# APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
Tuesday, October 22, 2013, 3:00 p.m.
City of Shasta Lake Council Chambers
4488 Red Bluff Avenue, City of Shasta Lake, 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 McArthur, Giacomini, Jones, Moty, Susie Baugh, Watkins and Kehoe were present.

1. **Call to Order**
   Chair Watkins called the meeting to order at 3:00 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 **Minutes – June 25, 2013, SRTA Meeting**

5-2 **Future Meeting Schedule Through October 2014 – Information Only**

5-3 **2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Amendment #6**

5-4 **Final Plan Report for FY 2010/11 Sustainable Communities Planning Grant (Contract Number 3010-538)**

5-5 **Funding Retiree Health Insurance and Accelerating Annual Payments**

5-6 **Correspondence**

5-7 **Review and Approve Disbursements**

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

## Regular Calendar

**6. Executive Director's Report**

Executive Director Dan Little discussed three items: First is that the state of California is consolidating state and federal money for everything non-motorized into the Active Transportation Program. Legislation just recently passed concerning this; however, the state still has to adopt guidelines. The next workshop at the December board meeting will be to discuss non-motorized funding. We'll give you a good picture of what that legislation looks like, and tell you how the regulations are taking shape.

The second item is the SRTA board priorities survey. Some had difficulty with the computer forms. We would like all the board members to respond. I am offering to meet with board members individually and get them completed. (Hard copies of the survey were handed out.)

The third item – I want to congratulate the city of Anderson on the Deschutes Road Roundabout completion. It was a good job by the city of Anderson with Caltrans supporting them.

**7. Adopt New Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Policy and 2013/14 RSTP Budget**

Executive Director Dan Little: A RSTP workshop was presented at the last meeting. However, a budget was not adopted. In researching the method of distribution, it was discovered that current practice is incorrectly based on the urbanized area population. It should have been based on the region's total population. Because of this, the city of Redding received more funds than it otherwise would have over the past 20 years from what would have been Anderson and Shasta Lake shares. We would like to correct this going forward to match the boards stated intention 20 years ago.

Motion was made and seconded (McArthur/Kehoe) to correct the distribution going forward and approve the 2013/14 RSTP budget.

Chair Watkins: There are projects in the cities of Shasta Lake and Anderson that are still waiting to be funded with RSTP. Over the last 20 years, the city of Redding has had the benefit of an extra $2 million. While this is an honest error, I think it could partially be corrected. We ought to go back and look at two to five years and make some restitution. Redding is already budgeted for this year, so I propose we make the correction and leave this year as is. However, next year and the year after, we use restitution so that the cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake are made a little bit whole so they could take on a couple more projects that they've never been able to do.

Board member Baugh: For the city of Redding it's not a large amount of money, however, for the cities of Shasta Lake and Anderson it is a lot. I think we need to look at this; three to five years is a good range.

Board member Jones: Did the adopted policy match the actual distribution method?

Executive Director Dan Little: It was consistent with the policy as written, but we have the resolution from the board 20 years ago that clearly says that the money should be distributed in the same manner in which the state hands it to the region, which is by population. The policy was followed but incorrectly captured the boards stated intent.

Board member Jones: How do other agencies distribute their funds; are we consistent with them?

Executive Director Dan Little: Most distribute funds under a competitive program where the regional board has discretion on how they are used. This board chose to delegate that authority and provide formula distributions to the cities and the county. So it is very unusual in the first place, but those that do formula apportionment tend to do it by population.

Board member Kehoe: I understand that until this meeting the cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake have been comfortable with the allocations.

Chair Watkins: We only became aware of it yesterday. While the county and cities are happy to take what gas tax money they can get, I think that's not the question. The question is, does the practice match our intent and should there be any correction other than just from this point going forward?

Chair Watkins opened meeting to public comment.

Chuck Aukland, Assistant Director, City of Redding Public Works: It's a bit difficult to try and understand what the intent of the board was 20 years ago. The policy on that was adopted; it did say it was supposed to be by population in the urbanized area. So we did follow the adopted policy over this 20-year period. It would be a big hit to the city of Redding to go retroactively at this time. The city only has about $1.1 million a year to work on its roads.

Board member Moty: If the board 20 years ago had a stated intent – in reality the board after that adopted the policy which I think supersedes the stated intent. I'm not inclined to go back and try to undo things from past years; I think we should move forward.

By previous motion made and seconded (McArthur/Kehoe), the staff recommendation passed unanimously.

Executive Director Dan Little: For clarification, the motion was to approve the staff recommendation so it also included adoption of the RSTP budget.

