

## **APPROVED MINUTES**

### **SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)**

Tuesday, April 22, 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 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 Hartman were present. Alternate board member Jones was present.

#### **1. Call to Order**

Chair Comnick called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

#### **2. Staff Introductions**

Will Kempton, Director, California Department of Transportation was introduced and invited to address the Board. Mr. Kempton noted that the rural parts of the state have typically been neglected when it comes to transportation. The focus is on the urban areas when dealing with congestion. The major freeway going through Shasta County is a huge goods movement arterial; it needs attention, not just in Los Angeles, but from San Diego all the way up to Yreka. Mr. Kempton noted that they have a good understanding of some of the rural problems and it is going to take a lot of effort and collaboration on everyone's part to resolve them.

Mr. Kempton stated that the most significant benefit of having your own source of funds is the ability to leverage those dollars to obtain other funding. If the California Transportation Commission (CTC) is weighing two projects and one locality tells them they will come up with half the money for the project, the Commission will choose the locality with half the money.

Mr. Kempton continued to note that he personally does not see in 20 years the state or federal government coming in and doing what needs to be done to move traffic through this area on Interstate 5 to the level that it will need. Shasta County will continue to get its county share of funds through the State Transportation Improvement Program, but it will be a pittance compared to what will be needed in terms of investment in this corridor. Mr. Kempton stated that he doesn't see how Shasta County will be able to make the kinds of investments that will be needed without collaboration between the state, regional agency, and local governments to get the job done.

Board members asked Mr. Kempton questions on various issues including I-5, the railroad, matching local funds, and overpasses.

**3. Public Comment Period**

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

**Consent Calendar**

**4-1 Minutes of February 26, 2008, RTPA Meeting**

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

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

**4-4 Accept TDA Fiscal and Compliance Audits for Year Ended June 30, 2007**

**4-5 Miscellaneous Administrative Expenditures**

**4-6 Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) Transit System Safety Grant**

**4-7 Amendment #9 to the 2006 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)**

Executive Director Dan Little requested that item #4-3 be pulled from the consent calendar and continue to the June meeting.

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

**Regular Calendar**

**5. Adopt Public Participation Plan (Public Hearing)**

Staff member John Strahan explained that federal transportation laws - specifically SAFETEA-LU - require Metropolitan Planning Organizations to have a Public Participation Plan. Over 125 letters were sent out inviting people to become involved in the transportation planning process. The draft Plan was mailed to stakeholders and those who had expressed an interest. The Plan is now updated to incorporate all SAFETEA-LU requirements and employs a variety of strategies designed to provide all interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the transportation planning process.

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

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

6. **ShastaFORWARD>> Regional Blueprint: Project Update, Overall Work Program Amendment, and Personal Service Agreement Amendments**

Staff member Dan Wayne explained that they are currently in the first of four stages of the public outreach process, which is the community values and priorities assessment portion. The focus is to expand the number and diversity of individuals that have the opportunity to participate in the project. Mr. Wayne noted that in his assessment ShastaFORWARD>> is garnering a high level of project awareness amongst the community and a modest but growing number of people that are actively participating. Mr. Wayne explained that they are advertising in newspapers and on the radio, sending press releases, a KIXE television program is currently being aired a number of times, exhibits have been placed at all libraries to distribute project surveys, and various other efforts. In regard to next steps, Mr. Wayne noted that they will continue to arrange and hold small group outreach sessions through the third week in May and they are making arrangements to meet with each of the Planning Commissions throughout the County.

Board member Les Baugh read an email from Russ Mull, Director of the Shasta County Department of Resource Management, to CAO Larry Lees regarding AB 2870 and SB 375. Mr. Baugh also noted that he would like Russ Mull to come to a RTPA meeting and to present more of his thoughts.

Mr. Wayne noted that they have extended numerous invitations to the County to participate throughout the process, on occasion they have attended and participated, although Mr. Wayne hoped it would be more.

Executive Director Dan Little stated that AB 2870 is a placeholder bill that is very vague and does not include any substance yet because it is still to be developed. The assembly member is working with CALCOG to determine the bill's content. The CALCOG members are reluctant to establish any kind of new commission. It has a very long way to go through the legislature.

Mr. Little continued to note that SB 375 has been in the legislature for quite awhile. It is just starting to come to a point where there is a pretty good idea of what it will contain, but there will still be some changes. CSAC/League of Cities has recommended approval on the condition of various changes. SB 375 does not specifically reference regional blueprints, although Shasta County's blueprint could eventually be modified to comply with the provisions of the bill's sustainable community's strategy.

