

County of Lassen
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

H12



CHRIS GALLAGHER

District 1

DAVID TEETER

District 2

JEFF HEMPHILL

District 3

AARON ALBAUGH

District 4

TOM HAMMOND

District 5

Richard Egan

County Administrative Officer

email: coadmin@co.lassen.ca.us

Julie Morgan

Assistant to the CAO

email: jmorgan@co.lassen.ca.us

Regina Schaap

Executive Assistant to the CAO

email: rschaap@co.lassen.ca.us

County Administration Office

221 S. Roop Street, Suite 4

Susanville, CA 96130

Phone: 530-251-8333

Fax: 530-251-2663

MEMORANDUM

November 15, 2017

TO: Board of Supervisors
Agenda Date: December 12, 2017
FOR:
FROM: Richard Egan, County Administrative Officer
RE: Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Funding

RECOMMENDED ACTION: That the Board: Provide direction to staff.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION: At your May 9, 2017, meeting the Board approved requesting the entire allocation of RSTP funding from the Lassen County Transportation Commission for county streets and roads purposes.

DISCUSSION: At your November 14, 2017 meeting, Chairman Albaugh requested this topic placed on a future agenda for discussion and direction to staff.

The Lassen County Transportation Commission has regional discretion to allocate Regional Surface Transportation Program funding. From 2001 to date, the Commission has allocated 100% of its regional discretionary RSTP funding to the City of Susanville (see attached). The Board may ask for all, some or no RSTP funding from the Commission.

Please see the attached Commission meeting minutes from their June 5 and June 19, 2017, meetings regarding the County's request of May 9, 2017.

FISCAL IMPACT: Unknown potential revenue of up to \$129,000 (FY 2016/17 estimate) from the Lassen County Transportation Commission to the County Road Fund 122-1221.

ALTERNATIVES: Ask the Commission to consider adopting a formula or procedure for allocating Regional Surface Transportation Program Funding.

////////////////

Lassen County Transportation Commission
Regional Discretionary
Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Funds

Allocation Year	City	County/Other
2001/02	\$30,901	\$0
2002/03	\$30,903	\$0
2003/04	\$30,902	\$0
2004/05	\$30,902	\$0
2005/06	\$30,902	\$0
2006/07	\$30,902	\$0
2007/08	\$30,902	\$0
2008/09	\$32,636	\$0
2009/10	\$30,902	\$0
2010/11	\$73,216	\$0
2011/12	\$73,216	\$0
2012/13	\$107,483	\$0
2013/14	\$134,584	\$0
2014/15	\$129,027	\$0
2015/16	\$118,659	\$0
2016/17	\$80,561	\$0

Total to Date: \$996,598

Source: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/160307.cfm>

A. ELIGIBILITY

1. Eligible Projects and Activities:

- a. Location of Projects (23 U.S.C. 133(c)): STBG projects may not be undertaken on a road functionally classified as a local road or a rural minor collector unless the road was on a Federal-aid highway system on January 1, 1991, except-

- (1) For a bridge or tunnel project (other than the construction of a new bridge or tunnel at a new location);
- (2) For a project described in 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(4)-(11) and described below under "Eligible Activities" (b)(4) through (11);
- (3) For transportation alternatives projects described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) before enactment of the FAST Act (these are described in 23 U.S.C. 133(h) and in separate TA Set-Aside guidance.); and
- (4) As approved by the Secretary.

- b. Eligible Activities (23 U.S.C. 133(b)): Subject to the location of projects requirements in paragraph (a), the following eligible activities are listed in 23 U.S.C. 133(b):

- (1) Construction, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(4), of the following:

i. Highways, bridges, and tunnels, including designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads under 40 U.S.C. 14501;

ii. Ferry boats and terminal facilities eligible under 23 U.S.C. 129(c);

iii. transit capital projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code;

iv. Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements, including the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment;

v. Truck parking facilities eligible under Section 1401 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 137 note); and

vi. Border infrastructure projects eligible under Section 1303 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 101 note).

(2) Operational improvements and capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs. Operational improvement is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(18).

(3) Environmental measures eligible under 23 U.S.C. 119(g), 328, and 329, and transportation control measures listed in Section 108(f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi) of that section) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408(f)(1)(A)).

(4) Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, including railway-highway grade crossings.

(5) Fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 137 and carpool projects in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 146. Carpool project is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(3).

(6) Recreational trails projects eligible under 23 U.S.C. 206, pedestrian and bicycle projects in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217 (including modifications to comply with accessibility requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.)), and the Safe Routes to School Program under Section 1404 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note).

(7) Planning, design, or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

(8) Development and implementation of a State asset management plan for the National Highway System (NHS) and a performance-based management program for other public roads.

(9) Protection (including painting, scour countermeasures, seismic retrofits, impact protection measures, security countermeasures, and protection against extreme events) for bridges (including approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels on public roads, and inspection and evaluation of bridges and tunnels and other highway assets.

(10) Surface transportation planning programs, highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs, and workforce development, training, and education under chapter 5 of title 23, United States Code.

(11) Surface transportation infrastructure modifications to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of a port terminal.

(12) Projects and strategies designed to support congestion pricing, including electronic toll collection and travel demand management strategies and programs.

(13) Upon request of a State and subject to the approval of the Secretary, if Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance is approved for an STBG-eligible project, then

the State may use STBG funds to pay the subsidy and administrative costs associated with providing Federal credit assistance for the projects.

