APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)
Tuesday, April 27, 2010, 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 Dickerson, Jones, Watkins, Baugh, Comnick, and Hawes were present. Board member Moty was absent.

1. Call to Order
Chair Dickerson called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

2. Staff Introductions

3. Public Comment Period
No one wished to speak during the Public Comment Period.

Consent Calendar

4-1 Minutes of February 23, 2010, RTPA Meeting

4-2 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through April 2011 - Information Only

4-3 Approve Unmet Transit Needs – 2010/11 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Unmet Needs Findings, Allocation Instructions, and Claims Budget

4-4 Approve 2008/09 Revised (True-Up) Transportation Development Act (TDA) Allocation and Claims

4-5 Amendment #20 to the 2008 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)

4-6 Rural Statewide Google Transit Implementation Project

4-7 Amendment #3 to the 2009/10 Overall Work Program (OWP) Shasta*FORWARD>>* Implementation Efforts

4-8 Correspondence

By motion made, seconded, and unanimously carried (Comnick/Hawes), the Consent Calendar was approved.

Regular Calendar

5. Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Dan Little noted that the gas tax swap has passed the legislature and will be effective July 1. The sales tax on gasoline will be eliminated and replaced with an excise tax per gallon that will generate a similar amount of funds. It creates a stable source of funding with a dedicated amount going to debt service on past transportation bonds.

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) - the Board approved a $560,000 funding request for final design work for the South Redding Six Lane Project to widen Interstate 5. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) supports the request.

The Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) – the RTPA applied for supplemental funds hoping to get construction funding for the South Redding Six Lane Project. There should be a decision by the CTC in May.

Proposition 84 is divided into several grant programs administered by the Governor's Strategic Growth Council. Guidelines for the Sustainable Communities Grant Program were recently adopted. Eligible activities include general plan updates, zoning ordinances, and similar activities needed to be compliant with Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375 (SB 375).

Federal Housing & Urban Development Department (HUD) grants will also be available toward sustainable communities planning and incentive programs. $100 million is available nationwide; about $10 million is expected to be awarded in California.

Prior action was taken by the Board to program funding for a second round of Stimulus funds; however, the second round was not approved by Congress, so the programming must be removed.

There was an extension of the reauthorization, which appropriates federal funds through December of 2010. This allows time for the full six-year reauthorization that Congress is working on.

There will be a second round of the TIGER grant. It will be less money than last time; about $600 million nationwide. The South Redding Six Lane application will be submitted again.

The RTPA's South Redding Six Lane Project was nominated for an earmark. Congressman Herger's office informed the RTPA that the Republican members of Congress have since disavowed earmarks completely and taken them off the table.

The north state RTPAs are working on forming a coalition of all counties north of SACOG (Sacramento) and the MTC (Bay Area) regions in order to have a stronger voice in obtaining transportation funds in the north state and influencing transportation policy. A formal item may be brought to the Board in July.

Board member Les Baugh inquired about the several different sources for possible funding for the infrastructure of the South Redding Six Lane Project.

Executive Director Dan Little noted that the potential federal funding sources have dried up, but he is very hopeful about the CMIA funding. He is optimistic and gives a better than 50% chance of receiving funding. It will be known around May 20, at the regular CTC meeting.

Board member Jones asked why the Shasta County RTPA's TIGER I request for the South Redding Six Lane Project was denied, and if it is known what they're looking for in TIGER II.

Executive Director Dan Little answered that the process completely lacked transparency; US DOT did not share any scoring results. The projects that were approved, however, all had a strong ports and goods movement emphasis. Of the five projects picked in California, all but one were port or goods related. With regard to TIGER II, the draft guidelines are almost identical to the prior TIGER guidelines. The sense is that TIGER II is meant to approve some other projects that were designed but not approved in the first round. A continued emphasis on port and goods movement is expected.

Board member Greg Watkins inquired about the gas tax becoming an excise tax and how it's based.

Executive Director Dan Little explained that it will change annually and it will be indexed to be similar to what the sales tax on gas would be.

6. Regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions Target Setting Workshop & Sustainable Communities Strategy Informational Meeting

Executive Director Dan Little explained that SB 375 requires the RTPA to look at how coordinated transportation and land use policies and investments by local and regional agencies might reduce overall vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by cars and light trucks in the region. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) will be setting an emissions reduction target for each MPO region. The RTPA must develop and incorporate a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for meeting said target when the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is updated in 2015.

CARB representative Kurt Karperos provided a presentation on the regional target setting process. Mr. Karperos noted that there are three elements in California's transportation sector GHG reduction strategy: improved vehicle technology (e.g. more fuel efficient vehicles), reduced carbon intensity of vehicle fuel, and more transportation efficient land use patterns. SCS plans focus on the latter.

An SCS outlines the general locations and land uses within the region, identifies the housing needs across economic segments within the region, and integrates the region's transportation network with land use patterns.

If the SCS is not able to meet the target that CARB sets, the legislation allows for an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS). This is an opportunity for the community to daylight what it would take to get to the CARB target. The APS could be used to daylight and possibly leverage additional funding or other resources from the state.

Under SB 375, compliance is not based on penalties but rather benefits, including relief from CEQA/climate change impact analysis and improved competitiveness for discretionary state funding.

A Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) was organized to advise CARB on the factors and methodologies to be considered during the target setting process. The committee consists of local city council members, board of supervisors, representatives from metropolitan planning organizations, a developer, and an environmental representative.

CARB is required to release draft targets at the end of June and will hold workshops throughout the state to gather feedback. Final targets will be available in August in preparation for CARB Board consideration at their late September meeting.

CARB is looking for progressive targets, but is also mindful that there needs to be flexibility in meeting the targets consistent with the diversity of California regions.

