

APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)

Tuesday, April 17, 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 Comnick, Stegall, Dickerson, Goekler, Hawes, Hartman and Cibula were present. Agency Member Baugh was absent.

1. **Call to Order:**

Chair Comnick called the meeting to order at 4:00 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 December 12, 2006, RTPA Meeting and
Minutes of February 27, 2007, RTPA Meeting**

4-2 **Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through April 2008 -
Information Only**

4-3 **Accept TDA Fiscal and Compliance Audits for Year Ended June
30, 2006**

4-4 **Approve 2005/06 Transportation Development Act (TDA) True-
Up Instructions and Amended Claims**

4-5 **Adopt Legislative Platform**

4-6 **Approve ShastaFORWARD>>: GIS Services Agreement and Public
Involvement RFP**

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

Regular Calendar

5. Approve Unmet Transit Needs - 2007/08 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Allocation Instructions, Claims Budget and Unmet Transit Needs Findings

Staff member Sue Crowe explained that this was the 2007/2008 Transportation Development Act allocation and the final step in the annual unmet needs process. Sue noted that this year the comments received were not for services but were operational.

At this time the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) recommendation was presented by Sharon Howard, Chair, who reviewed the findings of the SSTAC. Sharon noted that SSTAC is aware that RABA has contracted with a company that is exploring a variety of methods to improve the public transportation system in our county. SSTAC is very impressed with the degree of study performed and the recommendations made so far. The SSTAC committee feels that current growth will soon exceed the capacity of our system of public transportation. SSTAC supports the recommendations of the SCRTPA. The SSTAC committee reports that there are no unmet needs at this time. Sharon noted however, that there are unmet needs, there are people in our rural communities who have unmet needs, there are people on the weekends who have unmet needs, there are people at night time who are working that need transportation who have unmet needs. Sharon continued to state that this is maybe not the best time to discuss those particular needs. This is not to say that there is not room for improvement in the transportation policy for Shasta County residents. Sharon ended by stating that developing a plan for all these needs will require a broad range of strategies, analysis and funding planning, with participation of the entire community in the process.

Sue Crowe noted that the recommendation is that there are no unmet needs that are reasonable to meet at this time. The RABA transit study is being looked at to see how it is going to come out, if there will be route modifications and what information the consultant gives. Sue continued to note that this year there is \$11 million to distribute for transportation in our area through the Transportation Development Act. For public transit \$6.9 million will be used with the remaining to go for "other uses".

Sue Crowe advised that this is the second year that RABA has not made farebox. The RTPA board dropped the farebox requirement to 15% for 2005/06. RABA fell just short of making the farebox requirement by \$20,450. Because of the joint powers agreement the agencies will be asked to

voluntarily subsidize this difference. This will be deducted from their funds for "other uses". Sue concluded that in June the RABA consultant will be coming to discuss some of his findings and at that time discussions will be held concerning options for compliance.

Agency member Cibula asked if there was a decrease in ridership or an increase in services.

Sue answered that there has been an overall decrease in ridership on the fixed route service, an increase on RABA Demand Response, and Shasta Senior Nutrition Programs (SSNP) picked up about 400 more passengers this year.

Executive Officer Dan Little explained the change in the spreadsheet is because they were trying to accommodate a request from the City of Anderson. There was an Anderson-only looped route established over a year ago. At the time there was a misunderstanding or miscommunication because that route resulted in extra service hours for the City of Anderson to pay for, so now they are operating on a deficit. Scott Morgan, City of Anderson City Manager, has a request in to RABA to go back to the old amount of service hours. Scott Morgan asked that it be budgeted accordingly, hoping that within six months into the fiscal year it will go back to something like the old hours. The claims were adjusted accordingly which allows Anderson to not be budgeted at a deficit. This is for budget purposes, how it really comes out will be taken care of as true-ups are done every year.

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

6. Approve 2007/08 Overall Work Program (OWP) (Public Hearing)

Staff member Sue Crowe explained that the OWP is the planning operating budget and defines the tasks that the RTPA will accomplish in the future year. The budget has been approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and Caltrans. Sue continued to explain that this year there will be a budget of over \$1.8 million programmed from a number of different funding sources. This is largely attributed to the Blueprint Scenario Planning and the Fix 5 Partnership. The federal funding coming in for planning is similar to previous years at about \$1/2 million and about \$100,000 from the Federal Transit Administration. Sue continued to note that this year's special funding for the OWP is focused on regional growth strategies such as ShastaFORWARD>> (the Blueprint project), Fix 5, and the Ox-Yoke/Riverside Interchange and Traffic Impact Fees Study. There are also several special projects within the

jurisdictions. The City of Redding has a traffic signal timing analysis, Shasta Lake has a traffic sign reflectivity analysis, RABA will be performing an analysis of their transit study review and there are several non-motorized projects within Anderson and Redding.

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

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

7. Amendment #4 to the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) (Public Hearing)

Staff member Thomas Hays explained that this item comes up every meeting. The FTIP was adopted in August 2006; this is the fourth amendment in four meetings. The reason for this amendment is that SAFETEA-LU has created a fourth year of FTIP programming. It is necessary to bring in the projects that were considered informational in year 09/10 in the original FTIP. The amendment is needed because of the new regulations and the need for a fourth year of programming in order to become compliant. A public hearing was requested on this matter in order to adopt the resolution. The projects are to install a collector distributor lane at SR44, to improve the Lakehead roadside rest area, and a State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) lump sum project - which is a summation of a lot of projects.