(14) The creation and operation by a State of an office to assist in the design, implementation, and oversight of public-private partnerships eligible to receive funding under title 23 and chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, and the payment of a stipend to unsuccessful private bidders to offset their proposal development costs, if necessary to encourage robust competition in public-private partnership procurements.

(15) Any type of project eligible under 23 U.S.C. 133 as in effect on the day before the FAST Act was enacted. Among these are:

i. Replacement of bridges with fill material;

ii. Training of bridge and tunnel inspectors;

iii. Application of calcium magnesium acetate, sodium acetate/formate, or other environmentally acceptable, minimally corrosive anti-icing and deicing compositions for bridges (and approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels;

iv. Projects to accommodate other transportation modes continue to be eligible pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 142(c) if such accommodation does not adversely affect traffic safety;

v. Transit capital projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, including vehicles and facilities (publicly or privately owned) that are used to provide intercity passenger bus service;

vi. Approach roadways to ferry terminals to accommodate other transportation modes and to provide access into and out of the ports;

vii. Transportation alternatives previously described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) and described in 23 U.S.C. 213;

viii. Projects relating to intersections having disproportionately high accident rates, high levels of congestion (as evidenced by interrupted traffic flow at the intersection and a level of service rating of "F" during peak travel hours, calculated in accordance with the Highway Capacity Manual), and are located on a Federal-aid highway;

ix. Construction and operational improvements for any minor collector if the minor collector and the project to be carried out are in the same corridor and in proximity to an NHS route; the construction or improvements will enhance the level of service

on the NHS route and improve regional traffic flow; and the construction or improvements are more cost-effective, as determined by a benefit-cost analysis, than an improvement to the NHS route;

x. Workforce development, training, and education activities discussed in 23 U.S.C. 504(e);

xi. Advanced truck stop electrification systems. Truck stop electrification system is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(32);

xii. Installation of safety barriers and nets on bridges, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife;

xiii. Electric vehicle and natural gas vehicle infrastructure in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 137;

xiv. Data collection, maintenance, and integration and the costs associated with obtaining, updating, and licensing software and equipment required for risk-based asset management and performance based management, and for similar activities related to the development and implementation of a performance based management program for other public roads;

xv. Construction of any bridge in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 144(f) that replaces any low water crossing (regardless of the length of the low water crossing); any bridge that was destroyed prior to January 1, 1965; any ferry that was in existence on January 1, 1984; or any road bridge that is rendered obsolete as a result of a Corps of Engineers flood control or channelization project and is not rebuilt with funds from the Corps of Engineers. Not subject to the Location of Project requirement in 23 U.S.C. 133(c); and

xvi. Actions in accordance with the definition and conditions in 23 U.S.C. 144(g) to preserve or reduce the impact of a project on the historic integrity of a historic bridge if the load capacity and safety features of the historic bridge are adequate to serve the intended use for the life of the historic bridge. Not subject to the Location of Project requirement in 23 U.S.C. 133(c).

Source: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/160307.cfm>

A. ELIGIBILITY

1. Eligible Projects and Activities:

- a. Location of Projects (23 U.S.C. 133(c)): STBG projects may not be undertaken on a road functionally classified as a local road or a rural minor collector unless the road was on a Federal-aid highway system on January 1, 1991, except-

- (1) For a bridge or tunnel project (other than the construction of a new bridge or tunnel at a new location);
- (2) For a project described in 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(4)-(11) and described below under "Eligible Activities" (b)(4) through (11);
- (3) For transportation alternatives projects described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) before enactment of the FAST Act (these are described in 23 U.S.C. 133(h) and in separate TA Set-Aside guidance.); and
- (4) As approved by the Secretary.

- b. Eligible Activities (23 U.S.C. 133(b)): Subject to the location of projects requirements in paragraph (a), the following eligible activities are listed in 23 U.S.C. 133(b):

- (1) Construction, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(4), of the following:

i. Highways, bridges, and tunnels, including designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads under 40 U.S.C. 14501;

ii. Ferry boats and terminal facilities eligible under 23 U.S.C. 129(c);

iii. transit capital projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code;

iv. Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements, including the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment;

v. Truck parking facilities eligible under Section 1401 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 137 note); and

vi. Border infrastructure projects eligible under Section 1303 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 101 note).

- (2) Operational improvements and capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs. Operational improvement is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(18).

(3) Environmental measures eligible under 23 U.S.C. 119(g), 328, and 329, and transportation control measures listed in Section 108(f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi) of that section) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408(f)(1)(A)).

(4) Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, including railway-highway grade crossings.

(5) Fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 137 and carpool projects in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 146. Carpool project is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(3).

(6) Recreational trails projects eligible under 23 U.S.C. 206, pedestrian and bicycle projects in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217 (including modifications to comply with accessibility requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.)), and the Safe Routes to School Program under Section 1404 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note).

(7) Planning, design, or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

(8) Development and implementation of a State asset management plan for the National Highway System (NHS) and a performance-based management program for other public roads.

(9) Protection (including painting, scour countermeasures, seismic retrofits, impact protection measures, security countermeasures, and protection against extreme events) for bridges (including approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels on public roads, and inspection and evaluation of bridges and tunnels and other highway assets.

(10) Surface transportation planning programs, highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs, and workforce development, training, and education under chapter 5 of title 23, United States Code.

(11) Surface transportation infrastructure modifications to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of a port terminal.