Walt McNeil, attorney representing Shasta Voices and a resident of the City of Redding spoke. Mr. McNeil requested that Shasta Voices also be copied on ShastaFORWARD>> public notices and

distribution of information. Mr. McNeil noted that his impression was that this is duplicative of what ought to be done by the Shasta County Planning Department. Mr. McNeil continued to note that, if it could be put in the public relations program and outreach to people, that there is the possibility that this could be part of a statewide effort to mandate future land use policies, there would be a lot more people at the meetings.

Staff member Dan Wayne noted that for all questions and concerns Mr. McNeil raised, there are responses to those on the project website. Invitations have been extended on several occasions, including in writing to Shasta Voices, to participate in a small group outreach session. ShastaFORWARD>> continues to be open and available to any comment, any participation, and all generated information is publicly available.

Executive Director Dan Little explained that it's not just the Shasta County Planning Department that has the main jurisdiction over the ShastaFORWARD>> issues. It's the three cities as well, that's why the regional agency is playing a role in this. It's very important to involve all the jurisdictions, not just the County, everyone involved equally; although most of the growth will be in the cities, not the county. There has been very good participation from all three of the cities, but the RTPA continues to struggle in getting the county involved.

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

**7. Approve 2008/09 Overall Work Program (OWP) (Public Hearing)**

Executive Director Dan Little explained that this was the annual RTPA budget for the next fiscal year, starting July 1st. It's mostly a Federal Highway Administration requirement that shows how the FHWA PL (planning) funds are going to be used as well as all the other fund sources. At the present time, just shy of half of the RTPA funding is based on special State Planning and Research grants. One for the Blueprint and one for the Fix 5 Partnership; the rest is in Federal Highway Administration funds and Transportation Development Act funds that can match some federal funds. The highway trust account is, for the first time, going into a zero balance in the next year and will continue to go down. This has never happened before. The result will be a reduction in all federal funding across the board. What that might mean in future years is a reduced ability to pass through as many funds to the jurisdictions for support work or at least limit it more to core functions, unless certain activities were successful in getting grants for projects deemed worthwhile.

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

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

**8. State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Update and Letter to Local Agencies Regarding Long-Term STIP Funding**

Executive Director Dan Little noted that at the last RTPA meeting the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) was adopted. There was funding to do a new project since Dana to Downtown is now fully funded. The Agency wanted to start the environmental portion for an Interstate 5 project. Mr. Little went to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) hearing for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which is where the regional plan is incorporated into the state program. There is a lot more need statewide than there is funding available. The preliminary recommendation by the CTC is that any new project phases that are starting would be moved to the fourth or fifth year of the program. The RTPA could get the project funds for I-5, but they are probably going to be in the fourth or fifth year of the program. The recommendations will come out in two weeks from the state and the CTC will adopt the STIP at the end of May.

Mr. Little explained that there is a letter to be provided to the city managers and county CAO. The letter is about the prospects of RTIP funding in the region. The letter states that the assumptions used in local traffic impact fee programs for interchanges are valid assumptions for the time being, but that if we don't also have a funding program for Interstate 5 (I-5), there are not enough funds to meet the assumptions of RTIP funding for other roads and interchanges. Therefore it is not realistic to think that limited RTIP funds could be used to take care of both I-5 mainline and interchange needs. If the Fix 5 fee program is not adopted, then those assumptions would no longer be reasonable to use.

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

**9. Caltrans Interstate 5 Travel Characteristics Presentation**

Executive Director Dan Little explained that this presentation is being done because the composition and characteristics of traffic on I-5 were not adequately addressed in public outreach and project studies. How much I-5 traffic is truck traffic? How much is pass through traffic? How much comes into the region and doesn't leave? How significant is I-5 to the area? How many vehicles get off at the interchanges to do business in our community?

Tammy Quigley from Caltrans District 2 gave a presentation on the travel characteristics of the I-5 corridor in Shasta and Tehama County. Ms. Quigley showed slides that addressed the relationship between trucks and vehicles along the corridor and the percentages of trucks versus vehicles in the Redding urban area at key locations. She also talked about the outcome of an origin and destination traffic study.

Scott White, Caltrans District 2, added information concerning maintained lane miles and forecast vehicle hours of delay for the corridor. Mr. White noted that the bulk of the information comes from Caltrans' census bureau and is available on the Internet. Additional information for the origin and destination traffic study came from Caltrans District 2, and the delay information came from the RTPA Travel Demand Model.

