

APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY

Tuesday, October 25, 2011, 4:00 p.m.

John Beaudet Community 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 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, Watkins and Cornick were present.

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

4-1 Minutes of June 28, 2011, RTPA Meeting

4-2 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule through October 2012 - Information Only

4-3 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Delegation Process

4-4 2010 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Amendment #10

4-5 2011/12 Overall Work Program (OWP) Amendment #1 Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) Transit Plan Update

4-6 2011/12 Overall Work Program (OWP) Amendment #2 and Authorize Request For Proposal For an Integrated Traffic Data Collection and Management Plan

4-7 Over-Distribution of Transportation Development Act (TDA) Funds to the Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA)

4-8 Correspondence

Chair Moty pulled item 4-7 from the consent calendar at the request of board member Baugh.

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

4-7 Over-Distribution of Transportation Development Act (TDA) Funds to the Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) *At the September 26, 2011, board meeting, board member Baugh requested an agenda item for an explanation of an overpayment of funds to RABA.*

Board member Baugh: Concerning the \$750,000 overpayment to RABA; the staff report says "due to a new claim format." Could you explain what that new claim format is?

Executive director Little: Staff is in a constant endeavour to make the claims more transparent. The format/spreadsheets are frequently updated and revised. One of the cells in the new format had an incorrect formula, resulting in a \$750,000 overpayment to RABA.

Board member Baugh: The staff report also says that the over/under distribution of funds is typical. Is \$750,000 considered typical?

Executive director Little: A formula error is not typical, an overpayment to RABA is. RABA's funding is based on a budget that includes other grant funds. The \$750,000 is an annual operating grant from the Federal Transit Administration that is normally received in June or July. Last year's funds were not received until October. Underpayments to RABA are not typical because RABA has the priority for TDA funds so it can continue to operate.

Board member Baugh: It wasn't the amount that concerned me as much as the lack of notification to the board about a payment of that size. What concerned me was the continued payment to RABA. Two-hundred and some thousand dollars were released in August. That would take on the appearance of being a loan. Does staff have the authority to make that decision without board approval?

Executive director Little: Grant funds can be delayed and RABA has to operate; at times there is not enough time to go to the board. If there is a substantial shortfall and RABA has a cash flow problem then the RTPA board would need to approve amended claims, as done in the past. When the annual true-up (budget to actual revenue and expenses) is prepared, that is the mechanism for board approval.

Board member Baugh: The lack of notification to the board?

Executive director Little: The board can be notified in the future on something like that. It wasn't felt that this occasion rose to the board's level because eventually the board would become aware of it through the claims and true-up process, and approve it in that respect.

By motion made, seconded and unanimously carried (Baugh/Hawes), item 4-7 was approved.

Regular Calendar

5. Update Light to the Shasta County Travel Demand Model

Executive director Little explained that the board previously directed staff to carry out an 'update light,' a near-term update to the Shasta County Travel Demand Model (TDM), not to be confused with the new 'activity-based model' which will be completed in about 18 months.

Staff member Sean Tiedgen discussed that the current TDM model was released in 2008 with a 2005 base year. Economic conditions have changed drastically since this time. The update is needed for the model to remain useful for planning and traffic impact studies. State and federal guidelines also require an up-to-date TDM for use in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) process. Without a valid TDM the RTP will not be compliant. The updated model uses 2010 census data. Growth rates are based on the most recent data and vetted through local agencies through the Shasta Model Users Group (SMUG).

Board members asked questions concerning the price of gas, growth trends, changes in the community and development phasing assumptions.

Staff member Sean Tiedgen answered that the future activity-based model would have the ability to analyze the impact of the price of gas on changes in travel behavior, but not the 'update light'.

Mr. Tiedgen added that the TDM is only as good as the information put into it. RTPA staff works with staff from all the local agencies to get the most accurate information regarding current and proposed projects likely to be built. The development assumptions are one of several inputs into the model, including growth assumptions and expected transportation infrastructure projects. The phasing assumptions represent the anticipated year each project will be completed.

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

6. Request Reinstatement of Full-Time Planning Position from Shasta County

Executive director Little explained that this item is in response to the August county action to reduce RTPA staff. The way staffing arrangements are made under the current

bylaws, there's no authority for the RTPA board to directly restore the staff. That decision can only be made by the Shasta County Board of Supervisors (BOS) or the director of public works. It is fitting that the RTPA board weigh-in on the issue.

With reduced staffing, the RTPA must concentrate on core functions to the detriment of grant funded projects. Without a full planning staff, a new OWP with a down-scoped work plan will need to be brought to the board.

The RTPA gets enough planning grants that it no longer relies on TDA funds. For every dollar of RTPA staff time there is a dollar of discretionary grants to help pay for it. What that means is \$300,000 is now available to the cities and the county for streets and roads, or to RABA for transit.

Staff is recommending that the board request reinstatement of up to two planners to the RTPA to maintain RTPA efforts and grant successes. Alternatively, one planner could be returned to the RTPA.