(12) Projects and strategies designed to support congestion pricing, including electronic toll collection and travel demand management strategies and programs.

(13) Upon request of a State and subject to the approval of the Secretary, if Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance is approved for an STBG-eligible project, then

the State may use STBG funds to pay the subsidy and administrative costs associated with providing Federal credit assistance for the projects.

(14) The creation and operation by a State of an office to assist in the design, implementation, and oversight of public-private partnerships eligible to receive funding under title 23 and chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, and the payment of a stipend to unsuccessful private bidders to offset their proposal development costs, if necessary to encourage robust competition in public-private partnership procurements.

(15) Any type of project eligible under 23 U.S.C. 133 as in effect on the day before the FAST Act was enacted. Among these are:

i. Replacement of bridges with fill material;

ii. Training of bridge and tunnel inspectors;

iii. Application of calcium magnesium acetate, sodium acetate/formate, or other environmentally acceptable, minimally corrosive anti-icing and deicing compositions for bridges (and approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels;

iv. Projects to accommodate other transportation modes continue to be eligible pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 142(c) if such accommodation does not adversely affect traffic safety;

v. Transit capital projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, including vehicles and facilities (publicly or privately owned) that are used to provide intercity passenger bus service;

vi. Approach roadways to ferry terminals to accommodate other transportation modes and to provide access into and out of the ports;

vii. Transportation alternatives previously described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) and described in 23 U.S.C. 213;

viii. Projects relating to intersections having disproportionately high accident rates, high levels of congestion (as evidenced by interrupted traffic flow at the intersection and a level of service rating of "F" during peak travel hours, calculated in accordance with the Highway Capacity Manual), and are located on a Federal-aid highway;

ix. Construction and operational improvements for any minor collector if the minor collector and the project to be carried out are in the same corridor and in proximity to an NHS route; the construction or improvements will enhance the level of service

on the NHS route and improve regional traffic flow; and the construction or improvements are more cost-effective, as determined by a benefit-cost analysis, than an improvement to the NHS route;

x. Workforce development, training, and education activities discussed in 23 U.S.C. 504(e);

xi. Advanced truck stop electrification systems. Truck stop electrification system is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(32);

xii. Installation of safety barriers and nets on bridges, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife;

xiii. Electric vehicle and natural gas vehicle infrastructure in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 137;

xiv. Data collection, maintenance, and integration and the costs associated with obtaining, updating, and licensing software and equipment required for risk-based asset management and performance based management, and for similar activities related to the development and implementation of a performance based management program for other public roads;

xv. Construction of any bridge in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 144(f) that replaces any low water crossing (regardless of the length of the low water crossing); any bridge that was destroyed prior to January 1, 1965; any ferry that was in existence on January 1, 1984; or any road bridge that is rendered obsolete as a result of a Corps of Engineers flood control or channelization project and is not rebuilt with funds from the Corps of Engineers. Not subject to the Location of Project requirement in 23 U.S.C. 133(c); and

xvi. Actions in accordance with the definition and conditions in 23 U.S.C. 144(g) to preserve or reduce the impact of a project on the historic integrity of a historic bridge if the load capacity and safety features of the historic bridge are adequate to serve the intended use for the life of the historic bridge. Not subject to the Location of Project requirement in 23 U.S.C. 133(c).

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

June 19, 2017

(1) CONVENE:

LCTC's Special Meeting convened at 3:33 PM by Chairman Garnier, in the Lassen County Board of Supervisors Chambers at 707 Nevada Street, Susanville, CA.

Commissioners Present: Wilson, Hemphill, Garnier, Albaugh, Franco, and Teeter.

Commissioners Absent: None.

Others Present: Gordon Shaw, Selena McKinney, LSC Transportation Consultants; Dan Newton, Jared Hancock, City of Susanville; Tamara Rich, Caltrans; Margaret Long, LCTC Counsel; Larry Millar, Tony Shaw, David Knut, Lassen County; Richard Egan, and Cheryl Strange, LCTC Staff.

- 1.1 The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
- 1.2 Agenda Approval: on a first by Mr. Hemphill, second by Mr. Albaugh, it was unanimously passed to approve the agenda.
- 1.3 Minutes Approval: On a first by Mr. Albaugh, second by Mr. Hemphill, it was passed to approve the minutes for the May 8, 2017, meeting. Mr. Franco abstained.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION: Ms. Garnier announced the topic of discussion to be the performance employee evaluation of Legal Counsel.

- 1.4 Closed Session:
Public Employee Evaluation: Legal Counsel

It was agreed to move this item to the end of the meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ITEMS DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION: Mr. Egan reported that there was nothing to report regarding Closed Session discussion.

(2) CORRESPONDENCE / PUBLIC COMMENT

- 2.1 Correspondence: None.
- 2.2 Public Comment: None.

(3) REPORTS

3.1 Reports by Caltrans, CHP, City of Susanville, Executive Secretary, and LCTC Staff:

Caltrans Report (Caltrans): Ms. Rich gave an update on the Honey Lake rest area and said the contractor reported that he plans to reopen the facility by early next week.

California Highway Patrol Report (CHP): None.

City of Susanville: Mr. Hancock reported on a meeting with Caltrans to discuss the Cap M project and said the project should line up nicely with the Gateway project. He stated that two projects are going before the CTC with staff recommendations for approval on both. He commented that the Pancera Plaza project was recently added and on schedule, with funds coming from the removal of roads from the rehabilitation list.

