



Grass Valley • Nevada City

Nevada County • Truckee

MINUTES OF MEETING September 20, 2017

A regular meeting of the Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC) was held on Wednesday, September 20, 2017 in the Nevada County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City, California; and District 5 Board of Supervisors Conference Room, 10879A Donner Pass Road, Truckee, California. The meeting was scheduled for 9:30 a.m.

Members Present: Jan Arbuckle*, Carolyn Wallace Dee, Ann Guerra, Larry Jostes, Dan Miller, Valerie Moberg, Ed Scofield

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Daniel B. Landon, Executive Director; Mike Woodman, Transportation Planner; Dale Sayles, Administrative Services Officer; Carol Lynn, Administrative Assistant

Standing Orders: Chairman Jostes convened the Nevada County Transportation Commission meeting at 9:32 a.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Jostes referenced the large crowd of approximately 80 people present at the meeting, saying it was larger than he had seen in a long time.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

CONSENT ITEMS

Chairman Jostes requested that commission members who make a motion or second an item on the agenda raise their hand so the note takers can clearly recognize who they are.

1. Financial Reports

A. June 2017 and July 2017. *Approved.*

2. NCTC Minutes

July 19, 2017 NCTC Meeting Minutes. *Approved.*

3. Allocation Request from the Town of Truckee. *Adopted Resolution 17-31 approving the allocation of \$471,016 of LTF and \$57,515 of STA Funds for transit/paratransit operations for FY 2017/18.*

4. Amendment 3, Professional Services Agreement for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update with Fehr & Peers. *Adopted Resolution 17-32 approving Amendment 3 to the Agreement between NCTC and Fehr & Peers to prepare an update to the Nevada County RTP.*
5. Amendment 1, Professional Services Agreement for the Eastern Nevada County Transit Development Plan (ENCTDP) Contract with LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC). *Adopted Resolution 17-33 approving Amendment 1 to the Agreement between NCTC and LSC to update the ENCTDP.*
6. Disposal of Surplus Equipment – computer. *Adopted Resolution 17-34 approving the disposal of Surplus Property/Capital Assets of an HCC Core i5 Intel 2400 Desk Top Computer.*
7. Amendment 2, Professional Services Agreement for Airport Land Use Planning Services with Mead & Hunt, Inc. *Adopted Resolution 17-35 approving Amendment 2 to the Agreement for Airport Land Use Planning Services with Mead & Hunt, Inc. commencing September 16, 2017 through September 16, 2018.*

Commissioner Guerra made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Commissioner Scofield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Aye votes from Commissioners Arbuckle, Dee, Guerra, Jostes, Miller, Moberg, and Scofield.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

8. Correspondence
 - A. <https://knco.com>: Highway 174 Ranks Poorly for Wildlife Crashes, File 1200.6 09/11/2017.
 - B. www.sacbee.com, Tony Bizjak: Caltrans wants to spend \$28 million fixing this highway, but locals call it overkill, File 1200.6, 9/4/2017.

Executive Director Landon stated he did not have any comments on these articles, however he thought it was good background information for the items coming up on the agenda.

9. Executive Director's Report
 - 9.1 State Route 49 Stakeholders Committee
 - 9.2 2017 Association of Environmental Planners (AEP) Institute Conference Participation

Executive Director Landon referred to the background information presented regarding the two items on his report. The first item reported on the August 15, 2017 State Route 49 Stakeholders Committee meeting held at the Grass Valley California Highway Patrol office. The second item was a summary compiled by Transportation Planner Mike Woodman regarding his participation as a speaker on the panel at the August 4, 2017 AEP Institute Conference. There were no questions or comments concerning anything on the report.

10. Project Status Report

A. Caltrans Projects: Cameron Knudson, Caltrans District 3 Project Manager for Nevada County.

Mr. Knudson commented that he will no longer be working as the liaison to NCTC, as he had been given other assignments. Mr. Knudson introduced Jonathan Pray, Transportation Engineer and Project Manager with Caltrans, who would be taking over the position of reporting to the Commission. Mr. Knudson then gave a summary of projects listed in the September Project Status Report.

