

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION**

March 6, 2017

**(1) CONVENE:**

LCTC's Regular Meeting convened at 1:00 PM by Chairman Garnier, in the Lassen County Board of Supervisors Chambers at 707 Nevada Street, Susanville, CA.

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

Commissioners Absent: DeBoer.

Others Present: Dan Newton, Dan Gibbs, Jared Hancock, City of Susanville; Ron Leal, Paratransit; Jim Mackay, Susanville Indian Rancheria; Larry Millar, Tony Shaw, Bob Burns, David Knaut, Lassen County; Richard Egan, Cynthia Raschein LCTC Staff.

1.1 Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

1.2 Agenda Approval: On a first by Mr. Albaugh, second by Mr. Wilson, it was passed to approve the agenda.

1.3 Minutes Approval: On a first by Mr. Hemphill, second by Mr. Teeter, it was passed to approve the February 6, 2017, minutes.

**(2) CORRESPONDENCE / PUBLIC COMMENT**

2.1 Correspondence: None.

2.2 Public Comment: Clinton Davis, Chairman for Southern Cascades Community Service District, announced that their ambulance service will begin running March 13, 2017.

**(3) REPORTS**

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

Caltrans Report (Caltrans): None.

California Highway Patrol Report (CHP): Mr. Micheletti thanked the County and Caltrans for their work during the storms.

Ms. Garnier thanked CHP for adding enforcement at the crosswalk at HWY 139.

City of Susanville: None.

County of Lassen Report: None.

Susanville Indian Rancheria Report (SIR): None.

Executive Secretary Report (LCTC Staff): None.

Summary of Commission Financial Activities: Ms. Raschein reviewed information as presented in packets and asked for questions.

(4) NEW BUSINESS

4.1 1:00 p.m. Unmet Needs Public Hearing: Ms. Garnier recited the public hearing opening statement.

Ms. Raschein reported on the meeting held at Lassen Senior Services on February 22, 2017, with one comment to add a stop to the city route that is closer to Northeastern Rural Health Clinic.

Public Hearing was opened at 1:06 p.m.

Yvonne Peterson sent an email requesting extended hours to 5:52 PM on Saturday's, service to her storage unit on Johnstonville Road, benches and shelters at the city bus stops, and "no smoking" signs at the bus stops to help enforce the non-smoking policy.

Ms. Garnier recalled previous conversations regarding Johnstonville Road and offering service from the college, but that there was not enough ridership to justify the route. Ms. Raschein replied that she did not recall any trial routes on Johnstonville Road, and that there are currently no stops on Johnstonville other than the bus yard.

Mr. Albaugh asked if no smoking signs were necessary in public areas or if it was just common sense. Ms. Raschein replied that she would look into how nonsmoking areas apply to bus stops. She further commented that there are signs posted on the buses.

Public Hearing was closed at 1:11 p.m.

On a first by Mr. Albaugh, second by Mr. Teeter, it was unanimously passed to direct staff to perform analysis of public comments for final adoption.

4.2 Fiscal and Triennial Audit Request for Proposal: Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets.

There was no additional discussion.

On a first by Mr. Hemphill, second by Mr. Albaugh, it was unanimously passed to authorize staff to circulate new Request for Proposals for audit services and consider appointing an evaluation committee to review received proposals for a recommendation to the Commission.

- 4.3 Amend Authorized Agent for Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA): Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets.

Ms. Garnier asked the name of the program manager of Prop 1B. Ms. Raschein confirmed that Jennifer Louie was the program manager.

On a first by Mr. Albaugh, second by Mr. Wilson, it was unanimously passed to amend the existing Authorized Agent for the PTMISEA program to Richard Egan, Executive Secretary.

- 4.4 Amend Authorized Agent for California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES): Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets.

There was no additional discussion.

On a first by Mr. Teeter, second by Mr. Albaugh, it was unanimously passed to amend the existing Authorized Agent for the Cal OES program to Richard Egan, Executive Secretary.

- 4.5 Amend Authorized Agent for Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP): Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets.

