

Map-21 Update

5/30/13 2:10 PM

DL – pleased that the Big 4 MPO’s agreed to allow for less funds for them to allow an additional \$2 million for the small/rural MPO and RTPAs.

Phil – Any other updates

1. Performance management group has not met yet.
2. Phil – Assuming Gov’s ATP (TAP) bill will go through? Melissa – Caltrans staff mentioned they are waiting to see what passes and then decide how to approach funding.
3. Marcella – anyone submitting TIGER program. BCAG – yes and applying under rural program for a transit facility in Butte. Dave Moore – Caltrans submittal on Buckhorn “capstone” project. \$5million need. Provide a letter of support by NSSR? HCAOG also submitting a letter of support. Nevada – Town of Truckee will submit an application for a Pedestrian tunnel. Dlittle – Oasis project by the COR. SRTA to write a letter of support, but not need one from NSSR as it’s more local than regional. TCTC – How is Oasis “regional?” little
4. Phil – motion to do a letter of support for NSSR projects. Dlittle seconds motion. DL, individual letters or single letter? BCAG – single letter since all projects fit under “rural program.” (Marcella to draft letter). Gary D3 – Butte and Nevada projects. Preparing letters by Caltrans D3 and coordinate on providing letters for those projects.

1. Tamera – no new projects for the foreseeable future. Anyone else have a project?
2. Butte – State Route 74 (potential)
3. SRTA – RASL project potentially to try to finish that projects. Would cause for programming hold up for a few years; issue with having regional funding as a match; likely not for this cycle
4. Tehama – SR 99 Los Molinos project; finalist in top 4 for Tranny project. There is a gap in the route and trying to get funding for Phase 3. Maybe potential for ADA funds (\$2billion?)
5. Lisa Davey-Bates – one segment of Feb 2015 to program 8-mile segment \$150 (or 160?) million. Caltrans advises breaking into 10 small projects to get completed. Working on environmental and minor improvements. Accident rates are very high so trying to get safety money to backfill project (Caltrans D1). Fully funded through environmental.
6. Barbara OK – FLAP program (headquarters website for discretionary funding is really good resource; impressed with website.)
7. DL – how to coordinate on working together for various applications for project (verify with DL on what this is referring to). Barbara – good idea and know we have had success in the past when doing that. Phil – agreed and would be happy to discuss at STIP hearing. Tamera/DL – motion to designate Phil as NSSR rep to CTC regarding STIP hearing.

1. Gary D3 – believes NSSR is a planning activity and may not fit the definition of “lobbying.” May try to provide information about what NSSR can do.
2. Barbara OK – This issue is really about semantics.
3. BCAG – there is an issue of communication between Caltrans audit folks and planning folks/FHWA on what is “ok” expenditure of funds or not. Gary D2 – agrees that in his recent findings this is what he has found. Lets discuss with Celia, do an FAQ and see if we can resolve this; also talk to Aaron Burns; and identify what RPA funds are eligible for uses. Potentially get a fact sheet. Tamera – would like to see what the final letter was to PCTPA. Gary to provide information to Sean T. and Sean to provide to the group (and possibly provide on website...or intranet).
4. Lake – have had to work into even specifying in tasks of a work element. So having this communication and direction is helpful.

DLittle – longtime goal to get someone from north state on CTC. Every time there is a new Gov. then they scrap applications and then start over. Found out typically there are 200 applications or more. Potentially one former SRTA board member who is interested. Potentially a NSSR letter?

Phil – has one application from John M.? He also received a letter from Del Norte. Need someone politically connected.

DLittle – need someone with a direct tie to the Gov. of CA.

Phil – thinks we found someone as a good candidate. If every county can find someone that is local, then it may be more effective. Then we could have more applicants in the “pool” of reps for CTC.

Letters of Support

5/30/13 2:10 PM

DanLittle – if folks have letters of regional significance then request letter of support via Sean/Chair, must write, SRTA circulates via email, folks have a chance to voice concern (silence is consensus). Does this work?

Tamera – Should provide a draft to Chair to review, revise as appropriate, finesse, etc. Once letter is final then it can be signed and then posted on website. (Truckee – ped tunnel; Butte - \$8 million facility; Buckhorn (Caltrans D2).

1. Characterize letters of support as from Directors from agency and likely not need board approvals.

Lake, Mendocino, Del Norte (others?) have call boxes.

1. Phil – planning over time to try to put call boxes at recommended distances. Strategy to put boxes where roads are least traveled. Limited by cell phone coverage for boxes. Mendocino now installed satellite call boxes where there is little or no cell coverage. Had for 8-9 months. Costs more, but without it not able to have the boxes where it is located. Plans to put out more over the years.
2. Del Norte – able to have a special tower to mount on call box and allow for cell service. Getting lots of usage where they have a 1-lane section on HWY 101; especially when signal fails.
3. Barbara – sounds like that Del Norte item is a SHOPP and safety issue/project. Tamera agrees, but in meantime they don't mind providing if it helps for safety. Caltrans D1 is concerned about HWY 101 falling into the ocean.

