APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY
Monday, December 19, 2011, 1:30 p.m.
City of Anderson Council Chambers
1887 Howard Street, Anderson, 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 Comnick were present.

1. Call to Order

Chair Moty called the meeting to order at 1:33 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 September 19, 2011, RTPA Meeting

4-2 Minutes of September 26, 2011, RTPA Meeting

4-3 Minutes of October 25, 2011, RTPA Meeting

4-4 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule through December 2012 - Information Only

4-5 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Amendment #11

4-6 Appoint Members to the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC)

4-7 Approve Proposition 84 Sustainable Communities Grant Application (Round Two)

4-8 Correspondence

Board members Hawes, Baugh and Moty abstained from item 4-1.

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

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

4-7 <u>Approve Proposition 84 Sustainable Communities Grant Application (Round Two)</u>

Executive director Little explained that authorization is required to submit a Proposition 84 (Prop 84) grant. Grants are intended to assist regional agencies in implementing Senate Bill 375 (SB 375). By the year 2015, a sustainable communities strategy (SCS) must be incorporated into the regional transportation plan (RTP). Prop 84 funds also help fill other agency needs, such as the development of GIS data for travel demand modeling. Discussion with partner agencies is occurring regarding prospective work tasks. Staff will provide a copy of the grant proposal and update the board on the agency's SCS work plan at the February 2012 RTPA meeting.

<u>Discussion:</u>

Board member Jones: What amount of money are we talking about on this particular grant?

Executive director Little: About $500,000. To date we've been fortunate in that whatever we have requested has been granted.

Board member Jones: This will move us further towards the implementation of sustainable community planning elements. In the staff report it says it's not limited to the climate action plan (CAP) and the general plan amendment. What can you tell folks today that we're going to be spending $500,000 to further implement the CAP in northern California?

Executive director Little: A CAP is an eligible activity, but is not related to this project nor the agency. The RTPA is not proposing to do a CAP or seek funding for one. The CAP is being pursued by the Shasta County Air Quality Management District (AQMD). The AQMD has no jurisdiction to direct the RTPA board on policy,

Board member Jones: If the board does not accept this grant, what will it mean to the RTPA?

Executive director Little: It will mean not being able to implement the agency's SB 375 work plan. Without a compliant RTP, the RTPA and local agencies do not qualify for federal transportation funding. All projects must be in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), and those projects must flow from the RTP.

Board member Jones: What can you say to people that have great fears with the CAP and people's ability to travel the way they want to? Do you think that this is heading us down a path where we're going to see more restrictions stemming from the data that's collected ultimately?

Executive director Little: Nobody knows what future legislation will be, or what will stem from this effort. However, if you look at SB 375 in and of itself, it doesn't require local jurisdictions to do anything. My suggestion would be to stay involved in the process. As the RTPA we try to be as transparent as possible in all of our activities. There will be some committees and various public involvement opportunities. This will be laid out at the February RTPA meeting.

Board member Jones: The sustainable community planning element – how closely related is this to Shasta*FORWARD*>> and the work that was done then?

Executive director Little: Shasta*FORWARD*>> wasn't an implementation document, it was to gather information from the public. The RTPA can or cannot draw information from it for the SCS. However, it does not set forth the plan nor identify high priority development areas. How it is used is up to the RTPA board and staff.

Board member Baugh: The next RTPA meeting is past the application due date. The staff report is vague; it doesn't really say what is being applied for or how the money would be spent. The board is being asked to approve a grant for unknown uses that, in general, comply with the terms of a law that many of us have problems with. Can you (Mr. Little) tell us specifically what is planning to be applied for and what $500,000 will be used for?

Executive director Little: Some of the things are known, some of them are not. Not all meetings with the local jurisdictions have been held. Since RTPA meetings are held infrequently, an alternative would be to have a special meeting to share the grant proposal prior to submittal.