- *SR 174 Safety Improvement from Maple Way to You Bet Road* – Mr. Knudson referenced the group Save Highway 174 as being in opposition to the project, and said the Nevada County Board of Supervisors had also sent a letter in opposition to the project. Mr. Knudson said Caltrans representatives met with representatives of the Save Highway 174 group to discuss their ideas and different options. He said Caltrans also had meetings with Assemblyman Dahle to discuss the project. Mr. Knudson said they were on the agenda for the October 24, 2017 Board of Supervisors meeting to discuss the project and answer questions. He said Caltrans is making an effort to stay in communication with the Save Highway 174 group as much as possible.
- *SR 49 Widening to Five Lanes Starting at the North End of the La Barr Meadows Road Project to just before the McKnight Way Interchange* – Mr. Knudson reported Caltrans is doing the environmental and archeological studies required to prepare the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and move the project forward.

Executive Director Landon asked if there would be additional costs related to the additional environmental and archeological studies. Mr. Knudson replied right now they are keeping within their budget and would keep the Commission informed of any changes. Chairman Jostes asked if there was an update on the funding for the project. Mr. Landon replied \$3 million was identified for the current phase, project approval and environmental documentation, and \$3 million for plan specifications and estimates. He said he is in conversation with District 3 Deputy Director Tom Brannon regarding a future bid for funds under the State Transportation Improvement Program that will hopefully identify funding for construction and right-of-way, and he will present those recommendations to the Commission at the November meeting.

Mr. Knudson said there were several other projects in development on the SR 49 corridor that have not been programmed yet. He said one of these SHOPP safety projects could add state dollars, however it has not yet been approved. He said Mr. Pray will be reporting on those project approvals as they come forward. Executive Director Landon explained the SHOPP projects Mr. Knudson mentioned would add shoulders to this section of SR 49 between La Barr Meadows Road and McKnight Way, increasing the cross section and improving the roadway, and would be incremental toward the future project.

Commissioner Scofield asked if the projects scheduled for 2018 had been funded. Mr. Knudson replied some of those projects would be going to the CTC for approval in October, after which they would know which projects would be programmed, and then more projects would go before the CTC in December. Commissioner Scofield asked if SB 1 would give a better chance of project approval. Mr. Knudson said as safety projects, the ones in this

section of the SR 49 corridor are not as reliant on SB 1 dollars. He said as the projects become programmed, they will be brought forward in the report.

- *SR 49 Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) Overlay* – Mr. Knudson reported this paving project from the Yuba River Bridge to the county line is nearing completion. He said the pavement is done and they are working on the smoothness in some portions, and he anticipated it would be complete by the end of this construction season.
- *SR 20 Yuba/Nevada Counties Safety Project to Widen Shoulders and Correct Curves* – Mr. Knudson reported the two new projects on SR 20 to widen shoulders and correct curves, one near White Cloud Campground and the other near Lowell Hill Road, are in the beginning design and environmental stages and will be started quickly. He said the two projects between Mooney Flat Road and the Parks Bar Bridge in Yuba County, and two more west of Parks Bar Bridge, are in various stages of design. Referring to the concerns of the bicycle community, he said the projects will include 8-foot shoulders, and they are progressing well. Mr. Knudson asked for questions.

Commissioner Guerra asked regarding the opposition to the project on SR 174, if there has been any movement on the issue of the clear recovery zone. Mr. Knudson replied Caltrans has not been effective in showing what they have done to this point, so they are developing displays that will outline some of the changes they have made. He said some things can be changed and some cannot, and they will continue the discussion at the October 24 Board of Supervisors meeting. Commissioner Guerra thanked him for his service to the Commission. Mr. Knudson replied he has truly enjoyed working with the Commission, and Mr. Landon and his staff have been phenomenal to work with and he was very appreciative. Commissioner Guerra said it was a shame to lose him.

