APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)
Tuesday, February 26, 2008, 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 meeting time, place and attendance; the order and general nature of discussion; Board deliberations; and action taken, if any.)

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

1. **Call to Order**
Chair Comnick called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

2. **Staff Introductions**

3. **Public Comment Period**
Marta McKenzie, Shasta County Health and Human Services (HHSA) Director spoke. Marta noted that input had been gathered from the direct service staff of Mental Health, Public Health, and Social Services. Several issues were raised about transportation, specifically around the Breslauer site where a number of their services are provided. Marta stated that she hopes that they can begin a dialog into the future; she does not expect this information to go anywhere or do anything today. Marta continued to note it is her firm belief that there should be more services of the agency programs available in more locations and not be so dependent on Breslauer Way transportation. It is a difficult place at times to get to, especially if you are transporting yourself from outer lying areas of the community. Marta noted that almost 8,500 clients come to the Breslauer campus each month. It took 86% of the clients surveyed less than an hour to get to the Breslauer campus. Almost 42% of the clients at Cascade are reliant on other people to provide them transportation. They are very anxious to develop a broader relationship and look forward to more dialog in the future.

Consent Calendar

4-1 **Minutes of December 18, 2007, RTPA Meeting**

4-2 **Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through February 2009 - Information Only**

4-3 <u>2006 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Amendment #8</u>

4-4 <u>Revision #1 to Policy 5-1: Policy to Prioritize the Distribution of Federal Planning Funds</u>

4-5 <u>Correspondence</u>

By motion made, seconded and unanimously carried (Hartman/Hawes), the items on the Consent Calendar were approved.

Regular Calendar

5. <u>Consider 2008/09 Transit Needs Assessment and Conduct 2008/09 Unmet Transit Needs Hearing (Public Hearing)</u>

Executive Director Dan Little explained that the Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides money for transit through a quarter cent of the general sales tax which is the Local Transportation Fund. It also gets revenue through the sales tax on gasoline called State Transit Assistance Funds. There is a one-time infusion of monies through Proposition 1B. That's the money that comes in for RABA. Through the transit needs process, transit funds first get apportioned to jurisdictions so they can meet their transit needs. The role of the RTPA is to decide what level of transit service is reasonable to meet for each jurisdiction and, if there is money left over after each jurisdiction meets its transit obligations, they can use excess funds either for additional transit at their own discretion or for streets and roads.

Staff member Sue Crowe explained that this is the normal process for the unmet transit needs. Before the funds can be disbursed they must first evaluate transit needs, take public testimony at the public hearing, receive a recommendation from the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council, and then funds are allocated in April or June. The first TDA recipient is the Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA). The TDA subsidy is $3.52 per trip; this is a portion of the operating expenses less what is taken in at the farebox. It does not count for capital purposes. Demand response has a TDA subsidy of $15.98 per trip. This is where the majority of the costs are. Sue continued to explain that fixed route has declined in the last four years, but demand response is increasing by about 2,500 passengers per year. The farebox is calculated system-wide. It's the combination of fixed route and demand response. If you calculated those individually, fixed route exceeded the 19% farebox requirement. But demand response is at 16.1%, which pulls the farebox ratio down. Overall there was a system-wide increase of 3.6% from last year. Sue continued to note that although RABA did not meet the system-wide farebox requirement of 19%, the CTSA did meet their performance criteria and so did the Burney Express.

Executive Director Dan Little explained that RTPA staff will take all comments received and provide written responses at either the April or June RTPA meeting.

Chair Comnick opened the floor for public testimony. The following people spoke:

Daisy Riley explained that she rides the bus and depends on it every day. It usually takes her an hour to get to work because she has to transfer from one bus to another. There are some busses that take longer. If a bus is 5 or 10 minutes late it could create a problem with someone's job.

Rick Cornelius explained that he is totally dependent on the bus system. If he doesn't use the bus system, he has to walk. Rick noted that he objects to option A1. If the advertisement process is done properly, by using the television advertisement system, $35,000 will be made up in the first year's time.