Staff member Wayne: Grant tasks would be consistent with the board's prior approved SCS approach. RTPA staff is working with partner agencies to help identify tasks of value to their local agency and would help further the SCS process.

Executive director Little: There are several steps in the process. The board must accept the grant and subsequent work products to the extent we are even successful. If there is something in the scope of work that the RTPA board doesn't want, they could choose not to pursue that portion of the grant.

Board member Comnick: If we don't apply now, we are out of it for sure.

Board member Watkins: I worry about plans like this and grants because this forces us to take money and to play the game that the feds and the state want us to. I don't have a problem taking their money, I just have a problem taking it and having a plan that eventually ties our hands in the future. We need to play their game, but we don't want to let it commit us to anything in the future that would be detrimental to the surrounding communities.

Staff member Wayne: As local agencies, we have different perspectives and priorities than the state; however, there is some degree of overlap. Our goal is to identify these shared interests and obtain grant funding.

Executive director Little: Grant awards will not be made before the next board meeting. The grant application, or any portion of it, could be withdrawn at the board's request.

Public comment opened by Chair Moty:

Gary Cadd, citizen: From my observations SB 375 is not good legislation. There are those of us in the community that have been studying it, have great problems with it and know what's in it. Transportation is a large portion of it. We need to be focused on what's coming at us and how it's going to come at us.

By motion made and seconded (Dickerson/Comnick), with the understanding that staff will come back at the February RTPA meeting with the final application package; item 4-7 passed with five in favor (Moty, Watkins, Comnick, Dickerson and Hawes) and two opposed (Jones and Baugh).

Regular Calendar

5. Executive Director's Report

Executive director Little explained that federal transportation bills are typically six-year bills that lay out federal programs and policies and how they are to be funded. The current transportation bill expires in March. The senate's version of the new bill, called MAP 21, is a two-year bill. Although funding levels are the same as the current bill, they have not identified how that revenue would be generated.

Ninety programs will be consolidated to 30 in the new bill in order to simplify and streamline funding. A new freight program on major corridors is also proposed; Interstate 5 would be one of these major corridors.

A few days ago, word was received about the Tiger grants. There were two applications in Shasta county – the RTPA assisted Anderson on the Deschutes Project and wrote a letter of support for the Oasis Project. Neither of the applications received an award.

Some Corridor Mobility Improvement Account funding is possible to complete the Deschutes Project. The RTPA is working with the California Transportation Commission staff to make that project whole.

6. Update on Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Shasta County

Executive director Little explained that the evaluation subcommittee for the RTPA executive director discussed the issue of the MOU. This subcommittee will meet until something is resolved; shooting for the February meeting to bring some kind of MOU back to the board.

Discussion:

Chair Moty: The evaluation committee consists of past chair Dickerson, vice-chair Watkins and myself. The committee discussed the memos prepared by the RTPA and Shasta county attorneys and what would be workable and feasible out of the memos. Three items were taken back to Mr. Lees, the county administrative officer. Discussions were held concerning whether these items would work in an MOU. Committee members will meet with Mr. Lees again the first part of January to see if there is an agreeable solution to present to the board.

Board member Dickerson: We're a long way from a resolution. I would like to hear from other board members on what they would like to see in the MOU. What has been presented by the RTPA and Shasta County attorneys does not get the RTPA where it needs to be.

Board member Watkins: I would like to hear direction from the other board members in how to approach one of the key provisions in the MOU – does the RTPA board nominate the RTPA executive director and then the county approves it? Or, does the county nominate the executive director and then the RTPA board approves it? It seems to me that the RTPA board should nominate the executive director and then the county should concur or deny.

Discussion was held concerning the:

- RTPA executive director being nominated and whether they are a county employee at the time or not;
- County nominating the RTPA executive director and the RTPA board giving final approval;
- RTPA board nominating the RTPA executive director and the county giving final approval;
- RTPA executive director having autonomy in RTPA matters from the county; and
- RTPA having a new host agency or going independent.

