

APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)
Tuesday, December 11, 2001 4:00 p.m.
Board of Supervisors' Chambers, Courthouse
1500 Court Street, 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 Clarke, Connick, Hawes, Kight, McGeorge, Wilson, and Alternate Agency Member Duryee were present. Agency Member Reno was absent. Representatives of the RTPA, Shasta County staff, Caltrans, City of Redding, City of Anderson, City of Shasta Lake, and RABA were present.

1. Call to Order:

Chair Connick called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Chair Connick presented Vi Klaseen with a resolution from the RTPA thanking and commending her for her hard work and dedication towards transportation planning over the years. Ms. Klaseen thanked the Agency.

2. Public Comment Period:

There were no requests to speak during the public comment period.

Consent Calendar

3-1 Minutes of October 23, 2001, RTPA Meeting

3-2 RTPA Meeting Schedule Through October 2002

3-3 RTPA Fiscal & Compliance Audits and Independent Auditor's Management Letter for Year Ended June 30, 2000

3-4 Advised the Agency of Letter of Support for Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) Planning Grant

By motion made, seconded and carried, the items on the Consent Calendar were approved.

Regular Calendar

4. Update on Trial Transit Services - Information Only

Executive Officer Kovacich reported that at the October RTPA meeting staff did not have financial information concerning the farebox ratio for the new/expanded transit services in

the Intermountain, Cottonwood and Airport Road areas. Staff now has the financial data and it is as follows:

| Ridership Time Period | Airport Road Express | Cottonwood Express | Intermountain Express |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Week of November 5 | 21 | 26 | 103 |
| Week of November 12 | 25 | 26 | 99 |
| Week of November 19 (Thanksgiving Holiday) | 14 | 25 | 41 |

| Route | Current Farebox Ratio | Required Farebox Ratio |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cottonwood Express | 2.9% | 10% |
| Intermountain Express | 4.8% | 10% |
| Airport Road Express | 1.3% | 20% |

Staff has ridden all of the routes and spoken with the riders. The the passengers seem to enjoy the service. However, the farebox ratio for the first 19 days of the service is not positive. Staff will continue to monitor the routes and update the Agency at regular meetings.

5. Accept Final Draft of Transportation Concept Report (TCR) for the Shasta County Portion of State Route 89 and Authorize Executive Officer to Sign the Final Document- Consider Action

Executive Officer Kovacich reported that at the last RTPA meeting staff from Caltrans gave a presentation on the Draft TCR for State Route 89. The report is expected to be finalized in January. Caltrans' staff has requested that the Agency authorize the Executive Officer to sign the final report. There have been no changes to the report concerning the portion of State Route 89 in Shasta County since the October meeting when it was presented to the Agency. Kathy Grah from Caltrans was available to answer any Agency Member questions on the matter. There were no questions.

By motion made and seconded (Clarke/Hawes) the Agency unanimously voted to accept the report and authorize the Executive Officer to sign the final version.

6. Consider Transit Productivity Report- Consider Action

Executive Officer Kovacich stated that the Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires RTPAs to work with the transit provider to improve transit productivity, monitor key factors and to prepare a report with any suggested improvements. During the past year RABA's fixed route productivity has remained status quo. An increase in passengers and service hours was noted for the demand response services.

Agency Member Duryee noted that the RTPA will need to address the fact that \$150,000 from the Department of Social Services is being used to implement the new/expanded transit services. The RTPA may have to reconsider the farebox issue in the future.

By motion made and seconded (Hawes/McGeorge) the transit productivity report was accepted by unanimous vote.

7. Consider Approving Resolution in Support of Proposition 42 - Consider Action

Executive Officer Kovacich reported he was approached by proponents of Proposition 42 to endorse the proposition to be included in the March 2002 General Election. The proposition will make available the existing sales tax on gasoline be used to fund street, road, highway and public transit improvements. It will ensure that the sales tax motorists pay at the gas pump will be used for transportation projects. The proposition will not increase the sales tax, but dedicate the sales tax to transportation issues. The estimated amount of revenue to Shasta County after 2008 over 20 years will be approximately \$92 million. The money will be apportioned as follows:

| | |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Shasta County | \$68 million |
| City of Redding | \$20.7 million |
| City of Anderson | \$2.2 million |
| City of Shasta Lake | \$2.3 million |

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

8. Approve Project Priority List for Rural Transit System Grant Program - Consider Action

Executive Officer Kovacich reported that in recent years the California legislature has recognized under funded transportation needs; both for infrastructure and for operating and maintenance purposes. As a result the state enacted the Traffic Congestion Relief Program which is making over \$5 billion available for transportation purposes over the next several years. Unfortunately, little if none of this windfall is earmarked for rural transit needs. Recognizing this gap the legislature has authorized the Rural Transit System Grant Program (RTSGP). This program makes available \$18M on a one-time basis statewide and earmarks it to be used in non-urban areas.

The guidelines for implementing this legislation specify that each California county will be "entitled", or "guaranteed" an amount that equals their pro-rata share of the non-urban California population. As a result of this provision, Shasta County applicants are virtually guaranteed \$276,401. Additionally, there may be a competitive cycle of grants as well. This competitive cycle will occur if counties do not apply for their guaranteed entitlement. This may occur because the requirements for eligibility are that 1) the applicant not have claimed any TDA funds in 2001/02 for Streets and Roads purposes, and, 2) the applicant must be in a non-urban area.

