APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
Tuesday, June 26, 2012, 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 Regional Transportation 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, Watkins and Comnick were present. Board member Hawes was absent.

1. **Call to Order**
Chair Moty called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

3. **Staff Introductions**

4. **Public Comment Period**
There was no one who wished to speak during the public comment period.

Consent Calendar

5-1 **Future Meeting Schedule Through June 2013 – Information Only**

5-2 **Approve Agency Insurance**

5-3 **Approve Amendment #1 to Personal Services Agreement for Activity-Based Model and Approve New On-Call Services Maintenance Agreement with DKS Associates**

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

Regular Calendar

6. **Executive Director's Report**
Executive Director Little reported that the SRTA has hired Dave Wallace as the new Senior Accountant.

The Federal Reauthorization for Transportation Act one-thousand day extension expires this Friday. There will either be another extension or a brand new act.

7. **Adopt the 2013 Shasta County Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) (Public Hearing)**

Executive Director Little explained that the FTIP is a four-year program of projects that receive federal funding. It contains most of Shasta County's transportation and transit projects. It is required to be updated every two years.

Staff member Jan Bulinski noted that the 2013 FTIP has been prepared in conformance with federal regulations for consideration by the board. It underwent public review as required. Transit and road projects must be included in the FTIP to qualify for federal funding. Prior to October 1, the SRTA will submit the approved final draft to Caltrans. After which, the Federal Highway Administration will give the final approval in December.

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

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

8. **Approve State Grant Contract for Proposition 84 Sustainable Communities Planning & Incentive Program**

Executive Director Little explained that this grant was previously brought before the board with a request to submit the application, but didn't include the full scope of work. The full scope of work was then brought back to the board for review.

Staff member Dan Wayne explained the SRTA was successful in getting the full amount of the grant proposal; it is anticipated that the funds will be available in August. The scope of work is divided up into tasks that are directly or indirectly related to implementation or development of the Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) pursuant to SB 375. Several additional tasks were also included on behalf of the City of Redding and the City of Shasta Lake; the products of which will support SCS development and/or implementation.

There are 36 months to complete the grant from the time the grant contract is executed.

Public comment opened by Chair Moty:

Charles Alexander, citizen: Some of us have at least some rudimentary awareness of Prop 84 guidelines as it pertains to water and integrated water management and how a lot of those guidelines seem to have little connection with water management. Are we facing the same situation here with the transportation grant where we might have to accept conditions that have only a very lightly spurious connection with the subject matter of the grant or are the conditions pretty well centered on the subject matter of the grant?

Staff member Dan Wayne: There are no specific requirements to receive the funds other than fulfilling the scope of work we have proposed.

Public comment closed:

Discussion:
Board member Jones: The trails are referred to as recreational opportunities, but then are referred to also as day to day transportation purposes. Is the goal for day to day transportation or recreation?

Staff member Dan Wayne: In working with stakeholders and previous outreach associated with other projects, one of the community desires that was identified was an opportunity to integrate the regions recreational trail system with the transportation network. There is a small amount of funds in this grant to take a look at the three cities on a regional basis and determine if there are some simple easy connections between, for example, the Sacramento River Trail and downtown Redding and other locations. If those connections are fulfilled, then someone could use the recreational trail system as a transportation corridor as well.

By motion made and seconded (Comnick/ Dickerson) the staff recommendation passed with four in favor (Moty, Watkins, Comnick, Dickerson) and two opposed (Jones, Baugh).

9. Approve 2012/13 Unmet Transit Needs Findings, Allocation Instructions and Claims Budget

Executive Director Little explained that this is the final step in the process that was started at the RABA/RTPA workshop in March, which included the unmet transit needs hearing. By statute there is also a Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) recommendation. The SSTAC recommendation is that the current level of transit service is the level that is reasonable to meet. This is consistent with the staff recommendation. The SSTAC also recommends as part of RABA's short-range plan that RABA look at expanding hours of service and consider fare increases. Also, for the county to consider, or study, a service extension to the Fall River Mills/McArthur area, and an additional mid-day Burney run.

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) budget is included in this process. Those funds are the shares that the four jurisdictions pay to fully fund RABA.

Normally a true-up is done for the prior year. This year, in order to streamline things, the true-up has been included as a line item in the budget for next year.

RABA is not meeting the farebox ratio requirement. It is recommended that the farebox penalty be delayed until the end of the year when a true-up is done and actual costs are known.

Discussion:
Board member Jones: A few members on the RABA board are frustrated with the lack of efficiency; not reaching the farebox ratio. What ability does the SRTA board have to force a change when the farebox ratio really has no teeth? I'm wondering if there is anything the SRTA board can do to stress to the RABA board that there needs to be a better job done with funds; that there needs to be a more efficient system and maybe scrutinize the system to a heavier level than it is today.

Executive Director Little: This board could find that the current level of service is not reasonable to meet and that the service needs to be scaled back. Then it's a complicated question of where do you cut the service? I wouldn't recommend doing this hastily without working with RABA to find out what that reduced service would look like and whether it would even meet the required farebox ratio that the SRTA board sets.

Board member Moty: Are you aware of any transportation agencies in the state that are meeting the 19% farebox ratio? Are we just in the ballpark or are we out of line? Is there anything comparable to Shasta County?

Executive Director Little: For each short-range transit plan update that RABA does every three or four years, they do a comparison to other systems and RABA is in line with similar agencies. The last one I recall reading is that it was in the middle or a little below the middle. There will be updated information as part of the new short-range transit plan that will be presented to the SRTA board in six to nine months.