Afton Fitzgerald - Health and Wellness Coordinator for Hill Country Clinic in Round Mountain. As a case manager, she has noticed quite a few problems with transportation issues. In 2007, Hill Country Clinic saw about 13,000 patients, 60% of which are located in Burney or Redding. Ms. Fitzgerald stated that RABA does not stop in front of the facility; rather the closest stop is 5 miles away in Montgomery Creek. Afton further stated that eastern Shasta County is in need of some sort of conversation with the RTPA about being able to have a stop in front of Hill Country Clinic.

Executive Director Dan Little noted that there is often confusion concerning RABA's responsibilities versus the RTPA's responsibilities. RABA is the operational entity and the RTPA deals with the expansion of the service area, hours and days. One reason the claims and the unmet needs findings might be delayed until June is that the RTPA will be working with RABA staff to get cost estimates for providing the alternative A1 transit service next year that the RABA board adopted. Once the costs are known the claims can be processed, assuming they start on July 1.

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

6. Adopt 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) (Public Hearing)

Executive Director Dan Little explained that this is a 5 year budget program or capital improvement program for projects where RTIP funds are used. The RTIP gets its funds from the state. Historically there were also federal funds, but now those funds go entirely towards maintenance of the state highway system. What the RTPA gets now for the RTIP is a portion of the sales tax on gasoline, thanks to Proposition 1A. The RTPA gets a projected amount of three to five million dollars annually. This is a substantial amount, but is not enough to meet all of the regional needs.

Mr. Little continued to note that they are now in a position to start thinking about new phases of existing projects or new projects for RTIPs. They are recommending a project on Interstate 5 (I-5) to program the environmental review work. It would be a six-lane Interstate 5, from Bonnyview Drive to the Central Interchange. The recommendation for the Interstate 5 project is to go ahead with RTIP funds for this phase of the program to then be back-filled in later phases - hopefully as soon as the 2010 cycle. Even with this recommendation to start the I-5 environmental project, it will still take up to 10 or 15 years to complete this project.

Mr. Little continued to note that back in 1999 the RTIP funded $150,000 in environmental cost for the Buckhorn project. Environmental work is still underway. The whole project need is $243 million. Funding is not available for this project, and given the needs that are in the urban area, it is not prudent to go ahead and pursue Buckhorn through the regional funds. Those funds should be focused on congestion relief needs. Buckhorn will still be chipped away at through other means; some construction projects will be done in bits and pieces through the State Safety Program.

Mr. Little explained that the Stillwater project is a case where there is some congestion but it’s not as big a regional need as an Interstate 5 project. Stillwater has turned into a $68 million dollar project. It was initially thought to be $20 million. The RTPA staff feels it is best to table this project in favor of projects that are more central to the core of the region where funds can be leveraged.

Mr. Little recommended performing the first phase of environmental for Interstate 5 and then in 2010 start programming the other phases.

Mr. Little noted that another project in the program is the East Redding Bike Lanes.

Chair Comnick opened the floor for public testimony. One person spoke.

Phillip Powell is a citizen that lives off of Burton Lane which is off of Stillwater and Highway 44. Mr. Powell stated that he understands that funds are not available and funds are tight everywhere – state, county, etc. But there are definite safety concerns. There have been some serious accidents out there and there was a fatality as well, so safety is a huge issue. Congestion is also a big issue and should be seriously looked at. The speed limit use to be 55; it is now 65. Putting in a merging lane as well as lowering the speed limit is one possibility.

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

Agency member Dick Dickerson asked for clarification of what the motion covers.

Executive Director Dan Little explained the motion was to approve the 2008 Draft Regional Transportation Improvement Program. $1.195 million dollars will be programmed for the environmental phase of the Interstate 5 widening from Bonnyview to the Central Interchange at State Route 299. The East Redding Bike Lane Project will be divided into two segments – one to be constructed next year for $800,000 for the east/west segments, and the Old Oregon Trail segment for $1.7 million in fiscal year 10/11. Also, Planning and Programming Monitoring funds will be used throughout the five year cycle of about $365,000 annually.

7. **<u>Shasta*FORWARD*>> Update</u>**

Executive Director Dan Little noted that Shasta*FORWARD*>> is moving along and has garnered more interest than he anticipated. A grant was obtained, as directed by the Agency, to engage the public on growth-related issues and to gather good data. Already some of the data obtained is being used, including a consolidated, countywide general plan layer. There is also a GIS data base of different types of growth constraints, environmental sensitivities and so forth.

