Over thousands of years, the San Benito and Pajaro Rivers have deposited rich soil that is still being used to grow vegetable crops year round.

The County has a long history of agricultural production and agriculture continues to be the economic driver of the region. The County boasts a $298 million (2013) agricultural industry along with manufacturing, education, health care, and government.

**GREAT RECESSION**

Since the last Regional Transportation Plan, San Benito County felt the negative impact of the Great Recession. Most notably, the unemployment rate has been higher than the statewide and national average. Most notably, at its peak in February 2010, San Benito had an unemployment rate of 21.3 percent compared to California at 12.8 percent and the U.S. average of 10.4 percent\(^3\) over the same time period. Between 2000 and 2010, only 802 new jobs were created compared to an increase in population of 2,035.\(^4\) Although foreclosures were abundant between 2007 and 2012, they have since declined. The housing market appears to be rebounding as the vacancy rate is down to 5.5 percent.\(^5\)

**REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST**

The most persuasive reason for preparing a Regional Transportation Plan is to address increased pressure from population growth on transportation infrastructure.

Looking forward, an increase in the population will strain area roads and highways, decrease capacity for freight movement, and increase the demand for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

San Benito County growth is projected by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the three county region of San Benito, Monterey, and Santa Cruz Counties. Through an interactive dialogue with planners in the Monterey Bay region, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments prepared a Regional Growth Forecast for use in preparing the Regional Transportation Plans of the three counties. The Regional Growth Forecast estimates population, employment, and
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\(^3\) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics  
\(^4\) U.S. Census 2010  
\(^5\) U.S. Census Bureau, DP04, Selected Housing Characteristics, 2010-2012 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimate
growth to the year 2035.

According to the Regional Growth Forecast, San Benito County is expected to grow by 47 percent between 2010 and 2035 to 81,392 people in 2035. Adding an estimated 26,123 new residents will strain the existing highway system which lacks capacity to handle increases in traffic volumes. Employment and housing is also expected to grow along with the population. By 2035, employment is expected to grow to 21,508 jobs and housing is expected to grow to 24,854 housing units.

Demographic changes during the next 25 years will influence the transportation demands of the community. Between the years 2010 and 2020, the Monterey Bay region is expected to regain the jobs lost during the recession. During this time, jobs in San Benito County are expected to grow by 25.3 percent. Afterward and during the years 2020 to 2035, job levels will grow more slowly, by an estimated 4.1 percent, as the baby boomers retire but remain in the population.

This shift in the age of the population will create new and different challenges for our transportation system.

Figure 2-3 depicts the San Benito population by age range in the year 2010 and compares it with the age range in the year 2035.

The population of those 65 and older is expected to increase by 74.1 percent between 2010 and 2035. By 2035, those 65 and older will reach 9,333 people and represents 11.5 percent of the total population.

San Benito County is expected to grow as the economy grows. The population age 20-64 is expected to grow by 14,225 while job growth is projected to grow by 5,308. The gap between population growth of those between 20 and 64 and the employment forecast is a result of employment growth in the Silicon Valley and other areas. The largest industry in San Benito County, agriculture, contributes slow, but steady growth in employment.

**TOURISM**

Tourism is expected to play an important role for San Benito County over the next 20 years. Many destinations attract tourists to the region for different reasons as outlined below.
State Parks including Hollister Hills State Vehicular Recreation Area, the San Juan Bautista Mission, and Fremont Peak all attract visitors to the region. Hollister Hills provides off road motor biking. The San Juan Bautista Mission is a popular outing for area schools because of its importance to the rich history of California. Fremont Peak State Park attracts hiking and camping enthusiasts with breathtaking views of the Monterey Bay.

Pinnacles National Park attracts people interested in geology, bird watching, wildflowers, hiking, and caving. Pinnacles National Monument became the 51st National Park in January 2013. As a result, Pinnacles National Park is expected to draw visitors to the region. The east entrance to the Pinnacles is accessed by Highways 25 and 146. The Park has seen an increase in the number of visitors since the Park changed its status in January 2013. An increase in vehicle traffic on Highways 25 and 146 is expected as a result. Recreational trips to the Pinnacles peaks in the spring and falls back during the autumn.

TRAVEL AND SAFETY

Safety of those using the transportation system is a very important consideration in developing this Regional Transportation Plan. This section summarizes the safety issues and challenges facing the San Benito County region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driving and Vehicle Availability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miles driven each day (2011)</td>
<td>1,346,150A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of driver licenses issued (2012)</td>
<td>35,755 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No vehicle available (2010-12)</td>
<td>2.8% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One vehicle available (2010-12)</td>
<td>26.3% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two vehicles available (2010-12)</td>
<td>35.5% C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 2011, the San Benito County region contained 88.84 maintained miles of State highways, 385.71 maintained miles of County roadways, and 109.78 maintained miles of city streets. There are also 8.68 maintained miles of National Park Service roads and 306.4 maintained miles of State Park Service roads. Most of the City streets include sidewalks. There are 11 miles of Class II bicycle lanes and 3.1 miles of Class I bike trails.

Most households had access to at least one vehicle, and 70.8 percent of San Benito households had two or more vehicles available. According to the Department of Motor Vehicles, there were 35,755 driver licenses issued to San Benito County residents in 2012.

The rate of fatal and injury collisions in California have been declining since the 1930s when the California Highway Patrol began tracking the information. The 2010 statewide mileage death rate was 0.84. In 2011, San Benito County experienced a mileage death rate of 1.02, above the statewide average but below the national average of 1.11. In 2011, there were 8 pedestrian and 13 bicycle collisions.

The mileage death rate is expressed as fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.
MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION

HIGHWAYS, STREETS, AND ROADS
Of the 899.41 miles of San Benito County’s highways, streets, and roads, 593 miles are used by the motoring public for commuting to work, transporting goods, traveling for recreation, moving people by bus, bicycling, and walking. On average, San Benito County highways, streets, and roads saw 1.3 million miles of travel each day. The majority of those miles, 79 percent, are driven on rural highways, streets, and roads (2012).

Commuting to other counties for work is also very important for San Benito County residents. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, 51.1 percent of the workforce traveled within the County for work. Another 32.1 percent of residents, traveled to the San Francisco Bay area (including Santa Clara County) for work. Still another 15.7 percent of workers traveled to Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties for work. The remaining 1.1 percent of the workforce traveled to other areas for work. The commute pattern has changed since 2000 as shown in Figure 2-5.

![Journey to Work: 2000 and 2010](image)

Figure 2-5  Journey to Work 2000 and 2010  
Source: U.S. Census

Traveling to other counties for work accounts for 48.9 percent of the daily commute. Residents have a limited number of highways to travel to their job sites. Those traveling to Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties likely take State Route 156. Those traveling to the Bay area likely travel by way of State Route 25. These assumptions are further supported by traffic counts taken on these routes, as illustrated in Figure 2-6.
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6 U.S. Census 2010 Journey to Work
State Route 25 between Hollister and US 101 is an important corridor for the region. Due to safety concerns, the California Highway Patrol, the California Department of Transportation, the Council of Governments, and local leaders formed the Stay Alive on Highway 25 Committee in 2000. The Committee reviewed, analyzed, and made recommendations for safety improvements along the corridor. In 2010, the final phase of safety improvements were constructed between SR 156 and the San Benito County line with a concrete median barrier and consolidated driveways to reduce conflicts.

The State Route 25 corridor is important for residents who work in Santa Clara County and points north. The Council of Governments is working with Caltrans and others to identify funding for a future project to increase capacity in the corridor.

### Traffic

The majority of people in the San Benito workforce drives alone to work. A smaller percentage carpool. The split by mode of transportation is further depicted in Figure 2-7.

### Mode of Transportation

San Benito residents use the public roads and highways system for their daily needs and this need will grow as the population grows. Combined with population growth, San Benito County is isolated in that other economic centers are at least 20 miles away.

### PUBLIC TRANSIT

Public transit services in San Benito County are provided by the San Benito County Local Transportation Authority. An extensive menu of services is provided including the following:

- **Fixed Route** – serves Hollister on the Red, Green, and Blue lines
- **Paratransit** – serves those eligible who have a disability and their trip start or end is within ¾ mile of the fixed route
- **Dial-A-Ride** – serves trips outside of the fixed route area
- **Intercounty** (Service to Gilroy)

### Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Annual Daily Traffic (2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101</td>
<td>48,000-58,000^A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 25</td>
<td>22,900^B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 156</td>
<td>29,344^C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 152 Average Weekday Daily Traffic (2009)</td>
<td>36,600^D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2-6 Average Annual Daily Traffic**

Sources:

- Transportation Concept Report, U.S. 101, August 2013
- Hollister to Gilroy State Route 25 Widening and Route Adoption, Draft Environmental Impact Report and Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, April 2010
- San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project, Final Environmental 4 Impact Report/Environmental Assessment, October 2008
- Route 152 Trade Corridor Project (U.S. 101 to Route 99), Preliminary Traffic and Revenue Study, February 12, 2010

### Modes of Transportation

| Travel alone by car or truck | 73.9% |
| Travel with another person, carpool | 17.1% |
| Travel by working from home | 5.0% |
| Travel by other means | 1.7% |
| Travel by walking | 1.4% |

**Figure 2-7 Modes of Transportation**

Source: 2007-2011 American Community Survey,
- Caltrain – serves the Caltrain station
- Greyhound – serves the Greyhound station
- Gavilan College – serves San Juan Bautista and Gavilan College

- Out of County Non-Emergency Medical Transportation – provides transportation for people with a disability or elderly for medical appointments outside of San Benito County
- Senior Lunch Transportation Program – Provides transportation to the elderly for a lunch program at the Hollister Community Center
- Medical-Shopping Assistance Program – provides transportation and escort service to those with a disability or elderly for medical services and for shopping

In Fiscal Year 2012/2013, the Local Transportation Authority reported that 136,865 passengers used these public transit services. This form of transportation is important for getting children and adults to school, residents to medical services, people to shopping for necessities, and other trips.

An important component of improving transit ridership is locating housing and services near existing bus lines. This encourages transit usage, decreases the need for parking, and improves air quality. Transit must also serve these developments with more frequent service.

Funding cuts to public transit since 2009 have severely undermined the ability of local decision makers to meet the needs of the community. A troublesome cycle begins when funding cuts at the State level occur. This results in service cuts at the local level, followed by ridership declines. Ridership on public transit services has decreased by 19.6 percent since 2009 when transit funding cuts were first made by the State. Funding cuts coupled with the rising cost of maintenance, fuel, parts, and labor undermine the long term stability of transit service in the region. A reliable source of funding is needed to restore services and avoid service cuts and fare increases.

The Local Transportation Authority is updating its Short Range Transportation Plan and developing a Long Range Transportation Plan to address some of these challenges.

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION
Active transportation plays an important role in the transportation system. Increasingly, people desire more opportunities to participate in walking and bicycling to work, school, and for recreation. Active transportation has many benefits including reducing congestion and air pollution, improving health, and improving quality of life.

Active Transportation is a means of getting around that is human-powered, primarily walking and bicycling.
As the region grows over the next two decades there will be a great need for public infrastructure to accommodate active transportation. With over 25,000 people under the age of 19 by 2035, bicycling, and walking will play an important role in the transportation menu of options.

**AVIATION**
San Benito County has two general aviation airports, Hollister Municipal Airport and Frazier Lake Airpark. General aviation airports do not have scheduled commercial air-carrier service operations. These two airports serve those who use helicopters, gliders, propeller aircraft, and jets. Single engine piston aircraft represent the majority of airport operations.

The Hollister Municipal Airport serves private pilots, corporate interests, and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire). The airport also serves supporting industries. In 2010, an estimated 53,000 operations (takeoffs and landings) occurred at the airport. The number of operations is expected to grow to 130,600 by 2030 as the airport develops and support facilities expand. Currently and into the future, no commercial passenger service is anticipated at the Hollister Municipal Airport. The Hollister Municipal Airport includes two runways: a longer 6,350 foot runway, and a shorter 3,150 foot runway.

The Frazier Lake Airport is considered quasi-public use because it allows the public to land and take off, but only allows members to rent hangers. Frazier Lake Airport is unique in that it has one grass runway and one water runway. The grass runway is 2,500 feet long and the water runway is 3,000 feet long. In 2013, annual operations accounted for 10,500 take offs and landings with forecasted operations for 2020 at 23,990.

These two general aviation airports will continue to play an important role in the future of transportation in San Benito County, whether for general aviation or business purposes.

**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**
Transportation demand management is intended to reduce congestion at peak times through the promotion of strategies including carpooling, vanpooling, working from home, or walking and bicycling. These strategies are aimed at the peak commute times as a way of getting more people through roadways and managing traffic delays.

The San Benito County RideShare program has played an important role in transportation demand management over the last 20 years. Ridesharing services include:

- Carpool, vanpool, and bicycle matching,
- Vanpool vehicle leasing,

---

7 Hollister Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, June 21, 2012
8 Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Frazier Lake Airpark, November 15, 2001
• Bike Week and Rideshare Week promotions, and
• Marketing transit services.

**TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT**

Transportation system management involves technologies and strategies to improve the efficiency of the transportation network. Transportation system management includes Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). In collaboration with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, and the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies in Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara, the Council of San Benito County Governments developed an Intelligent Transportation Systems Deployment Plan. The Deployment Plan outlines the strategies and projects for the San Benito region. Some of these strategies and technologies include:

• Traffic light synchronization which improves traffic flow and reduces traveler delay
• Advance traveler information including 5-1-1 which provides real-time information about traffic delays, transit options, and more
• Improved efficiency for commercial vehicles including weigh-in-motion, automated route guidance, electronic clearance, and other methods
• Ramp metering which improves the efficiency of heavily used highways

**CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES**

With the demographic, transportation system, and economic context described above, the San Benito County region is faced with a complex set of challenges over the next 2 ½ decades. These challenges are the backdrop for the remaining chapters of this Regional Transportation Plan.

**TRANSPORTATION FINANCING**

The biggest challenge to solving the transportation challenges ahead is funding at all levels. Stable and reliable funding for the array of transportation projects and programs is critical to maintaining and improving our infrastructure. The projected growth forecast and the demand to travel will additionally put pressure on our transportation infrastructure. The need for transportation funding has far surpassed expected revenues with the sunset of San Benito County Measure A, State funding cuts to public transportation since 2009, the diminished value of the gas tax, and the elimination of the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program for the Monterey Bay region in 2005. In San Benito, the gap between reasonably expected revenues and future need is $486 million over 20 years.

An increase in the use of more efficient vehicles combined with the value of the gas tax diminishing has created an enormous gap in funding for the region, State, and nation. To illustrate the point, Figure 2-8 shows this gap.
Because San Benito County is home to many who work in other counties and its population center is geographically distant from neighboring counties, funding large transportation projects is an overwhelming challenge.