Only Anderson (non-urban and zero Streets and Roads) and Shasta Senior Nutrition Program (serving the non-urban area and zero Streets and Roads) are eligible within Shasta County. The cities of Shasta Lake and Redding are urban. These two cities and the County of Shasta have all claimed TDA funds for Streets and Roads.

The City of Anderson owes Streets & Roads money to the RTPA. This year's claim for Anderson will go to fund past costs.

The applications have been ranked and the results are as follows:

| Cycle | Agency | RTSGP Request | Project |
|-------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Guaranteed | SSNP | \$97,625 | Replace two buses |
| Guaranteed | City of Anderson | \$163,270 | Replace Bus on Route 9 |
| Competitive | SSNP | \$132,157 | Replace three vans |
| Competitive | City of Anderson | \$163,270 | Replace another Route 9 bus |
| Competitive | City of Anderson | \$42,225 | Replace a demand response bus |

Executive Officer Kovacich asked that the Agency recognize the hard work of staff member Thomas Hays. Originally, Shasta County was guaranteed only \$70,000 from this grant. Mr. Hays researched census data and discovered that Shasta County was actually due \$280,000 in guaranteed RTSGP funding. After reviewing the issue with Caltrans, it was decided that Shasta County will be guaranteed \$270,000.

By motion made and seconded (Clarke/Hawes) the Agency voted unanimously to:

1. Approve a revised annual Transportation Development Act (TDA) claim for the City of Anderson, and;
2. Authorize the Executive Officer to sign letters of support to Shasta Senior Nutrition and the City of Anderson's applications for funding.
3. Consider approving Resolution No. 01-11 designating the regional priority to be assigned to each RTSGP application.

Scott Morgan, City Manager for the City of Anderson thanked the Agency for its support and praised the efforts of RTPA staff for the hard work and dedication they gave to this

project. He stated the entire region will benefit from their efforts.

9. Conduct Public Hearing and Adopt 2001 Social Service Transportation Action Plan Update - Consider Action

Executive Officer Kovacich explained that TDA requires the Social Service Transportation Action Plan Update be revised every two years. During the last two years, Shasta Senior Nutrition Programs, the CTSA for Shasta County, has made a continuous effort to combine purchasing and maintenance to reduce the overall costs to the social service transportation providers in the area. An updated report has been prepared and it is recommended the Agency accept it.

Chair Connick opened the public hearing. There being no one who wished to speak either for or against the item, Chair Connick closed the public hearing.

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

10. Conduct Public Hearing and Adopt 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Shasta County - Consider Action

Executive Officer Kovacich reported that the 2001 RTP has been a two year process involving staff and local agencies. The public was not very responsive during the process, although all 19 RTP working group meetings were noticed in the local newspaper, agendas were sent to several individuals who had initially expressed interest in the issue, and meetings posted on the Internet via the RTPA website. Mr. Kovacich apologized for not having the draft plan included in the meeting packets. Agency comments have been received, but they were minor in nature.

Agency Member McGeorge suggested that staff mail agendas to all of the senior programs in the area to help get more interest in the process in the future. Executive Officer Kovacich stated that staff will work with Shasta Senior Nutrition Programs to get more people involved.

Chair Connick opened the public hearing. Vi Klaseen stated that although agendas were posted on the Internet, many individuals do not have access to it. She further urged the Agency to consider putting priority on transit projects as there are many people in the community who depend on public transit to get around.

There being no one else who wished to speak for or against the item, Chair Connick closed the public hearing.

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

11. Conduct Public Hearing and Adopt 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

for Shasta County - Consider Action

Executive Officer Kovacich reported that the RTP is the plan to guide transportation projects over the next 20 years. The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is the similar in that it is the annual budget to fund the plan. The RTIP includes the projects that were brought before the Agency at the October meeting with the exception of the City of Redding replacing the Parkview Bridge project with a grade separation project and a project to further study the downtown mall project.

Shasta County will have \$31 million in resources, but will program \$40 million out of this RTIP. The state allows for advanced funds from "out years" subject to availability. RTPA staff will ask for \$9.5 million in advance funds to the pay for the projects listed in the RTIP. Staff believes it can keep all projects in the program going. However, there will be no capacity to fund new projects until 2008.

Agency Member Clarke agreed with the aggressive approach staff is taking towards programming projects.

Chair Connick opened the public hearing. There being no one who wished to speak either for or against the item, Chair Connick closed the public hearing.

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

Agency Member Duryee suggested that in the future RTPA meetings be held not only at the Shasta County Board of Supervisors' Chambers, but at the City Halls in the area to try and gain more public interest.

Executive Officer Kovacich announced that the February RTPA meeting will be held at the City of Redding Council Chambers. This meeting will include the annual unmet transit needs hearing.

12. Adjourn:

There being no further business to discuss, Chair Connick adjourned the meeting at 4:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Kovacich, Executive Officer

RTPA Meeting Minutes
December 11, 2001
Page 7

/jmg