Discussion was held regarding the entrance to the Plaza to clarify work to be completed by Caltrans.

County of Lassen Report: None.

Susanville Indian Rancheria Report (SIR): None.

3.2 Executive Secretary Report (LCTC Staff): None.

(4) UNFINISHED BUSINESS

4.1 Transit Development Plan: Mr. Gordon Shaw with LSC Transportation Consultants gave a power point presentation on the Draft Transit Development Plan.

Mr. Albaugh asked if the polled households without cars are in the City or the County. Mr. Shaw answered that it is both.

Mr. Albaugh asked to clarify the recommendations for bus purchases. Mr. Shaw replied that that replacement is on an as needed basis and that some verbiage in the plan is taken from previous reports.

Mr. Hancock asked if bus size versus actual ridership was considered in the analysis. Mr. Shaw answered that ridership varies during the day allowing the need for larger buses on routes, and that a smaller bus does not necessarily mean it costs less to run.

Mr. Hancock asked for a breakdown of funding sources. Mr. Shaw reviewed information as provided in presentation packets.

Discussion was held regarding future Federal funding scenarios.

Mr. Hancock asked if 'on demand' bus stops cause confusion. Mr. Shaw said that as long as riders understand the concept it works well, but can put the route behind schedule. Mr. Hancock asked if there are funding sources that can be partnered with other counties who share connecting routes. Ms. McKinney replied that Federal funding is already figured in the equation, but money is not exchanged county to county. Mr. Hancock asked if the GPS system was included in the polled survey. Ms. McKinney confirmed that it was. Mr. Knaut said that many riders do not have smart phones to fully utilize the system.

Mr. Egan asked for elaboration regarding no recommendation for fare increase. Mr. Shaw said that if you want to increase ridership, fare increases are not favorable statistically and can cause ridership to decrease. Mr. Shaw commented that overall, Lassen County has a very efficient transit system when compared to other areas of similar population.

Mr. Franco agreed with recommendations to eliminate routes with low ridership, and wondered if marketing would help gain riders. Mr. Shaw said that advertising has been used in the past and it might be a good time to try again. Mr. Franco expressed concern regarding developing a transit center with its potential to become a gathering place for transients. Mr. Shaw said that the vision for the transportation hub is just for a place for buses to transfer passengers safely, but that it is not currently in the plan.

Mr. Albaugh asked if the pool bus stop was included. Mr. Shaw said that because there was no change to cost, it was not included in the plan details, but it is included as an on demand stop.

Mr. Albaugh asked if alternative fuel should be considered for buses. Mr. Shaw said in the future, fossil fuels may be banned. He added that many transit systems are purchasing electric, but they are very expensive.

Mr. Hancock asked if the fares for the route to the depot can be looked into as those riders are getting reimbursed for more than the fares are costing.

Mr. Knaut said that there are funds available for electric buses and that the prices for those buses are decreasing as more become available. Mr. Shaw suggested looking at this again in a few years because the bus trends are evolving quickly.

Mr. Wilson commented that advertising has been tried before, but may be time to try again. He asked Mr. Knaut to comment on technological enhancements. Mr. Knaut replied that the webpage was a bit complicated and he is working to make it easier to use. He said that he tracks site usage, and that public use varies. Mr. Wilson stated that when the grant was first approved, Commission members were worried about long term cost. He requested that this be monitored closely to determine if it is really a benefit. Mr. Shaw said that this type of program benefits the administration side even if the riders are not using it, and that there is a recommendation in the plan to continue to add more enhancements.

No action was taken.

- 4.2 2017/2018 fiscal year proposed budget including Local Transportation Fund (571-5711); State Transit Assistance Fund (572-5721); and LCTC Proposition 1B (573-5731): Mr. Egan reviewed information as presented in packets and highlighted the material requested by the Commission.

Mr. Wilson asked for clarity regarding the carryover balance. Mr. Millar explained how the budget evolved and that the 128 no longer exists, so it is all included in the 571 fund.

Ms. Garnier asked for an explanation for \$99,827.00 included in the LTSA TDA funds. Mr. Millar responded that part of this budget was discussed at the last meeting as it falls under the LTSA.

Led by Mr. Millar and Mr. Egan, detailed discussion was held to clarify how the funds are moved between LCTC and LTSA budgets to balance expenditures and revenue.

Mr. Albaugh motioned, and it was seconded by Mr. Teeter, to approve the 2017/2018 fiscal year proposed budget including Local Transportation Fund (571-5711); State Transit Assistance Fund (572-5721); and LCTC Proposition 1B (573-5731).

Mr. Egan reminded the Commission that approval of the motion does not resolve the issue of where the RSTP funds are spent.

Discussion was held regarding whether to revise or retract the motion and the best language to make funds apportionment clear.

Additional discussion was held regarding how funds should be apportioned.

Ms. Garnier stated that based upon the percentage of traffic in the City, coupled with the history of apportionment consistently going to the City, and the fact that the County receives funds from other sources, she would like the money remain with the City. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Franco agreed.

Mr. Albaugh amended his motion to include language for the entire apportionment to go to the County for use on Center Road rehab which would also benefit the City annexed prison building. Mr. Teeter said that he will not second the amendment. Mr. Hemphill said he would second the amended motion as it would benefit both entities.

By roll call vote, the motion failed with Commissioners Garnier, Wilson, Franco, and Teeter voting "no", and Hemphill and Albaugh voting "aye".