**10. Fix 5 Partnership: Receive Update and Approve Revised Work Plan**

Executive Director Dan Little reminded the Board that, at the October meeting, they gave direction to advance the Fix 5 Partnership to the jurisdictions for a decision. At that time, there was a Phase I and Phase II. In discussions with city managers and the CAO, they recommended that it would be less confusing to combine Phase I and Phase II. Some of the legal counsels advised the Agency to explore the possibility of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) instead of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The Board was asked if staff should complete the remaining Phase II work and bring it back as one program, or should they push forward without the details of a JPA or MOU, in order to get an up or down vote. Staff recommendation is to combine Phase I and Phase II, since the Phase I work completed so far already encompasses most of the Phase II scope. Direction is also needed regarding a JPA versus a MOU. A JPA does not have to relinquish all authority to a JPA agency; it can be specified which powers would go to the JPA and would be retained by the cities and county. Mr. Little clarified that what is being requested now is Board direction to either move forward with the balance of Phase II, and to consider a JPA, or to proceed directly to the county and cities for a decision.

Board member Les Baugh questioned as to why the staff report does not outline details explaining a JPA as compared to a MOU. He does not want to make a decision where information is not provided.

Board member Dick Dickerson noted that Mr. Little was not asking the Board to commit to either a JPA or MOU; Mr. Little is asking if staff should prepare a JPA and bring it back for later consideration.

Mr. Little confirmed that the direction would be to prepare a JPA for consideration, for input, not a JPA for adoption. This would not bind the Agency to approve a JPA; it just directs staff to go prepare one for consideration and for Board discussion. If the Board absolutely does not want a JPA and would rather go back to a MOU, this would be an appropriate time to provide that direction.

Mr. Little further explained that some of the city attorneys recommended that a JPA should at least be explored for legal reasons instead of the MOU, and perhaps to ease program administration. Mr. Little also noted that the alternative in the staff report is also viable and staff does not mind bringing Fix 5 to each agency immediately.

Board member Glenn Hawes noted that the timing is not good right now; the economy is on the downside and he doesn't know whether it is appropriate to push forward at this time.

Board member Norma Comnick noted that the Anderson city manager has asked them to not take a stand on it until it is discussed at a City Council meeting.

Board member Les Baugh stated that unless the City of Redding approves this, there is no future for it. It makes sense to find out whether the City of Redding is interested before they spend additional resources on revising the program.

Board member Dick Dickerson noted that there is no such proposal at this time; rather Mr. Little is asking the Board to direct him to cooperate with the city managers and the CAO and take a look at combining both phases and then presenting to the Cities of Redding, Shasta Lake, and Anderson. All the Board would be doing today is directing Mr. Little to follow the suggestions of the city managers. The RTPA Board needs to be able to review a proposed JPA, but the staff should be doing both things; they should be looking at combining the two phases and also at a draft JPA for the Board to look at. This is the recommendation staff has made.

A motion was made to approve the staff recommendation and seconded (Palmer/Dickerson).

Kent Dagg, CEO, Shasta Builders Exchange noted that he didn't think there would be any support for a JPA. Things are bad in the construction industry, which has a ripple effect through the entire business community. To move this impact fee forward at this time is not even realistic. It needs to be postponed for awhile, put on the back burner until the economy turns around. The Shasta Builders Exchange is not for Fix 5.

The motion was voted through a show of hands with two board members voting in favor (Dickerson/Palmer) and five board members opposed (Comnick, Hawes, Baugh, Hartman, Jones). The motion did not carry.

Board member Glenn Hawes motioned that it be tabled for six months and see if there is a change in the economy. If there is no change at that time, table it again for six more months, until things change.

Scott White, Caltrans District 2, reminded the Board that they are under contract with the state to expend funds and complete the project in a timely manner.

Mr. Little added that the contract issue referenced by Mr. White is the grant that is funding Fix 5, funding is available until February 2009.

Board member Les Baugh motioned that this be tabled until the meeting of June 24, with additional clarification explaining the basis and the points that they want to possibly accomplish with a JPA and clarifying what the work plan means.

The motion was seconded by Glenn Hawes. A show of hands was again used with three board members voting in favor of and four members voting against. The motion did not carry.

Mr. Little clarified that no action means that staff will move forward pursuant to the October direction, which isn't that much different, because they will need to continue to work with the city managers to get it to some level acceptable to them. Staff will provide the RTPA Board with updates. Mr. Little continued to say that he will still meet with the city managers and county CAO to see if the JPA is the desired mechanism. If so, he will provide a presentation on that at the June meeting.

**11. Executive Director's Report**

Executive Director Dan Little explained what it would mean for the RTPA if Shasta County went into air quality nonattainment under the federal standards. Air modeling would have to be done to show that air pollution levels will be reduced over time. He doesn't think nonattainment rules will apply for another five years in terms of transportation. Designation could occur as soon as two or three years. It then takes an additional two years of process for those designations to actually occur. If it happens as in the past, lawsuits will be filed in the federal courts from different interest groups on both sides of the issue.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Comnick adjourned the meeting at 6:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

/jac