

LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY



John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

Office:
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 600
Sacramento, CA 95814

P.O. Box 1028
Susanville, CA 96130

Date Posted: May 6, 2022

To: THE LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION:

Mendy Schuster, Chair (City Council)
Quincy McCourt (City Council)
Thomas Herrera (City Council)

Tom Hammond (Co. Supervisor)
Jeff Hemphill (Co. Supervisor)
Aaron Albaugh, Vice-chair (Co. Supervisor)

Subject: **REGULAR MEETING**

of the

LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

A meeting of the Lassen County Transportation Commission has been scheduled for **Monday, May 9, 2022, at 1:30 p.m.**

The meeting will be held at the City Council Chambers, 66 North Lassen Street, Susanville, CA.

Zoom Link: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87934295828>

Call in number: 1-253-215-8782

The Agenda is as follows:

(1) CONVENE

1.1 Pledge of Allegiance

1.2 Adoption of the Agenda: **Motion Required**

The Commission may make any necessary additions, deletions or corrections to the agenda including moving items to or from the agenda.

1.3 Approval of the Minutes for March 14, 2022, Regular Meeting: **Motion Required**

1.4 Approval of the Consent Calendar: **Motion Required**

NOTE: All matters listed under the Consent Calendar are considered routine and will be enacted by one motion by roll call vote unless any member of the Commission wishes to remove an item for discussion. The reading of the full text of all Resolutions will be waived unless a Commissioner requests otherwise.

1.41 Payment of Clerici Consulting for Executive Secretary and LCTC staffing fees and costs in the amount of \$29,956.09. *

REQUESTED ACTION: Approve payment of Clerici Consulting fees and costs in the amount of \$29,956.09 as shown in Invoice #009-24 for April 2022.

1.42 Request to Extend Contract for Legal Services with Sloan Sakai, LLP. *

REQUESTED ACTION: Adopt Resolution 22-04 authorizing the Executive Secretary to prepare and execute documents to extend the contract with Sloan Sakai, LLP for legal services.

(2) CORRESPONDENCE/PUBLIC COMMENT

(3) REPORTS

3.1 Reports from Caltrans, CHP, City of Susanville, County of Lassen, and LCTC Staff

- Caltrans Report
- California Highway Patrol (CHP) Report
- City of Susanville Report
- County of Lassen Report
- Susanville Indian Rancheria Report

(4) NEW BUSINESS

4.01 ANNOUNCEMENT OF ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION

- There are no closed session items.

4.02 ANNOUNCEMENT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

4.10 ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

4.11 Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Audit Reports

ACTION REQUESTED: BY MOTION, receive and file the Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Audit Reports and direct staff to forward Audits to Caltrans.

4.12 FY 2022/23 Unmet Transit Needs Determinations

ACTION REQUESTED: BY MOTION, adopt Resolution 22-05 finding that there are no new unmet transit needs in that is reasonable to meet for implementation in FY 2022/23.

4.12 Fiscal Year 2022/23 Overall Work Program and Budget

ACTION REQUESTED: BY MOTION, adopt Resolution 22-06 approving the FY 2022/23 Overall Work Program and Budget.

4.14 Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) Update

ACTION REQUESTED: None. This is an informational item only

(5) INFORMATION ITEMS

5.01 Executive Secretary Report

Updates:

- US 395 Coalition Building
- ATP Public Meetings
- Infrastructure Legislation

(6) CORRESPONDENCE

6.01 None

(7) OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 Matters brought forth by the Commission

7.2 Next Commission Meeting – **Monday, June 20, 2022, at 1:30 p.m.**

7.3 Adjourn

* Attachment

Enclosure

^ Handout

ITEMS TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR FUTURE MEETINGS:

- Final LRSP Adoption
- Draft Active Transportation Plan
- Progress on on-going planning efforts
 - US 395 – Investment Plan Draft Report
 - City and County capital projects
- Identification and adoption of Commission By-laws

LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

MINUTES

Regular Commission Meeting

March 14, 2022

City of Susanville Council Chambers
66 North Lassen Street
Susanville, CA

1:30 P.M. Open Session

1:30 P.M. OPEN SESSION

1. Convene

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:23 P.M.

Roll Call: Present: Albaugh, Bridges (alternate), Hemphill, Herrera, McCourt, Schuster
Absent: Hammond

1.1 Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was deferred.

1.2 Adoption of Agenda:

It was moved by Commissioner Albaugh and seconded by Commissioner Hemphill that the Commission adopt the agenda with the following changes:

- Move Item 1.5 Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson before Item 1.3 Approval of Consent Calendar*
- Move Item 4.13 Local Road Safety Plan Update to follow the approval of the Consent Calendar*

With the changes the Agenda was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Albaugh, Bridges, Hemphill, Herrera, McCourt, Schuster
NOES: None
ABSENT: Hammond
ABSTAIN: None

1.5 Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

The Commission was asked to elect a Chairperson to preside at meetings of the Commission for the balance of the calendar year 2022.

It was moved by Commissioner Albaugh and seconded by Commissioner Hemphill to nominate Mendy Schuster to be chair for the remainder of 2022. No other nominations were made. The motion was passed with the following vote:

AYES: Albaugh, Bridges, Hemphill, Herrera, McCourt, Schuster
NOES: None
ABSENT: Hammond
ABSTAIN: None

The Commission was asked to elect a Vice-Chairperson for the balance of the calendar year 2022.

It was moved by Commissioner Hemphill and seconded by Commissioner Bridges to nominate Aaron Albaugh to be Vice-chairperson for the remainder of 2022. No other nominations were made. The motion was passed with the following vote:

AYES: Albaugh, Bridges, Hemphill, Herrera, McCourt, Schuster
NOES: None
ABSENT: Hammond
ABSTAIN: None

1.3 Approval of the January 10, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes

The Commission was asked to adopt the Minutes of their January 10, 2022, Regular Meeting.

It was moved by Commissioner Hemphill and seconded by Commissioner Herrera to approve the minutes as presented by staff. The motion was passed by the following vote:

AYES: Albaugh, Bridges, Hemphill, Herrera, McCourt, Schuster
NOES: None
ABSENT: Hammond
ABSTAIN: None

1.4 Approval of Consent Calendar

Commissioner Albaugh had questions about Item 1.41 Payment of Clerici Consulting Invoice for Staffing Services. Specifically, he had concerns about the value being provided by staff, and whether tax money was being well spent. A lengthy conversation ensued with all Commissioners providing comment. The Executive Secretary provided examples of how the current staffing effort provided skills and experience that would be hard to duplicate if staffing returned to its pervious circumstances. He noted that the funding being used was specifically for Commission administration and planning activities, that it was by and large not transferable to other uses, and that much of the work was

required by statute. He added that if any Commissioner had concerns regarding staff work and their return on investment, that he was always available.

Elizabeth Norton commented that staff was always very responsive to her inquiries.

It was moved by Commissioner Hemphill and seconded by Commissioner Albaugh that that the Commission approve the Consent Calendar as presented by staff. The motion was passed by the following vote:

AYES: Albaugh, Bridges, Hemphill, Herrera, McCourt, Schuster
NOES: None
ABSENT: Hammond
ABSTAIN: None

Item 4.13 Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) Update – Note: The quality of the internet connection and zoom call deteriorated over the course of this item and failed before the end. Staff continued with the presentation by phone connection.

Gordon Shaw provided an overview and update of the LRSP. The presentation included the following;

- Purpose and need of doing an LRPS
- Existing crash history
 - Data summary
 - Location of crashes
 - Crash by type
 - Bike and Pedestrian incidents
 - How crash data for Lassen County compares to statewide averages
- Identified high crash corridors
- Recommended specific stie safety improvements

Commissioner Albaugh commented that this was valuable information, and that perhaps a second presentation could be done for the May meeting. The Executive Secretary commented that the document was being circulated for both agency and public comment and that the final plan would be brought back to the Commission in May. He added that separate presentations were planned for both the Board of Supervisors and the City Council in April.

Commissioner Herrera added that there did not seem to be a lot of data for Main Street/SR 36 or nearby roads.

The Executive Secretary added that this was for locally owned roads and not for the state highways. Data for SR 36 specifically would be in the Main Street/SR36 Safety Plan. Commissioner Herrera added that he thought there were more accidents and near misses from people using side streets to get around traffic on Main Street, but then coming back out to SR 36. The Executive Secretary responded that he would chat with Gordon about this and get additional information.

This was an information item and not action was taken by the Commission.

2. CORRESPONDENCE/PUBLIC COMMENT

No written communications were received.

No public comment was offered.

