APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY
Tuesday, October 26, 2010, 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 Jones, Watkins, Moty, Hawes, Comnick, and Baugh were present. Board member Dickerson arrived during item #6.

1. Call to Order
Vice-Chair Moty called the meeting to order at 4:07 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 July 27, 2010, RTPA Meeting

4-2 Minutes of September 22, 2010, RTPA Meeting

4-3 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through October 2011 - Information Only

4-4 2010 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Amendment #1

4-5 Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) Transit System Safety Grant

By motion made, seconded, and unanimously carried (Comnick/Jones), the Consent Calendar was approved with Board member Hawes abstaining from item 4-2, and Board member Baugh abstaining from items 4-1 and 4-2.

Regular Calendar

5. Executive Director's Report
Executive Director Dan Little gave an update on the North State Super Region, noting the group recently met in Chico and decided to meet quarterly.

On behalf of several rural counties in California, the RTPA entered a consultant agreement to implement Google Phase II. Caltrans has since negated the contract because they decided to expand the scope of work. The RTPA will no longer be involved in the second phase of the Google project.

The state budget has passed with transportation coming out fairly untouched. Mr. Little explained Propositions 22 and 42, noting that staff will monitor whether these propositions pass and their consequences.

6. Shasta Regional GIS Platform Feasibility Study Final Report & Recommendations and Contract for Regional Parcel/Road Centerline GIS Data

Staff member Dan Wayne explained the actions before the Board today are necessary elements for the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) planning approach adopted by the Board in February 2010.

The ultimate goal of the project is, first, to establish a home for regional GIS data; second, to develop a tool for demonstrating progress in complying with greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that the California Air Resource Board has assigned to the region; and third, to build a regional platform in such a way that the local partner agencies could utilize the platform for a variety of local applications and needs. The Shasta Regional GIS Platform Feasibility Study (Study) has also become an opportunity to create a structure for generating grant revenue.

Jennifer Pollom, consultant, of Vestra Resources, Inc. provided an overview of the Study and its recommendations.

Clint Keller of Vestra Resources, Inc. demonstrated one of the potential applications of the platform via a prototype of the web-based portal. An analysis of vacant and underutilized parcels in locations with a high degree of transportation accessibility was shown.

Jennifer Pollom described the developing partnership with Shasta College to house the regional server and share in the maintenance thereof.

By motion made and seconded (Baugh/Watkins), acceptance of the Shasta Regional GIS Platform Feasibility Study Final Report and Recommendations passed unanimously.

Staff member Dan Wayne explained a grant was received for the development of spatially accurate and merged parcel and road centerline data for the region. This data represents the basic fundamental spatial layer to be used in the Regional GIS Platform; all other data will be tied spatially to these layers. Although region-wide data is desirable, it is recommended that the efforts under this contract focus on the south-central urban region (SCUR). This is the area where the vast majority of development is projected to occur.

Mr. Wayne noted bids were received from qualified local consultants to provide GIS services, and ENPLAN was ranked highest.

Board member Hawes asked why the whole county isn't included. He believes the county has participated in the process. Since this is being done, the whole county should be included.

Executive Director Dan Little noted that data outside the SCUR wasn't essential to the SCS at this time and could be added to the scope of work at a later date if needed.

Board member Baugh noted that he thought it was important to include the whole county. He stated that he hasn't supported the regional blueprint planning process in the past, but now sees benefit in supporting this effort. He emphasized that the RTPA is a 'regional' agency.

Board member Watkins asked if there is anything to be learned by doing the SCUR first, then applying this knowledge when completing the balance of the county.

Todd Burciaga from ENPLAN explained that any lessons learned during Phase I could be applied to Phase II. Both options are doable from a workflow standpoint.

Board member Moty asked if the project would be the same price whether it was done in two pieces or one. Also if time would be lost by breaking the project apart.

Mr. Burciaga answered that it would be the same price, and that only a small amount of time would be lost.

Board member Moty asked Dan Wayne who will benefit from this project.

Mr. Wayne explained that the desired outcomes are tied to the funding source. The best and only funding source for the Regional GIS Platform stems from climate change and SB 375. First and foremost, the focus needs to be on SCS planning and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) target setting and compliance, because that's what the funding is meant to accomplish. However, as a strategy from the very beginning, it was always determined the project would be built in a way that it would allow for an infinite number of other applications and types of data, thereby benefiting all local agencies.

Board member Jones asked who will pay for maintenance and upkeep of the platform down the road when funding runs out.

Mr. Wayne noted that the study recommendations are based in part on the lowest ongoing cost, where funding is less certain. For the first two years maintenance costs will be shared by Shasta College and existing grants. Long term, funding will come from a combination of local agency in-kind staff time, and future anticipated state funding related to SB 375.

Board member Jones asked if there would be any duplication of effort with the City of Redding.

Mr. Wayne answered that there would be no duplication, that regional data is only a compilation of local data with the RTPA filling in data gaps.

By motion made and seconded (Hawes/Baugh), the Board unanimously authorized the Executive Director to complete a contract with ENPLAN, under the condition that the project includes the whole county.

7. Regional Government Forum Discussion and Follow-Up

Executive Director Dan Little noted that by the feedback he's received, the Forum was successful. People felt that the goals of educating the public about the RTPA were met. He is now looking for questions or general feedback from the Board.

Board member Watkins noted that it was a two-hour meeting that will be cut down to a one-hour video presentation, and he wondered what would be kept and what would be cut out.

Mr. Little noted that the video won't be ready until mid-November. Primarily it will be edited by KIXE's personnel, but now would be a good time for Board suggestions.

Board member Watkins recommended that all of Rusty Selix's comments be included.

Board member Moty noted that it was good basic information on the RTPA.

Board member Dickerson stated that the history of RTPAs and MPOs should be kept in.

Citizen Gary Cadd noted that Rusty Selix's comments on regional government were most pertinent to the program, as well as to the people of Shasta county.

8. Presentation of Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) Projects

Chuck Aukland of RABA gave a presentation explaining RABA's capital projects; capital revenues; TDA revenue history; rolling stock; technology upgrades; maintenance/administration facilities; the downtown transfer facility; stops, shelters, and accessibility; 7-year program summary; advertising; and the marketing campaign.

Board member Dickerson asked if RABA's capital improvement program includes more bus stop benches and shelters.

Mr. Aukland responded that it does.

Board member Moty asked if there were any conflicts as a result of moving the Greyhound station to RABA's downtown transfer terminal.

Mr. Aukland answered that there were no issues or operational conflicts.

Closed Session

9. Executive Director's Evaluation

Vice-chairman Moty recessed the Board to a closed session to perform the Executive Director's evaluation. (Board member Baugh did not attend the closed session)

Open Session

Chair Dickerson noted that an evaluation was performed of the Executive Director.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Dickerson adjourned the meeting at 6:03 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

____
Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

/jac