

APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)

Tuesday, June 26, 2007, 4:00 p.m.

Shasta County Board of Supervisors Chambers

1450 Court Street, Suite 263, Redding, 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 Connick, Stegall, Dickerson, Goekler, Hawes, and Baugh were present. Agency member Hartman was absent.

1. Call to Order:

Chair Connick called the meeting to order at 4:01 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 April 17, 2007, RTPA Meeting:

4-2 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through June 2008 - Information Only:

4-3 Acceptance of RTPA Triennial Performance Audit:

4-4 Acceptance of RABA Triennial Performance Audit:

4-5 Policy Revisions:

4-6 Adopt Bylaws for the RTPA:

By motion made, seconded and carried, the items on the amended Consent Calendar were approved with Board member Baugh abstaining on item 4-1. Items 4-3 and 4-6 were pulled for discussion.

Discussion was held between Board member Les Baugh and Executive Director Dan Little on item 4-3 concerning RABA not making farebox and the other agencies contributing funds to make up the difference.

Discussion was held between Board member Les Baugh and Executive Director Dan Little on item 4-6 concerning the bylaws and

representation or voting rights, and the Board's overall authority or decision making ability.

By motion made, seconded and carried items 4-3 and 4-6 were approved.

Regular Calendar

5. ShastaFORWARD>> Public Involvement Support Services Agreement

Executive Director Dan Little explained that this was previously called the Regional Blueprint Plan and that a grant from the state was received for this. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was prepared and a consultant secured to gather geographic information system (GIS) data. This is now the final step of consultant involvement, to engage help on the public involvement end.

Staff member Dan Wayne explained that this was the second of two consultant contracts associated with the ShastaFORWARD>> project. The first one was for GIS services; the second is for public involvement services. Dan stated that Moore & Associates was chosen because they effectively demonstrated the skills needed and have an understanding of planning and transportation in general. It was unanimous among all the evaluators of the proposals that Moore & Associates should be recommended.

Discussion was held concerning Moore & Associates being the same consultant that RABA has for their transit study, and \$60,000 for media purchase.

Dan Wayne noted that the Board is being asked to authorize the completion of the Personal Service Agreement with Moore & Associates for the amount listed and to expend contingency funds that are built into the contract, not to exceed \$14,265, for unanticipated additional work or for modified work tasks because of the length of the project and how the project may evolve over the next year and a half. Those can then be addressed without having to do an amendment to the contract.

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

6. Review Draft Phase 1 Traffic Impact Fee Program & Recommend Next Steps by the Fix 5 Partnership:

Executive Director Dan Little explained the Board is presented with a working draft of the nexus report that will drive the first phase of the traffic impact fee (TIF) for Interstate 5. It is a fairly complete product, about

90% finished. Dan gave a brief overview giving the bottom line of where the traffic impact fee program is at and the nexus report, noting that he could give more detail later. Dan explained that the total cost for widening I-5 from Corning to Shasta Lake is around \$700,000,000. A few segments were dropped out of the improvement need to keep the traffic impact fee down to a reasonable level. A look was given to external funding sources that may be available with a goal of the Partnership being able to leverage funds. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) decided on around 50% external funding for the Shasta County stretches and about 55% funding for Tehama County from outside sources. Dan noted that after some segments were taken out and adding in the grant received from Proposition 1B, the remaining need is \$559,000,000. The Shasta County portion of that is \$237,000,000. Half of that is expected to be received through leveraging of funds. Dan noted that Caltrans recently performed an "origin-destination" study. The TAC determined with the help of this study that 60-70% of traffic on I-5 is local. TAC also determined that after looking at cost, external funding sources, and the maximum allowable fee that can be charged in the end, the TIF comes out to almost \$1,800 per household equivalent. A Memorandum of Understanding will be done before the program is adopted. Dan noted that Muni-Financial is going to prepare a cost burden analysis of the fee program. Draft ordinances will be prepared for every jurisdiction and they will be customized in coordination with the counsels of each jurisdiction. Anticipated adoption of the Phase 1 Fee Program will be from mid-August to mid-September. Dan continued to explain that phase one is a rough cut, one-fee-fits-all areas program. It is still legally adequate to get the program started and start leveraging funds. Phase two will be more detailed, it might look at zones of benefit, trip length and get more into truck traffic. Some areas that benefit more from improvements to I-5, such as being close to an interchange or relying on I-5 to move traffic, might pay a slightly higher fee.

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

7. Receive Presentation and Accept Travel Demand Forecasting Model:

Executive Director Dan Little explained that at the last RTPA meeting there was a presentation to the Board on the Travel Demand Forecast Model with growth projections in housing and employment. The Board had questions as to how the forecast information was brought about, what process was used, etc. Thomas Hays with Mike Aronson from Dowling & Associates will answer those questions with another presentation today.