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

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

8. Accept Travel Demand Model Forecast and Receive Caltrans I-5 Forecast Presentation

Executive Officer Dan Little explained that Thomas has been working for a couple of years on the Travel Demand Forecast Model. Projections come from the Traffic Model for Interstate 5 in connection with the Fix 5 Partnership. The traffic model is used for all of the studies; as it is updated it will give the official projections to go forward with not just the I-5 study, but with several projects as well as private consultant use.

Staff member Thomas Hays reported that one of the OWP tasks is now completed after more than a two year effort. The Shasta County Travel Demand Forecasting Model has been around since 1995. It is usually updated every five years. This update was created by census 2000 data. An item was

brought to the Board in 2004 for a contract in January 2005 with Dowling and Associates. Thomas continued to note that the model is very useful in transportation planning for a number of things, such as the Caltrans Transportation Concept Report. It is also a needed tool to demonstrate air quality conformity determinations. It will be a very useful tool in assessing different land use scenarios and its affect on transportation trips for the ShastaFORWARD>> (Blueprint). It will be backbone information to determine the future Level of Service on all the links for the Fix 5 Partnership. It is also currently being used on the Traffic Impact Fee Program for the corridor study at Riverside. Thomas continued to explain that the model was developed by representatives from all jurisdictions, Caltrans and developers called the Shasta Model Users Group (SMUG). Some new functions were built into this model's version. It can determine Level of Service and generate Traffic Analysis Zone reports. Thomas explained four graphs that were developed with information from the model. The attachment includes Shasta County road improvements, residential projection, Shasta County employment projection, and Shasta County Development Assumptions that were identified during the buildup of the model.

Discussion was held concerning where the data came from that was put into the model for projections. The Agency members want to feel comfortable with the basis of the model before approving.

Executive Officer Dan Little suggested that at the upcoming June RTPA meeting staff could provide more detail about the model, go into more detail about the planning department involvements from the various jurisdictions and how some of the economic analysis was done through sub-consultants.

Thomas noted that he would like to send the Agency the documentation that will have key items he will reference at the June meeting.

Kathy Grah of Caltrans District 2 gave a presentation on the Transportation Concept Report (TCR). Kathy explained that her current assignment is to study I-5. She takes data from the Shasta County Traffic Model in doing this. Kathy explained that she estimates where land use is going to be, tries to figure out where things are going to go and makes estimates. Models always start with using historical basis for traffic projections. In Shasta County there are locations that are rated by Level of Service, which is a way to rate highways and freeways. Level A is a pretty easy route, easy to maneuver, not a lot of issues, and there are not a lot of cars around. Level F, by her projections, is where Shasta County will be if things are

not taken care of. Kathy explained that in 2005 most people were driving the speed limit. However, in 15 years it will drop about 15 miles per hour, maneuverability will be less and people will be stuck in some traffic. In 2030, from the traffic projections, people will be at a very low speed - this in relation to the growth that could happen in the area. Kathy continued to explain that currently from Knighton Road to South Bonnyview the capacity being used is at 68% with 32% left over. This is level of service C. In 2015 there is only 9% available at level of service E. In 2030 capacity being used is at 114%. No more vehicles can fit on the road. Kathy concluded in stating that the draft Transportation Concept Report will be ready in June for review.

It was decided to table the Travel Demand Model Forecast, to be presented again at the June meeting.

9. Receive Caltrans Presentation - 2007 Construction Projects

Executive Officer Dan Little explained that this presentation has been done annually and was done exactly one year ago. It proves to be interesting to the Agency to see the different projects. Dan introduced Phil Baker and Chris Harvey from Caltrans District 2 who did the presentation on 35 projects. Chris noted that they currently have right around \$49.9 million in construction now and that number will go up this summer. Shasta County is getting a real benefit from a lot of Caltrans safety projects. Chris noted that if any of the Agency members have any questions, they can contact himself or Phil Baker anytime.

10. Executive Officer Report

Executive Officer Dan Little updated the Agency on the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) that the Agency adopted at the last meeting. Statewide there were more projects proposed than what there was financial capacity for, but Shasta County's projects made it. It was thought that the RTPA would have to pay for the project development costs for the Cottonwood Hills Truck Climbing Lane project, but to Caltrans and Brian Crane's credit, they got the costs covered through the state's interregional share. The RTPA did get the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account grant for the Cottonwood Hills project.

Dan updated the Agency on the Fix 5 Partnership noting that a presentation on it was given to the Shasta County Board of Supervisors that morning. The Board gave the green light to go forward with the partnership and present information about the Traffic Impact Fee at the next Board

meeting. The same round of presentations are going to be given at all the jurisdictions.

Dan noted that there were a couple of letters in the Agency member's packet that needed to get out quickly that Dan wrote concerning the State Local Partnership Program.

Dan informed the Agency that he and Dean Goekler, the RTPA CALCOG representative, went to a CALCOG regional issues forum.

Dean Goekler stated that he learned a great deal at the CALCOG meeting. He noted that there were some interesting topics discussed about greenhouse gas emissions and tying things for propositions 1A through 1E to those things. Dean continued to note that it was very informative and that he learned a lot. It cemented his thought process and his goal as he noticed that the larger metropolitan areas that have Councils of Governments are already in line for funding and are aggressively seeking it. Shasta County has to be very guarded and very watchful that it does not get overlooked. Dean ended by saying that he is very pleased that Shasta County has representation and is not being left out of the loop.

Norma Connick noted that she serves as the Sacramento valley representative for the League of California Cities on a committee known as Communication, Transportation and Public Works.

Executive Officer Dan Little noted that Item #11 is a continuation of the meeting for the Bay Bridge tour.

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Connick continued the meeting to the Bay Bridge tour on May 24, 2007, leaving from 1855 Placer Street at 8:00 a.m. and returning at approximately 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Little, Executive Officer

DSL/jac