Mr. Franco suggested making allocation adjustments gradually.

Mr. Teeter asked why just the RSTP funds are being scrutinized. Mr. Egan responded that the RSTP funds are a discretionary action decided by the Commission; which has been heavily directed to the City in the past.

Ms. Garnier said that \$80,000.00 is not a big deal in regards to the Center Road project when it is costing millions of dollars. Mr. Millar responded that regardless of the amount, the money can still help the project. Ms. Garnier commented that she feels it's weird that the County came in hastily with their request not allowing time for the City to refigure their budget. Mr. Egan replied that when the money was first offered several years ago, it was around \$20,000.00 and has steadily increased over the years. He commented that the request is not hasty as he presented a power point presentation back in February which included the disparity of funding between the two jurisdictions with emphasis placed on RSTP funding. Mr. Millar elaborated that this is an annual budget item, and that the request was made when solicited for budget information.

On a first by Mr. Teeter, second by Mr. Wilson, it was passed to approve the 2017/2018 fiscal year proposed budget including Local Transportation Fund (571-5711); State Transit Assistance Fund (572-5721); and LCTC Proposition 1B Fund (573-5731) using previous formation.

Discussion was held regarding proper use of funds by entities.

By roll call vote, the motion passed with Commissioners Garnier, Wilson, Franco, and Teeter voting "aye" and Commissioners Hemphill and Albaugh voting "no".

4.3 Resolution No. 17-10 providing budget instructions to the County Auditor for Fund 571 for the 2017/2018 fiscal year: Mr. Egan asked for questions.

On a first by Mr. Albaugh, second by Mr. Teeter, it was unanimously passed to adopt Resolution No. 17-10 providing budget instructions to the County Auditor for Fund 571 for the 2017/2018 fiscal year.

Mr. Wilson asked for clarity regarding the \$5,000.00 for software. Mr. Millar referred to the budget sheets and said that reserve was set up three years ago for software renewal and updates. Mr. Wilson expressed that he does not feel the benefits have been proven with the software and requests that future discussion be held when the contract end comes closer. Mr. Knaut said that he will bring this matter before the Commission prior to the contract renewal date. Ms. Garnier asked if some data can be provided on program benefits verses money spent, and requested that information be provided well in advance of the contract end date. Mr. Knaut said that he will work with LRB and monitor the website activity to compile information for presentation.

4.4 Resolution No. 17-11 providing budget instructions to the County Auditor for Fund 572 for the 2017/2018 fiscal year: No discussion was held.

On a first by Mr. Albaugh, second by Mr. Franco, it was unanimously passed to approve Resolution No. 17-11 providing budget instructions to the County Auditor for Fund 572 for the 2017/18 fiscal year.

- 4.5 Comment letter from the Lassen County Transportation Commission to Caltrans regarding the US 395 Transportation Concept Report under Caltrans Authority: Mr. Egan referenced the letter as provided in packets.

On a first by Mr. Teeter, second by Mr. Franco, it was unanimously passed to approve the comment letter from the Lassen County Transportation Commission to Caltrans regarding the US 395 Transportation Concept Report under Caltrans Authority and authorize the Chairperson to sign.

(5) OTHER BUSINESS

- 5.1 Matters brought forth by the Commission: Mr. Teeter asked for a report on the Skyline Extension project and CTC. Mr. Millar stated that it will go before the CTC for action next week. Mr. Teeter asked if the County will be ready. Mr. Millar responded that they are already moving forward.

Regular meeting recessed at 5:26 p.m.

Closed Session, Item 1.4: Opened at 5:27 p.m. Closed at 5:45 p.m.

Meeting re-convened at 5:46 p.m.

- 5.3 Adjournment: 5:47 p.m.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

June 5, 2017

(1) CONVENE:

LCTC's Special Meeting convened at 2:02 PM by Chairman Garnier, in the Lassen County Board of Supervisors Chambers at 707 Nevada Street, Susanville, CA.

Commissioners Present: Wilson, Hemphill, Garnier, Albaugh, Franco, and Teeter.

Commissioners Absent: None.

Others Present: Dan Newton, Jared Hancock, City of Susanville; Ron Leal, Paratransit; ; Tamara Rich, Kathy Grah, Caltrans; Margaret Long, LCTC Counsel; Larry Millar, Tony Shaw, David Knaut, Lassen County; Richard Egan, LCTC Staff.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

1.1 Public Comment: None.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION: Mr. Egan announced the topic of discussion to be the performance employee evaluation of Legal Counsel.

1.2 Closed Session: Opened at 2:04 PM; closed at 2:33 PM. A. Public Employee Evaluation: Legal Counsel

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ITEMS DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION: Mr. Egan reported that the Commission conducted a performance evaluation of Legal Counsel.

Discussion was delayed until a copy of the letter could be presented to the Commission.

(2) CORRESPONDENCE / PUBLIC COMMENT

2.1 Correspondence: Green Dot Transportation Solutions RE: LCTC Request For Proposals for Staffing Services.

Mr. Egan reported that Green Dot was disappointed that they could not participate in the RPF process as they are currently under contract with the City and the Commission.

2.2 Public Comment: Covered in Item 1.1.

(3) REPORTS

3.1 Reports by Caltrans, CHP, City of Susanville, Executive Secretary, and LCTC Staff:

A. Caltrans Report (Caltrans): Ms. Grah offered an apology for lack of thorough notification regarding the close of the Janesville rest area.