One method of meeting this challenge that has been adopted by the Council of Governments, City of Hollister, and San Benito County is the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program. These fees are levied to ensure that new development pays its fair share to the transportation improvement costs associated with growth. The last update to the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study was completed in 2011. This update eliminated the State Route 25 4-Lane Widening project from the project list for funding. The Nexus Study replaced the Highway 25 4-Lane Widening Project with a passing lanes project. Although the need for capacity improvements is recognized by San Benito COG and its member jurisdictions, financial constraint made it necessary to eliminate the widening project and it was replaced with operational improvements, in the form of proposed passing lanes. The Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study is scheduled to be updated in 2015.

SYSTEM PRESERVATION
The San Benito County region has invested millions of dollars in its transportation system including enhancing existing bikeways and highways. Maintenance is needed to protect this public investment for generations to come. However, because of the instability and
vulnerabilities of previous funding sources and the current funding shortages, challenges exist to keep San Benito County's transportation infrastructure in good repair.

Many of the County roads serve remote rural areas and some serve as alternative routes to the State Highways when an incident occurs and ties up traffic. The most pressing challenge with maintaining these streets and roads is funding to extend the life of the roadway or walkway with limited State, Federal, and local financial resources.

**FREIGHT MOBILITY**

The San Benito County transport network is at a crossroads for moving goods throughout California and the Nation. To the west of the County, the Salinas Valley produced $4.03 billion in agricultural value in 2010.\(^9\)

San Benito County is also home to a strong $298 million agricultural industry (2012).\(^10\) The ability of farmers and producers to get product to the market is crucial. The movement of perishable goods from farm to table relies on investment in transportation infrastructure for long term sustainability. While agriculture steals the show when it comes to freight mobility, other products also rely on the transportation system to support business. Additionally, the increase in population that is projected for San Benito County will lead to increased consumption and an increased local demand for inbound freight.

The effect of this industry can be seen on State highways in San Benito County by the percentage of truck traffic on State highways (Figure 2-9).

![Figure 2-9 Percentage of Truck Traffic on State Highways in San Benito County](image)

Sources:
- \(^A\) San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project, Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment, October 2008
- \(^B\) Route 152 Trade Corridor Project (U.S. 101 to Route 99), Preliminary Traffic and Revenue Study Report, February 12, 2010
- \(^C\) Hollister to Gilroy State Route 25 Widening and Route Adoption, Draft Environmental Impact Report and Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, April 2010

Given the amount of truck traffic on State highways, the movement of goods within and through San Benito County is of Statewide interest.

One challenge to improving freight mobility in San Benito County is establishing a comprehensive truck route network which meets Caltrans and engineering requirements. Many of the County roads were built decades ago and lack adequate space for the large trucks to turn
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\(^9\) Economic Contributions of Monterey County Agriculture, Leading the Field – 2011, Monterey County Agricultural Commissioners Office

\(^10\) San Benito County 2012 Annual Crop Report
at intersections or tight curves. There are also various length and weight restrictions on portions of the State Highway System within the county, including State Routes 25 and 146.

In order to support the agricultural economy, the County will need to invest in its roadways and correct these issues. However, availability of funding will make it difficult to make these investments.

**INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE**

A Regional Transportation Plan must recognize the connection between land use and transportation. In this respect, the Council of San Benito County Governments worked closely with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the Cities of Hollister and San Juan Bautista, and San Benito County to coordinate land use and transportation through the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

**SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY**

In 2008, Senate Bill 375 was passed requiring Metropolitan Planning Organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Sustainable Communities Strategy integrates land use and transportation planning by coordinating transportation investments with land use patterns in the region to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally, the Sustainable Communities Strategy accommodates the housing needs of the region.

The Sustainable Communities Strategy is an element of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan prepared by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments and covers the tri-county area of Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz Counties. As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, the Council of San Benito County Governments coordinated with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments on the development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy by identifying transportation projects for inclusion in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

The Regional Transportation Plan contains this list of projects for San Benito County, which were identified through coordination with local jurisdictions. Projects were selected based on extensive public outreach, project performance, and to support the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments developed a sustainable land use pattern in conjunction with local jurisdictions that is supportive of the countywide transportation projects list.

Understanding the enormous challenges associated with San Benito County transportation needs, and general lack of funding for repair and maintenance needs, the Council of San Benito County Governments placed an emphasis on system preservation. This direction is reflected in the project list and is reflected in the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

For more information on the Sustainable Communities Strategy, refer to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments’ *Monterey Bay 2035: Moving Forward* at [www.AMBAG.org](http://www.AMBAG.org).
Regional transportation planning in San Benito County involves collaboration with our regional partners, the local jurisdictions, community groups, and the public. *On the Move: 2035* involved a greater emphasis on reaching out to community groups and partnering with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments on the Sustainable Communities Strategy than in previous Regional Transportation Plans.

Additionally, the Council of Governments works with the local jurisdictions and partner agencies on the project list including determining the purpose, need, cost estimates for projects as well as the financial plan.

The following chapters describe, in detail, the regional issues and overall policy approach, a snapshot of the existing transportation network, investments for our transportation future, financing, performance, and public participation efforts.
Chapter 3 Regional Issues and Overall Policy Approach

The Council of Governments worked closely with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments to develop a set of policy goals that were responsive to the needs of the region’s transportation system. These policy goals are crafted to guide policymakers in their comprehensive and day-to-day decision making about transportation.

Additionally, the Council of Governments reached out to the public to help develop these goals and objectives in order to ensure that planning decisions are responsive to what residents of San Benito County want to see for their community. Using public comment and data from the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the goals and policy objectives reflect the majority of San Benito County residents’ desires for a healthy, active lifestyle, safe motor vehicle travel, and options for shorter trips to be taken by bicycle or by walking.

San Benito County has seen a recent surge in efforts among the community to initiate change as reflected in these goals and policy objectives. For example, in 2011, the Community Foundation for San Benito County launched Community Vision San Benito, hosting a summit to answer this question: "What would you like San Benito County to be in 10 years?" Over 200 people attended and themes such as health, safety, and community emerged. In nearly every way, transportation options can affect the attainment of this goal. One theme that emerged from the public input was the desire for San Benito County to "have improved transportation, that meets the community's interest." Other community partnerships among different agencies have also emerged, with the alignment of transportation and land use planning, public health, and economic development all showing a need for infrastructure that meets the goals set forth in this plan. Figure 3-1 illustrates the way transportation impacts so many segments of the community and can have an effect on quality of life.

Federal and State Planning Goals

The Regional Transportation Plan considered the federal and state planning goals when the local goals and policy objectives were being developed. U.S. Congress issues federal planning factors (Title 23 United States Code, Section 134(f)), which are revised when the federal transportation bill is reauthorized. The regional and local transportation goals align closely to these federal planning factors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motorized users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motorized users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and for freight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improve-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ments and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and between modes, people and freight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote efficient system management and operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3-2  Eight Metropolitan and Statewide Planning Goals**

The State of California participates in several statewide planning efforts related to transportation. The California Transportation Plan (CTP 2040) is a state-level transportation plan that combines statewide transportation goals with regional transportation and land use plans to produce a unified multimodal transportation strategy. The California Transportation Plan defines performance-based goals, policies, and strategies to achieve a collective vision and recommendations for California's future, statewide, integrated, multimodal transportation system over the next 25 years.

In addition to the California Transportation Plan, Caltrans completes five modal plans statewide:

- California Aviation System Plan
- California Freight Mobility Plan
- California State Rail Plan
- Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan
- California Statewide Strategic Plan
These statewide modal plans help regions develop a framework for long-range transportation planning locally.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL TRANSPORTATION GOALS

The San Benito County Regional Transportation Plan calls for a safe, sustainable, globally competitive multimodal transportation system that provides reliable and efficient mobility and accessibility for people, goods and services.

Policy goals were adopted by the COG Board in January 2013 and are further described below.

The goals adopted in the previous 2010 Regional Transportation Plan were extensive and categorized by mode of transportation. The Council of Governments advisory committees reviewed those goals and recommended streamlining them and making them more dynamic and applicable to the needs of the region.

While the Plan focuses on San Benito County, it is important to consider the transportation network as it operates throughout the Monterey Bay region. Therefore, the goals were aligned closely with those of COG’s regional partners at the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), the Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission, and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County.

Figure 3-3 lists the regional and local transportation goals and policy objectives approved by the Council of Governments Board of Directors. These goals and policy objectives are further described and illustrated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Policy Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and Mobility</td>
<td>Provide convenient, accessible, and reliable travel options while maximizing productivity for all people and goods in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>Raise the region’s standard of living by enhancing the performance of the transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Promote environmental sustainability and protect the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Communities</td>
<td>Protect the health of our residents; foster efficient development patterns that optimize travel, housing, and employment choices and encourage active transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity</td>
<td>Provide an equitable level of transportation services to all segments of the population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation and Safety</td>
<td>Preserve and ensure a sustainable and safe regional transportation system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACCESS AND MOBILITY

Successful transportation planning efforts must be committed to the belief that all residents and visitors of San Benito County are able to access basic needs conveniently, safely, and affordably. This includes the need to get to school, work, health care, shopping, and recreation.
This long-range transportation plan provides for this accessibility by investing in transportation options across all types, including walking, bicycling, driving, and taking transit.

**ECONOMIC VITALITY**
A well-performing and well-planned transportation system can enhance economic well-being across the region. Investments in transportation have a direct impact on retail spending and job growth. In addition to job growth, efficient freight transportation attracts new business and lowers the inventory costs for goods and services.

The transportation system also supports a regional, state, and national freight industry that relies on efficient movement of goods. The County transportation system also supports a $298 million dollar agricultural industry that is a large producer of jobs and enhances the region’s economy.

**ENVIRONMENT**
A successful Regional Transportation Plan allows all residents to enjoy a better quality of life, including the ability to lead a healthy lifestyle and enjoy clean air and water and ample opportunities for recreation and physical activity. It also focuses on the need to protect our valuable natural resources and wealth of prime agricultural lands. In addition, transportation planning can have an effect on air quality. The Council of Governments is tasked with considering transportation alternatives that improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light trucks.

**HEALTHY COMMUNITIES**
More and more, the link between transportation and the health is emerging. Transportation policy decisions can greatly impact the health of individuals as evidenced in obesity rates, air quality, and tasks demanding concentration at school. The American Public Health Association notes that transportation has a direct link to the following public health factors:

- Levels of Physical Activity
- Safety and Injury Prevention
- Air Quality
- Health of vulnerable populations, including children, the elderly, and lower income populations
- Mental Health

Additionally, there is an opportunity to control health care costs by investing in sidewalks and bicycle lanes and transit stops.

Figure 3-4: Health Determinants vs. Expenditures
improvements. In San Benito County, there have been several recent initiatives that created opportunity for stewards of public health to partner with the Council of Governments to ensure that transportation decisions adequately address public health. These included partnerships with the YMCA, the Department of Public Health, and First 5 San Benito, a local nonprofit whose vision is that “San Benito County children and their families will reside in a safe, healthy and nurturing environment, enjoy equal access to resources and realize their unique potential with a strong sense of responsibility to self and community.” For example, as a continuation of work of First 5 San Benito’s Dunne Park Collaborative, the Council of Governments led planning efforts to improve safe routes to R.O. Hardin and Calaveras Elementary schools including identifying existing conditions that prevent an/or discourage community members from walking, bicycling, and scooting within the project area. Additionally, the San Benito County Local Transportation Authority has created partnerships with local schools and healthcare providers, including the San Benito Health Foundation and Hazel Hawkins Memorial Hospital, to install bus stop shelters to make traveling by public transit more comfortable by providing better walking, bicycling, and scooting access to transit.

**SOCIAL EQUITY**

It is important that transportation investments reflect the needs of all residents in the region, and not disproportionately favor any one segment of the community. A responsive Regional Transportation Plan will spread resources throughout the region, making investments in diverse geographic regions and to benefit diverse populations. Over the past 15 years, there has been a greater focus throughout California to ensure that projects and planning efforts consider socioeconomic factors including income, education, and occupation. In San Benito County, 12.7 percent of the population is below the poverty line,\(^{11}\) with 20 percent having an education level below high school education.\(^{12}\) Available mapping of San Benito County income distribution shows no highly disadvantaged segments of the community; however, the heavy commute population out of the county masks the reality of income disparity. For example, research completed for efforts to improve safety around R.O. Hardin and Calaveras schools in West Hollister showed that approximately 80% of students lived in households that met income requirements for a free school lunch.

Overall, it is rare to receive feedback from socially and economically disadvantaged populations when making transportation policy decisions related to project development; therefore, decision-makers are tasked with considering social equity impacts of transportation investments.

\(^{11}\) 2010 U.S. Census

\(^{12}\) 2010 U.S. Census
SYSTEM PRESERVATION AND SAFETY
San Benito County is home to:

- 899 miles of local roadway
- 88 miles of state highways
- 13 miles of bicycle trails/lanes
- $1 million in annual transit operations
- Two general aviation airports

San Benito County is also home to 55,269 (2010 Census) people using these facilities daily, needing them to be in a safe, navigable, and well-maintained condition. In addition, San Benito County is expected to grow to have a population of over 81,332 by 2035. The goal of this Regional Transportation Plan is to ensure that transportation investments are adequate to maintain existing transportation facilities and meet the needs of the community.

Overall, San Benito County is committed to planning for a transportation system that will enhance the lives of its residents and visitors, while preserving the rich and varied resources available.
Chapter 4  Snapshot of the Existing Transportation Network

The strength of San Benito County’s regional multi-modal transportation network lies in its vast network of roads, bus routes, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes.

This chapter discusses the existing system needs and provides a snapshot of the facilities that make up San Benito County’s transportation multi-modal network. The chapter highlights the importance of a coordinated multi-modal planning system which is critical to the continued growth of our local and regional economies. This coordinated planning approach is important to ensure that as the system grows; we manage transport in a way that is sensitive to the San Benito County region’s valuable natural and community resources. As such; it is critical to discuss the impacts growth will have on the existing transportation network.

As the region’s transportation network grows and the need for maintenance grows, transportation funding is shrinking, as illustrated in Chapter 2. To understand the impact and needs of the transportation network, it is important to provide insight into San Benito County’s regional travel patterns and behaviors.

REGIONAL TRAVEL BEHAVIORS
Nine out of ten trips in the San Benito County region use our highway and arterial network, which supports a host of modes, including the automobile, transit, and active transportation. The region is also home to a growing number of commuters.

In San Benito County, the average commute time to work is just over 30 minutes; this is higher than the United States and State of California averages. In addition, 48.9 percent of San Benito County residents now commute to jobs outside of the county, leaving for work in the dark and coming home after dark.13

The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments’ Regional Travel Demand Model also estimates the mode choice by users of the San Benito County region roadway system in Figure 4-1.

