

By motion made and seconded (Clarke/Connick) the staff recommendation passed unanimously.

6. Caltrans Presentation of Bay Bridge Project

Gary Purcell, Construction Manager of Caltrans, gave a presentation of the Bay Bridge Project. The Bridge is included in the State bridge retrofit program. The West span is a suspension bridge being retrofitted and is about

80% complete. The East span, after analysis, was decided not to be cost effective to retrofit, and is being replaced instead. The cost of the Bay Bridge Project is between 2.5 and 3 billion dollars.

There being no other business to discuss, Chairman Kight adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Kovacich, Executive Officer

/jac