Board member Les Baugh asked if in each area are there multiple targets to be established. Mr. Karperos noted that there are region-wide targets for 2020 and 2035. Board member Les Baugh asked, since our goal is to set emission reduction targets, is it broken down by type of emission or is it an overall target. Mr. Karperos confirmed that there is one overall target and that reduction targets will be measured by percentage reduction per capita. Board member Baugh asked how CARB will deal with outside influences, such as Sacramento's air blowing into Shasta County. Mr. Karperos answered that Shasta will not be responsible for reducing greenhouse gas emissions that don't originate in their region. The target CARB sets is related to the transportation that occurs within Shasta County. Board member Baugh asked about emissions being counted from local forest fires. Mr. Karperos answered that the targets are for passenger vehicles within the region only. Board member Baugh asked how CARB balances efforts between the north state, which is relatively clean, and areas like Los Angeles. Mr. Karperos said that CARB targets will reflect and support each individual region's abilities and sustainability plans. Board member Baugh asked how moving forward at such an aggressive pace is justified given the present economy. Mr. Karperos answered that Shasta County needs to help CARB understand what is appropriate for the region – what is reasonable and how people want the region to grow. It is a benefit to the economy to have more efficient regional and local planning.

Board member Watkins noted that there are areas in Shasta County that are retirement areas where quality of life does not equate to high density. Mr. Karperos responded that a SCS, whether it's in Shasta County or Sacramento, is going to have some large lots, some detached smaller lots closer to town, and some attached housing lots. It's that spectrum of choices that provides the quality of life. Board member Watkins asked if scientists gave a 94% assurance that GHG has nothing to do with climate change, would anything change in this process? Mr. Karperos answered that the opportunities presented by SB 375 to facilitate more sustainable communities are worthy of the effort due to other financial, air quality, and congestion relief benefits, regardless of climate change.

Chair Dickerson noted that CARB has established that light trucks and vehicles are responsible for 25% of GHG. CARB has also indicated that there are three ways to attack that 25% - through high-tech vehicles, improvements in gas technology, and MPO's coming up with coordinated transportation-land use plans. Mr. Dickerson asked that if the first two technologies result in 25% reduction, do the MPO's have to come up with zero? Mr. Karperos answered that all three are needed to meet GHG goals. Chair Dickerson noted that since there are no non-compliance penalties involved, then why does this have to be done? Mr. Karperos answered that state law mandates that California reduce GHG emissions and that MPO regions must also add an SCS plan for reducing GHG emissions to the RTP. Following through with that plan is incentive-based. Chair Dickerson added that Shasta County, before there was a SB 375, had been working on a sustainable community approach. The threat of a state law is not necessary to make Shasta County plan well for the community.

RTPA staff member Dan Wayne followed Mr. Karperos with a presentation on the RTPA's SB 375 response. Mr. Wayne believes that CARB will bolster regions that seek to create a genuine plan and make some type of honest effort to move in that direction. The burden and opportunity is on local agencies to really define how they wish to respond. That includes what specific growth pattern makes sense in this region and what specific strategies might simultaneously help achieve the CARB target while also helping local agencies achieve their own specific goals and priorities.

There are several advantages that the region has in meeting SB 375 mandates. First, extensive public outreach and an adopted regional growth vision are already accomplished through the regional blueprint process. Second, the RTP update and SCS element isn't due until 2015. Because other regions must complete their process prior to Shasta County, the RTPA may observe and learn from them. Third, the RTPA Board approved a plan that will yield a beta-version SCS as early as 2011. This will give local agencies the opportunity to test and revise as needed before the SCS is formalized in the RTP in 2015.

The RTPA will provide formal presentations and request specific input from local agencies during the SCS development process.

7. <u>Adopt the 2010/11 Overall Work Program (OWP) (Public Hearing)</u>

Executive Director Dan Little explained that the OWP is the RTPA's annual budget and must meet state and federal standards as a requirement of the region receiving funds.

RTPA staff member Sue Crowe explained the OWP is a budget of projects, such as developing the RTP and funding for SB 375. Close to $900,000 is passed through to the jurisdictions for administrative and planning purposes. This year's OWP has $2.2 million budgeted.

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

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

8. Status Report: 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Executive Director Dan Little explained that this item is informational and the Board will be receiving a draft copy of the RTP and EIR within the week.

RTPA staff member John Strahan explained that the RTP is required by state and federal laws. It is a long-range, 20-year planning document intended to identify transportation issues, needs, and funding. In areas that meet federal air quality standards, such as Shasta County, the RTP must be updated every five years.

Projects must be listed in the RTP to be eligible for state or federal funding. Therefore, the RTPA has worked closely with Caltrans, RABA, the County, and the three cities to update all project lists. Over the next 20 years, $1.5 billion is identified in capital transportation needs. Funding is projected for $326 million, or one-fifth of the needs.

A 45-day public review and comment period will be held for both the draft RTP and draft EIR. The documents will be available for review at public libraries, the RTPA office, and on the RTPA web site. It is planned to bring the final documents to the Board for approval at the July meeting.

9. Caltrans Update on Shasta County Projects

Chris Harvey, from Caltrans District 2, presented seven of the major projects that will be in construction this year. They are: 1) Dana to Downtown; 2) Cottonwood Hills Truck Climbing Lanes; 3) South Redding Six Lane; 4) I-5 and 44 Direct Connector; 5) Antlers Bridge Project; 6) Manzanita Curve Improvement and Truck Lane; and 7) Turntable Bay.

Board member Watkins suggested that Caltrans make improvements to the Pine Grove exit interchange before they do the Shasta Dam Blvd. exit into Shasta Lake.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Dickerson adjourned the meeting at 5:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

____

Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

DSL/jac