Mr. Albaugh asked for clarity on LCTOP. Ms. Raschein replied that this is funding for low emissions amenities such as bus shelters, to encourage citizens to use the bus system. She further stated that these funds will be used for the bus shelter at the pool.

On a first by Mr. Wilson, second by Mr. Teeter, it was unanimously passed to amend the existing Authorized Agent of the LCTOP program to Richard Egan, Executive Secretary.

- 4.6 Planning, Programming, and Monitoring Agreement: Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets.

Mr. Albaugh asked for a list of projects for STIP funding. Ms. Raschein replied that there is one County and two City rehab projects and the rest will be PPM projects.

Mr. Albaugh expressed concern regarding more City than County projects and asked if the dollar amount ends up being even for both. He asked Mr. Millar if the county is doing what they should to ensure County projects get their fair share. Mr. Millar stated that it is up to the commission to decide order of priority for funding allocation.

Ms. Garnier asked the timeframe to use the funds. Ms. Raschein stated that funds must be used two years from the date that Caltrans signs the contract.

Mr. Hancock elaborated that a good indicator for upcoming projects would be to monitor projects that are going through the planning and environmental phase or plans and specifications phases.

On a first by Mr. Teeter, second by Mr. Wilson, it was unanimously passed to adopt Resolution 17-03, executing the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Planning and Programming and Monitoring (PPM) Agreement for 2016/17 PPM funds, and authorize Executive Secretary to sign agreements and submit all documentation necessary to receive PPM funding per the agreement.

- 4.7 Application for 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 California Transit Security Grant Program funds: Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets and listed various items that would qualify and that an item would need to be identified today to qualify for funds.

Ms. Garnier asked where the greatest need is. Ms. Raschein replied that additional security cameras for the buses and bus yard are needed.

Mr. Albaugh asked the reason for 2015/16 reimbursement. Ms. Raschein stated that it is due to receiving notification of funds still available to apply for. She further commented that this is the last year for Prop 1B funding.

Ms. Garnier asked if pricing was gathered. Mr. Knaut replied with a breakdown of various equipment and pricing.

Mr. Albaugh asked if camera maintenance and necessary upgrading would be feasible with Prop 1B funding going away. Ms. Raschein answered that if the equipment is found useful, then new funding sources could be sought.

Discussion was held regarding types of cameras and systems to use for various scenarios and timeframes for both fiscal years.

Ms. Garnier asked if instead of putting all the money into cameras, could it be used for rescue and response equipment. Ms. Raschein replied that it could be identified on the resolution and then research what rescue and response equipment would qualify.

Mr. Franco asked if there were enough events on the bus to warrant additional cameras. Mr. Leal responded that there have not been many incidents.

Discussion was held regarding what type of emergency equipment might be needed for disaster situations or vehicle accidents. Mr. Leal responded that buses are equipped with adequate equipment for evacuation scenarios, and that they would rely on first responders for vehicle accidents. He stated that they have emergency response kits at the bus yard that

would be transported by the supervisor to any incident site and that they have many plans in place to handle various situations.

Mr. Franco asked what type of communication systems are available on the buses. Mr. Leal said that there are cameras and radio communication on each bus that connect to the yard and extra cell phones that can be assigned.

Mr. Albaugh asked if funds could be used to acquire easements on private property for shelters or benches. Mr. Knaut replied that easements could be obtained or property could be purchased and he was still waiting for information regarding right-of-way for insurance liability purposes. He further stated that scenarios would vary from property to property.

Ms. Garnier asked if the majority of bus stops were on private property. Mr. Knaut responded that the most used stops were on private property, but not the majority. He further commented that survey numbers do not support needs for bus stop shelters.

Discussion was held confirming that projects may be changed at a later date and it was agreed to identify security cameras as use for funds. Direction was given staff to identify potential project options to present at the next meeting.

On a first by Mr. Wilson, second by Mr. Hemphill, it was unanimously passed to adopt Resolution 17-04 authorizing Executive Secretary to sign all necessary documents to acquire grant funds for security cameras, and implement appropriate transit safety and security improvements upon approval of the application.

