

APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)

Tuesday, October 25, 2005, 4:00 p.m.
John Beaudet Community Senior Center,
1525 Median 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 County Regional Transportation Planning Agency, but rather as a record of meeting time, place and attendance; the order and general nature of discussion; Agency deliberations; and action taken, if any.)

Agency Members Clarke, Connick, Hawes, Goekler, Murray, and Hartman were present. Agency Member Mathena was absent.

1. Call to Order:

Chair Hawes called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

2. Public Comment Period:

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

Consent Calendar

3-1 Minutes of July 26, 2005, RTPA Meeting

3-2 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through October 2006 - Information Only

3-3 Authorize Request for Proposal (RFP) Process for Future Audits

By motion made, seconded and carried, the items on the Consent Calendar were approved.

Regular Calendar

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich introduced Liz Johnson of Wilkins, Underwood & Johnson. Liz is replacing Jim Underwood in representing the RTPA as legal council.

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich advised the Board that there might not be enough business to conduct a meeting in December. If there is no meeting in December, the next meeting would be the Unmet Needs Hearing in February 2006.

4. Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Update

Staff member Dan Little explained that the State has adopted the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Fund Estimate, which enables the 2006 RTIP to be developed. RTIP's are required to be submitted to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) every two years. The State Fund Estimate shows how much money can be programmed or budgeted for projects. The Fund Estimate is showing there is new programming capacity, but will not be available until the fifth year. Some of the projects that are currently programmed will have to be spread out to later years.

Dan continued to say the new money available will be \$10.554 million in the fifth year. CTC guidelines state that funding should be limited for cost overruns on projects. They suggest looking at existing commitments and fund those. Dan noted funding the existing commitments, and covering cost overruns will be the first priority. Other funding sources will be looked at as well to help fund projects.

Board Member Norma Comnick noted that the only project on the list for Anderson was the Ox Yoke/Highway 273 improvements. Anderson will be looking for help on the Riverside/I-5 project.

Dan Little stated that staff hopes to get to a point where they can do a call for new projects, but they are not there yet.

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich noted that there were recent discussions with John Stokes and Rich Barchus about developing a study for the Ox Yoke/Riverside interchange.

5. Southern Region Transportation Planning Study and Impact Fee Program Update

Staff member Dan Little gave a power point presentation and an overview of the study. He explained that the study came at the request of Shasta County to look at the needs of the Cottonwood and South Anderson area. The interchange at Gas Point Road is one of the most congested in the County. In the General Plan there are several planned roads in Cottonwood that do not yet exist. The County has found that it has helped in the past to adopt plan lines for new roads. Dan continued to state that the study is looking at traffic needs and what is going to be needed in the 20-year horizon. Traffic impact fees would be developed to fund the projects.

Staff has been working with Cottonwood residents. There have been four public meetings and four Technical Advisory Committee meetings, as well as meetings of Cottonwood

businesses. Also involved is Shasta County, the City of Anderson, Caltrans, the City of Redding, Cottonwood School and Tehama County.

Dan continued to explain about traffic signals at Gas Point Road, improvements to the Main Street interchange, roundabouts and plan line roads.

Dan ended by noting that there will be at least two more public meetings and a few more meetings with the businesses to better refine the details.

Board member Ken Murray inquired as to where in any of the plans is it being looked at to expand I-5 into three lanes in both directions from the City of Shasta Lake to the County line?

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich noted that there is a meeting scheduled on November 16, 2005, with three city managers and the CAO, to discuss the state highway system. At this point they are looking at some type of a traffic impact fee dedicated to the state highway facilities. Projects on the state highway system are not included in any traffic impact fee programs with the three cities or the County.

Board member Murray noted that Congressman Herger informed him that no one had asked for any money earmarked for I-5 from the Federal Highway Fund. He continued to note that Brian Crane informed him that Caltrans does not like earmarks. Murray concluded that if Caltrans is not going to champion, then the RTPA and each of the cities and the county need to champion with Herger to get our fair share of the earmarks the next go around.

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich stated that the current highway bill that was approved six months ago was discussed about two and a half to three years ago. At that time, it was decided the earmark should go for the top item on the list, which was Stillwater - widening Highway 44 from Airport Road out to Palo Cedro. At that time the Vineyards and Sun City were not on the horizon; Stillwater was the more imminent need.

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich explained that if there were an earmark in the 2011 highway bill, it would not fund 100% of the need. If widening I-5 is a \$200 million project, we may get \$5-\$10 million. The other revenue to bridge that gap would not come from Federal or State government, unless there is some wholesale change in the gas tax or some other

revenue. Generating revenue locally would have to be looked at, be it through a sales tax or a traffic impact fee.

6. Shasta County Travel Demand Forecasting Model Update

Staff member Thomas Hays gave a power point presentation and overview of the model. He noted the project development team included personnel from Shasta County, the City of Anderson, the City of Shasta Lake, the City of Redding, Caltrans and the RTPA. Thomas explained that the model is used for long-range transportation planning, air quality conformity, level of service analysis, roadway system deficiencies, STIP project ranking and special studies. The project is on budget and gets updated every five years.

Board member Goekler requested feedback from other members of the board to have staff look into the possibility of separating the RTPA from the County of Shasta. He explained the reason is to make the RTPA a standalone agency. He believed it would give the Agency a lot more power and affirmation if it had a separate voice from the County.

Discussion was held concerning the RTPA separating from the County, with staff being directed to refresh a previous study and bring it back to the next RTPA meeting with the results.

There being no other business to discuss, Chairman Kight adjourned the meeting at 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Kovacich, Executive Officer

/jac