This data is notably important because most commuters travel at the same time of day on roads and highways that meet or exceed today’s capacity demands. Increased traffic has adverse impacts on San Benito County’s regional transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modes of Transportation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel alone by car or truck</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel with another person, carpool</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel by working from home</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel by other means</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel by walking</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4-1  San Benito County Mode Choice Data
Source: 2007-2011 American Community Survey, DP03

13 2010 U.S. Census, San Benito County
system – causing a strain on the existing infrastructure and available funding resources. Maintaining the local transportation infrastructure is important for the entire region and in order to do so, it is critical to understand the transportation needs of the San Benito County region.

**MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT**
How well our transportation system performs directly affects the day-to-day movement of people and goods. On a macro scale, it shapes the region’s economic vitality, growth patterns and quality of life. Several needs have been identified upon evaluating existing transportation conditions which should be assessed.

The predominant mode of transportation in the San Benito County region is the private vehicle. This particular mode of transportation excludes many residents like children under the legal driving age, persons with limited means, or persons with disabilities. As we identify the needs in the region it is crucial to also recognize the needs of the multi-modal transportation system as a whole to include alternative transportation facilities; such as public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities to accommodate residents that do not have access, or choose not to use, a private vehicle.

Despite the importance of the San Benito County region’s transportation system, improvements have not kept pace with the region’s increasing population and transportation demand. As a result, the region’s traffic congestion continues to increase, leading to a less productive transportation system, impacts to air quality, deterioration of transportation infrastructure, and financial and health impacts to commuters.

**Roadways**
San Benito County region’s network of roads is crumbling under the weight of decades of underinvestment. The California Statewide Needs Assessment Project surveyed California’s 58 counties and 480 cities in 2012 on the condition of local streets and roads infrastructure. It collected data on the amount and type of funding used to support the needs of pavement, essential component needs, and bridges. San Benito County’s average pavement condition was 66, consistent with the statewide average.\(^\text{14}\)

\(^\text{14}\) 2012 California Statewide Needs Assessment Project
The Statewide Report identifies that there is a significant need for increased funding for local streets and road maintenance. There is a statewide funding shortfall of $82 billion over the next ten years. Currently, only $2.5 billion a year is available statewide for local streets and road maintenance in California. In the San Benito County region, the 20-year pavement needs total $313 million.

As noted, a shortage of funding has had a significant impact to the multi-modal transportation system as a whole – including the needs of public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Public Transit
Public transit needs in the San Benito County region have increased – causing an increase in local Unmet Transit Needs. In 2009, the State of California eliminated Proposition 42 State Transit Assistance Increment (STA) funds from the Transportation Development Act due to State budget constraints. As a result, the San Benito County Local Transportation Authority had to make significant reductions to its transit services and increase fares. At the 2012 Unmet Transit Needs hearing, the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council found that the lack of mid-day Fixed Route service was an unmet transit need that was not reasonable to meet due to funding constraints.

Current transit funding projections inadequately meet all the transportation needs in San Benito County. In order to meet public demand, San Benito is always looking toward generating revenue through various grants to help fund transit. Some examples of recent grants that were awarded to the Local Transportation Authority include:

- Continuation of Intercounty Gavilan College and Greyhound Services
- Transit Internship Program
- Transit Design Guidelines
- Short-Range and Long-Range Transit Plan
- Transit Infrastructure Assessment

Although the agency has been successful in receiving grants, these types of funds are unstable in nature. Grants are typically highly competitive and last one to two years. While these grants are helpful, they are not guaranteed nor consistently funded. Therefore, these grants do not provide a sustainable and/or reliable source of funding needed for planning activities or maintaining service levels.
Bicycle and Pedestrian (Active Transportation)

San Benito County's regional financial needs also impact the regional bikeway network. Currently, the regions' bikeway network is modest in size. However, steps have been taken towards improving citizens' quality of life which create a more sustainable environment by reducing traffic congestion, air pollution from vehicle exhaust emissions, noise, and energy consumption. The Council of Governments has also actively sought grant opportunities to meet the funding shortfall of the bikeway network. Past grants have included:

- Community Based Transportation Planning Grant, which funded the (San Benito County Bikeway and Pedestrian Master Plan),
- Bicycle Transportation Account and Safe Routes to School Grant funded the construction of the San Juan Highway Bike Lanes Project. These grant programs were consolidated into the Active Transportation Program (ATP).
- Monterey Bay Area Unified Air Pollution Control District's AB2766 Vehicle Emissions Reduction Grant Program, which funded the construction of the Southside Road Bike Lanes Project
- Silicon Valley Health Trust Grant, which funded the Safe Routes to School Implementation Plan for R.O. Hardin and Calaveras Schools

Funding for San Benito County's regional multi-modal system typically comes from a range of sources, including state gasoline taxes, county sales taxes, Transportation Development Act, State Transit Planning Assistance. For detailed funding sources, see Chapter 6.

Identification of new strategies will play a vital role in moving the region towards a more cohesive multi-modal network. These strategies will address the current and future needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, drivers, and the disabled.

An essential component to any multimodal system should be a “Complete Streets” approach to facility planning. Complete Streets is a roadway design template whereby facilities for different modes of transportation, such as bicycle and pedestrian, are accounted for within the street design.\(^\text{15}\) Such a design would include a roadway travel lane adjacent to a bicycle lane and sidewalk, including necessary separations for safety. All facility design decisions should foster a cooperative relationship between recreational and commuter traffic. Appropriate signage and wayfinding strategies need to be employed to ensure that transportation is safe and efficient for all modes, see Chapter 5 for more details.

\(^{15}\) Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook
The implementation of Complete Street strategies and policies is important in the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system that facilitates the safe and efficient movement of people and goods. In addition, using performance measures, which are later discussed in Chapter 7, allows us to evaluate current and projected transportation needs of the region.

A Complete Streets Guidebook was prepared by the regional transportation planning agencies of San Benito, Monterey, and Santa Cruz counties and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. This Guidebook is found in Appendix A.

**MULTIMODAL SYSTEM**

A truly multimodal transportation system is one that supports a variety of transportation resources including highways, local roadways, public transit, bike lanes and trails, pedestrian sidewalks and pathways, aviation, goods movement, and Transportation Demand Management. A multimodal transportation system ensures that land development practices and transportation projects promote community connectivity. A complete multimodal network will also support economic development, tourism and sustainability goals. As a result, the network will improve livability by offering travel choices for all ages and ability of users.

**LOCAL ROADWAYS**

Roadways are the backbone of San Benito County’s economic well-being. Roadways facilitate the movement of people and goods via multiple modes of transportation, including automobiles, public transit, and active transportation. A map of local roadways can be found in Figure 4-4.

The public roads system within San Benito County, the City of Hollister, and the City of San Juan Bautista extends for 521 miles. San Benito County’s network includes numerous county roads and city streets. Local jurisdictions classify these facilities according to their function into one of five categories: arterials, collectors, local, local business street, or private roads.

**Arterials**

Within urbanized areas, arterials provide access to major activity centers and accommodate pedestrian and bicycle use. Arterials usually have relatively high traffic volumes and travel speeds. Arterial streets have limited parking opportunities or parking is prohibited altogether.
Collectors
The collector street and road system primarily provides for vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle movement between sub-areas within residential, commercial, and industrial neighborhoods.

Collector streets and roads usually have moderate traffic volumes and travel speeds, consistent with a moderate level of pedestrian and bicycle use. Collector streets have limited on-street parking opportunities.

Local
The local street and road system primarily provides for vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle movement. Moderate to high traffic volumes and low travel speeds are consistent with the highest level of pedestrian and bicycle use. Main streets have ample on-street parking opportunities for commercial use.

Private Roads
Private roads provide access from public roads to properties otherwise unconnected to the public road system. Private roads are also found in multi-family or condominium development projects. Usually, local jurisdictions require new private roads to meet the same standards as public roads, but in many cases older facilities do not meet minimum public standards. Private roads usually have low traffic volumes and travel speeds, and pedestrian and bicycling facilities are often missing.

Existing Conditions
San Benito County’s roads have seen increased traffic due to growth in the late 1990s. Traffic congestion on rural roads in northern San Benito County has created long delays at rural intersections. Within Hollister, many local and collector streets are being used for through travel.

STATE AND FEDERAL HIGHWAYS
The San Benito region’s State of California highway system extends for 88 maintained miles. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) maintains five state highways in San Benito County which includes routes 25, 101, 129, 146, and 156. With the exception of U.S. 101, the highways in San Benito County were designed as two-lane conventional highways. Many of these facilities have been overwhelmed by increased commuter, recreational, and goods movement traffic. State highways are discussed in more detail below.

State Route 25
State Route 25 traverses the entire length of San Benito County in the south at the junction of State Route 198 in Monterey County, north through Paicines, Tres Pinos, and Hollister to the northern county boundary near Gilroy, where it connects to U.S. 101. This primarily minor rural route functions as a two-lane facility, with the exception of a short section in Hollister where there are three miles consisting of four and six lanes.
State Route 25 is a primary commuter route between Hollister and Gilroy. Between 1998 and 2003, State Route 25 experienced a high number of traffic accidents and fatalities along the corridor. Anecdotal evidence indicates that heavy peak-period traffic volumes impact parallel routes including Frazer Lake Road. State Highway 25 from the Monterey County line to State Highway 156 is eligible for inclusion in the California Scenic Highway program.

In response to these conditions, the Council of Governments in coordination with various state and local government agencies has planned and implemented a series of projects, identified below, that address the needs of travelers using Highway 25 in San Benito County.

- **Highway 25 Bypass**  
The Measure A Authority funded and the Council of Governments constructed the Route 25 Hollister Bypass, which was opened to the public in February of 2009. The Bypass is a six and four-lane urban arterial with bicycle lanes that begins at the intersection of State Route 25 at Sunnyslope Road and extends north intersecting East Park Street, Hillcrest Road, Meridian Street, and Santa Ana Road. The new facility continues north and then west to connect to San Felipe Road and Highway 25. The new route is parallel to and to the east of Downtown Hollister.

  In 2014, the Council of Governments worked in partnership with Caltrans to designate the Bypass as the official State Route 25. The existing State Route 25, that runs through Downtown Hollister was relinquished and is now a city owned street. The transfer of the Bypass to the State was made in May 2014.

- **Highway 25 Safety and Operational Enhancements Project**  
In 2010, the Council of Governments completed construction on the Highway 25 Safety and Operational Enhancements Project. The purpose of the Highway 25 Safety and Operational Enhancements Project was to reduce the potential for cross centerline collisions by constructing a median barrier and consolidating private driveways. This project is located on State Route 25 between San Felipe Road in San Benito County and U.S. 101 in Santa Clara County; a distance of approximately 11.2 miles.

- **Highway 25 Widening**  
Caltrans, in cooperation with the Council of Governments and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, is proposing the eventual replacement of 11.2 miles of the existing State Route 25 two-lane conventional highway with a four-lane expressway in San Benito and in Santa Clara Counties. In San Benito County, the project would extend for 8 miles from San Felipe Road (within the City of Hollister) to the San Benito/Santa Clara County line. This project is intended to add capacity along the corridor. For fiscal constraint reasons, funding for the Highway 25 Widening project is unavailable in the 2035 planning period.
U.S. Highway 101

U.S. 101 passes through the northwestern portion of San Benito County for 7.5 miles and serves primarily interregional traffic. It is the main north/south route that Caltrans classified as a principal arterial and includes it as part of the Interregional Route System (IRRS). San Benito County has designated the route as a Scenic Highway. U.S. 101 from the Monterey County line to State Highway 156 is eligible for inclusion in the California Scenic Highway Program.

U.S. 101 in San Benito County starts as a four-lane expressway at the Monterey/San Benito County Line and changes to a four-lane freeway 1.6 miles north. The route continues as a four lane freeway to the Pajaro River Bridge at the San Benito/Santa Clara County Line. State Routes 156 and 129 intersect U.S. 101 in San Benito County. Caltrans has identified a route concept for U.S. 101 that is a six-lane freeway configuration, which is currently unfunded.

State Route 129

As a two-lane conventional highway, State Route 129 extends from Santa Cruz County into the northwestern portion of San Benito County connecting to U.S 101 approximately 2.6 miles from the Santa Cruz/San Benito County Line. It provides access from State Route 1, in Santa Cruz County to U.S. 101 for truck traffic generated by food processing plants in the Watsonville area and a sand and gravel quarry in southeastern Santa Cruz County. The route also serves agricultural production areas used by farm equipment and slow-moving trucks carrying farm produce. State Route 129 provides access to Santa Cruz and Monterey County beaches.

Truck traffic originating from Santa Cruz County on State Route 129 impacts San Juan Highway and San Justo Road, both of which are narrow two lane roads ill-equipped to handle heavy loads and large vehicles. Agricultural-related businesses located on San Juan Highway are generating much of this truck traffic, which impact the county's roads as trucks move through the area toward State Route 156. In addition, Anzar High School, which is also located on San Juan Highway, generates motor vehicle traffic in the area during school hours.

The route concept for State Route 129 is a two-lane conventional highway with passing lanes where appropriate.
State Route 146

State Route 146, in San Benito County is a two-lane conventional highway used primarily to provide access from State Route 25 to Pinnacles National Park. Caltrans classifies this route as a minor arterial. San Benito County has designated the route as a local Scenic Highway and the corridor has been identified as eligible for inclusion in the California Scenic Highway Program.

State Route 146 is expected to accommodate anticipated growth through the long-term (2035) forecast without major capacity improvements. The route concept for State Route 146 is to maintain the corridor as a two-lane conventional highway.

State Route 156

State Route 156 traverses northern San Benito County, from U.S. 101 (west of San Juan Bautista) through San Juan Bautista and Hollister to the San Benito/Santa Clara county line where it connects with State Route 152. State Route 156 is a four-lane expressway from U.S. 101 to San Juan Bautista, where it narrows into a conventional two-lane rural highway. In the Hollister area, State Route 156 becomes a two-lane expressway, as it bypasses Hollister and maintains that configuration to the San Benito/Santa Clara County line. Near Hollister, the State Route 156 Bypass continues north of the city limits.

The corridor serves interregional traffic traveling east/west, including a substantial number of trucks during the week and recreational traffic between the Central Valley, Monterey Bay Area, and San Francisco Bay Area on the weekend. Caltrans classifies State Route 156 as a rural minor arterial and includes it as part of the Interregional Road System. State Route 156 is a Caltrans Focus Route. As such, the route has a high priority for completion to facility standards in order to handle higher volumes of interregional trip movements and connect all urban areas, goods movement gateways, and rural areas. It is also designated as a Federal Aid Primary Route and is part of the Freeway and Expressway System, although a large portion of the route is a conventional highway.

State Route 156 is also a major corridor for residents of Hollister, San Juan Bautista, and San Benito County traveling to Monterey and Santa Clara Counties. While portions of the facility have been upgraded to handle increased demand, the segment between San Juan Bautista and Hollister remains a two-lane facility. With conflicts between commuters and agricultural operations, improving safety on this highway segment is a priority for Caltrans and San Benito County policy makers.