Commissioner Dee said to Mr. Knudson that he would be missed, and that he has been very supportive to this area. She said the project on SR 89 has been started, it had been patched temporarily, then the entire roadbed was pulled up side to side and they started rebuilding it north of the Alpine Meadows Bridge to Donner Pass Road in Truckee, and it is a tremendous change. She thanked Mr. Knudson for being instrumental in the repairs and said she appreciated his help. Chairman Jostes said he appreciated Mr. Knudson's service.

- B. The Town of Truckee's Transit Operations: See attached report prepared by Kelly Beede, Town of Truckee Administrative Analyst II.

Executive Director Landon reported that Kelly Beede was not able to be at the Commission meeting due to a family emergency out of state, and he would like to have her present her report to the Commission at the November meeting. Chairman Jostes agreed.

ACTION ITEMS

11. Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) Appointments

Transportation Planner Mike Woodman reported the SSTAC advises the Commission on transit issues in Nevada County. Mr. Woodman said he would like approval for two more appointments to the Council as they continue to fill the vacancies. He said the first appointee is Faye Hignight, who works with Nevada County Child Protective Services and is seeking to be appointed as a representative of a local social service provider for persons of limited means. The second appointee is Robin Van Valkenburgh, Nevada County Transit Services Manager, who is seeking to be

appointed as a representative of the local consolidated transportation service agency. Mr. Woodman said staff recommends these two appointments.

Commissioner Miller made a motion to approve the appointments to the SSTAC. Commissioner Moberg seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Aye votes from Commissioners Arbuckle, Dee, Guerra, Jostes, Miller, Moberg, and Scofield.

12. Save Highway 174: Request for Guidance

Chairman Jostes referred to the large audience and surmised that most of them were there for the Save Highway 174 Action Item. He stated the group is asking for assistance from the Commission in facilitating communication between themselves and Caltrans. Executive Director Landon introduced Joe Heckel, Reginald King and Jeff Henninger as being representatives for the group and said they would like to give a presentation.

Joe Heckel introduced himself as a representative of the group Save Highway 174, and began the PowerPoint presentation. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to present the group's goals and concerns. He said the group is 150 strong and growing, and their goal is to have Caltrans reassess and re-engage the local community in regards to the Highway 174 project. He said their organization Save Highway 174 consists of affected property owners, residents and citizens of Nevada County who support reasonable safety improvements to the 1.9 mile section of Highway 174, but are concerned with the current design standards being applied to the entire length of that section by Caltrans. Mr. Heckel stated that the group is not in opposition to safety improvements to the highway, as Mr. Knudson referenced in his Caltrans Project Report, but rather they are interested in Caltrans engaging with the community and looking at revising the design.

Mr. Heckel stated that Highway 174, or the Colfax Highway, is recognized as one of the most scenic and historically rich highways in the Sierra Nevada Foothills. Nevada County's general plan classifies it as a scenic corridor, and it is listed on the State of California's website as being eligible for state scenic status.

Mr. Heckel stated the project proposed by Caltrans covers a 1.9 mile section of Highway 174 from Maple Way to You Bet Road, which would be leveled, straightened and widened, essentially doubling the width of the road surface from approximately 22-28 feet to 64 feet, including a 12-foot clear recovery zone, which is one of the group's most significant concerns. In addition, Caltrans would need to obtain Right-of-Way from property owners, perhaps 120 to 150 feet in length, which could include relocating or replacing overhead electrical lines or other utilities. He stated at least 14 acres would need to be obtained from 53 parcels, and over 1,700 conifers, oaks and other types of trees would need to be removed, along with ponds, springs, and wells. He said the projected cost is \$28.4 million for this project.

Mr. Heckel asked everyone in the audience who was there representing Save Highway 174 to stand to show their support; about 70 people from the audience stood up.

Mr. Heckel said the group believes there are other cheaper alternatives to improve safety along this roadway. He said the group has studied this project, and found that since the completion of the Project Study Report in 2014, Caltrans is still moving ahead with the same alternative. At this point he turned the presentation over to Reginald King.