Staff member Thomas Hays explained that the process was developed with the RTPA partners - the agencies and the county. A systematic process was used for translating land use and transportation supply into projections of future travel demand. Collaboration was the key to the process with staff such as Doug DeMallie the Planning Director for the City of Redding, Carla Thompson from the City of Shasta Lake, John Stokes from the City of Anderson, Scott White from Caltrans, and GIS expert Jim Coats from the City of Redding. There was consultant support from Dowling Associates, Strategic Economics, Omni-Means, Willdan, Pacific Municipal, Economic Science Corp, Redding Economic Development, Department of Finance, as well as the planning departments and traffic engineers from each jurisdiction. Thomas continued to note that every major road is now in the model and contains their related capacity and other attributes needed for regional modeling. The model improvements were recapped, they include: select link and zone analysis, a level of service calculator based on volume to capacity, and traceable assumptions. Thomas concluded by noting that SMUG will meet biannually to review the model and determine if there are any problems, updates needed, etc.

Mike Aronson of Dowling Associates highlighted the future development process noting that they have a very good inventory of every known development, as well as overall population and employment growth trends. Mike explained the tops-down bottom-up approach to the forecast process.

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

8. Amendment #5 to the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) (Public Hearing):

Staff member Thomas Hays noted that it is the close of the fiscal year, there are a lot of new programs starting to develop, and the RTPA is being advised of additional funding for the region. SAFETY-LU requirements, High Risk Rural Road funds, STIP augmentation funds, the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account, and the Highway Safety Improvement Program are some of the sources of additional funding that were amended into the FTIP.

Chair Connick opened the floor for a public hearing with no one wishing to speak.

By motion made and seconded (Baugh/Stegall), with Board member Hawes abstaining on South Bonnyview, the staff recommendation passed unanimously.

9. Adopt the Shasta County Coordinated Human Transportation Plan (Public Hearing):

Executive Director Dan Little explained this is a plan that staff member Sue Crowe, the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) and the Social Services Technical Advisory Council (SSTAC) have worked on. This is a federally required plan to continue receiving federal transit funds. The recommendations in the report are advisory, not mandatory, but they are possible solutions for efficiencies that would be attempted to be coordinated and implemented in the future.

Staff member Sue Crowe explained the Coordinated Human Transportation Plan (CHTP) is a plan to consolidate funding and transportation services for primarily the elderly, disabled, people with disabilities and persons of lower incomes in our region. The document replaces the old Social Services Transportation Plan.

Chair Cornnick opened the floor for a public hearing.

Kimberly Fancher with the Highway 44 Safety Project and the 299 East and West Collaborative asked if they were working with the medical centers in the rural areas for transportation.

Sue Crowe answered that they sent out a questionnaire to a lot of agencies and they will continue to pursue that. Right now it consists of mostly social service agencies, human transportation providers, and church groups; but the medical community is also a big part of it.

By motion made, seconded and unanimously carried, the staff recommendation passed unanimously.

10. Caltrans 299/44/36/395 Focus Route Corridor Management Plan Presentation:

Executive Director Dan Little explained that the Corridor Management Plan (CMP) includes all of Highway 299 to the coast and Highway 44 to Reno. The plan is important because it will be used for future funding.

Scott White of Caltrans District 2 explained the purpose of the CMP is about positioning for future funding opportunities. This process was initiated in response to Proposition 1B. A CMP is required to be developed for any route on which the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funds would be expended.

Laura Rose of Caltrans District 2 spoke on the details of the plan. She explained that the corridor components consist of State Route 299, Highway 44, Routes 36 and 395. The purpose of the CMP is to evaluate mobility based on the

function of the corridor overall. The plan's intent is to identify deficient areas within the corridor. The idea is to develop a unified concept to manage, operate, improve and preserve the corridor in all modes, in all jurisdictions within the north state. The next steps with the plan are to have working sessions with staff of partner agencies along the corridor. A distribution of a draft is anticipated for August. The document will then be presented to the Trinity, Shasta and Lassen RTPA's for concurrence in approximately September or October.

By motion made and seconded the staff recommendation passed unanimously.

11. Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) Transit Plan Update:

Executive Director Dan Little noted that this item is recommended to be continued to the October meeting because the plan has not been reviewed by RABA as was expected.

By motion made and seconded the staff recommendation passed unanimously.

12. Executive Officer Report:

Executive Director Dan Little noted that he had met with Caltrans Districts 1 & 2 directors and three RTPA directors from Humboldt, Trinity and Shasta Counties concerning Buckhorn Summit. They were hoping through proposition 1B there would be some money for Buckhorn Summit, but that did not come to fruition. They held a discussion concerning a strategy that Caltrans developed to chip away at improvements to Buckhorn. There is money available through the SHOPP safety program where they can do some improvements. The concept of a partnership was discussed in terms of lobbying to get earmarks. Dan did not commit any funds since the needs in the urban area are too high to commit any funding to Buckhorn.

Discussion was held concerning the Bay Bridge tour which four Board members participated in. Dan noted that the bridge project manager, Gary Purcell, has invited them back in a year or year and a half when they are doing the cables on the suspension portion of the bridge.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Connick adjourned the meeting at 5:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, Executive Director

DSL/jac