Mr. Hemphill expressed frustration regarding previous discussion for Caltrans to provide alternative means for restrooms to alleviate hardship to business owners along the HWY 395 corridor. Ms. Grah stated that the contractor is trying to get the job completed quickly and that she is requesting a weekly report which can be forwarded to the Commission.

Discussion was held regarding the duration of the closure and construction schedule.

California Highway Patrol Report (CHP): None.

City of Susanville: Mr. Hancock reported that the City is preparing a response to the letter sent by the Commission for budget requests and that projects are moving forward.

County of Lassen Report: Mr. Millar reported that there is a lot of storm damage with some roads still closed, but work is already progressing.

Susanville Indian Rancheria Report (SIR): None.

3.2 Executive Secretary Report (LCTC Staff):

A. Skyline Extension: Mr. Egan reviewed information as provided in packets and stated that Ms. Zolotoff is confident that the amendment will be approved.

Mr. Wilson asked if staff could provide a presentation that reviews project cost.

Discussion was held regarding funding, project timelines, and deadlines.

(4) NEW BUSINESS

4.1 Report on RFP for Staffing Services to the Lassen County Transportation Commission:

Mr. Egan reviewed information as provided in packets and reported that there were some registered applicants, but no proposals submitted.

Mr. Albaugh asked about the release and submittal dates and if it was circulated again, would it the same methods be used, or aim to reach farther. Mr. Egan clarified the dates, and stated that the RFP was circulated widely through various means and feels that anyone looking for employment in the consulting field would have seen the request.

Mr. Albaugh asked for a recommendation on how to make it more appealing. Mr. Egan suggested breaking it into components, but also suggested trying again with the same RFP in case timing was bad the first time.

Ms. Garnier asked if the Commission would like to appoint another Committee to re-evaluate the RFP, and feels that no direction can be given at this time.

- 4.2 Addendum to Letter of Engagement by and between the Lassen County Transportation Commission and Prentice, Long and Epperson establishing a not to exceed maximum cost of \$15,000, and setting the duration of the Agreement to terminate on June 30, 2018, unless extended by mutual agreement: Mr. Egan reviewed information as presented in packets and highlighted the addendum changes.

Mr. Albaugh asked how far the money will go. Ms. Long said that she would have to defer to Mr. Egan as she was uncertain of the administration hours. Mr. Egan gave a brief breakdown of the components to meeting preparation. Mr. Egan and Ms. Long agreed that it would probably last a few months.

Mr. Teeter commented that he regrets voting in favor of the separation and wishes that staffing could be through the County or the City. He expressed concern that the Commission will just spend more money for services that were already provided. Ms. Garnier said that services provided were not the issue.

Mr. Albaugh agreed with Mr. Teeter and said that he voted in favor of the separation because he felt the need to go through this exercise so the Commission could move forward.

On a first by Mr. Albaugh, second by Mr. Wilson, it was unanimously passed to approve the Addendum to Letter of Engagement by and between the Lassen County Transportation Commission and Prentice, Long, and Epperson establishing a not to exceed maximum cost of \$15,000, and setting the duration of the Agreement to terminate on June 30, 2018, unless extended by mutual agreement and authorization to the Chairperson to sign.

Mr. Hemphill proposed getting the City to provide staffing services. Ms. Garnier reiterated the need for a Committee to re-evaluate the situation. Mr. Teeter expressed the need to move forward with the course as set.

- 4.3 Designation of Interim Executive Secretary effective July 1, 2017, to perform all necessary executive, administrative, fiscal, procurement and project management functions and responsibilities of the Lassen County Transportation Commission, including but not limited to executing any and all fiscal and administrative documents required and necessary to conduct LCTC business with Caltrans, City of Susanville, County of Lassen, Susanville Indian Rancheria, Lassen Transit Service Agency, and other individuals and agencies: Mr. Egan recommended appointing Ms. Long as Executive Secretary.

Mr. Wilson asked if there would be conflict of interest in acting as Legal Counsel and Executive Secretary. Ms. Long commented that because the Secretary acts under direction from the Commission, there would be no conflict.

Discussion was held to clarify that Ms. Long would be the lead for all matters concerning the LCTC and designated signatory, but that she would be delegating work to her staff.

On a first by Mr. Hemphill, second by Mr. Albaugh, it was unanimously passed to designate Margaret Long, and Prentice, Long, and Epperson, as Interim Executive Secretary effective July 1 , 2017, to perform all necessary executive, administrative, fiscal, procurement and project management functions and responsibilities of the Lassen County Transportation Commission, including but not limited to executing any and all fiscal and administrative documents required and necessary to conduct LCTC business with Caltrans, City of Susanville, County of Lassen, Susanville Indian Rancheria, Lassen Transit Service Agency, and other individuals and agencies.

4.4 Resolution No. 17-09 approving the 2017/18 Overall Work Program (OWP): Mr. Egan reviewed information as presented in packets.

Discussion was held to clarify the State Highway Account (SHA).

Mr. Wilson asked about the changes to the RPA. Mr. Millar replied that most of the changes are related to staffing modifications, but that most of the items are just a guess at this time until the transition is complete. He further stated that whoever takes over can set up the funds as they wish and can be amended throughout the year.

Discussion was held regarding working with Caltrans to meet deadlines or file for extensions.

