

## APPROVED MINUTES

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (MPO)

Tuesday, December 14, 2004, 4:00 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 meeting time, place and attendance; the order and general nature of discussion; Agency deliberations; and action taken, if any.)

Agency Members Comnick, Clarke, Mathena, Goekler and Hawes were present. Agency Member Kight and Wilson were absent.

1. Call to Order:

Vice Chair Hawes called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m.

2. Public Comment Period:

There was no one who wished to speak during the Public Comment Period.

### Consent Calendar

3-1 Minutes of October 21, 2003, RTPA Meeting

3-2 Future RTPA Meeting Schedule Through December 2004 - Information Only

3-3 Appoint New Members to the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) - Consider Approval

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

### Regular Calendar

4. Authorize Executive Director to Complete a Personal Services Agreement (PSA) to Prepare a Southern Region Planning Study and Traffic Impact Fee Program

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich explained the Board authorized RTPA staff to distribute a RFP to conduct a planning study in the South County area. Dan explained that the objective of the study has three deliverables. A proposed plan line for a new road from West Cottonwood north towards Anderson to intersect with West Anderson Drive, then go over towards Rhonda Road and maybe

eventually tie in with some interchange improvements on I-5. Secondly, the consultants would suggest ways to address current and future traffic conditions, specifically at First Street, Gas Point Road and Rhonda Road, including improvements to the Gas Point Road interchange. Finally, a proposed traffic impact fee would be turned over to the County and maybe to the City of Anderson for adoption.

Dan noted that four proposals were received, with Omni Means submitting the lowest bid. Omni Means bid was approximately \$70,000 less than the next bid, which totaled approximately \$140,000. Dan recommended the Board to enter into agreement with Omni Means for an amount not to exceed \$104,964.

Public comment was made by Mort August, Vice President and Area Manager for Willdan. Mort stated that when the numbers were taken, Willdan came out with 83 points and Omni Means with 81 points. Willdan's fee rates are also commensurate with the other firms. Mort continued to state that for a \$100,000 effort and a \$170,00 effort they would be talking about two different levels of service. Mort noted that a \$100,000 contract is not the same project three other firms proposed on, and that it would only be fair to put it back out to a RFP with clarifications on the level and scope of service wanted.

Board member Hawes asked Mort if the original RFP did not specify the qualifications being looked for in the project.

Mort answered that the RFP was very broad and spoke of activities in general, not being detailed in its tasks. Willdan proposed on what they thought the Agency would want, if it is not then they would like the opportunity to submit a different proposal or enter into negotiations with staff on reducing their fee.

Board member Mathena asked Dan Kovacich if Omni came in low because they have done work in that area before.

Dan answered that possibly Omni Means will use some of the work effort they have done on some of their other projects in the area, which could affect their start up costs that the other consultants would still have.

Mort August noted that on Willdan's team, besides himself, their project engineer is a former Caltrans/County employee; their traffic people have studied this particular interchange before and their modeling consultant is the RTPA's modeling consultant that was just awarded the new update remodel.

Board member Clarke asked Dan Kovacich to clarify what Mort meant in reference to different projects.

Dan explained that Omni Means is currently under contract to prepare an EIR for Cottonwood Hills Estates, has prepared a plan for the Deschutes Interchange and is preparing the EIR for the Del Webb project.

Dan further explained that evaluations of the proposals were done by representatives of Anderson, Redding, Caltrans and the RTPA. The evaluations were done before the cost envelopes were opened up. The proposals were not looked at from a total points stand but from a ranking of one through four. Omni Means and Willdan both came up with 12 points. When the envelopes were opened and there was such a large difference in bids, negotiations were started with Omni Means.

By motion made and seconded (Clarke/Comnick) the staff recommendation passed with Clarke, Comnick, Hawes and Mathena in favor and Goekler opposed.

**5. Stillwater Presentation**

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich explained that Caltrans has had the Stillwater Project under review for several years and the environmental phase is nearly completed. This will be a candidate project that will be prioritized for a STIP cycle.

Dan introduced Dave Moore, Senior Engineer and Bill Sutherland, Project Engineer of Caltrans, District 2 who did a presentation on the Stillwater Project. Dave noted that this project was originally programmed in the 2000 STIP. The proposed project today involves improving the section between Airport Road and Deschutes to four lane freeway standards. It would be set up with a median wide enough to add a third lane in each direction in the future. New bridges will be constructed over Stillwater Creek and Clough Creek. The existing bridges now have scour problems and will have to be replaced either with this project or with a separate Caltrans project. The four-lane freeway would terminate at the Deschutes intersection. The intersection at Gilbert Drive would be removed. The draft environmental document and draft project report will be available for public review in January, with a public open house being held in February. There have been approximately 250 written comments on the project from previous public meetings and two petitions with 100 to 200 signatures. There is no money available right now to move forward on this project; therefore, after the environmental document is approved, the project will be closed until funding comes in for the remainder of the project.