**8. Presentation and Adoption of the integrated Traffic Data Collection and Management Plan for the Shasta County South Central Urban Region**

Executive Director Dan Little: This started a couple of years ago when we were working together with Caltrans. Trucks came through the area and we didn't know where they are going to, coming from, or what they're hauling. We don't know how much traffic coming through the region stops at businesses, or just passes through. We would also like to have real time constant information. We don't know if the peak hours are during the school period or during the commute time. We have a need for better data. Caltrans already collects a lot of this data, but we wanted to look towards a blueprint for what our region-wide architecture would look like, and include traffic sensors and monitoring stations. The reason is that we could get these improvements done as part of projects or through specialized grants for intelligent transportation systems. Most of the projects that are built on the state highway system are SHOPP projects.

Associate Transportation Planner Sean Tiedgen gave a PowerPoint presentation covering:
1. Why there was a study
2. The current state of data collection
3. Data collection needs
4. What data is needed
5. Why data is needed
6. Addressing Regional Transportation Plan goals
7. Recommended alternatives
8. Proposed project costs
9. Project cost summary
10. What we get for the investment
11. Next steps

Board member Giacomini: This plan is primarily focused on the I-5 corridor, nothing east or west. Are we setting ourselves up to not get any projects in those areas? Highway 44 is a major corridor and Highway 89 is a busy corridor.

Executive Director Dan Little: When you look at the big-ticket projects SRTA funds, they tend to be congestion focused. SHOPP projects are based more on safety and maintenance needs. Intelligent transportation systems build a case for congestion relief projects which are needed in the urban area. Rural projects tend to receive SHOPP funds and rely on data already available, such as accidents and pavement condition. More money is actually spent in our rural areas than our urban areas and this will not change.

Board member McArthur: You mentioned interagency information sharing. Are you also including law enforcement since you mentioned license plate readers?

Associate Transportation Planner Sean Tiedgen: At this time we are not. What we're looking at currently is we can improve the flow of traffic within the region. This is primarily coordinated with Caltrans and the local city/county public works and planning staff. During the development of the 2006 ITS Architecture Plan we did meet and discuss various IT needs with Caltrans, city/county staff, local law enforcement, CHP, Shascom, emergency responders and other federal/state agencies. A need was identified then for a future traffic management center that could coordinate local traffic, emergency response and include data from Caltrans' traffic management center, when the population level, congestion and needs warranted. Also, the cities do not currently use loop detectors to gather traffic data.

Executive Director Dan Little: I don't know if there's a legal issue with license plate readers. More likely the main recommendation is the Bluetooth readers. They have a unique identifier, but it doesn't identify specific people, just recognizes the individual signal coming in and going out of the county. License plate readers are more invasive in that they can be traced to a specific vehicle.

Board member McArthur: The staff report says that acceptance of this report does not commit any agency to fund or build the recommended improvements. But potentially that is the goal. It sounds like we'd be looking for grants to fund the approximate $2.9 million.

Executive Director Dan Little: Yes, that is the goal, but it's not required. It would be an optional element as part of a construction project, if we can afford it.

Associate Transportation Planner Sean Tiedgen: Any potential grant project would first come before this board for approval.

Board member Kehoe: Concerning the financing – it was indicated that the source of the funding is from grants, SHOPP and STIP. You indicated that there would be no diversion of money from streets and roads.

Associate Transportation Planner Sean Tiedgen: Correct.

Board member Moty: The time that it would take staff to go through the process for grants; would it offset what we would lose on the other side?

Executive Director Dan Little: There are not three or four intelligent transportation system grant opportunities a year; it's maybe one every two years. Grants are not the most likely funding scenario. The reason it's going to take a while to complete is because it will be project by project.

Executive Director Dan Little: This idea was discussed and developed by the then deputy director. It would make a big difference if we had better data. When I go to Sacramento to talk to people about funding for Interstate 5 they really want to know how much is interregional traffic versus local traffic. To have better data is to have a better argument.

Chair Watkins: Bluetooth technology – most of the younger generations use this. There is a huge array of vehicles out there that are sending their frequency. If you had a Bluetooth on highway 299 out of Burney and your receiver was down in Palo Cedro then you would know how many people were coming and going. The technology is changing fast; it would be cheaper to do Bluetooth than probably any other option available.

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

**9. Accept North State Transportation for Economic Development Study (NSTEDS) Final Report**

Executive Director Dan Little: This came about as a result of the 16 counties representing the North State Super Region. They received a grant to better connect transportation planning and transportation improvements to economic development. The goal was to better bridge the gap between transportation planning and economic development and create some rural standards to justify transportation improvements.

Senior Transportation Planner Dan Wayne: Reported that the study is now complete and that findings and recommendations will be incorporated over time into the agency's plans and programs. This will be used to support grant proposals for project-specific planning and capital transportation grants. The full report is available on the SRTA website. Transportation and economic spatial data and analyses will be made available via the FarNorCalGIS web-portal.