3. REPORTS

3.1 Caltrans

Mike Mogen was not present but provided staff with the following brief update:

- *Clean CA Susanville Gateway Monument: Caltrans is putting together the plans, specs and estimate for this project and plan to start construction late this summer. Should start in May. The Executive Secretary added that the City might be asking for a one year extension on the Gateway project.*
- *“Good-Fred”: Is still in suspension for the winter.*
- *Bordertown Wildlife Fence: Also is in winter hiatus but should start back up in May*

3.2 CHP

No report was provided by CHP.

3.3 City of Susanville

Erik Edholm confirmed that the Gateway project will likely be delayed a year to get the maintenance agreement completed.

3.4 Lassen County

Pete Heimbigner reported that the two county STIP projects (B&C) have been awarded construction contracts and are waiting for the beginning of construction season. Rehab B will begin late Summer or early fall. Rehab C will start in late May early June.

3.5 Susanville Indian Rancheria

No report was provided by Rancheria staff.

4 NEW BUSINESS

4.01 Announcement of Items to be Discussed in Closed Session

There was no closed session.

4.02 Announcement of Action Taken in Closed Session

There was no closed session.

4.10 Action/Discussion Items

4.11 Draft Fiscal Year 2022/23 Draft Overall Work Program and Budget

John Clerici reminded that the Overall Work Program (OWP) and Budget is the primary management tool for the Commission and its staff. The OWP contains a description of the activities to be undertaken by the Commission in the coming fiscal year along with detailed budget information.

John provided an update of the major differences from the current OWP and the Draft OWP for next fiscal year. He noted that the primary difference was that the current OWP focused more on finishing some significant planning documents, next years would be more oriented to implementation.

John added that the Administrative Draft FY 2022/23 OWP and Budget was provided to Caltrans on February 28 (as required by statute) for review and comment. Lassen County, the City of Susanville, the Susanville Indian Rancheria, and other stakeholders were provided an overview of the proposed OWP and Budget at their March 7 TAC meeting. He noted that once Caltrans and agency review is complete, a revised Public Draft will be distributed for review and comment to a broader audience. The revised Draft FY 2022/23 OWP and Budget will be brought back to the Commission for comment and adoption at their May meeting.

It was moved by Commissioner Hemphill and seconded by Commissioner Bridges to adopt the staff recommendations to circulate the Draft FY 22/23 OWP and Budget for public review and comment. The motion was passed with the following vote:

AYES: Albaugh, Bridges, Hemphill, Herrera, McCourt, Schuster

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hammond

ABSTAIN: None

4.12 FY 2022/23 Unmet Transit Needs – SSTAC Meeting

Genevieve Evans provided a brief report on the February 23rd, 2022, the LCTC SSTAC hearing. The meeting was intended to discuss potential unmet transit needs in Lassen County. Eight SSTAC members and other representatives of transportation providers and members of the public met in person and virtually at the Susanville City Council Chambers. She noted that the meeting was advertised to the public through notices in the local on-line publication, at City Hall, flyers on buses, notification on the LCTC Website (Lassenctc.com), LTSA website and through social media.

She summarized the potential transit needs which were brought up at the SSTAC meeting. They included:

- Out of county medical trips for all residents but mainly for persons not eligible for Medi-Cal*

- *Transit service to outlying areas such as Spaulding or Bucks Bay*
- *Transportation back to homes for people who were transported to a hospital by ambulance. Discharge often occurs in the middle of the night.*
- *A “Dine around Town” program which would get homebound seniors out and about to socialize.*

Education/information – Many residents, medical professionals and social workers are not aware of all the various transportation options in the area.

Genevieve concluded that staff will analyze the identified deficiencies and apply the “Unmet Transit Needs” and “Reasonable to Meet” definitions to make a recommendation to the LCTC as to whether the identified deficiencies should be considered as unmet needs and whether those unmet needs are reasonable to meet. The Unmet Transit Needs Report will be brought to the commission at the May meeting.

This was an information item and not action was taken by the Commission.

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

The following is an overview of some of the issues, projects, and coordination currently being advanced by LCTC.

5.01 Executive Summary Report

The Executive Summary provided a brief update for the Commission. It included the following:

Active Transportation Plan (Bikes and Pedestrians)

Work on the ATP has entered an exciting new phase. Starting with some focused meetings with bicycle advocates in February (2/16 and 2/23), staff is preparing to hold two public meetings to engage a broader set of stakeholders. Two public meetings have been set for the end of March.

- *March 30 at the Westwood Depot Visitor Center 462-885 3rd and Ash Streets*
- *March 31 at the Susanville Railroad Depot Visitor Center, 601 Richmond Road*
Both open houses will start at 4:30 PM and go to 6 PM

The meetings will have an open house format with the following displays:

Regional Transportation Plan

Staff continues its update of the RTP. We have begun updating current conditions (Section 2 of the RTP) and have engaged the TAC to begin the process of updating project lists for the City, County and State facilities. The goal is to have the updates for both Sections 1 and 2 completed by the end of June.

US 395

Staff continues its work on the US 395 Coalition Building Effort. At our last meeting we reported that a memo describing in some detail 11 passing lanes identified by the TAC was delivered on January 10. Since then, the information has been assessed by staff. The information has also been shared with Congressman LaMalfa’s office, as well as the US 395 TAC. Ultimately this information, as well as other reports generated by this and other efforts, will be used to prepare the draft and final Funding Plan

which will close out this phase of work. By the terms of the grant funding received to do the project this must be completed by the end of June.

In addition, Commissioner Hammond travelled to Washington DC recently to engage both Federal Agencies and elected officials on behalf of the project.

Our next steps will include the following:

- *Continue to engage Congressman LaMalfa and his staff*
- *Engage elements of the Department of Defense (Sierra Army Depot) and coordinate our efforts with them to help obtain potential project funding*
- *Re-engage the US 395 Coalition*
- *Re-engage Lassen County Stakeholders*
- *Develop information materials based on our findings for use in promoting the identified improvements to applicable Federal and State entities*
- *Adoption of approved elements into the Regional Transportation Plan*

6. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 Matter brought forth by the Commission

None.

7.2 Next Commission Meeting

Next meeting of the LCTC will be on Monday, May 9, 2022, at time 1:30 PM, at the City of Susanville, City Council Chambers, 66 North Lassen Street, Susanville, CA.

7.3 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

Submitted for approval by:



John Clerici
Executive Secretary



LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANING AGENCY

555 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 600
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

P.O. Box 1028
SUSANVILLE, CA 96130

John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

Staff Report

Date: March 7, 2022 **AGENDA ITEM 1.41**

To: Lassen County Transportation Commission

From: John L Clerici, Executive Secretary 

Subject: Payment of Clerici Consulting for Executive Secretary and LCTC staffing fees and costs in the amount of \$29,956.09

REQUESTED ACTION

Approve payment of Clerici Consulting fees and costs in the amount of \$29,956.09 as shown in Invoice #009-24 for April 2022.

PAST ACTION

This is the Twenty-fourth invoice under the contract with Clerici Consulting for Executive Secretary and staff services.

DISCUSSION

Attached is Invoices #009-24, with supporting documentation, and a detailed Progress Report for the period beginning April 1, 2022 and ended April 30, 2022. This invoice includes a detailed invoice for charges for sub-consultant Borroum Engineering in the amount of \$18,919.68.

Key items of work completed in the last month included the following:

- Provided follow-up to two public ATP meetings (Westwood, Susanville)
- Presented to the Lassen County Board of Supervisors on the LRSP
- Follow-up for March LCTC Commission and TAC meetings
- Provided engineering oversite for the US 395 Coalition Building effort
- Presented to Sierra Alliance at their SAID Kick-off Meeting

These charges are consistent with the billing trends for the FY 2021/22 OWP budget to date.

Attachments (1)

INVOICE

Project Title: Lassen County Transportation Commission
Executive Secretary and Staffing Services

Date: May 1, 2022
Invoice # 009-024
Billing Cycle Ended: 4/30/2022 (April 1, 2022 - April 30, 2022)

Clerici Consulting
 1555 Sean Drive
 Placerville, CA 95667
 530-919-9739
 jlfclerici@gmail.com

To: Ms. Mendy Schuster, Chairman
 Lassen County Transportation Commission
 PO Box 1028
 Susanville, CA 96130

Staff Member	Total Hours	Payroll Rate	Overhead Rate	Profit (5%)	Total Rate	Total Cost
John Clerici	77.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 71.50	\$ 6.83	\$ 143.33	\$ 11,036.41
Borroum Engineering LSC Transportation Consultants	April (22)					\$ 18,919.68
Printing, copies, reproduction						No Charge
Travel (Lodging, meals)						No Charge
TOTAL						\$ 29,956.09
Prior Balance						\$ 38,144.18
Payment						\$ 38,144.18
Total Due						\$ 29,956.09

Thank you for your history of prompt payment! As a small business, we greatly appreciate it!