Reginald King introduced himself as a resident on Highway 174, and presented a slide showing his driveway, located about one-third of the way through the 1.9 mile section from You Bet Road, and

said he has lived there for 45 years. He said he is a registered civil engineer and has designed hundreds of miles of two-lane road in both Placer and Nevada Counties, in the mountains and trees. He stated he has a vested interest in this project, and is very interested in safety. He commented there is no question safety improvements are necessary on Highway 174, but where he lives there is no need for horizontal or vertical alignment as is outlined in the project. He said between his home and Greenhorn Access Road there are compound and reverse curves that absolutely need some remedy, and many driveways there have no horizontal sight distance to see who is coming from the right or left, so those safety improvements need to be done. However, pointing to a graph of a Typical Roadway Section, and a photo of his neighbor's property, Mr. King said if Caltrans uses the 12-foot recovery zone with 2-to-1 cut slopes and 2-to-1 fill slopes, it will open up the tree corridor close to 80 feet, which will remove all of the trees in front of his neighbor's house that sits about 75 feet from the road. He said his neighbor had not put in a retaining wall due to the coverage of the trees.

Mr. King agreed this two-lane section with very little shoulder is a safety hazard for bicyclists, and widening of the pavement is necessary. He pointed to the graph showing the group's proposed alternative, widening the shoulder to 8 feet of pavement and 3 feet of gravel, basically the width of another lane, which would provide a recovery area. He said Caltrans' proposal, a clear recovery zone extending 20 feet beyond the edge of the road to give drivers room to recover if they leave the roadway, is advisory according to Caltrans traffic manuals and traffic safety standards; it is not mandated by law, and needs to consider site-specific conditions such as speed, line-of-sight and environmental conditions. He said the group's stance is that Caltrans should not apply the same standard in Nevada County that could be used in Yuba City where there is an abundance of farmland and roads without adjacent trees. He suggested earth stone walls could be built at the edge of the shoulder, therefore maintaining the trees in the area, and the shoulder widening could serve as a recovery zone. He added that two-thirds of the section would have major clearing of trees if the current proposed standard is applied.

Jeff Henninger introduced himself, saying he wanted to speak on the goals of the Save Highway 174 group. He reiterated the group is not opposed to a safety project, and contrary to the Caltrans Project Manager's comments, he did not believe the Board of Supervisors is opposed to a safety project. He stated the group is concerned about the current proposed highway design standard, including the Right-of-Way width of the project which seems excessive, and they feel a safety project can be accomplished without going to such extreme measures. He said they would like to minimize the impacts to residents who use Highway 174, while preserving its rural and scenic quality. He referred to Highway 174 as one of the rich treasures of Nevada County, and could have a possible scenic highway designation. He said the group would also like to minimize the property purchases by the State, in addition to minimizing the loss of trees, vegetation, waterways, wells and ponds. He believed property owners will lose value in their property, especially when a highway comes right up to the house. He referred to the 1,700 Sierra conifers over 6" in diameter, plus numerous trees and vegetation that would need to be clear cut.

Mr. Henninger stated the group would like to see Caltrans meet with the community and its leaders, have workshops and forums to get a plan that works for everyone involved, and revise the current project rather than go forward with their preferred alternative. He said there has been minimal public involvement, transparency or responsiveness by Caltrans with this project. He referenced Caltrans' May 24 Open House at Chicago Park School, where there was no presentation of the project and no attempt to explain the process to the people there. He said there were charts and graphs on tables, but when asked a question about decreasing speed limits, a Caltrans representative there replied they did not handle that issue, and there was no effort to engage the community and present the project in a way that everyone would be well informed.