**6. Authorize Chairman to Sign Letter of Support for Buckhorn Project**

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich explained that Shasta, Trinity, Humboldt County's and Caltrans District 1 and 2 are in partnership to fund this project that Caltrans has started

developing. Caltrans has secured a large amount of funding from the Interregional Program to fund the environmental component on this project. Dan continued to state that Caltrans is looking at some of their high cost projects statewide to determine whether they should abandon some of them or not. The RTPA has been requested by Caltrans to submit a letter of support for the project, hoping to keep Buckhorn in the process and under consideration. The funding for the next phases of this project are several years away. The Shasta County portion would be in the 3-5% range, or around \$10 million. Dan concluded that the letter would not tie the hands of the Agency; no funding commitment would be made. It would be a letter stating that the RTPA has a continued interest in the Buckhorn project and in being a partner with Caltrans.

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

7. **Authorize the Chair to Sign the Attached Letter to Governor Schwarzenegger Requesting That Proposition 42 Not Be Suspended in 2005/2006**

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich explained how the State Legislature and the Governor the last few years have suspended the provisions of Proposition 42. Proposition 42 directs the sales tax on gasoline sales to be used on transportation purposes. The initiative had a hardship clause that if the State declared a fiscal emergency, this funding would go to the State General fund. It is expected that the Governor will suspend it again in the 2005/2006 budget. The transportation community throughout the State has decided to make it more difficult for him to do this by making him aware of the impact in local regions. The affects in Shasta County the last two years have been a loss of approximately \$1 million a year for the County and approximately \$500,000 for the three cities that would have gone for maintenance. Approximately \$3 million has been lost in the last two years that would have gone to patching potholes. A portion of the sales tax was supposed to go into the STIP. Shasta County would have received about \$23 million that would have enabled more projects to be programmed.

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

8. **Conceptual Position on "Rescue Transportation" Proposal**

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich explained that because the Legislature and Governor have suspended Proposition 42, decreasing funds to the State Highway Account, the Self-Help Counties Coalition has sponsored a proposal. The proposal would make it more difficult for the Legislature to suspend Proposition 42, it would move Caltrans organizationally out from underneath

the Business Transportation and Housing Agency and would have it report to the CTC. It would change the terms of the CTC members to six or eight years, give the CTC the ability to appoint the Caltrans Director and Chief Legal Counsel and to remove Caltrans from the State personnel system. A controversial aspect of the proposal would give the CTC the authority to raise gas taxes without action of the Legislature or Governor - with a provision that the Legislature could override the CTC.

The Self-Help Counties Coalition is looking for comments from other regions throughout the State to see which portions they like and do not like. Their intent is to put the initiative on the ballot in November 2006. The specific action requested from the Agency is any comments they have that would be put into a letter to the Self-Help Counties Coalition for them to take into consideration.

Board members held discussion with the consensus that another initiative is not the answer. It was decided a letter would be sent stating that the Board does not endorse the proposition, but emphasize that the Legislature needs to keep their promises already made.

9. **Consider Scheduling a Workshop in April 2005, to Assess the Feasibility of Implementing a County Wide Sales Tax Measure for Transportation**

Executive Officer Dan Kovacich explained the purpose of this item was to start the process to gauge whether there is public support for a sales tax measure earmarked for transportation purposes. There is a need to look locally for funding, as there is no realistic hope of getting any funding from State and/or Federal sources in the foreseeable future.

There is also not much hope of a statewide solution. Seven out of ten counties throughout the State last November successfully voted to authorize sales tax for transportation purposes. Eighty percent of California's population lives in counties where they pay sales tax for transportation purposes. Therefore, there will likely be little pressure brought to bear on the State to either lower the voter approval threshold or to increase the statewide sales tax for these purposes.

Dan continued to explain that the specific action requested from the Agency is to consider whether to hold a workshop to assess the interest level of the public. The workshop would be in April with the Cities, County and Caltrans giving presentations of what their current and projected needs are.

The role of the RTPA workshop would be to act as a catalyst to raise the interest level of this issue. From there, the business

and commercial leaders would have to organize to move the issue forward. Dan continued to state that development of an expenditure plan would come next. Such a plan would form the basis of the issue to be put in front of the voters. The expenditure plan would outline programs and projects to be funded with the additional revenue raised.

Discussion was held among the Board members, including concern of the smaller areas of the region not wanting to pay a tax for roads being fixed in the City of Redding or Caltrans areas, although they use some of those roads, such as I-5.

By consensus the Agency adopted the staff recommendation.

**10. Adjourn**

There being no other business to discuss, Vice Chair Hawes adjourned the meeting at 5:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Daniel J. Kovacich, Executive Officer

/jac