4.8 Transportation Funding/Reform, Assembly Bill 1: Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets.

Discussion was held regarding where AB 1 was in the legislative process and that it has not been passed yet.

Discussion was held regarding the loan repayment amount and the need for preparedness to act quickly if needed.

Mr. Albaugh suggested an opposition letter be composed expressing loan repayment concerns. He offered to help compose the letter.

Discussion was held, and it was agreed to send a letter of opposition but be ready to switch to applying for funds. Ms. Raschein commented that once the Bill is passed, guidelines will be sent out with instructions for applying.

Mr. Franco asked if a letter of opposition will restrict applications for funds. It was agreed that it would not.

Mr. Albaugh made a motion to send a letter of opposition for SB 1 and AB 1. Mr. Hemphill seconded the motion.

By roll call, Commissioners Albaugh, Teeter, and Hemphill voted “Aye”; Franco, Wilson, and Garnier voted “No”. The motion was later revoked.

It was agreed that a motion was not needed and direction was given to staff to send letters of opposition for SB 1 and AB 1 and also to be prepared to apply for funds and plan for the loan repayment. Ms. Garnier said she was not in favor of sending the letters.

- 4.9 Identify and apply for projects for Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) funding: Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets and said that the only stops that meet the need for full improvement are on private property. She offered that the previously adopted Transit Design Manual could be revised to change eligibility criteria.

Mr. Hemphill asked if benches could be rented or leased to private property owners. Ms. Raschein said that no profit can be made from improvements and expressed concern for where the improvements would be located to keep it fair to business owners.

Discussion was held regarding implementing an application process to request bus stop improvements to private property and if any improvements currently on private property are owned by the City or County. Ms. Raschein stated that she is not aware of any.

Mr. Newton stated that city easements are not uniform and can vary from street to street.

Ms. Garnier if funds were already set aside for the pool stop. Ms. Raschein said that stop is being purchased through CalACT.

Ms. Garnier asked if funds need to be earmarked for specific projects now. Ms. Raschein said the Resolution can be generic, but when the request is sent to Prop 1B, specific projects will need to be identified and can be revised through a Corrective Action Plan.

Mr. Albaugh said he’d like staff to identify private property with attention to easements and right a ways.

Mr. Teeter asked for clarity regarding the placement of improvements, in that a revision needs to be done to include individual sites. Ms. Raschein replied that the eligibility requirements will need to be amended in the Transit Design Plan first.

Ms. Garnier asked when the amendment can be done. Ms. Raschein said that staff will work on the manual and bring it back for adoption.

Direction was given to develop an application for private property owners to apply for improvements.

Ms. Garnier asked about funding for improvements on private property. Ms. Raschein confirmed that there are no funds available that allow for improvements on private property. Ms. Garnier asked if the improvements could be done if there was a lease. Ms.

Raschein replied that not unless the easement is purchased outright or a long term lease is purchased. She further commented that after such purchases there may not be funds left for the improvements. Ms. Garnier said that businesses might consider the long term leases to get the improvements and to keep that option open.

Mr. Franco asked how people know where the bus stops are when most are only documented by a list. Ms. Raschein answered that the regular riders know where the stops are and that the reason for this project is to assign bus stops. She said the holdup is that if you disturb any cement, you must do full ADA upgrades. She said they are waiting for confirmation from Caltrans, and if it is found to be untrue, they can proceed with installing signs.

Discussion was held confirming that currently, riders use the bus schedule to identify bus stops.

On a first by Mr. Wilson, second by Mr. Teeter, it was unanimously passed to adopt Resolution 17-05, authorizing the Executive Secretary to sign and submit all documents necessary to request funding.

- 4.10 Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) Allocation Request: Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets and stated that these funds will be in addition to funds already received for the pool bus stop.

Mr. Albaugh asked who set the definition of “disadvantaged communities” and if we qualified as one. Ms. Raschein answered that the State sets the definition and that we are not in that category.

