APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)
Tuesday, October 28, 2008, 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 the meeting time, place and attendance; order and general nature of discussion; Agency deliberations; and action taken, if any.)

Agency Members Baugh, Comnick, Hawes, Palmer, Dickerson, Stegall, and Hartman were present.

1. Call to Order
Chair Comnick called the meeting to order at 4:05 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 24, 2008, RTPA Meeting

4-2 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through October 2009 – Information Only

4-3 Feasibility Study: Northern California Internet Transit Trip Planning Services

4-4 Correspondence

By motion made and seconded (Baugh/Hawes) the items on the Consent Calendar were approved.

Regular Calendar

5. Executive Director's Report
Executive Director Dan Little introduced John Bulinski, the new Caltrans District 2 Director; Sandra Rivera, Caltrans District 2 liaison for the RTPA and Native American liaison for District 2; Chuck Aukland, RTPA liaison from the City of Redding. Mr. Little also noted that RTPA staff member Thomas Hays passed his American Institute of Certified Planners exam.

Mr. Little gave a budget update, noting Prop 42 transportation funds were untouched, however, because of a loophole, $700 million was taken from transit. Proposition 1B money for transit, however, is still intact.

There is a Prop 1B program called State-Local Partnership Program. It is not known if any match is required to apply for this program. If so, it is not known if it has to be sales tax dollars or if impact fees are allowable. If so, the South Redding I-5 Project would be a candidate for millions of dollars in these funds. Currently there is only money for the environmental review of this project. No construction dollars have been identified.

The Federal Highway Trust Fund is for the first time in negative numbers. There are a number of reasons why, including the gas tax being a flat tax and lower gasoline sales due to higher gas prices. This means less federal money in Shasta County for state highway maintenance, Caltrans SHOPP program, and bridge rehabilitation.

Mr. Little discussed reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU, noting that there will be a hard look at the federal gas tax, as well as a consolidation of federal programs to make them simpler and easier to navigate.

Mr. Little spoke about Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), what it means to Shasta County, and what steps need to be taken. He noted that SB 375 stems from Assembly Bill 32 that passed two years ago, which addresses climate change and vehicle emissions. Mr. Little went over the timeline (handout) for SB 375 noting that the California Air Resources Board (CARB) will, in consultation with local agencies, set a regional target for Shasta County by September 2010. A Sustainable Community Plan does not have to be completed until the year 2014. SB 375 also has provisions for CEQA relief.

Discussion was held concerning SB 375 in relation to development, land use strategies, and the California Air Resources Board.

Mr. Little ended by explaining the difference between SB 375 and Shasta*FORWARD>>*: SB 375 addresses one component of green house gas emissions - those emitted from on road vehicles and light trucks based on vehicle miles traveled. He also noted that the RTPA has little choice but to comply with the law; and recommended that local agencies speak with a unified voice as we work with CARB in their setting of Shasta County's carbon reduction target. Shasta*FORWARD>>* is not designed or intended to meet the 'Sustainable Communities Strategy' (SCS) referenced in SB 375, but the modeling and methods developed through Shasta*FORWARD>>* can be adapted to SCS requirements.

6. Shasta*FORWARD>>* Regional Blueprint: Community Values & Priorities Assessment Report and FY 08/09 Blueprint Grant Application

Staff member Dan Wayne provided an update on recent activities since June 2008. Dan explained that they compiled all public input concerning the values and priorities portion of Shasta*FORWARD>>* and incorporated them into a final report. There are three core values that were found that almost all public input could fall under: 1) the natural setting, 2) the economy, and 3) mobility. Mr. Wayne noted that community workshops were held last week. Participant feed back validated the findings in the community values and priorities assessment. Participants also had the opportunity to outline possible growth development scenarios for Shasta County, identify measurable outcomes or achievements that they hope to achieve through this process, and provide some actions or strategies that they suggest to get there.

Mr. Wayne stated that all input received during community workshops is being organized for public review, after which the public will help narrow the wide range of possibilities down to the final three scenarios for modeling.

Mr. Wayne reported that a FY 08/09 Regional Blueprint grant application was submitted. The proposed scope of work is designed to augment existing activities in areas where more detailed data and modeling are needed. The Board is asked to approve a resolution authorizing the FY 08/09 Regional Blueprint grant application, and to accept the 'Community Values & Priorities Assessment' report.

By motion made and seconded (Stegall/Palmer), the staff recommendation passed unanimously.

7. <u>Environmental Impact Report for the 2009 Update of the Regional Transportation Plan</u>

Staff member John Strahan explained that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is updated every five years. The last Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for a RTP was prepared in 1995. That EIR does not address greenhouse gasses and is out of date, so a new one needs to be prepared. Through a Request for Proposal process, De Novo Planning Group was chosen to prepare the EIR. The Board is being asked to approve a personal services agreement with De Novo. Mr. Strahan noted that in order to hire De Novo, an amendment needs to be made to the Overall Work Program (OWP); therefore, the Board is also being asked to approve the OWP amendment.

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

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Comnick adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

/jac