Caltrans’ future route concept for State Route 156 is a four-lane access-controlled conventional highway from The Alameda to Union Road (west of Hollister), and a two-lane access-controlled...
conventional highway from Union Road to the San Benito/Santa Clara County Line. Caltrans has secured funding for the San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project and is currently in the final design and right-of-way phases to widen State Route 156 from The Alameda to Union Road. Once constructed, the existing State Route 156 will become a county road and will serve as access for residents living on the north side and a bicycle and pedestrian multi-use path connecting bicyclist traveling between Hollister and San Juan Bautista.

State Highway 156 from the Monterey County line to the Santa Clara County line is eligible for inclusion in the California Scenic Highway Program.

GOODS MOVEMENT
The majority of commodities in San Benito County are transported in and out of the county by truck, with a small portion transported by rail.

TRUCKING
San Benito County experiences a higher than average amount of truck traffic in and around San Juan Bautista and Hollister. Commodity exports from San Benito County are primarily agricultural products and quarry materials, and the transport of these products generates a significant amount of truck traffic in and out of the County. While this traffic is largely confined to state highways it also impacts local streets and rural roads not designed to handle large heavy trucks, creating conflicts with local traffic and adding to congestion. Seasonal trucking activity in the region is a challenge for farmers trying to get their produce to market. In addition to congestion, infrastructure is not adequate to handle large truck volumes. Figure 4-7 depicts highway freight movement in the United States. San Benito County is entirely covered by the lines, highlighting the importance of trucking in regional goods movement. Figure 4-8 depicts the existing and proposed freight network for San Benito County. Projects identified for funding in the Regional Transportation Plan’s timeframe include projects which will accommodate this freight network improvement need. Additional projects, such as improvements to the State Route 25, US 101 and State Route 152 corridors, are included in the illustrative, unconstraind project list in the Plan. These identified needs underline the importance of the need to accommodate a goods movement network that is safe and efficient.
RAILROAD
The primary rail line in San Benito County is the 12-mile-long Hollister Branch Line running from Hollister to Carnadero Creek in Santa Clara County. The facility transports approximately 10,000 gross tons of goods on the rail line each year. With the advent of the state highway and the competitive shipping rates offered by truckers, rail has become a less viable form of commodity transport than it was in decades past. In 2014, there were no established plans to expand rail growth in San Benito County by either the public or private sector.

PUBLIC TRANSIT SYSTEM
Despite San Benito County's common perception as an auto-oriented culture, the region's transit system includes an extensive network of services and options.

The San Benito County Local Transportation Authority was formed by a Joint Powers Agreement between the Cities of Hollister and San Juan Bautista and the County of San Benito in 1990. The Authority is responsible for the administration and operation of public transportation services in the County provided by County Express and Specialized Transportation Services.
During Fiscal Year 2012/2013, the Local Transportation Authority transit providers served 120,109 passengers on County Express and 16,756 on Specialized Transportation Services (Figure 4-9).

As an ongoing effort to coordinate public transportation services and resources in the San Benito County region, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, in partnership with the Authority and other regional transit agencies developed a comprehensive strategy for public transportation service. The Monterey Bay Area Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan identifies the current transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and individuals with limited incomes, and outlines strategies for meeting these needs. The Coordinated Plan can be found at www.AMBAG.org.

COUNTY EXPRESS TRANSIT SYSTEM
The County Express system currently provides three fixed routes in the City of Hollister, complementary Americans with Disabilities Act Paratransit service, Intercounty service to Gilroy in Santa Clara County, and a general public Dial-A-Ride.

As of December 2013, the County Express fleet included 23 vehicles. All vehicles are ADA compliant and equipped with wheelchair lifts/ramps and bicycle racks. The Local Transportation Authority contracts with a private operator for management, dispatchers, trainers, and drivers of its County Express transit service.

Fixed-Route
Fixed-Route service operates three Fixed Routes within the City of Hollister. These routes operate between 6:20 a.m. and 5:40 p.m. However, there is no Fixed Route service between 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Headways for each of the routes range from 40 to 50 minutes.
Dial-A-Ride

County Express transit system provides Dial-a-Ride service to parts of northern San Benito County, including Hollister, San Juan Bautista, and Tres Pinos, Monday through Friday from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. where and when Fixed Route is not available and on weekends. Reservations for the Dial-A-Ride may be made up to 14 days in advance. Same-day service is available but is subject to availability and a convenience fee.

Paratransit

Complementary Americans with Disabilities Act Paratransit service is available for residents and visitors who are eligible for the service as determined by the Authority. The service is for individuals who are not able to access Fixed Route due to a physical or cognitive disability and have trips that begin or end in a location less than ¼ mile from a Fixed Route bus stop. Reservations for the Paratransit service may be made up to 14 days in advance. Same-day service is available but is subject to availability and a convenience fee.

Intercounty

County Express’ Intercounty routes provide connections from the Cities of Hollister and San Juan Bautista to the City of Gilroy. There is daily weekday service to Gavilan College and the Caltrain station and Saturday service to the Greyhound station in Gilroy. The weekday shuttle service to Gavilan College is from 6:50 a.m. to 6:10 p.m. with a limited schedule when school is not in session. There are three early morning and three evening runs to the Gilroy Caltrain station for connections to Caltrain and Valley Transportation Authority bus services. Service to the Greyhound station operates on Saturday and Sunday from 7:40 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

SPECIALIZED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, 10.4 percent of the total county population is aged 65 or older. Many of these elderly individuals and persons with disabilities require specialized transportation services to travel to medical appointments, shop, and visit recreation centers.

The Authority contracts with Jovenes de Antaño, a local non-profit organization that has been providing specialized transportation services in San Benito County since 1990. Specialized services include Out of County Non-Emergency Medical Transportation, Medical Shopping Assistance Transportation, and Senior Lunch Transportation Program. These services are beyond the requirements of

---
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Americans with Disabilities Act. They provide escort services, door-through-door, and minor translation services.

Jovenes de Antaño also has a referral program that provides information about other social services within the community, coordination of home-based services, referral to legal assistance, and other local services to their clients. The coordination effort between Jovenes de Antaño and the Authority allows for efficient, affordable and reliable service for this critical need in the community of San Benito County.

**REGIONAL VANPOOL PROGRAM**

The Council of Governments administers a commuter Vanpool Program. The Program is designed to help San Benito County residents save money, reduce traffic congestion, and make the commute to/from work more pleasant by providing affordable shared transportation. The Vanpool Program fleet consists of four 15-passenger vehicles that are leased to commuters traveling to and from San Benito County.

**Calvans**

CalVans is a state-wide Vanpool Program that includes more than 200 vanpools tailored to meet the needs of commuters, plus nearly 150 vans especially designed for farm workers. CalVans is sponsored by the California Vanpool Authority.

**COMMUTER RAIL SERVICE**

Although there is no direct commuter rail service from San Benito County to Santa Clara County, County Express provides Intercounty shuttle service to connect commuters to Caltrain services available in Gilroy. The California High Speed Rail Authority has a planned route that is proposed to go through northern San Benito County as it connects the Bay Area with the Central Valley and Los Angeles. There is no planned stop within San Benito County.

**SCHOOL BUS TRANSPORTATION**

San Benito County has 11 public school districts, 7 private schools and 4 special-purpose schools. The four school districts that provide bus service for their students are Aromas-San Juan Unified, Hollister, North County Joint Union, and San Benito High School. School bus service is open only to students who live within a specific distance from the school or have a disability.

**TAXI SERVICE**

Taxi service is available from Hollister Taxi, LTD Taxi Service, and Yellow Cab.

**ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IN ACTION**

Active transportation modes (e.g., bicycling and walking) are essential and increasingly important modes of transportation. These non-motorized modes are low-cost, do not contribute to air pollution, help reduce roadway congestion, improve health, and contribute to quality of life. As the region works toward reducing congestion and air pollution, safe facilities
to encourage active transportation will become essential to meet the future needs of our residents.

**SUPPORTING ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION**

In recent years, there has been a push in state, regional, and local policies to enhance the existing transportation system while improving the environment. Some of the laws, planning documents, and guidelines which support this shift include:

- The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) challenges California to fight climate change through a comprehensive program reducing Greenhouse Gas emissions from virtually all sources statewide. The Act requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop regulations and market mechanisms that will cut the state’s greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 – a 25 percent reduction statewide.\(^\text{17}\)

- The California Complete Streets Act (AB 1358), passed in 2008, requires that any major revision of a jurisdiction’s General Plan include modification to the circulation element to “plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads and highways.”\(^\text{18}\) The Complete Streets Act will ensure that the transportation plans of California communities meet the needs of all users of the roadway including pedestrians, bicyclists, users of public transit, motorists, children, the elderly, and the disabled.

- In 2009, Governor Brown signed SB 99, which consolidates existing federal and state transportation programs, including Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) and Safe Routes to School into a single program, Active Transportation Program (ATP), with the focus to make California a national leader in active transportation.

- SB 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) directs the California Air Resources Board to set regional targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The new law establishes a "bottom up" approach to ensure that cities and counties are involved in the development of regional plans to achieve those targets.

- The Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook builds upon best practices from across the nation and was developed to assist local jurisdictions in planning, designing
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\(^{17}\) California Air Resources Board  
\(^{18}\) California Government Code section 65302(b)(2)
and implementing complete streets projects. Complete streets are roadways designed to safely and comfortably accommodate all users, including, but not limited to motorists, cyclists, pedestrians, transit and school bus riders, delivery and service personnel, freight haulers, and emergency responders. Complete streets accommodate people of all ages and abilities. See Appendix A.

- In May 2009, the Council of Governments adopted the San Benito County Bikeway and Pedestrian Master Plan. The Plan provides a blueprint for making bicycling and walking an integral part of the daily life in the San Benito County region. The Plan proposes 140.16 miles of designated trails, lanes, and routes that can be used to conveniently access major employers, shopping centers, and schools throughout the San Benito County region. The goals of the Bikeway and Pedestrian Plan are consistent with the system goals of the Regional Transportation Plan.

- In September 2010, the San Benito County Local Transportation Authority adopted Transit Design Guidelines. These Guidelines were developed to provide information about the benefits of incorporating transit-friendly design in private development projects, making new communities well served by transit, and encouraging transit use.

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS IN SAN BENITO COUNTY

An important first step in promoting Active Transportation is to recognize that city streets are not just for cars. This is significantly important when nearly 33 percent of Hollister’s population is under the age of 18 and generally would not have access to a vehicle for personal use. In fact, while city streets must accommodate automobile traffic, an equal or greater focus should be placed on accommodating pedestrians.

**Bicycling Facilities**

Like many communities throughout the United States, San Benito County is experiencing resurgence in bicycling as a means of transportation. The bicycle is a low-cost and effective means of transportation that is quiet, non-polluting, energy-efficient, versatile, healthy, and fun. Bicycles offer low-cost mobility to the non-driving public and offer recreational activity for people of all ages. Recent national and local surveys find that more people are willing to bicycle more frequently if better facilities are available.

In the San Benito County region, there are 13.21 miles of bicycle facilities in San Benito County. San Benito County and cities’ existing bikeway network consists of approximately 2 miles of bike paths and 11 miles of bike lanes. Existing Class I bike paths often parallel arterial roadways.
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Existing Class II bike lanes are on urban roadways, often on arterial streets. There are no existing Class III bike routes in the region. Figure 4-13 illustrates examples of the three bike lane classifications. Figure 4-14 depicts the current and proposed bicycle lanes.

Most bicycling in the San Benito County region is done on roadway shoulders, which are not striped for bike lanes, or sidewalks on busy arterials.

As is the case with pedestrian activity, the sign of a healthy street and city is the common use of bicycles for travel in and around town. In many cases, bicycles can be accommodated on well-designed streets without the need for separate bike lanes. As many of the major city streets in Hollister and San Juan Bautista become impacted by heavy traffic, planners must consider building bicycle facilities to encourage and accommodate bicycle travel. This can be accomplished by striping Class II bicycle lanes and posting Class III bicycle routes on existing streets and by providing alternative routes dedicated to bicycle and pedestrian use.

**Pedestrian Activities**

As they developed, the San Benito County region and its two cities often did not require new communities to include sidewalks on streets because they wanted to maintain the “country” feel. This creates a juxtaposition of wanting to balance the desire to retain a rural or small-town character with residents’ need to move about safely on foot. Sidewalks can minimize the dangers of weather conditions, tripping hazards, and public health concerns. Sidewalks elevate the individual from storm and stagnant waters along roadways that can collect debris or bacteria.

There are numerous places where sidewalks do not exist or end abruptly. For example, such a condition exists in Hollister on Sunnyslope Road. In this instance, pedestrians use a dirt path along the street. There are other examples in the county of inadequate sidewalk facilities. In San Juan Bautista, the lack of continuous sidewalk along 5th Street considerably limits pedestrian flow.

**Bicycle Safety Education Programs**

Education is an important element for increasing bicycling while also improving safety – bikeways cannot do it alone. There is also a need for proper education of both youth and adult bicyclists and motorists. In the past, the Council of Governments has promoted the following educational programs and projects in support of bicycling.

- Bike Week: Bike to School/Work Day
- Walk ‘N’ Roll Event
- Walk to School Day
- Suggested Safe Routes to School Maps
- San Benito County Bike Map
CLASS I
Multi-Use Path

Provides a completely separated right of way for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with crossflow minimized.

CLASS II
Bike Lane

Provides a striped lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway.

CLASS III
Bike Route
Signed Shared Roadway

Provides for shared use with pedestrian or motor vehicle traffic, typically on lower volume roadways.

---

Figure 4-13  Caltrans Bikeway Classifications
Source: 2009 San Benito County Bikeways and Pedestrian Master Plan
Since the adoption of the 2009 San Benito County Bikeways and Pedestrian Master Plan, the San Juan Highway Bike Lanes Project (U-17) has been completed.

Source: 2009 San Benito County Bikeways and Pedestrian Master Plan
**Safe Routes to School**

The San Benito County Safe Routes to School efforts aim to improve the health of kids and the community by making walking and bicycling to and from school safer, easier, and more enjoyable. Safe Routes to Schools uses education and incentives to encourage walking or riding a bicycle to and from school.

The Council of Governments has made great strides to encourage walking and bicycling within the San Benito County region. Specifically, by implementing various Safe Routes to School focus programs and projects, including:

- **Suggested Safe Routes to School Brochures** - Bilingual handouts for various schools in Hollister that outline the best suggested routes to and from school. Printable brochures are available online at: [http://sanbenitorideshare.org/schools/safe-routes-to-school/](http://sanbenitorideshare.org/schools/safe-routes-to-school/).

- **Safe Routes to Schools Program** – Draft Implementation Plan on improving facilities and encouraging walking and bicycling at R.O. Hardin and Calaveras Schools in Hollister.