John Clerici 5-4-22


PROGRESS REPORT
CLERICI CONSULTING ACTIVITIES

Project: Lassen County Transportation Commission

Clerici Consulting Project 009-024

Period: April 1, 2022 – April 30, 2022

WORK COMPLETED (through April 30, 2022)

SPECIFIC WORK ELEMENT RELATED ACTIVITIES

- **Work Element 100 – Administration**
 - Began developing agenda materials for the Commissions May TAC and LCTC meetings.
 - Met with Caltrans staff to develop presentation on wildlife barriers and other protective measures for the May LCTC meeting (4/18)
 - Provided follow-up for the March 2022 Regular Commission meeting.

- **Work Element 601A – General Planning**
 - Coordinate with Caltrans on information meetings that discuss impacts of State Route Development/System Management Plans
 - Red Rock CapM project meeting (4/22)
 - Susan River CapM project meeting (4/22)
 - Participated in NSSR ZEV working group meeting (4/27)
 - Continued to monitor regional and statewide transportation issues

- **Work Element 601B – RTP Data Collection**
 - Continued updates to RTP Sections 1 and 2.
 - Met with City of Susanville (Dan Newton and Bob Godman) to discuss data collection needs as they relate to public safety and travel improvement (4/27)

- **Work Element 601C – Active Transportation Programming**
 - Provided follow-up to ATP public meetings held in March, including outreach and information to Johnstonville Elementary School Superintendent regarding school zone safety on US 395

- **Work Element 601D – Transit Planning**
 - Participated in EV Infrastructure Grant Kick-Off meeting (4/29)

- **Work Element 602 – Programming**

- Continued to monitor 2022 STIP activities and respond to CTC comments and requirements for final adoption by the CTC
- Participated in Lassen County Janesville STIP project update meeting with Caltrans (4-29)
- **Work Element 603 – Outreach**
 - Provided interagency outreach through the LCTC Technical Advisory Committee
 - Provided follow-up to March TAC meeting
 - Prepared agenda and information for May 2 TAC meeting
 - Updated LCTC Website as needed
- **Work Element 604 – TDA**
 - Processed other TDA related claims and transfers as needed
- **Work Element 703 – US 395 Phase 2**
 - Continued support of US 395 coalition building efforts
 - Participated in 395 Coalition management zoom meeting (4/7)
 - Call with Representative LaMalfa’s staff on possible federal infrastructure projects (4/6 and 4/25)
 - Updated concept outline for US 395 investment phasing
 - Presented to Sierra Alliance at SAID grant kick-off meeting (4/5)
 - Contacted DOD official to discuss potential partnering with Coalition efforts to secure federal transportation funding (4/7)
- **Work Element 704 – Local Road Safety Plan**
 - Presented to the Lassen County BOS the draft LRSP to receive public comment (4/26)

Steve Borroum

Work assignments

Invoice period for April 1, 2022 to May 1, 2022

- With Caltrans, the Commission, the County and the City of Susanville work on updating the long-range transportation projects in the RTP, including amending the RTP as needed. This includes work on data collection, route planning, view of accident information and trends, non-vehicular transportation, and transit systems. This also includes work to analysis the County demographic changes and funding trends. (OWP work element 601A and 601B)
- With the local transit operator, Caltrans, the County, the City, and the County Auditor to identify available funding, and assist the Commission's project prioritization and programming processes. (OWP work element 602)
- With the independent auditor and the County Auditor addressing audit findings, address claims for ensuing year, preparing year end audit reports (OWP work element 604)
- Administration support for the grant (contracts, budgets and schedules, and invoicing) (OWP work element 703, and 704)
- Engineering oversight (OWP work element 703 and 704)

Steve Borroum
5/3/22



LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANING AGENCY

555 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 600
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

P.O. Box 1028
SUSANVILLE, CA 96130

John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

Staff Report

To: Lassen County Transportation Commission

AGENDA ITEM 1.42

Date: May 6, 2022

From: John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John L. Clerici", is placed over the printed name in the "From:" field.

Subject: Request to Extend Contract for Legal Services with Sloan Sakai, LLP

REQUESTED ACTION

BY MOTION, adopt Resolution 22-04 authorizing the Executive Secretary to prepare and execute documents to extend the contract with Sloan Sakai, LLP for legal services.

PAST ACTION

At their June 25, 2018 meeting, the Commission retained outside legal counsel from Sloan Sakai, LLP. The contract started on July 1, 2018. At their September 14, 2020, meeting the Commission chose to execute all three contract extensions keeping Sloan Sakai, LLP as legal counsel through June 2022.

DISCUSSION

From time to time the Commission requires legal advice on matter involving implementation of regional transportation issue/funding, contracting, human resources, and other matters as they may arise. Four the past four years the Commission has retained Sloan Sakai, LLP to provide legal counsel.

Over the past few fiscal years staff has budgeted \$15,000 for legal services, but actual billings have come in far less of that target. Staff anticipates this trend to continue. Funding to provide these services is paid through the Local Transportation Funds.

Sloan Sakai, LLP has provided timely and more importantly superior counsel to the Commission, and staff suggests that the relationship continue. In addition, since these services are funding using LTF a competitive bid process is not required by TDA guidelines.

Also, the agreement with Sloan Sakai, LLP can be structured so that it continues until the Commission no longer requires their services.

In addition, at your December 9, 2019 the Commission adopted Resolution 19-24 Approving Contracts Procurement Policy that provides for the action recommended by staff in retaining these services (attached)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff is in support of extending the Sloan Sakai, LLP contract indefinitely, and requests that the Commission adopt Resolution 22-04.

ALTERNATIVES

Commission to provide direction to staff.

LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution 19-24

RESOLUTION OF THE LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION APPROVING CONTRACTS PROCUREMENT POLICY

WHEREAS, the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) is required to have policies related to contracting pursuant to Caltrans and federal regulations related to certain funding sources;

WHEREAS, LCTC desires to have such contract policy including a conflict of interest policy consistent with the requirements of California law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Lassen County Transportation Commission hereby approves the following provisions as its Contracts Procurement Policy.

1. The Commission is a California local transportation commission that has no current employees who perform staffing services. All Commission business is carried out by consultants that provide services to the Commission based on agreements with the Commission.

2. All Commission agreements for services will be approved by the Commission.

3. The Commission as a California public agency will comply with the applicable California laws for the procurement of goods and services. It is the policy of the Commission that goods and services be acquired through a procurement process that provides full and open competition to the maximum extent feasible, consistent with California law and any applicable state and federal regulations.

4. The Commission will comply with the requirements of federal regulations and Caltrans requirements, including the Local Procedures Manual, when such regulations and requirements are applicable to the Commission due to the funding source for such Commission agreements.

5. For most contracts for services the Commission may award contracts to a qualified responsible consultant who is the most advantageous to the Commission's program when price and other factors are considered. The Commission will normally select the lowest bidder meeting the minimum qualifications, unless it can be demonstrated that accepting a higher cost proposal will provide substantially better product or service that would justify the higher cost.

6. Federal Contract Requirements. Federally funded contracts will require compliance with applicable Federal law and will include the following contract clauses and requirements as required by Federal regulations: Debarment and Suspension; Conflict of Interest; Lobbying Certification and Disclosure; Federal Civil Rights Laws and Regulations; Labor and Prevailing Wage Laws and Regulations; and applicable Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Requirements.

7. No Commission member, officer, consultant, or agent of the Commission will, on the grounds of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, age, gender, or sexual orientation, discriminate or permit discrimination against any person or group of persons in connection with the procurement of goods or services or otherwise.

8. There shall be no local preference provided for the ranking or awarding of Commission contracts.

9. Code of Conduct. No Commission member, officer, consultant, or agent of LCTC will participate in the selection, award or administration of a contract if a conflict of interest would be involved. Such a conflict would arise if any prospective contractor (or any subcontractor) considered for an award is a Commissioner, or any member of his/her immediate family, or domestic or business partner.

No Commission member, officer, consultant, or agent, that participates in the selection, award, or administration of a contract will have, directly or indirectly, a financial or other personal interest in any contract made or influenced by them in their official capacity as set forth in California Government Code sections 1090 *et seq.*.

No Commission member, officer, consultant, or agent of the Commission will solicit or accept gratuities, favors, or anything of monetary value from consultants, vendors, contractors, or potential consultants, or parties to sub-agreements in excess of the applicable gift limit established by the Fair Political Practices Commission ("FPPC"). Gifts will be reported consistent with FPPC requirements.