Mr. Henninger pointed out there has been minimal disclosure, environmental review or notice of availability of public documents for Nevada County residents. An example, he said, was a Caltrans workshop scheduled for June 9, 2016, which had a public notice published on June 4, 2016, giving little opportunity for people to plan their schedules to attend or to review documents. Mr. Henninger continued that at the meeting between Save Highway 174 and Caltrans at the NCTC office, the group gave a presentation of design alternatives based on information available, and asked Caltrans for engineering documents such as plan profiles and cross section sheets so skilled professionals like Reginald King could review what is being proposed, but to date there has been no reply from Caltrans and no documents have been received. He said Caltrans has given only two alternatives, either build it or not build it, and there has been no consideration given to other alternatives or revisions made to the project since the Project Study Report in June 2014. Referencing that the clear recovery zone is not mandated or required by law, Mr. Henninger asked if there was any other highway in Nevada County with a 12-foot paved lane, and 8 feet of paved shoulder plus an additional 12 feet of recovery zone on both sides of the fog line. He believed there was not a road presently in Nevada County with this standard, and that this current project would create a precedent for other highways in the county. He added Caltrans did not prepare a full Environmental Impact Report, but instead did a Mitigated Negative Declaration, and did not provide the public an opportunity to comment on the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process.

Mr. Henninger continued that for their study, to initially justify this project as a safety project, Caltrans chose to present data from 2010 to 2013 regarding collisions, injuries, and fatalities. However, Jeff pointed out that there are 12 ½ years of data available between 2005 and 2017, and refutes Caltrans' claim that the 2010-2013 data was the latest data available. He said he believes Caltrans chose that particular period because over the larger 12 ½ year period, the collisions with fatalities all occurred during the 2010-2013 period, which was also highest in injury rates. He pointed to a graph from the CHP Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System comparing different highways in the county, including Highway 49 and Highway 20, and stated the extreme measures being proposed on behalf of safety do not bear out when looking at the full amount of data that is available. Mr. Henninger referenced the next slide, Cause of Collisions on 1.9 Mile Section of Highway 174, and pointed out that 31% of the 102 collisions were attributed to speed, 26% to improper turns, and 14% to DUIs. He questioned if the Caltrans proposal of expanding this wide swath of highway in our rural area is going to address the speeding, improper turns and DUIs. He continued that if the road is straightened and widened, speeds will increase, with subsequent increase of potential accidents and injuries. Mr. Henninger turned the presentation over to Joe Heckel.

Mr. Heckel again commented the Save Highway 174 group supports reasonable safety improvements, however they believe that other viable, less intrusive improvements are possible. He said the 1.9 mile section of Highway 174 is average in the number of collisions, injuries and fatalities per mile per year. He said it is their belief that a wider highway, as per the standard, will encourage drivers to drive faster, therefore possibly increasing the number of collisions and fatalities. He said the people present at the meeting believe they have a beautiful rural highway and would like to keep it intact. He said many people moved to this area of the county because of the beautiful trees on the roadway, and asked if the template proposed for this 1.9 mile section of highway will ruin the neighborhood, jeopardize the ability of having this as a scenic highway at the county or state level, and set a precedent in the county for seeing this roadway template in other areas.

Mr. Heckel said to this date they have over 850 residents who have signed a petition asking Caltrans to cease or modify the project, and 150 residents have joined the Save Highway 174 group to ask Caltrans to change the project and observe the rural quality of the Highway 174 corridor, and to reassess and revise this project and be engaged with the community. Mr. Heckel said they

understood that this is Caltrans' project, not NCTC's project, and they appreciate the opportunity to talk to the Commission about it. He said they would continue their efforts to get Caltrans to change, however NCTC does have the ability to communicate and coordinate on local transportation projects in the county, so they are asking for NCTC's support and guidance to help their cause. He said they support the letter NCTC drafted that is directed to Caltrans about this project, but suggested the inclusion of wording that aligns with their mission statement and goals, to request Caltrans reassess and revise their preferred alternative by re-engaging the local community. Mr. Heckel concluded his presentation.

Chairman Jostes thanked the Save Highway 174 group for a very thorough presentation. He stated, as was pointed out, the Commission is not in direct line of approvals for this kind of project.

