

APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY

Tuesday, April 26, 2011, 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 actions taken, if any.)

Board members Dickerson, Jones, Moty, Baugh, Hawes, and Cornnick, were present. Alternate board member Lucero was present. Board member Watkins was absent.

1. Call to Order

Chair Moty 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

Chair Moty stated that there are two updated staff reports. Item 4-5 and 7. Amounts on the reports have changed from \$183,500 to \$225,000.

4-1 Minutes of February 22, 2011, RTPA Meeting

4-2 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through April 2012 - Information Only

4-3 2010 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Amendment #5

4-4 Accept Transportation Development Act (TDA) Fiscal and Compliance Audits for Year Ended June 30, 2010

4-5 Amendment #2 to the 2010/11 Overall Work Program (OWP)

4-6 Extend Dowling Associates Agreement and Issue a Request for Proposals for Updating the Shasta County Travel Demand Model

4-7 Correspondence

By motion made, seconded, and unanimously carried (Hawes/Baugh), the consent calendar was approved.

Regular Calendar

5. Executive Director's Report

Executive director Dan Little noted the Cottonwood Hills Truck Climbing Lanes Project has been approved and the South Redding Six Lane Project is going to construction. In between is what is being called the Gap Project. Funding is being sought to complete the environmental phase for the Gap Project so it can be construction ready should future grant funding become available. Caltrans is working with the RTPA and the City of Anderson in doing a value analysis for this project. Caltrans also received funding for a project initiation document. This is a necessary precursor to the environmental document.

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) will be holding a town hall meeting in Redding on June 7, 2011. A town hall meeting is not a regular meeting; instead the CTC gives the RTPA three hours to discuss topics of concern/interest. Part of what the CTC would like to cover is the North State Super Region, as well as time for informal dialogue. Mr. Little proposed that the agenda focus on highlighting recent state investments in Shasta County. RTPA board members are encouraged to attend this meeting as it is important to meet the CTC commissioners, thank them and ask questions.

Mr. Little noted that senior planner Thomas Hays will retire on May 13, 2011 and recognized his contributions to the agency.

Informational update from John Bulinski, Caltrans District 2 director:

Bids were opened on the South Redding Six Lane Project on April 4, 2011. This project will add an additional lane to I-5 between Bonnyview and south of Lake Blvd. The apparent low bidder is Tullis, Inc. Work will start about June 2011.

Mr. Bulinski noted that the I-5/44 Distributor Collector Project is currently under construction. Caltrans is also connecting ITS infrastructure directly to the district office via a fiber optic system. A cable median barrier on I-5 is being installed from Knighton Road to Bonnyview Road. The Cottonwood Hills Truck Climbing Lanes Project is under construction and should be complete in June 2011. Some paving projects on Highway 273 will be done this summer.

6. Senate Bill 375/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Planning Update

Executive director Dan Little explained that the RTPA staff has been giving information on Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) to the board in bits and pieces. This presentation is intended to get back to the basic provisions in the law and the RTPA's approach and work plan.

SB 375 is law and the RTPA is required to do a SCS in the updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Under the law, the SCS does not override the general plans of the cities and county, and in fact must be consistent with them. With the law there

are opportunities for the RTPA to acquire additional funding and gain some CEQA relief on greenhouse gas (GHG) requirements.

Staff member Dan Wayne gave a presentation on SB 375. In addition to SB 375s specific focus on GHG, the state has placed high priority on co-benefits such as; increased mobility, economic benefits, reduced air and water pollution, safe guarding natural resources, public health, etc. Mr. Wayne added to the list “resilience” – the capacity to adapt and to recover quickly from significant and rapid change in our region.

Mr. Wayne explained that today he was providing: 1) the basic need-to-know information about SB 375 from a local Shasta County perspective; 2) outlining the agencies response to SB 375; and 3) give a preview of what implementation might look like.

From a Shasta County perspective, there are five main points the RTPA needs to be familiar with in connection to SB 375:

1. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is charged with setting GHG reduction targets for the years 2020 and 2035. Shasta County’s target given by CARB is 0% change, which will be revisited in 2014. SB 375 only addresses GHG emissions based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT). SB 375 only applies to GHG from cars and light trucks. SB 375 only includes trips that have an origin and destination inside of the region. For trips that have either an origin or destination – one inside the region, one outside the region – Shasta County is responsible for 50% of those trips. Since the regional targets are on a per capita basis, Shasta County can grow in population and emissions as long as the county develops as efficiently as in the past.
2. The agency is required to prepare a SCS, a joint regional plan that covers both land use and transportation. The SCS will show what specific strategies will be employed to meet the GHG emissions reduction target. The SCS must be consistent with local general plans and it must be uniformly adopted by all agencies. Should the SCS fail to achieve the target from CARB; an alternative planning strategy (APS) will have to be developed.
3. The SCS must be added as a new chapter to the 2015 RTP update and be internally consistent with other chapters, including project selection and prioritization.
4. The SCS must be consistent with the regional housing needs allocation. The Housing and Community Development Department provides allocations for local agencies and reviews respective general plan housing elements to ensure compliance.
5. The SCS will provide some limited CEQA protections for the region. Because the SCS chapter is part of the RTP and subject to the environmental impact report (EIR), any new development that occurs in the region that is consistent with the SCS will, in effect, be covered under the umbrella of the RTP EIR.