The foregoing resolution was passed and adopted at the December 9, 2019 special meeting of the Lassen County Transportation Commission by the following vote:

AYES: Wilson, Hemphill, Franco, Teeter, Hammond

NOES:

ABSTAINED:

ABSENT:



JOE FRANCO Chair,
Lassen County Transportation Commission

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in the office of the Executive Secretary of the Lassen County Transportation Commission.

John Clerici, Interim Executive Secretary

December 9, 2019

LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution 22-04

**RESOLUTION OF THE LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
EXTENDING THE CONTRACT FOR LEGAL COUNSEL WITH SLOAN SAKAI, LLP**

WHEREAS, the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Lassen County and the incorporated City of Susanville; and;

WHEREAS, the LCTC requires legal counsel on a variety of issues related to its role as the RTPA for Lassen County; and

WHEREAS, Sloan Sakai, LLP has been providing legal counsel since 2018; and

WHEREAS, the current contract with Sloan Sakai, LLP ends on June 30, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the LCTC and Sloan Sakai, LLP wishes to continue that relationship and that this can be accomplished within the guidelines of the Transportation Development Act (funding source) and Resolution 19-24 Approving Contracts Procurement Policy adopted by the LCTC on December 9, 2019.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Lassen County Transportation Commission hereby approves the contract with Sloan Sakai, LLP be continued beyond June 30, 2022.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the new contract will run until severed by either party in writing.

The foregoing resolution was passed and adopted at the May 9, 2022 regular meeting of the Lassen County Transportation Commission by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINED:

ABSENT:

Mendy Schuster, Chair
Lassen County Transportation Commission

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in the office of the Executive Secretary of the Lassen County Transportation Commission.

John Clerici, Executive Secretary

May 9, 2019



LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANING AGENCY

555 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 600
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

P.O. Box 1028
SUSANVILLE, CA 96130

John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

Staff Report

Date: May 4, 2022

AGENDA ITEM 4.11

To: Lassen County Transportation Commission

From: John L Clerici, Executive Secretary

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John L. Clerici", is placed over the printed name in the "From:" field.

Subject: Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Audit Reports

REQUESTED ACTION: Receive and file the Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Audit Reports and direct staff to forward Audits to Caltrans.

BACKGROUND

According to the Transportation Development Act (TDA), Sections 6661, 6662, and 6751, LCTC is required to submit reports of fiscal and compliance audits to the California State Controller within 180 days following the close of each fiscal year. The fiscal and compliance audits of the financial statements of LCTC, the Local Transportation Fund, and State Transit Assistance funds have been completed by Richardson & Company, LLP. These audits are performed in accordance with Generally Accepted Auditing Standards by a certified public accountant and include a determination of compliance with TDA rules and regulations. Pursuant to TDA statute Section 99245, LCTC also contracts with an independent fiscal auditor to conduct certified fiscal audits of all TDA claimants in the LCTC jurisdiction.

For Fiscal Year 2020/2021, these audit reports include:

- Lassen County Transportation Commission
- Lassen County Transportation Commission – Local Transportation Fund
- Lassen County Transportation Commission – State Transit Assistance Fund

The approved LCTC FY 2020/2021 Overall Work Program and Budget includes the expenditure for the preparation of the fiscal year 2020/2021 audits and reports for the LCTC.

DISCUSSION

The audit reports included the Lassen County Transportation Commission, the Lassen County Transportation Commission Local Transportation Fund (LTF), and the Lassen County Transportation

Commission State Transit Assistance Fund (STA). This is the third financial audit of the LCTC since its administrative separation from Lassen County. This audit shows a steady improvement in the financial reporting and tracking of Commission funds. Changes in leadership and personnel at the County Auditor's office have facilitated these improvements. It continues to build on findings that were identified in the previous year's audits, however there is still room for improvement.

Commission Staff has requested that Ingrid Sheipline of Richardson & Company provide a verbal report directly to the Commission on the audit findings. An outline of the topics Ms. Sheipline will be addressing are included in Attachment C. In addition, Steve Borroum, who worked with Ms. Sheipline, city and county staff, and the County Auditor during this process, will be available to provide additional insights. It is staffs intention that future Audits will be shared with the Chair and Vice-chair, prior to a report to the full Commission.

The results of the audit as reported by Richardson & Company, LLP will be discussed by Ms. Sheipline. The Management's Discussion and Analysis presents a narrative overview and analysis of LCTC's financial statements during the fiscal year ending June 30, 2021, and is included as Attachment A. In addition to the Audit Report, independent audit firms are also required to submit communications regarding the audit directly to the governing board. This communication is included as Attachment B. The complete Audit is included as Attachment D. The FY 2019/20 Independent Audit, and supporting documents, once accepted by the Commission, will be available to the public upon request and will be available at LassenCTC.com.

Attachments (4)



550 Howe Avenue, Suite 210
Sacramento, California 95825

Telephone: (916) 564-8727
FAX: (916) 564-8728

MANAGEMENT LETTER

To the Commissioners and Management
Lassen County Transportation Commission
Susanville, California

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements of the Lassen County Transportation Commission (the Commission) as of and for the year ended June 30, 2021, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, we considered the Commission's internal control over financial reporting (internal control) as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Commission's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Commission's internal control.

A deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements on a timely basis. A material weakness is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses. Given those limitations, during our audit, we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses may exist that have not been identified.

We noted the following items that warrant consideration:

We noted that the allocation instructions did not include all of the required information as stated by section 6659 of the TDA. We recommend that the Commission review section 6730 of the TDA for all information that needs to be included within the allocation instructions.

We noted the resolution to allocate LTF funds to LTSA for purposes specified in section 6730 of the TDA did not include all findings by referencing the applicable sections of the TDA. We recommend that the Commission review section 6754 (b) of the TDA for findings that should be included in the resolution approving allocations.

* * * * *

This communication is intended solely for the information and use of management, the Board of Directors and others within the organization, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Richardson & Company, LLP

April 28, 2022

LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

SUMMARY OF 2020/21 AUDIT RESULTS

May 9, 2022

Presentation by Richardson & Company, LLP of the Audited Financial Statements, including the following communications required by Generally Accepted Auditing Standards:

Reports issued

- Audited Financial Statements with auditors opinion
- Internal Control and Compliance Reports
- Governance (required communications) letter
- Management letter

Independent Auditor's Report (page 1)

- Unmodified (clean) opinion (after adjustments were made)

Discussion of financial statements

Fund statements (page 5)

- Planning/General Fund has negative fund balance of \$95,888
- LTF has unapportioned balance of \$183,563
- STA/SGR has unapportioned balance for transit of \$15,316 and \$43,707
- Grant fund balance of \$468,516 available
- Note G – Amount owed to County for past pension/OPEB costs of \$181,783, to be repaid at \$100,000 per year beginning in 2020/21

Reports on Internal Control and Compliance (pages 19 to 22)

- No internal control weaknesses noted
- Compliance findings noted
 - LCTC to advise claimants of apportionments by March 1
 - LTF disbursements to County need to be supported by a claim

Governance letter

- Audit adjustments
 - 8 adjustments made to amounts in County's books

Management letter

- Other recommendations for improvement noted
 - Allocation instructions to include items required by TDA
 - Resolution approving allocations to LTSA to include items required by TDA



550 Howe Avenue, Suite 210
Sacramento, California 95825

Telephone: (916) 564-8727
FAX: (916) 564-8728

GOVERNANCE LETTER

To the Commissioners
Lassen County Transportation Commission
Susanville, California

We have audited the financial statements of the Lassen County Transportation Commission (the Commission) for the year ended June 30, 2021. Professional standards require that we provide you with information about our responsibilities under generally accepted auditing standards, as well as certain information related to the planned scope and timing of our audit. Professional standards also require that we communicate to you the following information related to our audit.

Our Responsibility under U.S. Generally Accepted Auditing Standards and *Government Auditing Standards*

As stated in our engagement letter dated July 9, 2021, our responsibility, as described by professional standards, is to express opinions about whether the financial statements prepared by management with your oversight are fairly presented, in all material respects, in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. Our audit of the financial statements does not relieve you or management of your responsibilities.

We have been engaged to report on the Schedule of Allocations of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and State Transit Assistance (STA) Funds, which accompany the financial statements, but are not RSI. Our responsibility for this supplementary information, as described by professional standards, is to evaluate the presentation of the supplementary information in relation to the financial statements as a whole and to report on whether the supplementary information is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the financial statements as a whole.

In planning and performing our audit, we will consider the Commission's internal control over financial reporting in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statements and not to provide assurance on the internal control over financial reporting.

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of the Commission's compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts and grants. However, the objective of our tests was not to provide an opinion on compliance with such provisions.