Public comment opened by Chair Moty:

Gracious Palmer, citizen: I was hoping this board was going to talk about an independent autonomous RTPA, not just about the executive director. All these choices seem to be stepping around the issue that the way to get to the best end result, which to me is an independent Council of Governments. Being independent from the county and not connected to another host agency - an independent, autonomous, RTPA – is the best solution.

Gary Cadd, citizen: I believe an independent RTPA needs to be in our future. The board has been grappling with the problem for some time now and I think it would be wise to move forward to an independent RTPA. There are a number of people in the community that are learning more about this issue and feel the same way that I do.

7. Interstate 5 Redding to Anderson Six Lane Project Value Analysis Report

Executive director Little explained that this project was formerly referred to as the Gap Project. It is to widen Interstate 5 to six lanes from the end of the Cottonwood Hills Truck Climbing Lanes Project (which is the Deschutes Road Interchange) and up to the Smith Road Overcrossing (south of the Churn Creek Interchange). It is ideal to first do a value analysis to look at the scope of the project and design alternatives before programming a project.

Phil Baker, project manager, Caltrans District 2, gave a presentation on the Redding to Anderson Six Lane Project. Mr. Baker explained that the big concept is to ultimately bring six lanes, three in each direction, from Red Bluff to a little beyond the city of Shasta Lake. The Redding to Anderson Six Lane Project is a piece of that bigger concept.

The 'value' in the value analysis report equals the greatest user benefits divided by the cost. The lower the cost of the project, the greater the value becomes. The more benefits you bring the user, the greater your value becomes. The value analysis team recommended widening the highway towards the median and utilizing existing right-of-way and existing median space to accommodate that widening. They recommended not replacing any of the existing structures.

The scope of work is widening Interstate 5 from Deschutes Road to Bonnyview Road. This will yield a continuous 15-mile segment of six-lane freeway. The project cost is $65 million in construction capital, support costs are estimated at $10.5 million. The environmental process will begin in January 2012 with environmental clearance anticipated in December 2012. The start of the design phase, best-case scenario, is January 2013. The best-case scenario for completion of design work would be August 2014. It is unknown exactly when construction will begin; the best-case scenario is April 2015 with about a two-year construction season, with completion in November 2016.

8. Adopt 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) (Public Hearing)

Executive director Little explained that the RTIP is a five-year program of projects through which projects such as the Dana to Downtown, the Cottonwood Hill Truck Climbing Lanes and many local projects have been funded. The plan provides for new funding of $2 to $3 million a year. For the first time, there is a clean slate in the program. The projects that were in the prior program have all their funding needs met. The projects that staff recommends are the Redding to Anderson Six Lane Project and the Deschutes Road Interchange Project. There has been payback discussion with the City of Anderson concerning the Deschutes Project. However, if the Deschutes Project is successful in receiving grants, it won't need the RTIP funds.

Transportation Enhancement (TE) funding is a subset of funds within the RTIP. It is for non-motorized transportation. There is about $600,000 in shares currently. A large project is recommended because it is federal money. It is recommended that these funds be held for a two-year cycle and grow via future shares; then it will be worthwhile to nominate a regional non-motorized project.

Discussion:

Jones: The I-5 Redding to Anderson Six-Lane Project is a high priority and a regional transportation need. I'm having trouble with the Deschutes Road Interchange being regional. I have concerns with the roundabout as well. I believe that if we move in this direction that it sets a precedent that we're moving away from some regional things and doing more local things. I also have some concerns with how Anderson is going to pay back the $3 million.

Dan L: That was also a concern of staff, which is why we developed the payback agreement. Without that, staff would have had trouble recommending it to this board. We think it's good on this project for a few reasons. One is that the amount is relatively small. The $3 million more than likely could be paid back in five to ten years. If it were a similar situation for a project in another jurisdiction where it was a small amount, the project was ready to go, we had no other identified use immediately for the construction dollars, then it would be something staff would recommend to this RTPA board for funding, because we can put the money to use sooner rather than later.