Board member Dickerson: RABA's failure to achieve whatever the farebox ratio is, is not based on lack of efficiency within operations. It's based on the pure fact that not enough people want to ride the bus. We've had any number of studies done on how to increase ridership. We've done just about everything that anybody can think of to try to increase ridership. The fact of the matter is that the only people that use RABA are the people that have to. People that have their own transportation use their own transportation. In a semi-suburban situation like we have here in Shasta county, you're just not going to get enough people on the busses to not have to subsidize them.

Board member Baugh: I agree with Mr. Dickerson. It becomes a delicate balance between the highest and best use of available dollars. Do we continue to subsidize at quite high levels and help those who need transportation, which is our mandate; or do we reduce some of those routes and provide more money to the greater numbers who use the public road system? We should consider the appropriate balance. I would like to see each of the entities have additional money to repair roads and sustain the greater number of people that use the road system. Not to remove RABA, but to reexamine. There are probably many routes that are not performing well that bring the averages down.

Chair Moty: I disagree with the word inefficient; it's just costly. It's costly because of where we live and the amount of area we have to cover. We owe it to the people who need transportation and we don't want to say that they don't count.

Motion was made to approve staff recommendation with the stipulation to delay any action relative to the farebox ratio true-up until the end of the year.

By motion made and seconded (Dickerson/Comnick) the amended staff recommendation passed with five in favor (Moty, Watkins, Comnick, Dickerson, Baugh) and one opposed (Jones).

10. <u>Caltrans Update on Shasta County Projects</u>

Caltrans Project Managers, Phil Baker and Chris Harvey, reviewed the status of several high profile Caltrans projects: The Interstate 5/44 Interchange Project; South Redding Six Lane Project; Redding to Anderson Six Lane Project; Antlers Bridge Replacement; Buckhorn Corridor; and the Deschutes Project.

11. <u>Executive Director Employment Agreement</u>

Executive Director Dan Little explained that in May the board approved the human resources policies and procedures for staff. The final piece of that is to have an employment agreement with the SRTA executive director. The agreement was drafted by counsel John Kenny. The goal was to keep it simple and consistent with the human resources policies and procedures as much as possible. Some of the key provisions in it are: 1) term of contract is six years; 2) salary is the same with the exception of a 20-year longevity increase of 5%, which would have otherwise applied as a county employee; 3) severance provision of four-month's severance pay; 4) flexible spending on the medical plan (cafeteria plan).

<u>Discussion:</u>
Board member Jones: How different is this than it was with the county?

Executive Director Little: I was not a contract employee with the county so there was no agreement; therefore, there were no term and severance issues. I was not considered executive management with the county. There is a stipend increase and a deferred compensation benefit that is dependent on employee's participation. There is a match provision; however, it is diminished because SRTA is not participating in social security. We are contributing to a deferred compensation fund in lieu of social security.

Board member Baugh: As far as the flexible spending on the medical plan – the court system allows $125 per month as an incentive to not use insurance that you don't really need. That has proven to be enough incentive to cause the court system to save money and employees to have additional money. The 75% rate would be exceptional in my mind, my concern would be that whatever we approve here we know is going to become the subject of negotiations for the entire balance of the staff of the agency. I think 75% is above and beyond.

Board member Dickerson: That is 75% of whatever the agency would pay into Mr. Little's health care anyway. So what the agency is actually doing is saving 25% of whatever that figure is. The 75% is not above what he would be getting otherwise.

Board member Watkins: A lot of times an employee is covered with a spouses insurance. I think that we need to have something that balances enough incentive that a person will turn down their medical if they can get health care elsewhere, and at the same time that the agency receives some sort of benefit for it. If you're saying 75% is not the right number, you need to come up with a second number.

Board member Moty: I've just found out, as Mr. Baugh did today, there is actually already a precedent in place and that is at the courts where they have a deal with their employees where it is $125 that goes into an account if you choose to be on your spouse's insurance. I have to agree with Mr. Baugh that the precedents been set and that's the area which I would now support. This reverses my position from before because I found out there is already something in place being used in our area.

Board member Watkins: The self-only health care for a SRTA employee, isn't that about $550 a month? How much is the agency paying for self only?

Executive Director Little: If it's for the employee only, it depends on how the employee enrolls. In my case, if I enrolled only myself, the agency would pay 100% of that under the personnel policy, that's $559. If I enrolled my whole family it would come at a cost to the agency of $843. That's under current premiums.

Board member Watkins: I was not aware of the courts $125 before this meeting today. That seems fairly low and I would think that a lot of people would continue to take the $559 coverage rather than take the $125 and have to pay tax on that. You're not saving much, and I think that it might not be enough incentive for a person to drop the second coverage. It seems that perhaps given that precedent that maybe the 50% rate which would be about $230 might be an appropriate amount for this board to consider.

By motion made and seconded (Dickerson/Watkins) the staff recommendation failed with two in favor (Dickerson, Watkins) and four opposed (Comnick, Moty, Baugh, Jones).

Board member Watkins suggested that they vote on 50% instead of 75%.

By motion made and seconded (Watkins/Dickerson) the amended staff recommendation failed with three in favor and three opposed.

Board member Jones suggested that for now they accept the agreement without the flexible spending item being included in the agreement and bring the item back at a future meeting.

By motion made and seconded (Jones/Baugh) the amended staff recommendation passed unanimously.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Moty adjourned the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

/jac