Planned Scope and Timing of the Audit

An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements; therefore, our audit involves judgment about the number of transactions to be examined and the areas to be tested.

Our audit included obtaining an understanding of the entity and its environment, including internal control, sufficient to assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements and to design the nature, timing, and extent of further audit procedures. Material misstatements may result from (1) errors,

(2) fraudulent financial reporting, (3) misappropriation of assets, or (4) violations of laws or governmental regulations that are attributable to the entity or to acts by management or employees acting on behalf of the entity. Our findings are included in the Report on Internal Control and Compliance.

We performed the audit according to the planned scope previously communicated to you in our engagement letter dated July 9, 2021.

Qualitative Aspects of Accounting Practices

Management is responsible for the selection and use of appropriate accounting policies. The significant accounting policies used by the Commission are described in Note A to the financial statements. No new accounting policies were adopted, and the application of existing policies was not changed during the year. We noted no transactions entered into by the Commission during the year for which there is a lack of authoritative guidance or consensus. All significant transactions have been recognized in the financial statements in the proper period.

Certain financial statement disclosures are particularly sensitive because of their significance to financial statement users. The most sensitive disclosures affecting the Commission's financial statements were the pension and OPEB liabilities billed by the County for past employee services in Note G.

The financial statement disclosures are neutral, consistent, and clear.

Difficulties Encountered in Performing the Audit

We encountered no significant difficulties in dealing with management in performing and completing our audit.

Corrected and Uncorrected Misstatements

Professional standards require us to accumulate all known and likely misstatements identified during the audit, other than those that are trivial, and communicate them to the appropriate level of management. Adjustments included eight audit adjustments needed to correct balances of the accounts and transactions consisting of:

- Entries related to the fiscal year 2019/2020 audit and rollforward fund balances.
- Remove negative cash balance in fund 573.
- Accrue Article 8 and Pedestrian and Bicycle Allocations.
- Accrue additional STA revenue.
- Remove fiscal year 2021/22 State of Good Repair allocations.
- True up STA allocation to LTSA.
- Reclassify amounts as deferred revenue received after the availability period and the relate entry for government wide financials.

Management has agreed to correct all such misstatements.

Disagreements with Management

For purposes of this letter, professional standards define a disagreement with management as a financial accounting, reporting, or auditing matter, whether or not resolved to our satisfaction, that could be significant to the financial statements or the auditor's report. We are pleased to report that no such disagreements arose during the course of our audit.

Management Representations

We have requested certain representations from management that are included in the management representation letter dated April 28, 2022.

Management Consultations With Other Independent Accountants

In some cases, management may decide to consult with other accountants about auditing and accounting matters, similar to obtaining a "second opinion" on certain situations. If a consultation involves application of an accounting principle to the Commission's financial statements or a determination of the type of auditor's opinion that may be expressed on those statements, our professional standards require the consulting accountant to check with us to determine that the consultant has all the relevant facts. To our knowledge, there were no such consultations with other accountants.

Issues Discussed Prior to Retention of Independent Auditors

We generally discuss a variety of matters, including the application of accounting principles and auditing standards, with management each year prior to retention as the Commission's auditors. However, these discussions occurred in the normal course of our professional relationship and our responses were not a condition to our retention.

Restriction on Use

This information is intended solely for the use of the Board of Directors and management of the Commission and is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Richardson & Company, LLP

April 28, 2022



LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANING AGENCY

555 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 600
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

P.O. Box 1028
SUSANVILLE, CA 96130

John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

Staff Report

Date: May 1, 2022

AGENDA ITEM 4.12

To: Lassen County Transportation Commission

From: John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

Subject: Fiscal Year 2021/22 Unmet Transit Needs Determinations

REQUESTED ACTION

BY MOTION: Adopt Resolution 22-05 finding that there is no new unmet transit needs in that is reasonable to meet for implementation in FY 2022/23.

BACKGROUND

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Lassen County, LCTC is responsible for the administration of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds. This responsibility includes the annual unmet transit needs process, which has four key components:

- Soliciting testimony on unmet transit needs that may exist in Lassen County;
- Analyzing transit needs in accordance with adopted definitions of “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet;”
- Consultation with the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC); and,
- Adoption of a finding regarding unmet transit needs that may exist for implementation next fiscal year.

Unmet transit needs may include establishing, contracting for, or expanding public transportation, in addition to services or measures required to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. If, based on the adopted definitions and criteria, any unmet transit needs are determined to be reasonable to meet by the LCTC they must be funded in the next fiscal year prior to any TDA funds being allocated for non-transit purposes.

DISCUSSION

An SSTAC Public Hearing was conducted on February 23, 2022, to solicit comments on unmet transit needs within the jurisdiction of the Lassen County Transportation Commission. The results of testimony and discussion are summarized in the attached report.

ALTERNATIVES

Provide direction to staff.

Attachment

STAFF REPORT

DATE: April 12, 2022
TO: Lassen County Transportation Commission
FROM: John Clerici, Executive Secretary
SUBJECT: FY 2022/23 Unmet Transit Needs

REQUESTED ACTION

By motion, Adopt Resolution 22-05 adopting the findings of the Unmet Transit Needs process.

BACKGROUND

The Annual Unmet Needs Process is required by Article 8, Section 99401.5 of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) for those regions that wish to spend Local Transportation Fund dollars on non-transit purposes such as streets and roads. The TDA requires that the transportation planning agency (such as the LCTC) shall hold at least one public hearing pursuant to Section 99238.5 for the purpose of soliciting comments on the unmet transit needs that may exist within the jurisdiction and that might be reasonable to meet by establishing or contracting for new public transportation or specialized transportation services or by expanding existing services. The annual process involves adoption of “Unmet Transit Needs” and “Reasonable to Meet” definitions, consultation with the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC), consultation with the Regional Transportation Plan, the Transit Development Plan, and an unmet needs hearing. Through this process, deficiencies in the public transportation system are identified. “Unmet Transit Needs” and “Reasonable to Meet” definitions were adopted by the Commission as Resolution 22-01 at the January 10, 2022 meeting, See Attachment A.

Staff has since analyzed the identified deficiencies and applied the “Unmet Transit Needs” and “Reasonable to Meet” definitions to make a recommendation to the LCTC as to whether the identified deficiencies should be considered as unmet needs and whether those unmet needs are reasonable to meet.

DISCUSSION

On February 23rd, 2022, the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) SSTAC met to discuss potential unmet transit needs in Lassen County. Seven SSTAC members and four members of the public met both in person and virtually through Zoom (meeting notes include as Attachment B). The meeting was advertised to the public through notices in the local on-line publication, flyers on buses, notification on the LCTC Website (Lassenctc.com), LTSA website and through social media.

The following summarizes the potential transit needs which were brought up at the SSTAC meeting and analyzes whether or not they are an “unmet transit need” and “reasonable to meet” according to adopted definitions.

Out of County Transportation for Medical Appointments

Applying the Unmet Need Definition

Although Lassen County has a hospital, patients must travel to a more urbanized area such as Reno, Nevada or Redding in California for specialized medical care. For example, there are no dialysis centers in Lassen County. Lassen County residents may also need to travel to Reno to connect to intercity transportation services or do some shopping.

Out-of-county transportation for seniors - Currently, Lassen Senior Services provides transportation to Reno for seniors by reservation.

Medi-Cal recipients - Medi-Cal recipients are eligible for free transportation to medical appointments out of the county through qualified transportation brokers. This type of transportation is typically available 24 hours a day with advance reservation. It should be noted that Medi-Cal patients must stay in California for medical appointments and therefore, cannot go to Reno for these services. The general public may use these services but it can be quite costly.

Medicare recipients - Unfortunately, Medicare does not typically pay for transportation to medical appointments. Therefore, there is a certain sector of the transit dependent population who is over 65 but not eligible for Medi-Cal and requires transportation to medical appointments outside of Lassen County.

Out-of-county transportation for the general public – The only out-of-county transportation available to the general public, who are not eligible for Medi-Cal, is an intercity route operated by Sage Stage out of Alturas. The Sage Stage Intercity Reno Route operates one round trip per day from Alturas to Reno with a stop in Susanville, three days per week. LTSA shares the cost of this service with Sage Stage. Reservations are required in advance.

The need for transportation to medical appointments in urban areas is likely to grow as the community ages. This also has been a transit need identified in SSTAC meetings for at least the past four years.

The LCTC adopted unmet transit needs definition indicates an unmet transit need is a deficiency in the public transit system **within the jurisdiction** of the LCTC. Transit service to Reno or Redding would extend beyond the boundaries of the LCTC jurisdiction.