- **Bike-to-School Day** - Free breakfast, peer support, and prizes. By encouraging students to safely ride to and from school, the event strives to reduce childhood obesity, traffic at school sites, and greenhouse gas emissions, and encourage long term bicycling habit.

- **Walk-to-School Day** - Annual event which encourages physical fitness and healthy habits, heightens awareness of traffic, safety and environmental concerns around schools, and encourages a long term bicycling habit.

- **Walk ‘N’ Roll** - The official kickoff event to Bike Week. In the past, this event has hosted a bicycle repair clinic, bicycle registration, low-income helmet giveaway, bicycle beauty contest, and bicycle safety course. The goal is to provide bicycle safety information and encourages a long term bicycling habit.

**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

San Benito County will experience a significant increase in the number of commuters over the next 25 years.

The U.S. Census reported that there were 23,907 individuals commuting to work in San Benito County between 2006 and 2010 and 48.9 percent of this workforce traveled outside the county to work. To help manage the growth in demand for highway capacity, the Council of Governments provides ridesharing services.

---
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RIDESHARING
The Council of Governments has provided ridesharing services to San Benito County residents since 1987, and the program focuses on commuters who travel outside San Benito County for employment. The goal of the Rideshare Program is to help commuters traveling to or from San Benito County use alternatives to driving alone. The Rideshare Program helps improve air quality by encouraging shared vehicle use, and use other modes of transportation as alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle.

As a resource to commuters, San Benito County Rideshare partners with the Bay Area’s Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for use of its 511 Ridematch Database. The database contains over 500 registered individuals in San Benito County that use carpool and vanpool ride matching services. After registering in the 511 database, registrants can see if there are others with a similar commute. If schedules align, a carpool can be formed, if there are a large number of people commuting to the same location, a vanpool could be formed.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT
Transportation System Management strategies increase the efficiency of the existing transportation system and reduce the need for costly system expansion. Transportation System Management strategies often use Intelligent Transportation System technologies. These measures include signal synchronization, ramp metering, “at-speed” truck scales “weight in motion”, and 5-1-1 traveler information systems. Strategic application of Intelligent Transportation System technology on our transportation system can increase system productivity by as much as 5 percent. Projects expected to significantly increase single-occupancy vehicle capacity are required to implement Transportation System Management strategies to mitigate the capacity increases.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) implemented a statewide effort to develop Corridor System Management Plans for corridors funded under the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account. This integration of transportation planning and operations seeks to maintain over the long term, through identification of multimodal, operational, and minor capacity enhancements, the mobility benefits gained from major corridor projects.

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS
Intelligent Transportation Systems involve the use of advanced computer, electronic, and communication technologies to increase the safety and efficiency of the entire surface transportation system.

The Central Coast region has a history of planning and implementing Intelligent Transportation Systems. In 2000, the Central Coast Coordinating Group, which is composed of various transportation agencies in the Monterey Bay Area, coordinated with Caltrans to develop the Central Coast Intelligent Transportation Systems Implementation Plan. Building upon this foundation, the region is deploying and promoting Intelligent Transportation Systems. This
project will help local agencies develop new products that will help each agency to better implement, operate, and maintain their Intelligent Transportation Systems projects. More importantly, the Central Coast Intelligent Transportation Systems Implementation Plan is expected to provide a more expeditious, unified and consistent integration of ITS projects into the State and regional transportation planning and programming processes.

The Central Coast Intelligent Transportation Systems Implementation Plan included various Intelligent Transportation Systems projects being considered for the Central Coast Region including:

- Traffic signal control (signal timing, synchronization, and central control)
- Network Surveillance (video of highways, traffic volume censors, smart call boxes)
- Interactive traveler information systems (internet websites, kiosks, telephone call-in systems, apps)
- Smart Motorist Aid Call Boxes

The San Benito County region continues to implement Intelligent Transportation Systems application in various transportation projects when feasible.

**EMERGENCY CALL BOX PROGRAM**

Call boxes help motorists in distress by providing a direct connection to a California Highway Patrol communications center. The motorist-aid system operates along major roadways throughout the State. The programs are administered at the county level by local Service Authorities for Freeways and Expressways (SAFEs).

In 1998, the Council of San Benito County Governments established the San Benito County Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (SAFE) to administer the $1 vehicle registration fee collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) for maintaining an Emergency Call Box Program in San Benito County. San Benito County Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (SAFE) currently maintains a total of 40 call boxes in region (Figure 4-16).

Call box usage in San Benito County has remained steady over the past few years. Call box usage trends for the year typically show a decrease in calls during the winter months as people
tend to travel less. Although cell phone usage is becoming more prevalent, it is still important to maintain this program because of the rural nature of San Benito County. There are areas with little to no cell phone service. Most recently, the Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways installed four call boxes in South San Benito County at the request of the California Department of Forestry due to the lack of cell service.

Figure 4-16  Map of Call Box Locations in San Benito County
Source: San Benito County Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways

PARK-AND-RIDE LOTS
San Benito County currently has two park-and-ride lots serving area commuters. One location is at the intersection of U.S. 101 and State Route 156 near Searle Road. The other location is in Hollister at the intersection of Hillcrest Road and Memorial Drive; this location also serves as a County Express transfer point for commuter transit service to Gilroy.

RECREATIONAL TRAVEL
San Benito County residents enjoy world-class recreation, sports and cultural amenities within the County as well as within a 45 mile radius. There are also a number of community organizations, educational facilities, public libraries and museums close to home. Highlights of recreational activities within San Benito County are noted below.
Pinnacles National Park, known for hiking, rock climbing, home to California Condors, camping and picnic grounds, is a close getaway. Those traveling to the east entrance of Pinnacles National Park use Highway 25 to get there.

Bicyclists, bird watchers and nature lovers venture out on the many winding roads or choose the canyon trek to Fremont Peak State Park with its magnificent vistas to Monterey Bay and observatory star gazing opportunities. Other major recreation facilities in San Benito County include the San Juan Bautista Mission, which the County region relies on tourism as its major industry, and the tourist traffic is welcome by downtown businesses. On street parking near Downtown San Juan Bautista is impacted by the shortage of parking at the mission. Many streets throughout the city are in need of maintenance and repair. Motorists traveling to and from San Juan Bautista use State Route 156 to access the Mission.

U.S. 101 is also used by the traveling public to access recreational opportunities on the Monterey Peninsula, Santa Cruz County, San Benito County, and points north and south. U.S. 101 is the coastal alternative to Interstate 5 connecting the San Francisco Bay Area to Los Angeles.

**AVIATION SERVICES AND GROUND ACCESS**

San Benito County has one public airport (Hollister Municipal Airport), one public/private airport (Frazier Lake Airpark), and several private landing strips scattered throughout the County. Regional airport services are provided by San Jose International Airport and Monterey Peninsula Airport.

In San Benito County, agricultural producers, fire fighters, and emergency medical services all depend on the use of the local airports for various purposes. Private aircraft users also use San Benito County's aviation facilities for commercial and recreational uses. The land uses surrounding the Hollister Municipal Airport are varied and include open space, agricultural uses, and industrial/commercial development. In order to promote compatibility between the land uses surrounding the Hollister Municipal Airport and Frazier Lake Airpark, the San Benito County Airport Land Use Commission guides itself by the Hollister Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and the Frazier Lake Airpark Comprehensive Land Use Plan, respectively. The Compatibility Plan and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan seek to protect the public from the adverse effects of aircraft noise, ensure that people and facilities are not concentrated in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, and to keep aircraft operational areas free from obstructions or activities that may impact aircraft navigation. The San Benito County Airport

---
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Land Use Commission is made of members of the Council of San Benito County Governments Board of Directors.

**Hollister Municipal Airport**

The Hollister Municipal Airport is located approximately two miles north of Hollister adjacent to State Route 156 and is owned and operated by the City of Hollister. The Airport Manager is responsible for the operation, maintenance, and management of the airport. A five-member Airport Advisory Commission provides recommendations on the policies and long-range plans for the Hollister Municipal Airport to the City Council.

The facility is a general aviation airport and is included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems. In its operational role, it is classed as General Utility and accommodates all current aviation aircraft except certain business jets. There are 167 aircraft currently based at the airport with annual operations estimated at 53,000.

Hollister Municipal Airport has two intersecting runways. Runway 13-31, the primary runway, is aligned in a north/west prevailing wind direction with winds commonly out of the northwest. The crosswind runway, Runway 6-24, is aligned east/west. Both runways are lit for night use.

Runway 13-31 is the longest runway at the airport with a length of 6,350 feet. Additionally, it is the only runway served with a straight-in instrument approach. Runway 31 is equipped with a localizer performance with vertical guidance instrument approach, with visibility minimums of 1¼ mile and a decision altitude of 553 feet Mean Sea Level (323 Above Ground Level). Large aircraft, such as business jets and Cal Fire aircraft, almost exclusively use Runway 13-31.

Runway 6-24 is 3,150 feet in length and 100 feet wide. Runway 6-24 is a visual approach runway that it has no straight-in approach procedures. As a crosswind runway, Runway 6-24 allows aircraft, particularly smaller aircraft which are susceptible to strong crosswinds, to safely land and depart the airport when wind conditions do not favor the primary runway. Local weather patterns indicate that winds are out of the northwest in the morning, favoring Runway 31. In the afternoon, winds shift and blow out of the west, favoring Runway 24.

The City of Hollister has made continual improvements to address the future needs of the Hollister Municipal Airport. The Hollister Municipal Airport, in cooperation with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the State, is planning an expansion of the Airport via a proposal for a jet center with unique “through-the-fence” access. This will allow increased air...
cargo traffic, including air-training centers for pilots and mechanics, plus support additional air tourism traffic to the area. A regionally recognized clean energy tech center is planned for workforce training and suitable alternative energy source opportunities.

Frazier Lake Airpark

Frazier Lake Airpark is located approximately 4.5 nautical miles northwest of Hollister Municipal Airport and is privately-owned and operated by the Frazier Lake Airpark Corporation. Two runways are available for use at the airport, one waterway which is 3,000 feet long and a turf runway that is 2,500 feet long. The airport does not have an airport traffic control tower and no published instrument approach procedures. Approximately 90 aircraft are based at the airport, with tiedowns being the only service available.

Regional Airports

San Jose International Airport is a major carrier airport that provides San Benito County residents with airline service throughout the state, nation, and selected foreign countries. The airport is approximately 55 miles north of Hollister and 45 miles from San Juan Bautista. Primary access to San Jose International Airport is via State Route 25, 156 and U.S. 101.

Monterey Peninsula Airport is a smaller regional airport that provides San Benito County residents with airline service within California and a few out-of-state destinations. The airport is approximately 40 miles southwest of Hollister and 35 miles from San Juan Bautista. Primary access to Monterey Peninsula Airport is via State Route 156 and U.S. 101.

The airports service the needs of agriculture, tourism, government, and other business interests throughout the region. Almost 50 percent of the total air trips to the area through the regional airports are specifically for business purposes while another 40 percent of those trips are for tourism. Without the region's airports, the potential loss of these patrons could mean a large loss to the region's overall economic productivity.
Chapter 5 sets forth a plan of action to address existing transportation deficiencies and future transportation needs.
Chapter 5  Investments in Our Transportation Future

This chapter sets forth a plan of action to address existing transportation deficiencies and future transportation needs. The programs and projects described in this chapter will help San Benito County achieve the goals and policy objectives identified in Chapter 3, allowing for more efficient and effective transportation systems. This host of transportation investments was identified based on input received from the public, policymakers, and staff at local jurisdictions.

This chapter reviews the investments identified in Chapter 5 by project mode. A detailed project list is included in Appendix C.

COMPLETE STREETS

The Council of Governments has committed to planning for complete streets in the future, and that commitment is reflected in the Regional Transportation Plan, with significant investments in bicycle and pedestrian facilities and other enhancements to the system. In 2013, the Council of Governments partnered with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County to develop a Complete Streets Guidebook (Appendix A).

“Streets are vital to daily travel, economic exchange and maintaining an acceptable quality of life.”

More and more, planners and engineers are recognizing that streets are used not only by drivers, but also people walking and bicycling or using other modes of transportation. All of these users have different needs, and streets should accommodate those needs. Complete Streets are streets that are comfortable and safe to use regardless of age, ability, or mode of transportation. Complete Streets planning considers streets as places in the community, where residents and visitors can meet, enjoy recreation opportunities, and be a part of the neighborhood.

Complete Street designs include amenities for bicyclists and pedestrians, such as bike lanes, wider sidewalks, and safer crossings. They also take into account the comfort of the user—for example, while a sidewalk or bike lane might be present, it might be adjacent to a high-speed roadway that a pedestrian would not be comfortable using. Adding street trees and buffer

Figure 5-1  Example of Complete Streets
Source: Monterey Bay Complete Streets Guidebook

Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook, September 2013
zones between the road and the bike lane or sidewalk can make the route more pleasant for the user. Measures to slow speeds can also be considered.

The Complete Streets Guidebook contains sample policies and engineering best practices that can be adopted by local jurisdictions to comply with California Complete Streets Legislation (AB 1358). Various complete street types are identified and defined in the guidebook, along with sample cross-sections, associated land uses and suggested roadway user prioritization. The complete street types provide design recommendations for various roadway arrangements. Another key component of the guidebook is a complete streets project review and design checklist (Appendix A). The checklist is a tool that can be used in planning and public works departments to identify opportunities for complete streets and document constraints or exemptions.

The Complete Streets Guidebook also addresses the link between Complete Streets design and economic development and includes a White Paper on the economics of Complete Streets. The Paper concludes that while we cannot say that implementing Complete Streets design will always have a significant positive impact on economic vitality, there is often a link. Several case studies have shown that when Complete Streets concepts are implemented, the area experiences economic growth. Figure 5-2 demonstrates the economic framework for evaluation of Complete Streets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Economic Activity</th>
<th>Direct and Non-Direct Transportation Impacts</th>
<th>Effect on Economic Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly Negative</td>
<td>Possibly None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Activity</td>
<td>Access&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Activity</td>
<td>Trip Volume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Activity / Investment</td>
<td>Trips Duration&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Impact</td>
<td>Construction&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Impact</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Values / Investment</td>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Growth</td>
<td>Health&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> New facilities for non-automobiles are likely to have a larger positive impact on economic activity than improving existing facilities.

<sup>b</sup> An increase in trip duration for automobiles may negatively impact economic activity while a reduction in trip duration for non-automobiles may result in a positive on economic activity.

<sup>c</sup> Construction of new facilities may have significant economic impacts, while adding new elements may have no to little impact economic impacts.

<sup>d</sup> If Complete Streets contribute to healthier people by encouraging regular physical activity. As reflected in Caltrans 'Main Street, California," encouraging walking and bicycling as a frequent mode of travel can reduce health spending at a state and federal level.