Commissioner Miller thanked Mr. Heckel for their report. He said he finds it encouraging when residents come to the meetings and show their support. He acknowledged it is an eligible highway for scenic designation, and he surmised Caltrans already treats it as a scenic highway. He believed it to be one of the most relaxing drives in the county, but as it is designed now, drivers have to pay attention when they are on it, and it is reasonable to request safety modifications to the project. He said there would be an opportunity to discuss the issue again at the upcoming Board of Supervisors meeting. He encouraged the Commission to move forward with the requested letter to Caltrans, including the recommended changes, to ask that Caltrans actively engage the community in a more collaborative effort. He said Highway 174 does have safety issues, but he felt what Caltrans is proposing to do would be abusive. There was applause and agreement from the audience. He said participation, involvement and engagement is critical, as exhibited here today with the number of people present, and hopefully again on October 24 at the Board of Supervisors meeting.

Commissioner Scofield observed, with the size of group present, if this was an issue to be decided by the Transportation Commission, or even the Board of Supervisors, and all that was being asked was to sit down, reassess and re-engage, the Commission would be doing it. He told Mr. Knudson the bureaucracy is probably frustrating, but it makes sense to be sitting down and seeing what can be done.

Executive Director Landon asked Mr. Heckel for a repeat of the wording that Save Highway 174 would like added to the letter to Caltrans. Mr. Heckel stated to have Caltrans reassess and revise their preferred alternative by actively engaging with the local community.

Commissioner Guerra made a motion to send the letter to Caltrans District 3 requesting consideration and response to Save Highway 174 concerns, with the requested wording adjustment. Commissioner Moberg seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Aye votes from Commissioners Arbuckle, Dee, Guerra, Jostes, Miller, Moberg, and Scofield.

Chairman Jostes commented it was very encouraging to have this number of people present at the meeting, as the Commission does not often see this kind of public involvement, and it is great that people having a strong interest in a subject are willing to come out and get involved. He thanked the audience for their participation.

**Commissioner Jan Arbuckle left the meeting at this time.*

13. Nevada County Transportation Commission Deputy Director Position

Executive Director Landon introduced Shellie Anderson, who prepared the analysis and recommendations, and invited her to give an overview of her work. Shellie said she would like to

walk the Commission through Bryce Consulting's report to assess the current organizational structure and make recommendations. Ms. Anderson said they collected data from similar organizations, and recommended a classification of Deputy Executive Director. She said many of the organizations they surveyed are part of the labor market and were considered in the computations. However, two of the organizations are not part of the identified labor market but were included because they have a Deputy Director position, and Bryce Consulting wanted to observe the trend and the consistent spread between the Deputy Director and Executive Director positions. She presented the job description for the Deputy Executive Director position that would be put in place. She said this position would help bridge the gap between the Executive Director position and the next level down. She said looking at the organizations they collected data from which have a Deputy position, there is an average 23% spread between the two positions. Bryce Consulting is therefore recommending the Deputy position salary be placed 23% below the Executive Director salary, resulting in a classification salary range of \$7,506 to \$9,210. She was also recommending a high-level management classification with a minimum and maximum rather than a step system as is used in other classifications below the Executive Director. She preferred this open range approach because the movement in the range is based on performance rather than incremental steps, giving more flexibility to management in awarding increases that are not at a set percentage. Ms. Anderson asked for questions.

Commissioner Guerra commented the Commission recently resolved how to establish salaries moving forward, and asked if this plan would throw a wrinkle into that process. Executive Director Landon replied it would not, as this plan would add a new position and salary range which would be put in place now, and would be surveyed again in four years.

Commissioner Scofield observed that creating this new position would open up another position below it. He added he supports the intention of the plan, but for the organization he does not want to call it a succession plan because the Commission has a right to hire whoever they want to this position. Commissioner Miller agreed and said he was confused with the title of Succession Plan when actually they are being asked to establish a new position, and he would prefer labeling it as establishing a new Deputy Executive Director position. Executive Director Landon replied they would change the title. Commissioner Miller added it would be easy as well.