1. DW gave a brief introduction on where this project started.
2. Sean T. gave an update on the status of FarNorCalGIS.

Gov. Brown Active Transportation Program

Discussion

5/30/13 2:10 PM

DanLittle – waiting on more information.

What about trying to get funds by a straight formula so that there is an annual distribution? NSSR letter on this? Does this group want to sign on to formula allocation?

Barbara – VMT data as a basis?

Discussion resulted in that potentially this could be an item for the group to discuss at the next meeting.

Freight

5/30/13 2:10 PM

DL – huge, dysfunctional group in trying to get consensus by folks. The committee wants a NSSR rep. Another meeting in Los Angeles (long beach). Phil to go?

Tamera – have they heard of Farm to market? Or Resources to market?

Letting folks know that Google Transit is available, funds though are expended and DL would like to ask where this project should go forward.

1. DL – mixed results about doing this individually. Either get a grant to fund the project or ask the State to fund.
2. Volunteer to have that discussion? SRTA is willing to initiate the dialogue...Tamera willing to do so as well to follow up.
3. One contract for NSSR? Group agreed this might be of benefit.
4. Ask for the State to manage the contract for NSSR and/or Rural Counties Task Force.
5. Barbara – this a 5311 eligible project?
6. Gary D2 – will reach out to Caltrans folks. And return word on this.
7. Tamera – will contact Sharon of RCTF to clarify they are fine with this. Asks if DL can provide information on what SRTA has done now...prior staff reports (Janie).

Chris W. presented on the report.

Discussion:

1. Closest rail transfer facility is in Roseville? And Reno and S. Oregon.
2. Chris mentioned some highlights from "near-term" opportunities that this group could focus on: Map-21 perf. Measures (sandag), Senate Bill 1, Interregional Strategic Plan.
3. DW – actually have the project translates into other projects that can develop and happen. Example: lack of rail transfer station – potentially identify a joint project with economic development group and identify potential in Anderson Dechutes road interchange for potential station. Leverage potential for a food processing plant.
4. DW – please provide comments on findings and recommendations.
5. Gary (Tehama) – comments back? end of month if possible.
6. Phil – what about broadband as a project for economic development/transportation?
7. Barbara – I-5 widening potentially? DL – it depends and likely not for North State. Chris – we have some tables, by county, where projects that overlap and those may be the ones with the most benefit. Barbara – I-5 may have importance. DI – true, but also need to look at projects with multiple benefits. Barbara – don't think there will be support for small regional projects.
8. DW – put yourself in the shoes of the economic development folks and try to see their issues and figure out what projects everyone
9. Gary – a couple projects in Tehama, such as one with Shasta College extension campus.
10. Chris presented some findings for folks to discuss....
11. Economic indicators from SANDAG report. Group would like to provide input at next meeting on a couple of items and propose the SANDAG performance measure group to include.
12. Barbara – what about I-5 alternates? Chris – we included some I-5 alternates (some real and some not-so-real).
13. Gary – how do we look at the positive impact on transportation and tie to economic benefit? Chris - Need to look at transportation user benefit metrics and intermediate transportation factors. Gary – Thinks that the table

14. Tamera – where are we? Chris – can we get feedback and produce a final report mid-june? Depends on timeline for folks.
15. Gary D2 – how do we close the loop between interchange/highway improvements? Fee programs for users (tolls)? Barbara – very unlikely that rural areas are going to pass or do anything related to “fees.”
16. DW – deadlines are artificial and SRTA can provide a draft report or even delay on final. We need to compile a full, final draft for folks. Chris – believes we need a 50 (or so) page final report, with a bunch of appendices; or, an expanded summary document for most, along with the document. DL/Tamera – get whole document available and then NSSR folks can review, comment, and then can get a final report done.
17. What about performance measure to deal with system preservation and have an economic component to look at life cycle cost investment versus deferred maintenance costs.
18. Phil – we have less resources to deal with the same issues urban areas have and we have more inventory per person to maintain. Rural areas have a higher disproportion costs to maintain per user (capita?). DW – this may be a report where NSSR can build off and get future funding for other studies and find other ways to move forward.
19. Performance measures report has not been completed and nothing discussed about economic impact. (currently over 500 pages of the study?) Gary – please provide a cohesive large report. Tamera – format guidance to regional groups so that they can comment and also for assisting in providing local examples in final report. DW – we can do that.
20. DL/tamera – one last meeting on conference call to wrap up the project before final deliverable.

NSSR Website 5/30/13 2:10 PM

- Needs to be updated and SRTA staff are currently doing a review of the website Plan is to update the website over the next couple of months
Important items to update are meeting agendas/minutes, letters of support, agency contacts, and NSSR statistics

Are there any other items the group would like to ensure we update the website with?

-

Other Projects

5/30/13 2:10 PM

Phil brought up a project...what project?

Gary D3 – ctp2040.org (include on NSSR website); based on 2030 plan.
Economics, public health, meet map-21 measures, Caltrans HQ is asking districts to reach out to MPO/RTPAs; Sean T. on CTP 2040 TAC.

Next NSSR Meeting

5/30/13 2:10 PM

Location: October? Nevada County. Work with Dan Landon.