Figure 5-2  Economic Framework for Evaluating Complete Streets
Source: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, White Paper on Economic impacts of Complete Streets
MEETING OUR NEEDS

Chapter 4 of the Regional Transportation Plan discusses in length the existing transportation system in San Benito County and the needs we face in the future. As the population grows and the Cities and County develop, there will be more and more pressure on the transportation network: streets and roads, public transit, airport operations, active transportation, and transportation technology. This Regional Transportation Plan sets forth a dynamic and extensive list of projects and programs to help meet that demand while meeting the adopted goals and performance objectives.

The projects included in the Regional Transportation Plan are consistent with projects included in the State’s Interregional Transportation Improvement Program and the Monterey Bay Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. The project list is financially constrained and projects identified do not exceed anticipated funding revenues. The list also contains unconstrained projects for illustrative purposes. These projects are a noted need but funding is not reasonably expected in the 2035 planning timeframe.

VEHICLE AND FREIGHT MOBILITY

While the Regional Transportation Plan looks at Complete Streets planning as a guide, it is unrealistic not to recognize the needs of the car and freight traffic on roadways. In particular, there are some roads that are meant to carry high volumes of traffic quickly and efficiently. In Northern San Benito County, this need is seen on Highway 25, 156, and U.S. 101. Highway 25 serves commuters travelling to jobs in Santa Clara County. The average number of trips on Highway 25 each day is expected to reach 22,900 by 2015.23 Highway 156 is expected to carry an average of 29,344 vehicles each day in 2015. U.S. 101 is expected to carry an average between 48,000 and 58,000 vehicles each day in 2035.

These trips mean increased pressure on these highways. The Council of Governments is proposing an investment of approximately $90 million in highway expansion projects in the Regional Transportation Plan. There are an additional $102 million in state highway operations projects proposed.

In addition to highways, higher-volume regional roads also serve high numbers of cars and trucks every day. The Regional Transportation Plan identifies 10 new segments of local roadway for expansion by 2035. These new roadway segments will carry high volumes of traffic and

23  Hollister to Gilroy State Route 25 Widening and Route Adoption, Draft Environmental Impact Report and Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, April 2010
ensure that circulation throughout the northern portion of the county remains flowing well. The majority of these projects are financed with Traffic Impact Mitigation Fees, as growth in housing and commercial services in the county require these new facilities to adequately mitigate for its traffic impacts.

**PUBLIC TRANSIT**
A growing population will have diverse needs that will not always be met by vehicle trips. Public transit will play a key role in providing access and mobility to future residents. The San Benito County Local Transportation Authority’s goal is to provide transportation options that are safe, reliable and affordable to enhance quality of life, reduce traffic congestion, and stimulate economic vitality of the growing community and incorporate new areas while maintaining efficiency and effectiveness throughout the system.

The Regional Transportation Plan identifies $61 million investment in transit operations and facilities. Of that amount, $11 million is expected to fund service expansion, including regional transit connections to Monterey, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz Counties. These investments will enhance the transit system and help meet the goal of providing access and mobility for all residents.

**AVIATION**
The Hollister Airport has significant need to adapt to future growth. The airport is an important resource for the region, providing jobs and revenue that help fuel the economy. Airport operations are expected to more than double by 2030.

Recognizing the airport’s role as an economic driver and important asset, the Regional Transportation Plan proposes investments for airport improvements in the future. The majority of this funding comes from the California Aid to Airports program, which provides an annual disbursement of funding to all general public airports in the State.

**ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION**
Active transportation projects are those which facilitate things like walking and bicycling while travelling. Active transportation projects can help improve public health by reducing the amount of time spent sedentary in a car while making trips. Active transportation projects are an important element of a well-rounded transportation plan, taking into consideration the needs of more than just vehicular travel.

These projects also help improve safety in the community. San Benito County has a growing “Safe Routes to School” program,
with several efforts to identify improvements that would enhance the safety around schools for children walking and bicycling. A number of these improvements are included in the Regional Transportation Plan.

Overall, the Plan commits $18 million in funding to Active Transportation projects in the next 20 years.

**SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE & PROGRAMS**
The Regional Transportation Plan also considers management of the existing system. These programs include:

- **Intelligent Transportation Systems**: commonly referred to as electronics, communications, or information processing used singly or in combination to improve the efficiency or safety of a surface transportation system. Recognized as having the ability to either increase the efficiency of the existing transportation system or incorporate ITS features and the resultant benefits to a new capital project, ITS provides the opportunity of system enhancement at significant savings to larger, capital- and/or operating-intensive projects. In San Benito County, ITS projects are included in the Central Coast Intelligent Transportation Systems Implementation Plan. The Council of Government was involved in the preparation of the Implementation Plan.

- **Emergency Call Box Program**: San Benito County operates emergency call boxes along Highways 25, 146, 101 and 156, as well as some rural County roads. The Call Box program helps improve the safety and security of residents and visitors to San Benito County by connecting drivers with roadside assistance.

- **Transportation Demand Management**: It is important to recognize that while efforts are made to improve the infrastructure available for travel, there is a need to monitor the demands on the transportation system and encourage practices that may help reduce demand on overly burdened networks such as highways. The Council of Governments offers services that assist users in defining alternatives to driving alone and encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation.

- **Freight Support**: Supporting the needs of freight and goods movement can be accomplished by using infrastructure and programs such as safety rest/parking areas, promoting existing public or private truck parking, turnouts, freight hubs or truck-rail transfer.

Figure 5-5 depicts proposed roadway improvements in San Benito County.

Chapter 6 considers the transportation investments included here, and looks to funding resources to identify monies available for projects.
Figure 5-5: New Highway and Roadway Projects
Chapter 6 Financing Our Transportation Investments

This financial element identifies nearly $515 million (escalated to year of expenditure) in local, state, and federal money available for transportation projects and programs through the 2035 planning horizon. The Council of Governments developed the financial projections based on these guiding assumptions:

- A consideration of previous funding levels made available to the region
- Funding identified in currently adopted plans and programs
- Guidance from state and federal offices
- Direction from policymakers regarding consideration of new, alternative revenues

The Council of Governments recognizes that financing transportation projects is a challenge due to the limited local, state and federal funding available to regions compared to the need. Because of this, the Council of Governments, along with its regional partners, advocates for additional funding at the state and federal levels. Locally, San Benito County and the cities of Hollister and San Juan Bautista have opted to partially finance transportation needs with a fee assessed on new residential and commercial developments under the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study. This strategy allows for an estimated $115 million in transportation dollars to come to the region over the next 25 years.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the lack of available transportation funding is the biggest challenge facing the San Benito County in its delivery of transportation projects and programs. As the region grows in population, the strain on available resources will continue to be a challenge.

The financial projections included in this chapter have been escalated to 2035 levels using a consistent escalation factor based on previous levels of funding and reasonable assumptions about future funding sources. These fund projections were developed in concert with regional partners who subscribed to the same methodology in preparation of their Regional Transportation Plans.

FUNDING SOURCES

FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES
Federal funding for transportation is delivered through the federal transportation funding bill. MAP-21, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, was signed into law by President Obama in July 2012. The bill provides for approximately $105 billion in transportation funding over a two year timeframe. While this investment is significant, there is still a momentous need that is left unfunded. Moreover, having only two years of identified funding
makes it difficult to project future funding levels. In addition, there is a need for a more secure, long-term federal funding source for transportation investments.

This financial plan assumes that federal funds will remain available for transportation projects; however, core revenues available are expected to decline due to increasing fuel efficiency. Because so much funding comes through fuel taxes and fees, a decline in fuel sales will lower revenues.

Figure 6-1 describes the federal revenue sources available to San Benito County:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Escalated Revenue (Dollars in 000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Bridge Program</td>
<td>The Highway Bridge Program provides funding to improve the condition of highway bridges through replacement, rehabilitation, and systematic preventive maintenance.</td>
<td>$50,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td>The goal of the program is to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, including non-State-owned public roads and roads on tribal lands.</td>
<td>$4,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program funds construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational improvements on federal and state highways, local roads, and bridges.</td>
<td>$17,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (5310)</td>
<td>The 5310 program awards grants to private non-profit organizations to serve the transportation needs of elderly persons and persons with disabilities.</td>
<td>$513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area Formula Program (5311)</td>
<td>This rural transit program provides funding for the purpose of supporting public transportation in rural areas, with population of less than 50,000.</td>
<td>$9,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Planning Grants (5304)</td>
<td>The Transit Planning grant program is funded by the Federal Transit Administration, which has authorized Caltrans to distribute these grant funds. Funds can be used for transit planning for sustainable communities and for rural communities.</td>
<td>$1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration Airport Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Airport Improvement provides grants to public agencies for planning and development of public-use airports that are included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems.</td>
<td>$4,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$87,039</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6-1  Federal Funding Sources for San Benito County
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STATE FUNDING SOURCES

Funding for California's transportation investments are comprised of the following taxes and fees:

- **State Fuel Excise Tax**: The State of California collects 35.3¢ per gallon excise tax on gasoline and 13¢ per gallon on diesel fuel, which historically has generated over $3 billion a year.

- **Fuel Tax Swap (2011)**: Eliminated the state sales tax on gasoline and instead imposed an additional excise tax on gasoline of 17.3¢ per gallon.

- **Motor Vehicle License Fees**: The state collects fees through the motor vehicle license program. A portion of these funds go toward funding the Call Box program in San Benito County.

The first four years of the anticipated funding under the State Transportation Improvement Program is consistent with the California Transportation Commission’s adopted fund estimate for 2014. Additionally, the fund estimates and projects contained in this Regional Transportation Plan are consistent with the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program and the Federal Transportation Improvement Program. Figure 6-2 further describes funding sources available statewide in California and the estimated amount available to San Benito County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Escalated Revenue (Dollars in 000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Improvement Program Match</td>
<td>The program grants funds for planning, development, or noise compatibility projects that are at or associated with individual public-use airports including heliports and seaplane bases.</td>
<td>$216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Aid to Airports Program</td>
<td>The purpose of the program is to assist in establishing and improving a statewide system of safe and environmentally compatible airports whose primary benefit is for general aviation.</td>
<td>$270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1B</td>
<td>A voter approved bond program for funding transit rehabilitation, safety, and modernization improvements, capital service enhancements or expansions, new capital projects, bus rapid transit improvements, or rolling stock (buses and rail cars) procurement</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways</td>
<td>The goal of SAFE is to quickly identify and respond to freeway incidents such as breakdowns and accidents in order to minimize their impacts in terms of congestion, public safety and air quality, and to increase the reliability of the freeway system and better manage traffic flow.</td>
<td>$1,434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Escalated Revenue (Dollars in 000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operations and Protection Program</td>
<td>The State Highway Operations and Protection Program funds the maintenance of the State Highway System and supporting infrastructure. Projects usually fall into the categories: collision reduction, major damage restoration, bridge preservation, roadway preservation, roadside preservation, mobility enhancement, and preservation of other transportation facilities related to the state highway system.</td>
<td>$90,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance</td>
<td>State Transit Assistance funds, which are derived from the statewide sales tax on diesel fuel, are for the development and support of public transportation needs that exist in California and are allocated to areas of each county based on population, taxable sales and transit performance.</td>
<td>$7,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program-Interregional and Regional Share</td>
<td>The State Transportation Improvement Program is a capital improvement program for allocations of certain state transportation funds for state highway improvements, intercity rail, and regional highway and transit improvements. Funds are divided into two categories: interregional and regional.</td>
<td>$29,242 – Interregional $29,665 – Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program</td>
<td>The purpose of the Active Transportation Program is to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, increase safety and mobility for non-motorized users, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and enhance public health.</td>
<td>$13,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Bill 2766</td>
<td>The Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District allocates the vehicle registration surcharge fee to fund a grant program. The program funds planning, monitoring, enforcement, capital, and technical studies.</td>
<td>$6,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180,680</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6-2  State Funding Sources in San Benito County

Appendix B includes a flowchart that illustrates how different revenue sources are collected and distributed in California.

**LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES**

Local fund sources augment state and federal funds, allowing for additional transportation investments in the region. Local funding is used on local streets and roads for maintenance and system preservation. Additional local funds are generated by the adopted Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee program, which funds both local roads and state highway capacity projects. These Traffic Impact Mitigation Fees pay for the costs attributable to the increased demand for
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public facilities reasonably related to development projects and per Government Code Section 66001. There are no local sales tax measures identified for transportation funding in San Benito County due to prior direction from the Council of Governments Board of Directors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Escalated Revenue (Dollars in 000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax (Highway User Tax)</td>
<td>Cities and counties receive Highway User Tax revenue ($0.13 per gallon for diesel fuel and $0.18 per gallon for gasoline) based on population.</td>
<td>$81,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Developer Impact Fees</td>
<td>Regional developer impact fees are assessed on new development to pay for new transportation infrastructure needs, as governed by AB1600 (1987). Fee levels are calculated based on a selected list of projects to be funded; due to nexus rules requiring a demonstrated reasonable relationship between the impact and improvement, these are almost exclusively road and highway system expansion.</td>
<td>$115,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County Developer Fees</td>
<td>Fees collected from developers by local jurisdictions used to build infrastructure needed to support new developments.</td>
<td>$9,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Fares</td>
<td>The Local Transportation Authority collects fares from passengers using the transit system.</td>
<td>$3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act</td>
<td>Local Transportation Fund (LTF), which is derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide.</td>
<td>$36,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool Lease</td>
<td>The Council of Governments collects fees in exchange for the lease of vans to commuter groups.</td>
<td>$432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$247,034</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6-3  Local Funding Sources for San Benito County

**NON-TRADITIONAL REVENUE SOURCES**

Given the unreliable and inconsistent flow of transportation funding in the United States, some regions may consider non-traditional revenue streams to augment state and federal funding available. The Local Transportation Authority operates an advertising program to generate non-traditional funds for public transit. This funding source is not identified in this Regional Transportation Plan due to a lack of interest over the last four years from interested businesses, public agencies, and non-profits.

Other transportation funding beyond those identified in this Regional Transportation Plan include local sales tax measures, vehicle base user fees, tolling, cap and trade revenue, or an increase in the gas tax at the State and/or federal level. These other funding sources were not assumed in the funding tables above due to prior Council of Governments Board direction. In February 2013, the Council of Governments Board directed staff to assume that additional
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funding beyond the core funding available today would not be available in the 20-year planning horizon.

**PROJECT COSTS VS. FUNDING PROJECTIONS**

As identified previously, the needs in San Benito County far outweigh the available funding. Figure 6-4 outlines the project costs as compared to available funding.