One provision that could be in a memorandum of understanding is that the RTPA hold funds that we distribute to Anderson for streets and roads.

Dickerson: In fact we may be setting a precedent but we're setting a two edged precedent in that the agency who comes forward wanting to do this would also have to have a repayment plan in place to do it. So going out into the future I think it's a positive thing.

Jones: The repayment plan is a zero interest loan to be repaid at no particular time, so it's not a real great plan and I don't see any potential for growth.

Dan L: There is no guaranteed payback within a certain term. However, the RTPA does distribute about $400,000 to the City of Anderson. A portion of that would be held back and we could have repayment in a reasonable time that doesn't bankrupt the City of Anderson.

Jones: The RTIP being a five-year budget to develop and deliver transportation improvements – I can support that. But on this interchange, specifically with regards to the RTIP, that portion of it I cannot support.

Chair Moty opened the public hearing. No one spoke.

By motion made and seconded (Hawes/ Baugh) the staff recommendation passed with six in favor (Moty, Watkins, Comnick, Dickerson, Baugh and Hawes) and one opposed (Jones).

9. Authorize Funds for the Environmental Phase of the Redding to Anderson Six Lane Project

Executive director Little explained that the action requested is to move $340,000 in state funds that the RTPA has been holding for match on the Redding's Diestelhorst Bridge restoration project to Caltrans for environmental review on the Redding to Anderson Six Lane Project. TE funds would then be used to backfill Redding's Diestelhorst Bridge Project.

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

10. Authorize North State Transportation for Economic Development Study Request for Proposals (RFP)

Executive director Little explained that the North State Super Region (NSSR) received a 100% funded grant to look at economics in the north state and how transportation investments can help stimulate the economy. This was an idea developed with the 16 other counties of the NSSR. Shasta county RTPA would serve as the lead agency for this project.

Staff member Wayne explained that the 'North State Transportation for Economic Development Study' is intended to bring funding into the region for increasing system capacity. One of the things that the north state regional agencies do not do well is make a strong business case for why state and federal funding partners should invest in the region – i.e. quantifying their return on the investment. For every dollar that the state and federal government spends, they want to maximize their return in the form of jobs, economic development and growth. This project will build that business case. The secondary objective is to strengthen relationships with the economic development community. The scope of work in the attached RFP is the product of discussion and feedback received from the NSSR and the economic development community.

This project is fully funded. There is no local match. The state and federal shares of the state planning and research funds were combined so the study could be performed.

Discussion:

Jones: You put in the report economic development and sustainability. What's the difference between the two then?

Dan W: They're one and the same. Throwing money where we're not getting any return on, that is not the direction that we prefer to go.

Jones: The $213,000 – is that gas tax or where is that coming from?

Dan L: It would be the federal excise tax from gasoline purchases.

Baugh: You mentioned return on investment. Where do you see this going in the next step?

Dan W: the outcome of this effort will be used when we go to Sacramento to appeal for additional funds or to prepare a grant application. We also gain a coalition of economic development stakeholders and north state regional agencies that supports the same list of projects that we're proposing.

Baugh: So you believe that the regional nature does carry additional weight? Are there some other examples of other agencies coming together and doing this?

Dan W: The North State Super Region, that concept is similar to what you see in the San Joaquin valley and other areas where they combine regions. They've been very successful at doing these types of studies. This not the first type of study of its nature ever done, but it's the first that we've ever done in this area.

By motion made and seconded (Comnick/Dickerson), the staff recommendation passed with six in favor (Moty, Watkins, Comnick, Dickerson, Baugh and Hawes) and one opposed (Jones).

Closed Session

11. Executive Director's Evaluation

Chair Moty recessed the board to a closed session to perform the executive director's evaluation.

Open Session

Chair Moty noted that the executive director's evaluation was performed.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Moty adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

____

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

/jac