Discussion:

Board member Baugh: The RTPA is in the middle of developing the SCS and the county is in the middle of an assessment process (Regional Climate Action Plan) – how do you see those two processes coming together?

Mr. Wayne: The RTPA is currently coordinating with Shasta County, whatever data the county collects the RTPA will be able to use in the SCS process. As well as the RTPA is advising the county on what travel demand model (TDM) outputs to use in the Regional Climate Action Plan process.

Board member Dickerson: In terms of the targets, in the RTPA's accountability for what traffic begins and ends in Shasta County – what type of technology is used that semi-accurately measures that?

Mr. Wayne: Caltrans has completed origin and destination studies in the past and will continue to refine them to better understand traffic entering and exiting the regional gateways.

Board member Dickerson: Do you take that information and apply some sort of formula to it based on a sample?

Mr. Wayne: Traffic data – whether collected from the California Household Travel Survey, the RTPA travel demand model or Caltrans studies – is pieced together for a better understanding of travel patterns.

Executive director Dan Little: Future real-time traffic monitoring on the I-5 corridor and key gateways will also help provide more accurate traffic data.

Mr. Wayne continued to state that the agencies planning approach for the SCS can be divided into three phases, four including the APS:

1. Seek funding for the process as there is no dedicated funding source for SCS planning or implementation.
2. Build a technical foundation – including development of complete, standardized and merged regional GIS data across all jurisdictions, enhance the TDM, develop a suite of GIS spatial analysis tools and develop a GIS platform.
3. Staged SCS development – a lot of up front work is being invested before actually delivering a SCS. This is to give local agencies every opportunity to be partners in the process.
4. If the SCS falls below the regional target, then the agency is required to do an APS. The APS does not become part of the RTP.

In terms of implementing the SCS there are two main goals:

1. The RTPA is searching for and seeking collateral benefits. A framework or plan of programs that is ready to receive state funding and respond to evolving state priorities.
2. To advocate on behalf of the region. Throughout the process there will be opportunities for the agency to promote and defend local priorities; including reiterating local land use authority, defending reasonable GHG targets, seeking funding for implementation activities, communicating with CARB to ensure a predictable process and generally safeguarding regional interests.

Discussion:

Chair Moty: SB 375 requires the region to develop a coordinated transportation and land use plan. People get hung up on the "land use plan." People think that the RTPA is going to require jurisdictions to follow some land use plan.

Mr. Wayne: Coordination between land use and transportation already exists; SB 375 establishes a more explicit connection to the GHG emissions related to certain land use characteristics and transportation investments.

Chair Moty: Can you give a specific example, for instance, what it would mean to Redding or Anderson if they have some land use they want, what kind of restrictions or clarification would be put upon that project? Or, is it for them to determine?

Mr. Wayne: The RTPA won't be coming in and saying that a project is good or bad. The RTPA will provide comments on a project based on whether or not it will significantly increase GHG. This will hopefully inform the city's process. In looking forward to funding specific transportation projects, the RTPA will likely be more inclined to fund projects that support more transportation efficient development.

Executive director Dan Little: SCS-consistent projects have yet to be defined, but will be consistent with existing general plans. If development occurs that is not consistent, it doesn't mean the project can't be developed, it means that GHG-related CEQA compliance would have to be determined at the individual project level.

Mr. Wayne provided a sample graphic illustrating what SCS implementation might look like. Some have interpreted an SCS as having urban growth boundaries. Shasta County's SCS will not have growth boundaries, but will include a set of strategically placed and regionally coordinated transportation investments, land use policies, and incentive programs that will effectively reduce vehicle miles traveled and associated GHG emissions.

Gary Cadd, Redding resident: When the SCS is finalized, if there is a conflict between the general plan of the county or one of the three cities, will the general plan have to be changed to reflect the SCS?

Mr. Wayne: That situation cannot happen because an SCS cannot be adopted or included in the RTP unless it is consistent with general plans.

7. Adopt 2011/12 Overall Work Program (OWP) (Public Hearing)

Executive director Dan Little explained the OWP is the RTPAs annual budget for all administrative and planning funds, consultant work and pass through funds to other agencies. It does not include capital project funds.

Staff member Sue Crowe stated the OWP is the money document that allows the RTPA to be reimbursed for staff labor and consultant services. Approximately \$2.1 million is budgeted this year for staff time and consultant cost. This year the RTPA is using toll credits for local match.

Discussion:

Board member Baugh: Since Shasta County doesn't have any toll bridges, how did it end up with the money?

Executive director Dan Little: For years the state has collected tolls, just recently the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration approved toll credits. Everyone qualifies because it's a state managed program.