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

**10. Conduct Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Workshop, and Approve RTIP Project Selection Priorities Policy**

Executive Director Dan Little: In this workshop we will be talking about the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the SHOPP. The STIP is derived from a portion of the state excise tax on gasoline, of which approximately $1.5 million comes to the Shasta region each year. Of the SHOPP, $26.2 million has come to the Shasta region annually; however, SRTA doesn't have direct authority over that program. SRTA needs to maintain a good line of communication with Caltrans concerning what Caltrans is proposing every two years for the SHOPP.

Don Anderson, Caltrans District 2 SHOPP Manager gave a PowerPoint presentation covering:

1. What the SHOPP is
2. Where the funding comes from
3. The SHOPP period and cycle
4. Shasta County SHOPP
5. How projects are selected

Executive Director Dan Little: By coordinating the SHOPP with some of our projects in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program we have been able to do a lot of good things. For example, before the South Redding Six Lane Project was built, there was a SHOPP project at the central interchange that complimented it by adding lanes and capacity which went a long ways towards the Six Lane goal for Interstate 5.

Executive Director Dan Little: I'm going to talk more about the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) because that's what this board develops and oversees. I will highlight a couple strategies that I'm contemplating because in December a new RTIP will be adopted.

The funds for the RTIP come through the state through the excise tax on gasoline. The RTIP is a five-year program that is updated every two years. So every two years there is another two years added to the five-year program. The programming capacity averages about $1.5 million annually that comes to the Shasta region. Currently we have been building up those shares, in large part because we've been successful receiving grants for projects through proposition 1B. Therefore, we are attempting to save up enough funds to build a significant project on Interstate 5 which gives us a better chance to leverage funds from the state. This board has done a good job of picking the right projects; staying focused on the bigger picture needs. The shares that we have now are about $14.2 million for the current cycle.

Regarding non-motorized projects – historically we had the Transportation Enhancement fund. These were federal funds for non-motorized uses that went into our fund estimate for the RTIP. With the new program, they took the money out of the RTIP and put it in a state program. This is not a good thing because this board no longer decides what projects are best for the region.

Planning, Programming and Monitoring funds are significant to us because it's one of our sources of year-to-year revenue to fund the agency. This is currently about $180,000 annually.

In terms of existing projects that we have in the RTIP, we have the design for the Redding to Anderson Six Lane Project. This covers the part that is not six lanes now is between the Cottonwood Hills truck climbing lanes and the South Redding six lanes that is between Deschutes and Bonnyview Roads. The environmental is completed for this. The design is programed and work is underway by Caltrans. We might be able to do a smaller component of Interstate 5. There is a stretch from Bonnyview Road down to Riverside Drive with no bridges/major structures, known as the 'big easy'. I'll be working with Caltrans between now and December to see if there's any way to partner to get some funds to construct this stretch. The question is does the board want our shares to accumulate until we can do a bigger project and get funds from the state, or is it better to get the money out on the streets now and do a smaller phase of this project?

The last piece is our Selection Policies and Priorities. We had what we called Project Selection Principles that this board approved. Those principles helped guide the board's decisions to do the kinds of projects that helped us stay ahead of congestion. What I want to do as part of updating all of our policies is take those guiding principles and make them formal policies.

Dave Moore, Caltrans District 2 Deputy Director of Programming and Planning: I work with each of the seven regions in our district to look at the programming of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds. I identify those projects that help to improve mobility across the state. Dave reviewed the Interregional Program; partnering; and non-motorized transportation.

Two segments of Interstate 5 are six lanes, construction is in process on most of Buckhorn on SR 299 to straighten and widen out that highway, and the Deschutes Roundabout was able to be funded. These and other projects were all done through partnerships. I want to thank everyone because we've had a great partnership going and we've made great progress in helping the people of northern California.

As far as the Interregional Program; Caltrans internal guidelines is to spend those funds on the interstate system and the focus routes system. The Redding to Anderson Six Lane Project is District Two's highest priority for ITIP funds

As far as non-motorized – we used to have the Transportation Enhancement Program; that was the non-motorized component of the STIP. Of those funds, 75% went to the regions; 25% went to Caltrans. So we had 25% of that pot, which was about $17 million annually to spend on non-motorized projects. Changes have been made and those funds have been moved out of the STIP. One hundred percent of those dollars are going into the Alternative Transportation Program. Caltrans lost their 25%. Therefore, you will probably see less non-motorized projects generated from Caltrans.

Executive Director Dan Little: I'm looking to the board for formal adoption and ratification of the prior guidance on our priorities for our use of RTIP funds. I'm looking to see if there is any board feedback about the $600,000 of prior shares for non-motorized use. I'm looking for reaffirmation of the commitment to the mainline, at least for the interim for the next cycle to get through the December RTIP adoption. Also, should we pursue a strategy of trying to move now and spend those shares that we're guaranteed, or wait until we have a firm commitment in terms of additional programming dollars from the state?