Ms. Raschein reminded the Commission that these funds do need to identify a project and recommended a free fare day around the time of the County Fair.

Discussion was held regarding what project to identify.

Ms. Raschein stated these funds can be combined with PTMISEA funds.

Mr. Albaugh asked if these funds can be used for Lassen Senior Services or Big Valley 50 Plus. Ms. Raschein said that when previously asked, these funds could not be used for either. Mr. Albaugh asked that it be looked into again.

Ms. Raschein reiterated the direction to identify bus stop improvements, but to look into Lassen Senior Services, Big Valley 50 Plus, and free fare days as eligible options.

On a first by Hemphill, second by Mr. Wilson, it was unanimously passed to 1) adopt Resolution 17-06, authorizing the request for funds from the LCTOP program, identifying “free fare” days, bus stop improvements, and senior transportation services for Lassen Senior Services and Big Valley 50 Plus as potential projects, and designate the Executive Secretary as Authorized Agent on behalf of the Commission; 2) authorize Executive

Secretary to sign agreements, and submit all documentation necessary to receive LCTOP funding.

- 4.11 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Amendment: Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets and stated that Mr. Millar and Mr. Newton were available to answer questions.

Mr. Millar commented that the final design process required environmental recertification by Caltrans. During the process, changes were made to the HWY 36 intersection as well as the need for a new hydraulic study due to the revised FEMA map, causing changes to bridge construction and the need for additional funds. He reviewed the increase in funding and timeline, and said the Freeway Agreement with Caltrans and CTC allowing encroachment is causing delays that will not allow the project to be completed in the 2017/18 STIP cycle. He said the maintenance agreement for the signal is also being worked on and estimates six months before details will be worked out. He referenced the 2016 Summary of STIP County Shares included in packets and gave a breakdown of how the funding could be amended. He said that Kelly Zolotoff with Caltrans, recommended re-scoping the City and County projects but keep as a project to bring back together later. He mentioned that the Skyline project has been a priority for the Commission ever since it was put into the RTIP in 2005 and gave a timeline of activity. He said that if the Commission decides not to proceed with the project FHWA will ask for the money received to be returned, equaling a little over one million dollars. He also stated that a lot of local funding has already been put into projects.

Mr. Albaugh asked if suggestions from Caltrans can be put in writing. Mr. Millar said that a lot depends on the next STIP cycle, but that it might help some.

Mr. Albaugh asked if the workload caused by storms would be too much to take on in addition to this project. Mr. Millar answered that the bridge design is 95% complete and estimates July or August of 2018 to go out for bids. Mr. Albaugh pointed out that as time passes, cost goes up.

Mr. Hemphill asked if Caltrans is holding this up. Mr. Millar confirmed that the Caltrans agreements and recertification are causing delays.

Ms. Garnier asked if the reason for not redoing the bridge design and hydrology study five years ago was due to funding. Mr. Millar said that they didn't know at the time, and due to where they were in the process it wasn't necessary. He said that at various stages, they conduct reevaluations of everything, and if anything changes to environmental, archeological, etc., adjustments need to be made to the project or you cannot proceed.

Mr. Wilson asked rather than taking out the projects that are ready to go in 2018/19, what the downside would be to pushing back a project that has already had delays and might have more delays. Mr. Millar responded that if the Skyline project does not get construction authorized by the twenty year mark in September 2018, the project dies. He further stated that Caltrans said that this has never happened, but that they would no longer



consider it a priority project. Mr. Wilson asked about the six or seven million they have taken off the table that was un-programmed. Mr. Millar said it would depend what the next STIP cycle will hold, but it wasn't an option in 2016, and in the past they would not let you take any new funding in the earlier years.

Ms. Garnier asked about using up money for three other projects, and what would be done with the extra money. Mr. Millar gave a list of options and said it would be up to the Commission.

Mr. Franco asked if there was a possibility to appropriate the un-programmed balance now. Mr. Millar responded that was not allowed.

Mr. Franco expressed concern whether this project could make the deadline when it's taken so long to get this far. Mr. Millar stated that since the right of way has been completed Caltrans has made the agreements a priority, but he still doesn't have a definite timeframe when they will take it to the CTC.