Discussion was held regarding the evolution of budgets and funds, various funds available besides OWP, and allocation options.

On a first by Mr. Albaugh, second by Mr., Teeter, it was unanimously passed to adopt Resolution No. 17-09 approving the 2017/18 Overall Work Program (OWP).

Mr. Albaugh expressed the need to work with Caltrans to keep funding in order.

Mr. Franco commented that he feels the Commission does not fully understand the OWP. Ms. Garner agreed and wondered if there was time to ask questions and continue at the next meeting. Mr. Egan offered information to clarify, and said that it will ultimately LCTC function will be up to the new administrator.

Mr. Albaugh asked Ms. Long how she will formulate funding. Ms. Long answered that through meetings it will be a work in progress, but she is confident based on the flexibility for modifications.

Mr. Hancock offered comment to help clarify.

Mr. Wilson said he would vote in favor as long as it is noted that it will be revisited.

- 4.5 2017/18 fiscal year proposed budgets for Local Transportation Fund (571-5711); State Transit Assistance Fund (527-5721); and LCTC Proposition 1 B (573-5731); Mr. Egan reviewed information as presented in packets and stressed that there are a lot of unknowns at this time, but felt it necessary to get a head start.

Discussion was held to clarify. Mr. Millar assisted LCTC staff in answering questions and offered for comment from the City and Caltrans to aid in dispelling confusion. Mr. Millar stated that only the transit funds as a whole are being presented for consideration in this meeting, and are not broke down. Mr. Egan went over the sequence of the approval process to highlight that each fund must be requested and approved by one governing body before it can be presented to the next governing body, and explained that many budget units serve as pass-through accounts. Ms. Garnier asked for a breakdown of functions per fund. Mr. Millar reminded the Commission that these are all preliminary numbers and many funds and budget units are intertwined. Ms. Garnier said it's hard to make a decision without all the facts. Mr. Shaw pointed out that there are two vacant LCTC positions that would normally take on the tasks for the Commission and that Mr. Millar and himself are working to conduct business for the Commission until they find a replacement or use Ms. Long's firm.

Mr. Egan suggested tabling this item.

Mr. Wilson asked that the PPM be updated to reflect \$25,000 for the County and \$86,000 for the City and no PPM money for the LCTC.

Discussion was held regarding STIP funding, each fiscal year's dollar amounts, and that the LCTC acts as a pass-through for these funds. Mr. Egan stated that historically all the money has been awarded to the City, but as a County representative he doesn't feel that is appropriate due to the fact that the amount has increased over the years and that the County has the majority of the maintained roads. Ms. Garnier asked if the County has any other funding sources. Mr. Egan responded that both the City and County have many funding sources, and that both the City and County have asked for all of the PPM money for the next cycle.

Discussion was held regarding PPM funds allocation, with both the County and the City offering comment on how they think the money will best benefit residents. Mr. Newton said there would be a profound impact to the City if all the funds were not allocated to them as they already have them included in their revenue. Mr. Albaugh asked how many maintained road miles the City has in their system and how many are eligible for Federal funding. Mr. Newton answered 52 miles are in the system and said he did not have the data with him for actual number for eligible roads, but said there were quite a few. Mr. Teeter asked if all funds have been expended in the past. Mr. Newton answer that they use all the funds. Mr. Albaugh asked Mr. Millar how many County maintained roads there are in their system. Mr. Millar answered that there are 840 miles of roads, of which, 360 are paved. He explained that these funds are regional, which allows the City, County, and the Rancheria to be eligible for this funding, and that he expects that the Rancheria will have

future needs as funding sources become limited. He said that the County roads are in dire need of maintenance repairs and would use the money towards Center Road to benefit both the City and the County as the prison is annexed by the City. Ms. Garnier asked if the total for the project is known and where other funding for the project will come from to make up the balance. Mr. Millar responded with project details and that STIP funds and other resources would make up the balance. Mr. Albaugh asked how many miles of roads were eligible for Federal funding. Mr. Millar responded that there are approximately 70 miles are Federal. Mr. Franco asked when the County request was made. Mr. Millar said that it was just submitted this year. He said that when the funds first became available, it was only \$30,000 which didn't make sense to split at the time. Mr. Franco said that the request makes sense, but feels it being presented without pre-warning. Mr. Millar responded that the request was made in reply to the memo sent out by LCTC asking for funding requests. Mr. Egan said that this issue has been talked about prior to Mr. Franco joining the Commission. Mr. Teeter asked for clarification regarding the RSTP funds. Mr. Millar said that the County gets approximately \$100,000 from State funding and \$373,000 from Federal Exchange funding. Mr. Wilson asked what other funding is received besides what comes from the Commission. Mr. Millar replied that the County receives approximately \$2,600,000 in gas tax money, SBT money is estimated at \$3,000,000, and that they do not receive as much STIP money as the City for rehab projects; the STIP money has been used for Skyline and other projects. He further commented that Federal Reserve money is no longer available.

Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Newton what funds the City receives outside of the Commission. Mr. Newton replied that they receive gas tax at approximately \$450,000, and \$100,000 in RSTP funds.

Mr. Egan commented that the unincorporated roads suffered more damage than the City roads during the 2017 storms. Mr. Franco asked if Federal Aid money will be available for those repairs and if so, how much. Mr. Egan replied that the funds won't be available until next year, and the amount won't be known until all calculations are complete and approved by FEMA. Mr. Millar said that the funds are reimbursable, not 100% funding, and are for repairs, not maintenance.