By motion made and seconded (Moty/McArthur), the staff recommendation regarding the RTIP policies passed unanimously.

Board member Jones: Does Interstate-5 have the main preference (in our RTIP project selection priorities policy)?

Executive Director Dan Little: It doesn't say that directly, however, it leads to regional facilities where we can leverage money. It doesn't tie our hands to that, but it definitely favors regional multi-jurisdiction facilities.

Board member Moty: concerning the money we have now, my suggestion is that we move forward with a smaller and more feasible project that's out there and get those dollars into our community.

Board member McArthur and Kehoe agreed with board member Moty. No one opposed the idea.

Board member Moty: If you can find better use of the $600,000 for a non-motorized project now rather than just sitting there, I'd like to get going on that. Bring us a project to consider.

## Closed Session

**11. Executive Director's Evaluation**
Chair Watkins recessed the board to a closed session to perform the executive director's evaluation.

## Open Session

Report of closed session: completed executive director evaluation.

**12. Consider Amending Executive Director Employment Agreement Regarding Compensation**
Board member Moty: The labor subcommittee previously met and based on increased responsibilities as an independent agency and consistent with staff increases in July, it is recommended that the executive director's contract be amended. I have a question for Dan – in the memo that the labor subcommittee put out it shows that your base pay is $100,526. It would jump to $122,642 – a 22% increase. The $100,000 base pay, does that include your longevity pay now or not yet?

Executive Director Dan Little: At the county I would have received a 20-year longevity increase which just kicked in. So, the $100,000 includes the longevity which is 5%.

Board member Moty: If the $100,000 includes longevity pay already and we do a 22% increase to $122,642 – how do we get to the total new compensation of $135, 212?

Executive Director Dan Little: The $100,000 was a fresh start as a base pay from which we add in the benefits applied to other staff. So it's just a nuance where the board could say that I already got my longevity, or we don't want staff to get even closer to you in terms of compaction/separation pay and so we want to grant the same increases that the other staff received by applying that same 5%.

Board member Moty: In realty the $100,000 would be 5% less for base pay. Which means that to get where we're trying to get to is 27% not 22%.

Executive Director Dan Little: Yes, we were trying to get to the end number. And with that clarification, we would have said instead of 22% it was a 27% increase in the base pay due to new responsibilities. The net result is the same.

Chair Watkins: The subcommittee had talked about giving the raise in steps, but decided to recommend giving a one-time increase that bumps him up to the point where he is not the lowest paid executive director of all the transportation agencies.

Board member McArthur: What is the overall percentage increase?

Board member Moty: It is a 35% increase. The problem is that we as a subcommittee misunderstood the base pay.

Chair Watkins: Had Dan come to us and said his base pay was $95,000 instead of $100,000, I think that the subcommittee would have increased the 22% to a higher percent, because we were trying to get to an end result of $135,000. I don't think knowing that fact changes what we would have recommended at this point.

Board member Moty: Another thing we looked at was that Dan is only 7% above the highest subordinate.

Chair Watkins: When we started looking at this 22% I was looking at what would we have to pay if we wanted to recruit an executive director from another agency or somebody with the skills. And I really think if we were looking to replace him we would be paying this $135,000 or we wouldn't be getting people with the qualifications to apply. That was a driving force in my thinking.

Board member Jones: Now that SRTA is independent from the county, with regards to personnel costs, how does it compare to what it was before? Is it more or less or the same? Is it more expensive independent than it was with the county?

Executive Director Dan Little: No, we paid the county support costs. By us doing these functions and even with the raises we're saving about $55,000.

A motion was made and seconded (Jones/Moty).

Board member Moty: We are getting close to the $55,000; however, we don't have any unfunded liabilities

Executive Director Dan Little: We took a step today on the consent agenda for that by paying for retirement medical insurance ahead of time. And we have a three year operating reserve.

Board member Moty: We need to clarify the base pay.

Executive Director Dan Little: SRTA legal counsel drafted up a suggested employment agreement, which is much simpler than what was done in the memo, but arrives at the same $135,212. It takes the $135,000 and divides it by 12 months to arrive at a monthly pay, and then stipulating the July 1 increases for 2014 and 2015.

Board member Jones: I make a motion for that to be reflected in the motion.

Board member Moty: I think we should put it in the minutes that we had to correct some of the language on the labor subcommittee memo. We are removing reference to longevity pay increases since he already gets that and increasing the raise in base pay by approximately 27%. It still ends up the same number.

Executive Director Dan Little: I will ensure the minutes reflect that.

The motion was voted on and the staff recommendation passed with six in favor (Giacomini, Moty, Baugh, McArthur, Jones and Watkins), and one opposed (Kehoe).

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Watkins adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

/jac