PROPOSED FINDING: It is staff's recommendation that transportation to Reno is not an unmet transit need. However, transportation to Reno and other out-of-county locations was addressed in the most recent transit plan update. Assuming transit funding is in-line with forecasts, the transit plan recommends implementing Non-Emergency Medical Transportation to Reno, one day per week on a reservation basis in FY 2022-23. The Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan includes a strategy to implement a volunteer driver/transportation reimbursement program in the county which could fill some of the non-emergency medical transportation needs.

Transportation Home from Emergency Medical Procedures in Reno, Nevada

It is not uncommon for a patient to be rushed to a hospital in Reno (90 miles away) in an ambulance and then have no transportation home to Lassen County. The patient may be discharged from the hospital in

the middle of the night. As discussed above, there are limited transportation options for Lassen County residents to/from Reno.

PROPOSED FINDING: It is staff's recommendation that transportation home from emergency medical procedures in Reno is not an unmet transit need. However, transportation to Reno and other out-of-county locations was addressed in the transit plan update. Additionally, conversations at the SSTAC meeting indicate a willingness for all transportation providers in the area to coordinate to best meet out-of-county transportation needs.

Transit Service to Outlying Areas Such as the Spaulding Tract

Applying the Unmet Transit Need Definition

There are communities in Lassen County which are not served by public transit. Spaulding/ Bucks Bay on Eagle Lake are examples. The greater Spaulding/Buck's Bay area (all of Census Transit 402 BG 1) has a population of around 900 people. The Spaulding Tract neighborhood (which could be directly served by public transit) has a population of just over 100 people. The one-way trip distance from Susanville is around 35 miles. The Lassen Rural Bus Eagle Lake Route makes two round trips on Saturdays to Spaulding, Buck's Bay and Stone's Landing from Memorial Day to Labor Day with advance reservations. The service will not operate unless there are at least three reservations. No public transit options are available midweek or spring, winter or fall seasons. As regular transit service to Eagle Lake communities is not available, this is considered an unmet transit need.

Reasonable to Meet Discussion

One reasonable scenario to provide public transit service to Spaulding and Buck's Bay is to provide two additional round trips one day midweek. To be consistent with the Saturday service, the service should be by reservation only. In FY 2019-20, the Eagle Lake service only operated around four Saturdays and carried 19 one-way passenger trips. Compared to other routes, the Eagle Lake route has low productivity (1.6 trips per hour) and high cost per trip (\$60 per trip); however overall cost of the service is low (\$1,153) because it operates so infrequently. By adding service one day during the week, ridership would likely only increase by around 8 one-way passenger-trips per year and would require an additional 12 vehicle service hours per year. This equates to less than 1 passenger-trip per vehicle service hour. Assuming the average fare paid per trip on the Eagle Lake Route in FY 2019-20, the additional day of service would increase fare revenue by \$18 and have a farebox ratio of 2.6 percent.

LCTC adopted definitions indicate that, "*Unmet transit needs which are an extension of service shall achieve at least half the system-wide performance standards, when considered separately. An exception can be made in the case of an extension of service determined to be a necessary lifeline service for transit dependent populations.*" The Systemwide passenger-trip per hour standard is 5 trips per hour and farebox ratio is 10 percent. An extension of the Eagle Lake Route would not meet half of these performance standards. The next consideration is if expanding the Eagle Lake Route qualifies as lifeline service for transit dependent populations. The proportion of zero vehicle households and low-income residents in the Spaulding area is lower than the countywide average. However, the proportion of seniors is slightly above the countywide average. The current Eagle Lake Route is operated more as a way for Susanville residents to access recreation in Eagle Lake not as a lifeline service. LTSA indicated they do not receive many requests for service from Eagle Lake to Susanville.

PROPOSED FINDING: Given the low ridership on the existing Eagle Lake Route and the expected poor performance of an extension of this service in comparison to adopted standards and reasonable to meet definitions, it is recommended that providing additional transit service to outlying areas such as Spaulding is not considered an unmet transit need reasonable to meet. If there are sufficient requests for service from Spaulding resident during the week instead of on Saturdays and there are drivers available, LTSA could consider operating the Eagle Lake Service mid-week instead of on Saturdays.

Establish a Dine around Town Program for Homebound Seniors

Applying the Unmet Transit Need Definition

A suggestion was made to provide transportation for homebound seniors to restaurants in the community as a social outlet for Susanville Seniors. Meal vouchers could be provided to seniors through Area Agency on Aging funds. LTSA DAR service is available throughout the community of Susanville from 7:00 AM to 6:52 PM on weekdays and 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM on Saturdays and could provide this service for the normal fare of \$1.75 per trip.

PROPOSED FINDING: As transportation within the community of Susanville is available during the early evening hours during the week, this is not considered an unmet transit need.

Education/Information

During the SSTAC meeting, there was a discussion regarding how many residents, medical professionals and social workers are not aware of all of the transportation options in the region. Providing information to health care providers and social workers about all the public, private and non-profit transportation options could eliminate some of the perceived unmet transit needs. Other counties such as Shasta County have developed pamphlets outlining all types of resources, including transportation available to disadvantaged residents.

PROPOSED FINDING: This is not considered an unmet transit need. LCTC staff intend to host a second SSTAC meeting this calendar year with the goal of increasing communication and coordination between transportation providers.

Approved by:

John Clerici
Executive Secretary

Attachment A

LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION 22-01
ADOPTING “UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS” AND “REASONABLE TO MEET”
DEFINITIONS

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides funding for streets and roads under Article 8 for counties with a population of 500,000 or less, and

WHEREAS, Lassen County has a population of less than 500,000 thereby making Lassen County eligible for funding under Article 8, and

WHEREAS, Section 99401.5 of the TDA requires that transportation planning agencies identify unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet prior to making any allocations for streets and roads, and

WHEREAS, the regional transportation planning agency is required to adopt definitions of the terms “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” by resolution as a component of the unmet needs process.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the definition of “unmet transit needs” is deemed as follows:

An unmet transit need is any deficiency in the system of public transit services, specialized transit/paratransit services, and private transportation services within the jurisdiction of the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) which has been identified by community members or through a local or regional planning process and which has not been funded and implemented. At a minimum, this may include desires for transportation services which are identified through the annual TDA Unmet Transit Needs public hearing, by the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council, in Lassen County’s Transportation Development Plan, in the Regional Transportation Plan, or in the compliance plan for the Americans with Disabilities Act as prepared by any public or private entity.

LCTC recognizes that public transportation includes a broad range of users, uses, and destination. Although, some services may be restricted or give priority to traditionally transit-dependent populations (such as elderly, disabled, low-income, or youth), all eligible users should have equivalent access or opportunity to use the service. The transportation desire of a small group of individuals or of the clients of particular agencies shall not, in and of themselves, be sufficient to justify a finding of unmet transit need.

Trips that would duplicate transportation services to the general public are not considered unmet transit needs. A need for transportation service beyond the fiscal year under consideration shall not be considered an unmet transit need at the present time. Provision of escorts or attendants is not a transit need.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the definition of “reasonable to meet” is deemed as follows:

LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION 22-01
ADOPTING “UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS” AND “REASONABLE TO MEET”
DEFINITIONS

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the definition of “reasonable to meet” is deemed as follows:

An identified unmet transit need can be determined to be “reasonable to meet” if it is demonstrated, based upon LCTC staff analysis or other independent evidence, that the transit need can be met within the following performance and financial standards:

- For fixed route services data analysis must demonstrate that the unmet transit need will meet a 10% fare revenue ratio Farebox ratio is defined as fare revenue divided by operating costs or in other words the proportion of operating costs which are covered by passenger fares.
- For all other systems, data analysis must demonstrate that the unmet transit need shall achieve at least the fare revenue ratio and passenger productivity standards established in the Lassen County Transit Development Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan or as established by statute
- Unmet transit needs which are an extension of service shall achieve at least half the system-wide performance standards, when considered separately. An exception can be made in the case of an extension of service determined to be a necessary lifeline service for transit dependent populations.
- Unmet transit needs shall not cause the transit system to fail to meet the systemwide farebox ratio standard set by the state through the Transportation Development Act (TDA) which is currently 10 percent for all Lassen Rural Bus transit services combined. The official farebox ratio used for TDA compliance is calculated annually by the Fiscal and Compliance Auditor.

The unmet transit need will not require the expenditure of more than the affected jurisdiction(s) proportional share of Transportation Development Act funds that are apportioned by LCTC on the basis of population.