Board member Jones asked questions concerning budgeting for two positions; future RTPA growth; workload; and staff cuts.

Executive director Little answered that the OWP budget was approved for two assistant and two senior planners, based on the agency's core functions and grant-funded obligations. Based on current laws, trends and voter approved propositions, the grant efforts and the basic core functions will continue to increase. As far as staff cuts – the county saw it as two full-time equivalents being removed, but professional planning staff were disproportionately reduced.

Board member Baugh asked questions concerning a consistent, continued need for RTPA staff; available funds in the future; and the requested position being dedicated entirely to the RTPA.

Executive director Little answered that there is a consistent need for staff. There is a large and growing budget reserve. Under the BOS reorganization, the position would be dedicated 100% RTPA activities.

Board member Jones asked questions concerning the request for two versus one position.

Executive director Little answered that two is preferred. If they compromise and the RTPA gets one and the county gets one, then they both end up short – the RTPA more so than the county.

Board member Moty asked questions concerning full-time RTPA planners prior to the August BOS change. Mr. Little's June report stated that only five FTE's were dedicated to RTPA functions.

Executive director Little answered that this was a cursory calculation based on a budgeted amount of 2,000 hours a year. This was a mistake because in actuality each FTE works 1,700 to 1,800 hours. Also, the prior fiscal year numbers were not available in June, but they are now and are significantly higher.

Public works director Minturn gave a background explanation of the number of planner positions in public works involving the RTPA and the plans and programs division. There are still five full-time permanent planning positions. The BOS did not eliminate any positions. Mr. Minturn gave an explanation of how much money is involved in environmental documents, engineering and right-of-way; including the percentage of federal funds. Public works needs these planners in order to carry out this work.

Gary Cadd, citizen, stated that the RTPA should be a separate agency from Shasta County and the RTPA board needs to move forward and get this taken care of.

Board member Dickerson made a motion that the RTPA make a request to the BOS to have two planners returned to the RTPA.

Board member Jones seconded the motion.

Discussion was held concerning the motion, including the information that if two planners are moved from public works to the RTPA, that would leave public works with no planners at all.

By motion made and seconded (Dickerson/Jones), an amended recommendation was made to request that the BOS return one planner to the RTPA. Motion passed with six in favor (Moty, Watkins, Baugh, Cornick, Jones and Dickerson) and one opposed (Hawes).

7. Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Shasta County

Executive director Little summarized discussion held at the last board meeting concerning the RTPA's authority over staff. The RTPA board directed staff to consult with county counsel regarding an MOU on the topic. Questions/talking points were posed by the RTPA's legal counsel to county counsel to determine under what conditions the county would agree to such an MOU. County counsel responded that the county would be unwilling to cede control of county staff to the RTPA board. They would possibly allow RTPA board input regarding staff. If the county is not willing to relinquish control, the RTPA could be hosted by another agency with proper indemnity and reimbursement clauses.

Discussion was held clarifying the direction the RTPA board gave at the last meeting; the county's response to the RTPA legal counsels correspondence in regard to "talking points" for the MOU; the RTPA board appointing their executive director; the city of Anderson or city of Shasta Lake becoming a host agency; the RTPA board having more say over RTPA staffing; and pursuing an MOU.

By motion made and seconded (Hawes/Comnick), a recommendation that the RTPA continue working out an MOU with the county passed unanimously.

8. Amendment and Administrative Modification Procedures for the 2010 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) (Public Hearing)

Executive director Little explained that this item is an amendment to the FTIP. It amends the guidelines concerning administrative amendments. It reflects new state and federal procedures.

Chair Moty opened the public hearing. No one spoke.

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

9. Potential Program of Projects for 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

Executive director Little explained that before the RTIP is adopted staff brings a list of potential projects to be included in the RTIP before the board. The RTIP is a five-year program of projects; it is the main source for capacity increasing projects. The state gives an estimate to regions on available funding capacity. There is a minimum share of \$8 million dollars available for programming to the region over the next five years. There could be as much as \$23 million, but that is unlikely given the statewide backlog of needs. Programming is not a guarantee of actual funding, but it's a good indication. The suggested projects are the I-5 Gap Project and the Deschutes Road Interchange and Roundabout.

Discussion was held concerning the I-5 Gap Project; the Deschutes Interchange and Roundabout Project; other potential projects such as Oasis Road and I-5 near Highways 44 and 299; and the RTPA assisting agencies in grant applications.

10. Caltrans State Route 36 Transportation Concept Report (TCR)

Laura Rose, Caltrans District 2, explained that the State Route 36 (SR 36) TCR is a long-range plan that runs 250 miles through six counties - from Humboldt County to Lassen County. SR 36 runs just under 12 miles through Shasta County. Concurrence with the SR 36 TCR does not commit the RTPA to anything, but will help attract funding as it becomes available.

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

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Moty adjourned the meeting at 6:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

/jac