Ms. Crowe: The OWP includes \$300,000 for the local agencies to take traffic and speed counts for the travel demand model. There is \$110,000 budgeted to the local agencies for support of the SCS planning process. There is also \$50,000 to update RABA's Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP).

Board member Jones: In regard to the RABA SRTP update – how often is it updated?

Ms. Crowe: Every five years. It was last done in 2007. RABA has applied for a transit grant for consultant services. Should the grant not come through, the money will be available through the RTPA.

Board member Jones: There are concerns with the SRTP in how well it's working and its effectiveness – the plan hasn't been very successful. Is it being approached any differently? Is there anything to be learned from past mistakes? There is a concern about spending \$66,000 on the SRTP.

Mr. Little: Past practice on this is to leave it to the discretion of the RABA board to guide and approve the plan. The RTPA's involvement is to assist with the funding.

Board member Baugh: Similar questions were asked at the last meeting and it was understood that RABA would be looking at some different ways to go forward.

Mr. Little: There is a possibility of a joint workshop between RABA and the RTPA in the future. Maybe as part of the plan update for the transit system.

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

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

8. Authorize Joint Applications for Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) Funds

Executive director Dan Little stated the CMIA is a state program. When the voters approved Proposition 1B, a \$4.5 billion subset of it was for the CMIA competitive grant process. In the first cycle of grants, the RTPA received funding for the Cottonwood Hills Truck Climbing Lane Project. As a result of project savings, attributable to a lower bid climate, there was room to do another call for projects. Shasta County was successful in obtaining funding for the South Redding Six Lane Project. There is a limited amount of further construction saving dollars; the bond program expires at the end of the 2012 calendar year.

Staff member Jan Bulinski noted that the latest CTC call for projects are those that enhance existing CMIA projects. The CTC prefers proposals that are construction ready by June of 2012. The RTPA has developed two applications in partnership with the City of Anderson and Caltrans. The City of Anderson project is at Locust Street and Deschutes Road for a roundabout. The environmental document and project report is complete for this project and the total cost is \$7.285 million. The RTPA is asking for \$6 million in CMIA money for construction. The Caltrans project is the I-5 extension project, which is .7 miles north of the Knighton Road overcrossing to .3 miles north of the Smith Road overcrossing. The cost is estimated at \$3.245 million in CMIA dollars for construction. Staff recommends that the Anderson project be placed as first priority.

Discussion:

Board member Jones: The environmental documents are complete; how quickly were those done and how long were they worked on?

Jeff Kiser, Anderson assistant city manager: This project has been around for a long time, it went in with the development of Walmart. The city has worked hard on this for the last five years, but it goes back well into the 90's.

Board member Jones: Why is it the first time it's come up to the RTPA? It's the first time a roundabout at this location has come before the RTPA for at least the last year.

Mr. Little: It's a project that's never been a RTPA supported project until this time when it became a viable candidate for grant funds. It has been in the RTP but was never supported with RTPA funds.

Board member Jones: When it is said that environmental documents are complete, is there a project study report, army corps, etc.?

Mr. Kiser: The process has just been completed in the last several months with Caltrans, Anderson is the lead agency.

Board member Baugh: The \$1.28 million difference between the request; is that the existing amount of money in the traffic fee?

Mr. Little: That's the existing amount of money that has been put into the environmental work, the design work and some of the right-of-way work. This is all through the traffic impact fee or direct payments by projects such as Walmart. It is one hundred percent Anderson funds.

Board member Hawes: Is there any contemplated mitigation for this project?

Mr. Kiser: There is no need for mitigation. The mitigation is the roundabout instead of a signal. A signal would mean structure work, so work has been minimized at this location with the design.

Board member Jones: What was the reasoning for a roundabout at this location as opposed to traditional lights?

Mr. Kiser: The structure on I-5 that is over Deschutes is not wide enough to fit all the lanes needed for a signal.

Board member Cornick: Would John Bulinski give an update on this project.

John Bulinski, Caltrans District 2 director: Caltrans is supportive of the project and has provided a support letter. This project is the districts highest priority of the third round of funding for CMIA dollars.

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

Discussion:

Board member Dickerson: There is an item the board should take a look at in the future. The RTPA is currently staffed on a part-time basis with county employees. There may be potential benefits in the board looking at some alternatives, such as an independent agency, or requesting that the county look at the possibility of separating the RTPA

activities from the public works department so that the executive director has a certain degree of independence that would allow the executive director more flexibility in moving forward with some of the projects that come before the RTPA. It is requested that this item be put on a future agenda and that staff bring some basic pros and cons of alternatives compared to the way it's being done now.

Board member Cornick: Did the RTPA consider this a few years ago?

Executive director Dan Little: It seems to resurface about every five years. In sixteen years this will be the third time it's come up. The last time was about five years ago.

Chair Moty: Any board member can request to put an item on the agenda, therefore; it is requested by board member Dickerson to put this item on the next agenda and further discussion can be held at that point.

Board member Baugh: It is also requested that the information that was presented five years ago be brought forward for review.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Moty adjourned the meeting at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

/jac