Mr. Hemphill asked if this has to be done today. Mr. Millar said that STIP amendments of this type take two CTC meetings which makes the amendment due by March 20, 2017, for notice at the May 17, 2017, meeting and action at the June meeting.

Discussion was held regarding holding a special meeting and the need to have Caltrans present to answer questions.

Mr. Franco asked if this has been discussed with the City. Mr. Millar said that he and Mr. Newton had a discussion after the last meeting.

Mr. Teeter asked for clarity regarding timelines to make the September 2018 deadline. Mr. Millar reviewed the timeline and said that the County will be sitting and waiting as soon as allocation was ready.

Ms. Garnier asked what if Caltrans doesn't have everything ready and funding is lost that could be used on other roads. Mr. Millar said that will be a tough decision for the Commission as they have kept this project as a priority.

Discussion was held regarding the easement acquisition delays and its effect on the project timeline.

Mr. Hemphill said that he would like to hear from Caltrans whether they can get their agreement done so deadlines can be met. Ms. Raschein said a special meeting can be held and request that Caltrans staff be present.

Mr. Franco asked if it's been looked in to how the Skyline project will line up with what's being planned for the Gateway project and suggested that it might be more cost effective to look at them together. Mr. Millar said he doesn't have any information on the Gateway project and he didn't know if they would even tie in together at some point.

Mr. Teeter commented for clarity that when this project started, all the easements and right of ways weren't already owned, and it was assumed they would be obtained later. Mr. Millar stated that previous County and City staff aggressively programmed all three phases at once when it should have been phased in as needed so we wouldn't be at the twenty year deadline.

Mr. Newton asked if Skyline South is at risk for losing funding too with the same deadline. Mr. Millar replied that it could because it is still on the Commission's list.

Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Millar's opinion if these three projects are still as important as it was in the beginning. Mr. Millar said that East and Extension are still priorities as they will relieve a lot of traffic off Main Street, but does not feel that the South project is as important as it doesn't tie in to a bypass.

Ms. Raschein stated that the projects are also noted as top priority in the Regional Transportation Plan for the last two updates. Mr. Wilson said he doesn't remember ever really talking about it, and that it was just carried over from previous boards and staff.

Discussion was held regarding the South project funding timelines and that it hasn't been programmed for years, but still recognized as a viable project.

Ms. Garnier asked about Punkin Center Road and Ash Valley Road. Mr. Millar said they are in sad shape and very important to the county. Mr. Albaugh elaborated on the severe wash boarding on Ash Valley Road, and that Punkin Center Road is in such poor condition that detours had to be created around bridges that ranchers use to move livestock; which are now unpassable after the storms.

Ms. Garnier asked for comment from Mr. Newton who confirmed that he met Mr. Millar after the last meeting to discuss the funding shortfalls and project removal options to present to the Commission for discussion and direction. He stated they also talked about the tight timelines and that the City rehab projects are on track. He expressed concern regarding un-programming projects altogether for fear they will never get funds replenished. He also recommended the STIP amendment. Ms. Garnier asked to clarify that he prefers that the projects get moved back and not deleted. He confirmed that if projects are not moved back then the money goes away until they decide it can be touched again, which might not be ever.

Ms. Garnier said she would like to know how much each rehab will cost so a more educated decision can be made on which roads to help. Mr. Newton gave some examples of how a project can be divided.

Mr. Teeter asked if some of these rehab projects were tied to water lines. Mr. Newton said that some were and that he would look into that.

Mr. Hancock expressed concern regarding removing rehab projects. He asked to see the letter from Caltrans to see what options are available. He said the state does not place high priority on rehab projects, so to be able to keep these on the list and keep funds available is important to the citizens and the goal is to use as much of the state funding as possible.

Ms. Garnier requested to see numbers for the balance of the \$960,000 if they were to pay that into the program funds, and asked what other options are available. She asked if some of the city street rehab can be tied to the water improvement and use Capital Improvement Funds, which would free up some money to be moved somewhere else. She also asked to find out what it will take to address the bridge issues. Mr. Hancock clarified that the roads involved with the water line project still need overlay.