Overall, San Benito County faces a deficit of at least $486 million in transportation funding available to the region. This lack of funding means fewer needed projects will be constructed, maintenance of local streets and roads will be deferred, and fewer programs implemented. This impacts the community in several ways: less access to jobs, medical appointments, and shopping, increased traffic congestion on commute routes, unreliable transportation systems, and a lack of public transportation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>Project Need (Dollars escalated in 000s)</th>
<th>Available Funding through 2035 (Dollars escalated in 000s)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Street and Road Maintenance &amp; Operations</td>
<td>$312,566</td>
<td>$138,070</td>
<td>$174,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>$145,866</td>
<td>$101,993</td>
<td>$43,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Capacity Expansion</td>
<td>$359,634</td>
<td>$89,848</td>
<td>$269,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Local Streets &amp; Roads</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>$97,353</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>$31,304</td>
<td>$18,539</td>
<td>$12,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>$91,800</td>
<td>$62,546</td>
<td>$29,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$8,155</td>
<td>$1,866</td>
<td>$7,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>$51,073</td>
<td>$4,539</td>
<td>$46,534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6-4 Projected Costs and Available Funding for San Benito County

Chapter 7 measures the performance and effectiveness of identified transportation investments.
Regional Transportation Plans are required to address the issue of climate change as a result of AB 32 and SB 375. Below is a description of the issue and how climate change may impact transportation in San Benito County.

Additionally, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments through the Travel Demand Model provided performance measures specifically for this Regional Transportation Plan, which are described in the pages to follow.

**CLIMATE CHANGE**

The increased amount of greenhouse gases caused by human activity has resulted in the increase of the average temperature of the Earth of more than 1.4°F over the past century. These activities include, but are not limited to, burning of fossil fuels, deforestation, agricultural, and industrial activities. Once greenhouse gases are emitted into the atmosphere, they do not disperse. They can remain there for a few years to thousands of years depending on the type of gas. Figure 7-1 uses a “bathtub” analogy to illustrate the collection of greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere. With population growth and increased human activity, the greenhouse gas blanket is increasing in thickness resulting in:

- Slow increase of the Earth’s average temperature
- Changes in weather patterns and amounts of rainfall
- Reduction of ice, show and permafrost cover
- Raising sea levels
- Increasing acidity of the oceans

![The Carbon 'Bathtub' and its Components](image)

**Figure 7-1 Carbon "Bathtub" Analogy**

If the amount of water flowing into a bathtub is greater than the amount of water leaving through the drain, the water level will rise. Carbon dioxide (CO\(_2\)) emissions like the flow of water into the world’s carbon bathtub. “Sources” of CO\(_2\) emissions such as fossil fuel burning, cement manufacture, and land use are like the bathtub’s faucet. “Sinks” of CO\(_2\) are like the drain. Today, human activities have turned up the flow from the CO\(_2\) “faucet,” which is much larger than the “drain” can cope with, and the level of CO\(_2\) in the atmosphere (like the level of water in a bathtub) is rising.

*Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*

---


IMPACTS TO SAN BENITO COUNTY
In addition to negatively impacting the environment, climate change can directly and indirectly impact agricultural and related industries.

Air Temperature
Temperatures have been steadily increasing since 1910. The Environmental Protection Agency has modeled temperature changes in the United States based upon high and low greenhouse gas emissions rates. Figure 7-2 illustrates the temperature changes across the United States for the mid and end of the 21st century.

Air temperature is vital in determining the yield of agricultural products. All plants have a minimum, maximum and optimum temperature in which they will survive, produce the most, and yield the best quality product. However, these temperatures may fluctuate depending on the local soil condition, water content and evaporative heat loss. For example, if the air temperature is above the maximum temperature for the plant, its effects could be offset by having soil that has enough water content and evaporative heat loss. However, if air temperature, soil water content and evaporative heat loss are not balanced, crop loss will result. Some agricultural forecasts suggest 36 percent to 40 percent crop loss could be expected in low emissions scenarios and up to 70 percent in higher emissions scenarios for wheat, corn, and cotton yields.

According the United States Department of Agriculture’s report, *Climate Change and Agriculture in the United States: Effects and Adaptations*, there are other negative impacts as well.
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impacts on agriculture in addition to the direct production levels. It identifies that higher air
temperatures also increase the number of invasive weeds, native and non-native insect pests,
and diseases in plants. For example, the mortality rate of insects is reduced while reproduction
rates increase during warmer periods.

The Agricultural Commissioner is responsible for controlling, eradication and detection of
invasive plants and pests in San Benito County. Since agriculture is a major economic driver in
San Benito County, the Commissioner has programs and policies in place to monitor and
address these issues. In its 2012 Annual Crop Report, the Commissioner deployed up to 950
insect detection traps to intercept new exotic and non-native insect pests before to prevent
establishment. There were also six sites that had programs in place to eradicate invasive weeds
and biological control programs for three invasive weeds and insect pests.

Water Resources

As air temperature rises, so does the need for water by people, animals, and agriculture.
According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), parts of California
experienced its all-time warmest winter weather in 2013-2014.\textsuperscript{47} As a result, there was very
little precipitation and even less snow. More than half of California’s precipitation arrives via
winter storms in December through February. The Central Coast, which
includes San Benito County, received a record low of 4.9 inches of rain. The
previous lowest record was 10.9
inches in 1923.\textsuperscript{48} On January 17, 2014,
Governor Brown declared a State of
Emergency due to new record lows of
California’s rivers and reservoirs. The
snowpack was at 20 percent of normal
average at that time of year.\textsuperscript{49}

The United States Global Change
Research Program modeled
precipitation levels for the entire United States. By the end of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century, there will be
less rainfall in San Benito County (Figure 7-3) impacting the agricultural and livestock
production.\textsuperscript{50} Decrease in rainfall amounts will mean less yield from crops and livestock,
resulting in a negative economic impact for the agricultural industry.

\textsuperscript{47} National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, http://www.climate.gov/news-features/event-tracker/winter-
storms-bring-only-fleeting-relief-drought-stricken-california, Accessed May 16, 2014

\textsuperscript{48} California Department of Water Resources, http://www.water.ca.gov/waterconditions/images/DWR-

\textsuperscript{49} Office of Governor, Edmund G. Brown, Jr., Governor Brown Declares Drought State of Emergency,

In terms of transportation, climate change will increase the cost of maintaining infrastructure. Heat can cause pavement to deteriorate at a faster rate due to softening, increasing potholes on local roadways.\(^{51}\) Figure 7-4 shows the pavement condition of a section of Tres Pinos Road in Hollister, California. The roadway received a slurry seal treatment approximately two years prior to the photo taken. Such treatments are estimated to last five to seven years, but as seen here, this section may not reach the five year mark.\(^{52}\)

In addition to the damage to pavement, increased air temperatures may cause damage to railways. Heat will cause rail tracks to expand and buckle. Although there is only 12-miles of railway directly serving San Benito County, it is being used to transport goods in and out of the San Benito County.

**Economic Impact to San Benito**

In addition to impacts to the physical world of San Benito, climate change will also impact San Benito County economically. The decrease in agricultural production would directly impact farms and ranches, as they would have less product to sell and income to generate. This results in a domino effect that impacts other industries that rely on agriculture, such as, warehousing, processing plants, packaging, trucking, and even rail transport. It would also reduce the number of jobs available in these industries. Of the 24,640 employed in San Benito County, approximately 26 percent work in these industries.\(^{53}\)

Despite potential negative impacts that climate change may have for San Benito County, it may be reduced through careful long-range planning. *On the Move: 2035* is one of the tools used to plan for the future. The following sections in the chapter outline what lead to development of *On the Move: 2035*, how the preferred scenario was selected, and the results of the preferred scenario.

**CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD**

In 1967, the California legislature established the Mulford-Carrell Act creating the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The Air Resources Board’s mission is to, “promote and protect public health, welfare and ecological resources through the effective and efficient reduction of air

---


\(^{53}\) U.S. Census, 2008-2012 American Community Survey, S2403
pollutants, while recognizing and considering the effects on the state’s economy.”

More recently and through a series of laws passed and a Governor’s Executive Order, the Air Resources Board developed and implemented greenhouse gas emissions and carbon limits for new vehicles and fuel sold within California (Figure 7-5).

Under Senate Bill 375, the Air Resources Board set regional emissions reductions targets from passenger vehicles. They also charged the Metropolitan Planning Organizations with developing strategies to meet emissions reduction targets. These strategies are outlined in the Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) which can be found in the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments’ *Monterey Bay 2035: Moving Forward* at [www.AMBAG.org](http://www.AMBAG.org).
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**Assembly Bill 1493**
- Passed in 2002
- Regulates greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles
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**Governor’s Executive Order S-03-05**
- Issued by Governor Schwarzenegger in 2005
- Set greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals to reduce 2010 emission levels to 2000 levels; reduce to 1990 levels by 2020; and reduce by 80 percent of 1990 levels by 2050
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**Assembly Bill 32**
- Passed in 2006
- Set goal of reducing greenhouse gas emission levels back to 1990 levels by 2020
- Authorized the California Air Resources Board to set policies, regulations, and enforce the limits through fines and fees

---

**Governor’s Executive Order S-01-07**
- Issued by Governor Schwarzenegger in 2007
- Created Low Carbon Fuel Standards in California
- Set a goal of reducing carbon intensity by 10% by 2020

---

**Senate Bill 375**
- Passed in 2008
- Required the California Air Resources Board to set regional emissions reduction targets from passenger vehicles
- Required Metropolitan Planning Organizations to develop Sustainable Communities Strategies to reach reduction targets

---

**Senate Bill 391**
- Passed in 2009
- Requires the California Department of Transportation to prepare the California Transportation Plan (CTP), the long-range transportation plan, by December 2015, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- Reaffirmed goals as described by AB 32 and Executive Order S-03-05.
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**Figure 7-5** Timeline of Legislative Actions Contributing to Greenhouse Gas Limits
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In 2009, Senate Bill 391 was passed and required the California Department of Transportation to prepare the California Transportation Plan (CTP), the long-range transportation plan, by December 2015, to reduce GHG emissions. The upcoming California Transportation Plan 2040 demonstrates how major rural areas, and state agencies can coordinate planning efforts to achieve critical statewide goals outlined in Assembly Bill 32 and Executive Order S-03-05 (Figure 7-5).

In order to achieve the goals outlined in Chapter 3 of the Regional Transportation Plan, the region must consider projected future growth impacts on land use and transportation projects to meet the needs of future growth. Although there are a myriad of scenarios to achieve the goals, funding for transportation projects is scarce.

**SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT**

In the past, land use and transportation planning efforts were viewed as completely separate. However, that philosophy has been replaced with the passage of California Senate Bill 375: Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008. The Bill mandates that regions set targets to address their greenhouse gas emissions through the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments is responsible for the Sustainable Communities Strategy which integrates land use, housing, and transportation planning for San Benito, Monterey, and Santa Cruz Counties.

Partnering with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments and the Hollister Downtown Association, the Council of Governments reached out to the community to gather public input and comment from residents of San Benito County to develop the Strategies and to shape the scenarios for the Regional Transportation Plan. Details on outreach efforts are provided in Chapter 8. After the first set of comments, the following five scenarios were developed:

**SCENARIO 1 - REGIONAL TRANSIT CORRIDORS**

Under Scenario 1, growth would be focused along regional transit corridors and rail infrastructure in existing cities. Local cities would encourage mixed use growth within its urban centers instead of growth on the outskirts or in rural areas. A priority would be placed on investing in public transit to expand and increase availability for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) to major destinations of employment and recreation.

A potential project under this scenario would be to fund public transit links, via shuttle or Bus Rapid Transit to the proposed high speed rail station in Gilroy in Santa Clara County. Such links would facilitate interregional travel for San Benito residents and tourists from the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles Region. This could potentially decrease commuter traffic while encouraging tourism in San Benito County.
SCENARIO 2 – EXPANDED COMMUNITY CENTERS
While the first scenario focuses on regional travel, Scenario 2 focuses on investments within San Benito County. Growth is encouraged within the existing neighborhoods near commercial corridors. Additionally, there is a push to attract green technology businesses and business incubators to the area to improve the availability of employment for residents. As a result, the number of residents commuting out of San Benito County for employment would be reduced.

Using the Complete Streets Guidebook (Appendix A) local streets and roads would be improved to encourage pedestrians, bicyclists and public transit traffic to key destinations. Examples of improvements could include bulb outs, narrowing of traffic lanes, and raised medians. Investments would also be made to increase local public transit to increase frequency of services, additional routes, and local express bus routes.

SCENARIO 3 - DISPERSED GROWTH
Unlike the first two scenarios, growth is encouraged in the unincorporated communities outside of the urban center. This type of development typically requires the conversion of open space or land previously used for farming activity. Investments would be focused on reducing congestion, travel time, highway safety improvements, and transit access for tourism.

These developments have been common within San Benito County in the past. According to the California Department of Conservation, there has been a loss of almost 34,000 acres in farmland between 1984 and 2010 in San Benito County. While most was converted to grazing land, approximately 11 percent of the loss can be attributed to “Urban and Built-Up Land.” Another 34 percent was converted to “Other Land.” Although the category includes a wide spectrum of land uses, a safe assumption can be made that a small portion of that loss was converted to rural residential uses.

SCENARIO 4 - TARGETED GROWTH AND ECONOMIC DIVERSITY
The focus of Scenario 4 includes the encouragement of attracting a variety of industries, supporting current and future industries, and managing housing availability for all residents.

55 California Department of Conservation, San Benito County 1984-2010 Land Use Summary
More importantly, investments would concentrate on goods movement needs of various industries and the low-income and minority populations.

Transportation investments include increased public transit services, heavy rail improvements, highway capacity and interchange improvements.

**SCENARIO 5 - SYSTEM PRESERVATION**
Under this scenario, growth would be allocated per local General Plans and transportation funding would center on the maintenance of existing facilities. No major land use changes or transportation improvements would be made.

**PREFERRED SCENARIO – A MIX**
After receiving public comment and policy board comments from additional workshops and surveys, none of the five scenarios were selected as a preferred scenario. Instead a hybrid of the scenarios was developed by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments to better reflect the comments received. Figure 7-7 illustrates and compares the performance of the hybrid scenarios. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments adopted Hybrid A as the Preferred Scenario for the region. Hybrid A emphasizes investments for active transportation, complete streets improvements, public transit services, and system preservation.

**PERFORMANCE TARGETS**
Working with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments and the public, the Council of Governments identified six targets with specific performance measures. The performance measures were used to evaluate current and future projects’ effectiveness in meeting the targets. Figure 7-8 summarizes those performance measures of the projects identified in Appendix C.

**Access and Mobility**
Access refers to the menu of options available for traveling within a city/town or from an outlying community to a state highway. Route options include any combination of vehicle, public transit, walking and bicycling.

Mobility refers to the ease of accessing route options. Depending on the mode of travel, the performance criteria will vary. For example, a person driving a vehicle would want increased mobility by decreasing travel time and delay encountered for a particular trip. However, a bicyclist would want increased connectivity of bicycle lanes.