Mr. Albaugh asked if the RSTP should be left in the budget and have the breakdown later. Mr. Teeter said that it would be interesting to change what they have historically done, and asked what that would look like.

Discussion was held regarding how to handle the RSTP money in the future. Mr. Franco said that instead of cutting off the City altogether, it should be done gradually. Ms. Grah offered that most agencies split it up. Mr. Newton commented that the County gets RSTP money that doesn't have to be approved by the Commission, and feels that is why the City has historically received the money needing approval through the Commission. Mr. Egan said that if the money was to automatically go to the City, that Caltrans would just send it to them directly. Ms. Garnier commented that the City serves the County and has a lot of traffic. Mr. Millar answered that it is not a straight correlation; that hitting a pot hole at 20

miles per hour on a City road is different than at 55 miles per hour. He reiterated that Center Road leads to the prison which is annexed by the City.

Mr. Newton gave some history about City roads and commented on funding shortfalls and limitations. He said they only have the gas tax money and RSTP funds for maintenance and that removing \$80,000 from their budget would be a great hardship to the City including possible layoffs. Mr. Egan sympathized stating that the County has already experienced layoffs.

Mr. Hancock commented that if the funds are not granted to the City, they will still need to figure out how to obtain those funds to remain eligible for SE 1 funds. He said the best interest of the City and County would be to help both agencies meet funding requirements. He asked that if the Commission feels that funds granted have been disproportionate that changes be made gradually.

Ms. Garnier commented for clarity that the County didn't budget the \$80,000 because the City historically received it, and that the City has already included it in their budget. Mr. Millar responded that he does have it as a potential funding source and that they have already had to lay off two employees in the last three months with the possibility of one more. He said in the past there have been reserve funds available, which are now depleted.

Discussion was held regarding the best way to allocate the funds. Ms. Garnier suggested splitting it between the agencies. Mr. Egan suggested that the item be tabled and the agencies prepare objective road condition data for presentation. Mr. Hemphill expressed that he feels that would be a waste of time and made a motion to table the item.

Mr. Wilson asked for clarity regarding the Transportation Sales Tax. Mr. Millar responded that the auditor's report is not available yet, so he used last year's figure.

Mr. Albaugh excused himself. No time was noted.

On a first by Mr. Wilson, second by Mr. Hemphill, it was unanimously passed to table Items 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7 regarding Fiscal Years 2017/2018 Budgets and continue discussion at the next meeting.

- 4.6 Resolution No. 17-10 providing budget instructions to the County Auditor for Fund 571 for the 2017/2018 fiscal year: Tabled until the next meeting.
- 4.7 Resolution No. 17-11 providing budget instructions to the County Auditor for Fund 572 for the 2017/2018 fiscal year: Tabled until the next meeting.
- 4.8 Comment letter from the Lassen County Transportation Commission to Caltrans regarding the US 395 Transportation Concept Report under Caltrans Authority: Mr. Egan opened the floor for comments.

Mr. Hemphill said that language needs to be added to request lengthening the passing lanes.

Mr. Albaugh requested language that limits the amount of time the rest areas can be closed, and alternative facilities be provided when closures occur.

On a first by Mr. Wilson, second by Mr. Teeter, it was unanimously passed to approve the comment letter from the Lassen County Transportation Commission to Caltrans regarding the US 395 Transportation Concept Report under Caltrans Authority with the noted additions, and authorize Chairperson to sign.

- 4.9 Independent Audit Report on LCTC Financial Statements for year ending June 30, 2016: Mr. Egan reviewed information as provided in packets.

No discussion was held.

On a first by Mr. Wilson, second by Mr. Albaugh, it was unanimously passed to receive and approve the Independent Audit Report on LCTC Financial Statements for year ending June 30, 2016.

- 4.10 Regional Transportation Surface Program (RSTP) Agency Exchange Funds Agreement No. X17-6137(038): Mr. Egan reviewed information as presented in packets and noted a reduction in the amount from what was originally anticipated.

Brief discussion was held to clarify that this Item is just to authorize Mr. Egan to sign and submit all necessary documents.

On a first by Mr. Wilson, second by Hemphill, it was unanimously passed to approve the Regional Transportation Surface Program (RSTP) Agency Exchange Funds Agreement No. X17-6137(038) and authorize the Executive Secretary to sign the agreement and submit any and all documentation.

- 4.11 Transit Development Plan Update: Mr. Egan reviewed information as presented in packets and suggested a special meeting to discuss further.

Discussion was held regarding meeting dates and times. It was agreed to hold the meeting on June 19, 2017, at 3:30 PM.

(5) OTHER BUSINESS

- 5.1 Matters brought forth by the Commission: Mr. Albaugh commented about the stakes on HWY 139 marking the road straightening.

Mr. Hemphill asked about the Caltrans blading on Bass Hill. Ms. Rich said she would check on it.

Ms. Grah asked if the Green Dot letter was discussed. Ms. Garnier reiterated Mr. Egan's comments that Green Dot was not allowed to submit a proposal due to already being under contract with the Commission. Ms. Grah said that there might be some options to explore.

- 5.2 Consideration of Cancellation of Regular Commission meeting for June 12, 2017: It was agreed to cancel the meeting of June 12, 2017, and schedule a Special Meeting for June 19, 2017, at 3:30 p.m.
- 5.3 Adjournment: 4:32 p.m.

DRAFT