The determination of whether a transit need is reasonable to meet shall also take into account as appropriate:

1. Likely demand for service based on transit use rates per capita in comparable communities and/or observed use rates in Lassen County.
2. Opportunities for coordination among adjoining public entities or with private transportation provider and /or funding agencies. This shall include consideration of other existing resources (including financial), as well as the legal or customary responsibilities of other entities (e. g., social service agencies, religious organizations, schools, carpools,

LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION 22-01
ADOPTING "UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS" AND "REASONABLE TO MEET"
DEFINITIONS

etc.) Duplication of other services or recourses is unnecessary and not a prudent use of public funds.

3. An unmet transit need may be determined to be unreasonable to meet because it is not feasible to initiate service within the coming fiscal year, due to the time required for vehicle acquisition, planning, or similar time factors, or because additional information is needed to determine whether or not the unmet needs is reasonable to meet. An unmet transit need shall not be determined unreasonable to meet more than once on these grounds.
4. The fact that an identified transit need cannot be fully met based on available resources shall not be the sole reason for a finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet.
5. Comparing unmet transit needs with the need for streets and roads shall not make the determination of whether an unmet transit need is reasonable to meet.

The foregoing resolution of the Lassen County Transportation Commission was adopted at its January 10, 2022, meeting by the following vote:

AYES: Albaugh, Hammond, Hemphill, Herrera, McCourt, Schuster

NOES:

ABSTAINED:

ABSENT:



JEFF HEMPHILL, Chairman
Lassen County Transportation Commission

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in the office of the Executive Secretary of the Lassen County Transportation Commission.



John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

January 10, 2022

Attachment B



**Lassen County Transportation Commission
Social Services Transportation Advisory Council**

Minutes

February 23, 2022 @ 2:00 PM

Susanville City Council Chambers
66 N. Lassen Street
Susanville, CA 96130

or

Virtual Meeting through Zoom

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/88452989997>

Meeting ID: 884 5298 9997

1 (253) 215-8782

1. Call to Order – Introductions
2. Overview of SSTAC and Unmet Needs Process
3. Input from committee and community:

David Knaut (Lassen Rural Bus) – Would like to put a bus stop at Sleepy Hollow Mobile Home Park. There is a stop before and after. Would like a stop closer to entrance.

Have received comments from Plumas residents wanting service to Redding because the Susanville Indian Rancheria no longer has transit service.

Thoughts of changing to on-demand (microtransit type service) in 7-10 AM and later in the PM and all day on Saturdays. On-demand would replace fixed route service during non-peak hours when fewer passengers per hour are carried. LRB is meeting with a company regarding procuring an app in exchange for fare sharing.

Thinking of add a stop at Casino for the commuter route and having a park and ride there.

Bus stop improvement project is on-going.

Will have a newer bus for City Route with HEPA filter. Plans for electric vehicles.

Working with Lassen Senior Services to provide more out-of-county medical trips to Reno or Redding with one week advance notice. Early discussions but Lassen Senior Services would find drivers and could use LRB dispatch. This would primarily be for senior and disabled residents. This is partially because LSS can't use TDA funds to do meal delivery anymore.

There has been a little uptick in ridership. People going to college, Base will open March 1st. West County route ridership is down. Ridership has been increasing for Express Route.

Caleb Shortz (Paratransit Services)- In the spring, will start marking bus stops with signage , hopefully increase ridership. Handing out transit information. Looking into on-demand service as David mentioned. Think on-demand service will lessen the mileage, because won't be serving the stops people don't go to. Company in Reno and Truckee and looking for a share of fares. This would be instead of fixed route in mornings and evenings.

Elizabeth Karp (Transit User who is 60 or older) - The only change Elizabeth would make is the name. She would like it to be called the "Trolley". Transit is a blessing. Great drivers. Daughters are happy with it. Don't want to lose that. Look forward to riding the bus each week.

Jeff Farrington- NorthBay Transit. Take people who can't afford rides to doctors. Go up to 400 miles. Jeff is manager is Lassen. Hear complaints that drivers don't show up. Have a satellite office. Don't have a shortage of vehicles. Have vans and Priuses. Seems like there are needs. MTM is big client now we contract directly with Partnership Insurance (Medi-Cal). Wheelchair vans. 7 days a week. Go to Reno, Redding and San Francisco. Corporate Office in Vallejo. Trying to get the word out that NorthBay is available to meet medical transportation needs.

Dan Bouse Southern Cascades Community Services District - Have 11 vehicles on non-emergency size. Have a different contract with MTM. Do get rides from them. Have a contract directly with Partnership (Medi-Cal) for wheelchair and do gurney transports for non-emergency. In the world of transport, NMT is ambulatory. If Partnership member, they are part of HMO that manages Medicaid in northern counties. Plumas county is part of different HMO. Have a 24-hour dispatcher. There are needs on wheelchair and gurney side. Also hear that drivers don't pick passengers. MTM ties to put lowest cost provider to the trip they can. So some brokers are coming from a long ways a way and using GIG model. So drivers have driven 3 or 4 hours before they have a 6-8 hour driver with passenger. This is a safety issue. Health care side isn't as regulated. There are a lot of needs not getting met. Most of clientele that we have are never going to make it to the bus stop. Many people are immune compromised. If can double up, we will but can't always do that. Transported Covid positive patients. Have a protocol. Have the disinfecting equipment. Want to hear about unmet needs. The need is big here. In the process of hiring an outreach worker.

Jeff wants to hire people within Susanville. This is important. We are in North Bay Transit. Need to hire local people going forward.

Partnership is all Medical. Some of our rural counties were last counties where Medical was a PPO model. Southern Cascades gets interest in system from Medicare patients who are not MediCal. Tried to look at funding mechanisms. Do a deep discount if they don't have someone to transport them.

Clinton Davis (Southern Cascades/Big Valley 50) – AAA council of California. Medicare Advantage does do some transportation but have to be in a heavily populated area. So, there are people who make \$50 too much so can't get a ride. Made a run at PSA 2 to try and find money to transport these people but didn't work.

Penny Artz (Lassen Senior Services)– Need service to outlying areas. Spaulding and Bucks Bay are examples. This is greatest need. Have LRB for in town. Do have a van with a wheelchair but need a trip pass for the highway because the vehicle is overweight. Will transport people from far away areas. 7 vehicles.

Clinton Davis (Southern Cascades/Big Valley 50) – Outlying areas transportation is a need. Don't have uber or Lyft here. Getting people educated to call MTM or Southern Cascade. Big Valley 50 has a route that runs 3 days a week. Go to doctors, post office and stores. People are starting to come back after COVID. Biggest need is medial. Do trips on Monday to Redding. Getting people educated as to what is available. Another need is picking people up at 2 am from hospital after they are discharged. Rules are that we can not transport to ER they have to call a 911. Trying to work with powers that be to pick up ambulatory patients after discharge. Some hospitals are taking people home in an ambulance. Biggest thing is people don't know. Jeff can get discharge from hospital.

Lassen County Health Resource Guide (Charlotte has info about guide). The Health Department is updating this guide. In both physical and on-line

Medical rides go to California not Reno because is covered.

Charlotte Roberts (Eskaton) – people on Medicare and not MediCal need out of town transportation.

Lots of Eskaton residents are getting dropped from doctors because people are showing up for appointments because drivers (contracted through MTM or other brokerage) are no shows to transport them to medical appointments.

Stan Bayles (BLM) -More bike trailers, keep in in bikes.

Amanda (LRB dispatcher/driver) – We get calls for people to go to Burney and Redding. Maybe dental in Burney or Oroville.

Maybe there can be a google sheet to share information on passengers and where they need to go. Moving guide to on-line. Lassen County Benevolence Association is putting together some information.

Barbara Longo (Lassen County Health and Social Services) – Opportunity: project contemplated through PSA2, senior services program. Dine around town program where seniors can get meal vouchers. How can we get homebound seniors to dine at local restaurants? HHS has a small fleet of cars. Could we have a trolley for seniors? Waiting to see if get funding through this. This is in Susanville mainly but could be others. More information will be released by PSA2. So elderly population can get out and socialize. LRB DAR could provide the service if it were within service hours.

Michael Harding (We care a lot foundation) - Haven't heard of any regional center client needs. Agree one of the problems is that nobody knows what services are out there. Shasta County has a pamphlet. Could look at this as an example.

Need to reach out to doctors too. Renown needs to know. Patients need to know what is available. Talk to social workers.

LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
**SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION
ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING**

IS THE BUS TAKING YOU WHERE YOU NEED TO GO?