Staff member Dan Wayne noted that there was a project advisory group meeting on January 11, 2008, which resulted in a refined public outreach strategy and a list of individuals that are able and interested to participate on the proposed Shasta*FORWARD*>> project steering committee.

In regard to technical development, the modeling output of UPLAN has been successfully merged with the Shasta County Travel Model. This means there is now a standard travel model output for the 'Current Trend' 2050 scenario. Four out of seven scenario performance measures have been finalized. Several computer generated animations have been developed. These illustrate current conditions and projected growth patterns through 2050. These will be available on the Shastaforward.com website and also be incorporated into the KIXE-TV program that is currently being produced. Mr. Wayne noted that there are four elements to the public outreach for this project. The fourth will allow the public to vote on their preferred regional growth alternative. This preferred regional vision will be presented to the County Board of Supervisors and each city council for their adoption and incorporation into local plans and programs.

Targeted small-group outreach sessions will be one of the key outreach strategies. Instead of relying on people to come to them, they will seek out opportunities to make presentations to community groups and small groups and to get more detailed and meaningful input from them. Mr. Wayne stated that the RTPA was successful in obtaining an additional $140,000 for 07/08 in grant funds. This is in addition to the $375,000 which was received in 06/07.

Mr. Wayne explained that the purpose of the steering committee would be to advise staff in regard to the most effective public outreach strategies. Also, to stimulate dialog in the community regarding growth-related issues. The steering committee is not the source of public input, nor is it intended or designed to represent the public mind.

Mr. Wayne summarized that the Agency is being asked to formally establish a Shasta*FORWARD*>> project steering committee and to direct staff to any other additional individuals that staff should extend an invitation to be on this committee.

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

8. **Elect Alternate CALCOG Delegate**

Executive Director Dan Little explained what CALCOG is (California Association of Councils of Governments). For about the last 10 years the RTPA has had a CALCOG delegate and alternate. There are a couple of forums yearly they attend. Board member Stegall is the CALCOG delegate and an alternate is needed.

Agency member Palmer nominated Dick Dickerson, agency member Glenn Hawes second with the nomination passing unanimously.

9. **<u>Caltrans Interstate 5 Transportation Concept Report (TCR) Presentation</u>**

Executive Director Dan Little explained that this is a concept report that has been under development for quite some time for the Interstate 5 corridor in District 2. There is a resolution for the Agency to accept the report, however, this does not bind the RTPA to any specific course of action, funding, or transportation priorities.

Kathy Grah of Caltrans District 2 explained the Interstate 5 Transportation Concept Report (TCR). The report covers Interstate 5 from the border of Tehama & Glenn Counties to the Oregon/Siskiyou border. The TCR looks at the whole route; what's going on with this route, what needs to be done, and starts discussion on how to get things funded. Ms. Grah noted that in the area between the City of Corning and the community of Mountain Gate, they would like to see the extension of the freeway from four to six lanes, ramp widenings, lengthenings and metering, and placement of Intelligent Transportation Systems. An area that could also be completed would be expansion of the local road system and the parallel routes that connect to Interstate 5. Ms. Grah ended by stating that over the next 20 years, Interstate 5 in District 2 will be a challenge to manage. The TCR report is the first step toward meeting the goals and needs of this corridor.

By motion made and seconded (Palmer/Hawes), the resolution was adopted unanimously.

10. **<u>Executive Director Report</u>**

Executive Director Dan Little, in regard to the Dana to Downtown project, recognized Caltrans staff for preparing the engineer's estimate, which was within 1% of the low bid. Mr. Little continued to note that in the state budget, transportation came out relatively unscathed thus far. The Interregional Transportation Improvement Program has $3 million for the Cottonwood Hills Project. The Public Participation Plan will be available for adoption at the April meeting. Staff plans on coming back to the Agency concerning the Fix 5 Partnership at the April meeting to consider some additional work. It was suggested at the Fix 5 Executive Committee meeting that a Joint Powers Authority be used to administer the program instead of a Memorandum of Understanding. It was also suggested to combine phase one and two all into one phase.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Comnick adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

/jac