Commissioner Scofield asked if the Action Item would come back to the Commission with the selection made of who would fill the position and the salary level. Executive Director Landon replied this Action Item would establish the position and the salary range within the confines of the staff budget, and as Executive Director he would have the ability to hire or promote, and he would look at filling that position. He added he would not be looking at back-filling the Transportation Planner position. He stated his opinion was that Mike Woodman, the current Transportation Planner, has been over-performing in his position, and Mr. Landon looked at this as a promotion that would reclassify Mr. Woodman and give him compensation for what he has already been doing. Commissioner Miller clarified this would be a promotion for Mr. Woodman to the position of Deputy Executive Director. Mr. Landon concurred. Chairman Jostes stated this was difficult due to the size of the organization, if there were twenty employees it would be different. He asked when the staff's organizational chart is put together would the Deputy Executive Director position and Transportation Planner position both be present. Mr. Landon replied they would, however the Transportation Planner position would remain unfilled. He said in the future when the budget is approved each year, the ebb and flow of funding conditions and work requirements may help dictate whether staff submits a request to fill the Transportation Planner position, or deems it as unnecessary to fill it.

Commissioner Scofield asked if the Executive Director would have the opportunity to fill one or the other of the positions. Executive Director Landon said yes, based on his budget capabilities. Chairman Jostes clarified that it would be at the discretion of the Commission whether to fill the Transportation Planner position as they see fit. Mr. Landon agreed, and reminded the Commission that in November he will be submitting his next five-year contract, which will be his last contract. Looking toward the future, he agreed with Shellie Anderson that promoting the Transportation Planner to the Executive Director level would be a bridge too far, but someone in a Deputy Executive Director position would be more competitive if the Commission were to seek applicants.

Commissioner Guerra voiced her understanding of the discussion, and also appreciated Executive Director Landon's sharing his thoughts with the Commission. She commented it made sense for Mr. Landon as a planner to be thinking five years ahead and building capacity in the office, something she very much appreciated.

Chairman Jostes asked if anyone objected to approving the recommendation with the stipulation that the succession aspects of the plan be removed, and the plan rewritten in a straight forward fashion. He asked if there was a motion to approve, with the caveats mentioned, the Nevada County Transportation Commission Deputy Executive Director Position.

Commissioner Guerra made a motion to approve the job description and salary range for the Deputy Executive Director position. Commissioner Scofield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Aye votes from Commissioners Arbuckle, Dee, Guerra, Jostes, Miller, Moberg, and Scofield.

14. Amendment II to the FY 2017/18 Overall Work Program (OWP)

Executive Director Landon stated in their year-end accounting it was determined that the State Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) Funds needed to be adjusted to match the actual expenditures that had been made during FY 16/17, therefore they request an increase in the budget of \$6,826 for the RPA formula funds. He said there was also a decrease in RPA grant funds by \$100,000 due to the fact that two Nevada County Public Works projects were not approved by the State, however, they plan to submit those same two projects under a new program known as SB 1 Planning Grant Funds, so \$100,000 has been added to Table 1 for SB 1 Planning Grant Funds. Mr. Landon continued that on the expenditure side of the budget, salaries and benefits were increased due to the addition of the Deputy Executive Director position, monies that came from the budget contingency, therefore the overall budget was not increased. He said the budget charts and the work elements have been modified to show the increased staff expenditures and the change in the Planning grants, and requested approval of Resolution 17-36.

Commissioner Scofield asked what the projects were that were not approved. Executive Director Landon replied one project is the intersection feasibility analysis at the intersection of Ridge Road and Rough & Ready Highway, and the other is a county-wide safety audit that will help identify the need for safety improvements throughout the county.


Commissioner Miller made a motion to adopt Resolution 17-36. Commissioner Scofield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Aye votes from Commissioners Arbuckle, Dee, Guerra, Jostes, Miller, Moberg, and Scofield.

SCHEDULE FOR NEXT MEETING


The next regularly scheduled meeting of the NCTC will be November 15, 2017 at the Nevada County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City, CA, starting at 9:30 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Chairman Jostes adjourned the meeting at 10:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted: 
Carol Lynn, Administrative Assistant

Approved on: 11/17/17

By: 
Lawrence A. Jostes, Chairman
Nevada County Transportation Commission