Share your thoughts on how to improve public transit in Lassen County at the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council Meeting (SSTAC)



SSTAC Meeting
Wednesday, February 23, 2022
2:00 - 3:00 pm

Susanville City Hall
66 N. Lassen St., Susanville, CA

Or

Teleconference Remote
Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/88452989997>

Meeting ID: 884 5298 9997

Call in number: (253) 215-8782

FOR QUESTIONS CONTACT: Genevieve Evans at LSC Transportation Consultants
Email: genevieve@lsctrans.com (530) 448-4083

Lassen County Transportation Commission



LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Resolution 22-05
Fiscal Year 2022/23 Unmet Transit Needs Determinations

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Statutes Section 99401.5 and 99401.6 requires the transportation planning agency to adopt its finding for unmet transit needs; and

WHEREAS, Section 99401.5 (a), (b), and (c) of the TDA requires that the identification of transit needs include the following: consultation with the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council, an assessment of the size and location of groups likely to be dependent upon transportation, an analysis of existing transportation services in meeting the transit demand, an analysis of potential alternate transportation services that would meet all or part of the demand, a public hearing for the purpose of soliciting comments on unmet transit needs, and a resolution defining “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet”; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Transportation Development Act Statutes Section 99238, the Lassen County Transportation Commission has established a Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) for the purpose of annually participating in the identification of transit needs, review and recommended action by the transportation agency, and advise the transportation planning agency on any other major transit issues; and

WHEREAS, the size and location of identifiable groups likely to be dependent upon transit, an analysis of existing transportation services in meeting the transit demand, and an analysis of potential alternate transportation services that would meet all or part of the demand is included in Lassen County’s Transit Development Plan and Regional Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, an SSTAC Public Hearing was conducted on February 23, 2022, to solicit comments on unmet transit needs within the jurisdiction of the Lassen County Transportation Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Lassen County Transportation Commission has considered all of the information compiled pursuant to Section 99401.5 of the TDA and evaluated all public comments against the adopted definitions of “unmet transit need” and “reasonable to meet”; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Lassen County Transportation Commission, based on definitions adopted by Resolution 22-01 finds that there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet within the jurisdiction of the Lassen County Transportation Commission:

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the Lassen County Transportation Commission at its May 9, 2022 meeting by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINED:

ABSENT:

Mendy Schuster, Chairman
Lassen County Transportation Commission

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in the office of the Executive Secretary of the Lassen County Transportation Commission.

John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

May 9, 2022



LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANING AGENCY

555 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 600
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

P.O. Box 1028
SUSANVILLE, CA 96130

John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

Staff Report

Date: May 5, 2022

AGENDA ITEM 4.13

To: Lassen County Transportation Commission

From: John L Clerici, Executive Secretary

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John L. Clerici", is placed over the printed name in the "From:" field.

Subject: Fiscal Year 2022/23 Overall Work Program and Budget

REQUESTED ACTION: BY MOTION, adopt Resolution 22-06 approving the FY 2022/23 Overall Work Program and Budget.

PAST ACTION

Each year the Commission prepares a Draft Overall Work Program and Budget and submits it to Caltrans. Following Caltrans comments, the Commission adopts an Overall Work Program and Budget in May for the upcoming fiscal year.

At your March 14, 2022 Regular Meeting, staff presented a draft of the FY 22/23 OWP and Budget for review and comment. Since then two developments have necessitated a change to the draft document.

1. Staff has chosen to carry WE 703 Strategic Partnership Grant for US 395 over to the first quarter of FY 22/23. Staff had anticipated finishing this work in FY 21/22.
2. Staff recently received notice that an application for a Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure Feasibility study grant had been successful. This is now WE 705 in the revised OWP.

DISCUSSION

The Overall Work Program (OWP) and Budget is the primary management tool for the Commission and its staff. The OWP contains a description of the activities to be undertaken by the Commission in the coming fiscal year along with detailed budget information.

This OWP and budget more accurately reflects the transportation/mobility needs of the region, the interaction between Commission, City and County staff, the Susanville Indian Rancheria, collaboration with neighboring RTPA's, and our on-going partnership with Caltrans, Washoe County and the State of Nevada. It also contains the core work described in the staff services contract with Clerici Consulting in the amount of approximately \$203,000, with additional work provided for in the expanded scope of work of approximately \$154,000. The expanded scope of work includes:

- Regional transportation planning and data collection – with enhanced assistance to the City and County for pavement management, traffic counts, assessment of safety needs, etc
-
-

- Active Transportation Program execution – grant writing, program updates
- US 395 Phase 2 management - Conclusion
- Highway Safety Improvement Program implementation
- Regional Transportation Plan - Update
- Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure Study

The work being performed under the expanded scope is primarily work that would have been given to consultants, but that falls under the skill set of LCTC staff. In addition, much of the expanded scope of work is covered by grants procured or continued by LCTC staff (\$62,060).

Another important note for this OWP and budget, is that it includes the third and final installment payment to Lassen County for unfunded pension benefits associated for the period when Lassen County provided staffing services to the LCTC. That payment for \$81,783 (drawn from Transportation Development Act funds) is shown in Work Element 100.

As always, I want to acknowledge Caltrans District 2 staff who have provided critical support in our efforts to create this OWP as well as Steve Borroum and his team who work on our budget issues.

The work elements in the OWP include on-going operations and grant-funded projects. The primary funding source is Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) from the State.

ALTERNATIVES

Provide direction to staff.

Attachments (2)

LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Resolution 22-06

Resolution Approving Fiscal Year 2022/23 Overall Work Program and Budget

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Government Code, the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) was created as a local planning agency to provide regional transportation planning for the area of Lassen County; and

WHEREAS, the Fiscal Year (FY) 2022/2023 Overall Work Program, Budget and Goals and Objectives (OWP) is the primary management tool for the Lassen County Transportation Commission, identifies the activities and a schedule of work for regional transportation planning in Lassen County, and is a requirement of the agreement between the Lassen County Transportation Commission and Caltrans; and

WHEREAS, the Draft OWP was presented at the March 14, 2022 Regular Commission meeting and staff has been working with Caltrans to address comments received; and

WHEREAS, LCTC staff anticipates using \$205,883 of Transportation Development Act funds to perform work detailed in the OWP (\$124,100 for staff expenses and \$81,783 for the finale installment to Lassen County for unfunded PERS liability); and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDERED that the Lassen County Transportation Commission hereby approves the FY 2022/2023 Final Overall Work Program and Budget and authorizes the Executive Secretary, Chairperson, and Legal Counsel to execute all applications, certifications and assurances, and other related documents.

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the Lassen County Transportation Commission at its May 9, 2022, meeting by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINED:

ABSENT:

Mendy Schuster, Chairman
Lassen County Transportation Commission

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in the office of the Executive Secretary of the Lassen County Transportation Commission.

John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

May 9, 2022



**LASSEN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANING AGENCY

John L. Clerici, Executive Secretary

555 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 600
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

P.O. Box 1028
SUSANVILLE, CA 96130

Staff Report

Date: March 8, 2022
To: Lassen County Transportation Commission
From: Gordon Shaw, Principal Planner
Subject: Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) Update

AGENDA ITEM 4.14

REQUESTED ACTION:

None. This is an informational item only.

BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION

This item was originally presented at your March 2022 meeting, though technical difficulties the presentation was difficult to follow. In addition the LRSP information was shared with the public in Westwood and Susanville on March 30 and 31 respectively, as well as with the Lassen County Board of Supervisors on April 26. At our May 2 meeting, your Technical Advisory Committee suggested that the presentation be shown again to the Commission in order to receive input from the Commission before adoption of the plan in June.

The LRSP identifies and analyzes safety problems and recommends safety improvements. The LRSP is required to obtain Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding. The LRSP includes extensive data collection and analysis of crashes and other traffic data throughout the County, public/stakeholder workshops and identification of safety projects designed to reduce potential future crashes.

The LRSP provides a framework for organizing stakeholders to identify, analyze, and prioritize roadway safety improvements on local and rural roads. The process of developing the LRSP has been tailored to local protocols, needs, and issues. Stakeholders who have been, or will be, asked to comment on the LRSP include:

- Caltrans District 2
- Lassen County Public Works
- Lassen County Sheriff's Department
- California Highway Patrol
- City of Susanville Public Works
- City of Susanville Fire Department
- US Forest Service



- US Bureau of Land Management
- Susanville Indian Rancheria
- Lassen Lands and Trails Trust

The goal of this effort is to develop a LRSP for Lassen County (including the City of Susanville) and subsequently to identify community supported projects for HSIP funding that will enhance mobility safety for the travelling public.

NEXT STEPS

On March 7, 2022, the LCTC TAC received a status report on the LRSP beginning the review and comment phase of the effort. Staff plans informational presentation to the Lassen County Board of Supervisors and City of Susanville City Council. In addition, staff will provide access to the LRSP for public comment using social media platforms, as well as utilizing existing and expected outreach opportunities (for example public meetings on the Active Transportation Plan in late March).

Our goal is to have a final document ready to be adopted by the LCTC at their June meeting.

Attachments - 1