Discussion was held regarding feasible meeting time and it was agreed to hold a special meeting on March 14, 2017, at 3:00 PM

Mr. Hancock commented that he would like specific direction from the Commission. He stated based on conversations with the County, he was told that this needed to be discussed in front of the Commission, but what he is hearing today is that the Commission is requesting that City, County and LCTC staff meet to discuss options and present ideas at the next meeting. Mr. Albaugh replied that the cost per individual road needs to be reported by City or County depending on jurisdiction, that way a decision can be made with cost as consideration. Mr. Hancock mentioned that he thinks there may be other funding sources available that would allow more projects to be completed. He said with the additional information provided today, he would like to explore more options and see if they can buy more time.

Discussion was held to further clarify timelines, strategies, and program balances.

Mr. Wilson asked for a list of City and County priorities. Mr. Hancock expressed concern regarding projects where money has already been spent and the risk of having to pay back funds.

Further discussion was held regarding the special meeting and it was agreed to schedule it for March 14, 2017, at 3:30 PM and requested that Caltrans be present.

4.12 Contract for Services between Lassen County and the Lassen County Transportation Commission: Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets.

Mr. Burns suggested that 4.12 and 4.13 may be out of order. It was agreed to address item 4.13 ahead of 4.12.

Mr. Burns commented that confidence in counsel is paramount and recommended that he bring back an amended services agreement that removes him as primary counsel and allows the Commission to use independent counsel. Mr. Hemphill said that the agreement already states the use of independent counsel. Mr. Burns reiterated removing himself as primary counsel to elevate any uncertainty of unbiased or unqualified services. He further

commented that he is uncomfortable with a client that does not come to him for advice or accept the representation he makes on legal issues. Mr. Wilson commented that there has only been a two times where recommendations have been questioned, and for the same topic. Mr. Burns answered that he expects this topic to come up again, and that he has concerns for the Commission questioning future conflict; by removing him will remove any question.

Mr. Franco elaborated on Mr. Hemphill's comment and that if the Commission exercised its right to get a second opinion might damage the relationship. Mr. Burns answered that it might, but that personal emotions were not an issue. Mr. Teeter commented that just because second opinions are sought, doesn't necessarily mean dissatisfaction with service. Mr. Burns said that he just wanted to provide an opportunity for this issue to not come up again. Ms. Garnier commented that she feels the board should have the right to use either counsel without having to consult with him first. Mr. Burns replied that he acts in best interest of whatever board he is representing and that he withdrew his request to be removed.

4.13 Contract for Services between Lassen County and the Lassen County Transportation Commission: Ms. Raschein reviewed information as provided in packets.

Ms. Garnier commented that the verbiage in the staff report should be 'for discussion' and not 'termination'. Mr. Egan responded that he changed the verbiage to give the Commission more flexibility.

Ms. Garnier reminded the room that it was the desire of the Commission to have this item discussed in closed session instead of open session and to keep that in mind with regards to comments. She gave some history of past discussions including operating options under consideration, and said the reason for the discussion is to decide what direction the Commission would like to go.

Mr. Wilson commented that he preferred to have this discussion in closed session, but was ok to have it in open forum. He stated that he believes that this item was placed on the agenda because of him and Mr. Egan's differences regarding carrying out direction for hiring. He said he has no problem with the contract with the County, but feels that what the board was looking for was not available in the pool of candidates, which he expressed to Mr. Egan prior to any hiring decision being made.

Mr. Egan commented that based upon the displeasure of the Commission regarding service being provided by the county, he embarked on a process to try to do a job that the Commission wants, and to involve the Commissioners in the process. He mentioned several changes that were agreed to by the Commission to help Commissioners be more involved including monthly meetings, agenda meetings, budget workshop with a staffing plan, and the substitution of one position for another. He stated that there were no complaints until the request to enter into closed session to discuss a contract between to public bodies; which counsel said cannot be done when asked previously. He commented that he would like to hear if the legal opinion was the same for this specific matter. He said he is happy to

adjust wherever necessary to make service what the Commission wants. He concluded by saying that the county takes personnel management seriously and will treat county employees the same as Commission employees.

Discussion was held regarding the creation of the position with emphasis on Commission approved funding and specific requirements sought in candidates, the options presented to Commissioners to get the service they want, and the inclusion of Commissioners in the hiring process with the ultimate responsibility falling to Mr. Egan.

Mr. Albaugh commented that he thinks the Commission is heading the right direction and that it cannot be self-serving with county and city needing to work together or terminating this agreement if they cannot.

Mr. Teeter asked Mr. Egan for clarity regarding the contract. Mr. Egan offered a brief synopsis.

Discussion was held regarding the evolution of the current staffing positions.

Ms. Garnier commented that the Commission was seeking someone that was more in tune with what was happening in Sacramento, the current trends, funding, and Senate Bills. She said that just appointing someone doesn't mean you will get the services. She said that is the reason Mr. Egan was appointed to find the services for the Commission.

Ms. Garnier said that in recent communication with Margaret Long, it was reiterated that you cannot discuss anything that might lead to talking about employees in closed session.

Mr. Teeter commented that another entity wouldn't necessarily provide staff that exceeds what is currently offered and further commented that open format is best.

Mr. Egan commented that there is no one person that can provide all the services the Commission desires.

Mr. Wilson said that if the person does not exist, the position should not have been filled. Mr. Egan replied that the job description was crafted around reality and not a wish list and that a qualified person was hired based on the description approved by the Commission.

Mr. Hemphill commented that the Commission would be best served by a consultant to keep track with Caltrans related items. Ms. Garnier agreed. Mr. Egan reminded the Commission that a consultant was one of the options suggested previously.

Discussion was held regarding consulting services, best way to seek services and implement a contract, and current staffing needs.

Mr. Albaugh suggested utilizing legislative tracking affiliations to help keep track of the legislative side.

Discussion was held regarding past searches for consultants, possibly trying again, and that the right consultant might pay for itself by finding additional funds.

Mr. Franco stressed the need for unbiased support and that the Commissioners should not be thinking 'county' or 'city' but act on behalf of the whole county.

Ms. Garnier asked for direction.

Mr. Hemphill suggested modeling after LAFCO and circulate an RFP to seek a consultant.

Mr. Albaugh asked if the termination is only for the LCTC. Mr. Egan reiterated last year's proceedings that fiscally separated the LCTC and LTSA and stated that he is the Executive Secretary for LCTC and Mr. Millar is the Executive Secretary for LTSA.

Mr. Teeter said that he was comfortable with the current way of doing business as long as City Commissioners agreed. Ms. Garnier responded that she doesn't feel this is a City versus County issue and that she represents the Commission, but wants to make sure that City and County are represented by a person or entity that's going to provide services to benefit the entire community. Mr. Teeter clarified that he just wants to make sure that framework is in place so all can move forward and not revisit the issue next year. Ms. Garnier said she wants an additional consultant just to stay in tune with Sacramento and not be tasked with other duties.

Mr. Wilson stated that direct conversations with Mr. Egan do not support his actions and feels that he manipulated the situation to achieve his goals. He reiterated that he wanted this discussion to be held in closed session and stated that Ms. Raschein has done a wonderful job addressing Commission issues over the past year, but that the specific goals for seeking additional support were not carried out as directed by the Commission.

On a first by Mr. Albaugh, second by Mr. Hemphill, it was unanimously passed to table this item for discussion the Special Meeting to be conducted on March 14, 2017, and to provide all minutes, job descriptions, advertising, and applications, pertinent to this issue to the new commission members.

Discussion for Item 4.12 was resumed.

(5) OTHER BUSINESS

5.1 Matters brought forth by the Commission: None.

5.2 Set date for the next Special Commission Meeting for March 14, 2017

5.3 Adjournment: 3:57 p.m.