**System Preservation and Safety**
Complementing access and mobility, the ability to maintain and preserve a region’s roadways is a high priority. There are 899 miles of rural and urban roadways maintained by local, state and federal jurisdictions in San Benito County. Regular maintenance prevents more costly roadway rehabilitation projects in the future. State highways are maintained by Caltrans while local jurisdictions are responsible for local street and roads.
## Scenario Performance Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goals</th>
<th>Performance Metrics</th>
<th>Hybrid A</th>
<th>Hybrid B</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and Mobility</strong></td>
<td>Trips within 30 mins</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commute travel time</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Vitality</strong></td>
<td>Jobs near transit</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truck delay</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td>GHG reductions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open space preservation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmland conservation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Communities</strong></td>
<td>Alternative transportation tips</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Equity</strong></td>
<td>Distribution of transportation inputs</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable transit access</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Preservation and Safety</strong></td>
<td>Maintain the transportation system</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend
- **Positive**
- **Neutral**
- **Negative**

**Figure 7-7** Hybrid Scenario Scorecard  
*Source: Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Source of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and Mobility</strong>&lt;br&gt;Provide convenient, accessible, and reliable travel options while maximizing productivity for all people and goods in the region</td>
<td>Increase the percent of peak period trips that are 30 minutes or less by mode.</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Demand Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve average work trip travel time.</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Demand Model and off model calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Preservation and Safety</strong>&lt;br&gt;Preserve and ensure a sustainable and safe regional transportation system</td>
<td>Reduce injuries and fatalities due to collisions.</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Demand Model and Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain the transportation system and keep it in a state of good repair.</td>
<td>State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) and California Transportation Commission’s Statewide Transportation System Needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Communities</strong>&lt;br&gt;Protect the health of our residents; foster efficient development patterns that optimize travel, housing, and employment choices and encourage active transportation</td>
<td>Increase active transportation trips (including transit).</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Demand Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease harmful airborne pollutants.</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Demand Model and Emissions Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce congested Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT).</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Demand Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Promote environmental sustainability and protect the natural environment</td>
<td>Reduce greenhouse gas emission by 0 percent by 2020 and 5 percent by 2035</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Demand Model and Emissions Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimize impacts to sensitive habitat areas and preserve open space.</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conserve open space and farmland</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Equity</strong>&lt;br&gt;Provide an equitable level of transportation services to all segments of the population</td>
<td>Improve the equitable distribution of investments through expenditures per capita and reduce the disproportionate impacts of those investments.</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the percent of population within ½ mile of a high quality transit stop (total population and transportation disadvantaged communities).</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Vitality</strong>&lt;br&gt;Raise the region’s standard of living by enhancing the performance of the transportation system</td>
<td>Increase the percent of jobs within ½ mile of high quality transit stop.</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce daily truck hours of delay</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Demand Model and off model calculations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7-8 San Benito County Performance Targets*
Pavement Management Systems are used to measure and report on roadway conditions. Such systems are regularly updated to forecast pavement deterioration over time, calculate the estimated cost for improvement projects, and identify strategies to maximize maintenance and funding needs. For more details on San Benito's pavement needs, see Chapter 4.

In addition to saving money and maintaining productivity, a well preserved transportation system increases safety for all users. Future transportation projects will improve and enhance the safety of the roadways. Safety is measured by the following:

- Number of accidents
- Number of fatal vs. injury only accidents
- Accidents per million miles traveled

According to the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) compiled by the California Highway Patrol, there were 249 motor vehicle collisions between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012. Of the 249 incidents, 26 were located on a state or federal highways and resulted in 11 injuries.

The rate of fatal and injury collisions in California has been declining since the 1930s when the California Highway Patrol began tracking the information. The 2010 statewide mileage death rate was 0.84. In 2011, San Benito County experienced a mileage death rate of 1.02, above the statewide average but below the national average of 1.11. In 2011, there were 8 pedestrian and 13 bicycle collisions.

Healthy Communities
By integrating land use and transportation planning, healthy communities are created by higher density of mixed-use and infill developments. Such developments encourage residents and visitors to use active transportation and decrease the use of vehicles because shopping and services are close by. With a decrease in vehicle usage, the following is achieved:

- Improved air quality by decreasing air pollution emitted from vehicles
- Decreased greenhouse gas emissions
- Reduced traffic congestion on roadways

Environment
Land use type can affect the environment in the immediate and regional areas. New developments, new roadways, and increasing roadway capacity typically requires the

---


conversion of open space or farmlands. This results in the loss of habitat and reduces the region’s agricultural production.

In a rural agricultural county like San Benito, decisions on expanding the transportation network and urban areas have an instant effect on agricultural land. Most of the projects outlined in Appendix C are located within the urbanized areas and in prime farmland. As seen in Figure 7-9, these projects are necessary because of the location of the existing urbanized growth and the travel and mobility needs of the workforce, residents, and freight mobility.

In addition to impacts to farmland, open spaces are also affected by urban development and transportation projects. In San Benito County, there are 13 Federal and State recognized threatened and endangered species. Of the 13, 4 species types are found near the projects listed in the Regional Transportation Plan. Figures 7-10 and 7-11 identify the locations of the threatened and endangered species.

Mixed-use and infill developments within urbanized areas and near residential neighborhoods provide additional opportunities for employment and retail shopping. Lessening the impact of development may reduce the immediate need for future expansion of the region’s roadway network and decrease the impact on the environment.

Social Equity
Transportation projects will be evaluated on the how equitable a transportation project is to the residents, businesses and visitors. A transportation projects social equity takes the following into consideration for communities of varying income levels:

- Ease of access
- Location of the project and potential impacts to nearby residents and business
- Equitable burden of funding transportation projects

Funding for the transportation projects identified in the Regional Transportation Plan are proposed to be funded with existing sources such as the County’s percentage of the state sales tax, state and federal fuel taxes, and traffic impact fees.

Economic Vitality
Investing in the transportation projects outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan is important to maintaining and encouraging economic vitality in San Benito County. Projects which increase capacity and provide safety improvements result in decreased delays for residents and commercial truck drivers.

Increasing the ease of access by roadways, bikeways, or pedestrian walkways attracts more businesses and visitors to the area. Direct access for residents and visitors is vital to supporting the local economy due to increased foot traffic by pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users in
Figure 7-9  Map Regional Transportation Plan Projects and Regional Farmland
Map depicts the locations of transportation projects in relation to the types of land in the project area. The California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) samples soil quality and irrigation status to rate agricultural lands.
Source: Council of San Benito County Governments and California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping Monitoring Program 2010
Figure 7-10: Federally Threatened and Endangered Species in San Benito County

Source: San Benito County Geographic Information Systems
Figure 7-11  State Threatened and Endangered Species in San Benito County

Source: San Benito County Geographic Information Systems
business districts. Equally important, businesses needing to receive and send shipments increase their productivity by spending less time spent in traffic and saving fuel costs.

PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES
The Council of Governments worked with local jurisdictions within San Benito County to provide information about current and future projects to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments to input into the Regional Transportation Demand Model.

Using data from 2010 as the base year, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments used the model to show how growth in San Benito County will affect transportation demands and greenhouse gas emissions in 2035. The Regional Transportation Plan discusses the base conditions for 2010, 2035 with a No Build Scenario and 2035 Preferred Scenario.

The Council of Governments partners with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments for modeling future transportation demands. Though it is beneficial to run transportation demand models, all have their limitations. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments model limitations are that it is unable to account for active transportation, or complete streets projects, which are listed in Appendix C. Although they are included, the model is not sensitive to public transit projects. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments estimates an overall 6 percent decrease of greenhouse gases from 2005 levels under the 2035 Preferred Scenario.

SYSTEM CONDITIONS
The amount of traffic congestion and its resulting impacts will depend on the decisions made by local jurisdictions and policymakers today. As San Benito County’s population increases 47 percent by 2035, the transportation system will also experience increased demand from personal vehicle use and truck traffic. Total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for the No Build and Preferred scenarios will increase by over 51 percent from 2010.

Despite the increase in vehicle miles traveled for No Build and Preferred Scenarios, the Preferred Scenario modeling results indicate that it is the superior scenario. According to Figure 7-12, the Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled is considerably less in the Preferred Scenario than the No Build through 2035. Figure 7-13 highlights the estimated Vehicle Hours Delayed for each scenario through 2035. Low vehicle hour delay numbers imply that there is less congestion.

---

58 Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, *Regional Transportation Demand Model*
on the roadways. Less congestion means greater productivity for industries that rely heavily on moving goods on major highways and local roads, reliability for residents, and benefits to the environment.

**Figure 7-12  Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled vs. Daily Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled**
*Source: Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments*

Approximately 54 percent of the San Benito County Labor Force is involved in industries that support agricultural production.\(^\text{59}\) This includes farming activity, transportation of raw agricultural products for packaging and processing, the processing and packaging of agricultural products and the shipping of products to retailers. For this reason maintaining and improving

\(^{59}\) State of California’s Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, *San Benito County Industry Employment & Labor Force – by Annual Average*
roadway efficiencies and safety is vital for freight traffic, as well as for commuters. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture,

The agricultural sector is the largest user of freight transportation in the United States...Adequate and efficient transportation is especially critical to successful marketing of U.S. agricultural products, which depends on transportation to deliver goods.\(^6^0\)

Figure 7-14 shows vehicle miles traveled for all modes and truck only. Although truck only is under 11 percent of the total vehicles miles traveled, it is still a significant amount. Of that truck only traffic, San Benito County transported 2.4 million tons of freight worth almost $2.5 billion in 2007.\(^6^1\)

![Figure 7-14 Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled Compared to Daily Truck Only Vehicle Miles Traveled](source: Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, Regional Transportation Demand Model)

**AIR QUALITY AT HOME**

Transportation planning, land use, and the resulting projects and programs impact air quality. With an increase vehicle travel, greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles is anticipated to increase for most of the United States. In California and San Benito County, that is not the case due to policy changes.

The greenhouse gas emissions for San Benito County are provided in Figure 7-15. The data within the first eight rows reflect the requirements of the legislative actions in Figure 7-6. The last row of Figure 7-15 are the project emissions without the passage of the Bills or Executive Orders.

---


\(^6^1\) Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, *Central Coast California Commercial Flows Study February 2012*
Greenhouse gas emissions are projected to decrease for the No Build and Preferred Scenario by 30 percent to 53 percent. There is an increase of about 16 percent of CO₂ emissions of the 2010 Base Year because of increased vehicle miles traveled. However, without the policy changes and increased regulations, CO₂ emissions would have increased by over 90 percent.

In addition to greenhouse gases, particulate matter (PM) is also a growing concern because of its ability to pass through the throat and nose and enter the lungs. Particulate matter is categorized by size (PM₁₀ and PM₂.⁵). Particulate matter are very small air borne particulates and are typically generated from industrial, farming, construction, and driving activity. It contains a combination of acids, organic chemicals, metals, and/or dust particles. Particulate matter has been linked to respiratory and cardiovascular disease, aggravated asthma, and many more health conditions.

The California Interregional Strategic Plan states, “It is widely accepted that carbon dioxide forms approximately 84 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions; this is true in California as in the rest of the word. The impacts from a change in global climate can be felt throughout the region. California has adopted the public policy position that global climate change is ‘a series threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California.’”

---

## Emissions Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 Base Year</th>
<th>2020 No Build</th>
<th>2020 Preferred Scenario</th>
<th>2035 No Build</th>
<th>2035 Preferred Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Particulate Matter (<em>{10}) (PM(</em>{10}))</td>
<td>0.2114</td>
<td>0.1477</td>
<td>0.1458</td>
<td>0.1919</td>
<td>0.1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Particulate Matter (<em>{2.5}) (PM(</em>{2.5}))</td>
<td>0.1449</td>
<td>0.0745</td>
<td>0.0736</td>
<td>0.0965</td>
<td>0.0962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sulfure Oxides ((\text{SO}_x))</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.0124</td>
<td>0.0123</td>
<td>0.0170</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Organic Gasses ((\text{TOG}))</td>
<td>0.9323</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.4931</td>
<td>0.5544</td>
<td>0.5522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reactive Organic Gasses ((\text{ROG}))</td>
<td>0.8413</td>
<td>0.4469</td>
<td>0.4421</td>
<td>0.4904</td>
<td>0.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carbon Monoxide ((\text{CO}))</td>
<td>8.7158</td>
<td>4.1481</td>
<td>4.1041</td>
<td>3.6049</td>
<td>3.5905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nitrogen Oxide ((\text{NO}_x))</td>
<td>4.3188</td>
<td>2.0972</td>
<td>2.0737</td>
<td>1.8853</td>
<td>1.8765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carbon Dioxide ((\text{CO}_2)) without Policy Changes</td>
<td>1,048.1088</td>
<td>1409.164</td>
<td>1392.832</td>
<td>2,027.6046</td>
<td>2016.3262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carbon Dioxide ((\text{CO}_2)) with Policy Changes</td>
<td>1,045.5264</td>
<td>1163.098</td>
<td>1149.669</td>
<td>1,613.7829</td>
<td>1605.266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Percentage Change from 2010 Base Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020 No Build</th>
<th>2020 Preferred Scenario</th>
<th>2035 No Build</th>
<th>2035 Preferred Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Particulate Matter (<em>{10}) (PM(</em>{10}))</td>
<td>-30.13%</td>
<td>-31.03%</td>
<td>-9.22%</td>
<td>-9.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Particulate Matter (<em>{2.5}) (PM(</em>{2.5}))</td>
<td>-48.59%</td>
<td>-49.21%</td>
<td>-33.40%</td>
<td>-33.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sulfure Oxides ((\text{SO}_x))</td>
<td>34.78%</td>
<td>33.70%</td>
<td>84.78%</td>
<td>84.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Organic Gasses ((\text{TOG}))</td>
<td>-46.48%</td>
<td>-47.11%</td>
<td>-40.53%</td>
<td>-40.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reactive Organic Gasses ((\text{ROG}))</td>
<td>-46.88%</td>
<td>-47.45%</td>
<td>-41.71%</td>
<td>-41.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carbon Monoxide ((\text{CO}))</td>
<td>-52.41%</td>
<td>-52.91%</td>
<td>-58.64%</td>
<td>-58.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nitrogen Oxide ((\text{NO}_x))</td>
<td>-51.44%</td>
<td>-51.98%</td>
<td>-56.35%</td>
<td>-56.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carbon Dioxide ((\text{CO}_2)) without Policy Changes</td>
<td>34.45%</td>
<td>32.89%</td>
<td>93.45%</td>
<td>92.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carbon Dioxide ((\text{CO}_2)) with Policy Changes</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>9.96%</td>
<td>54.35%</td>
<td>53.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7-15  Emissions Factors (EMFAC) in San Benito County*

*Source: Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, Regional Transportation Demand Model*
Chapter 8 Public Participation

Providing opportunities for public participation in the Regional Transportation Plan is important to the Council of San Benito County Governments. Early and frequent public involvement is essential to ensure that the community gains a clear understanding of the Council of Governments role as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for San Benito County. Furthermore, public involvement helps the Council of Governments policymakers and staff better understand the needs and concerns of the community, leading to more meaningful planning efforts and activities.

In compliance with federal and state requirements and to guide effective public involvement, the Council of Governments utilized its Public Participation Plan. The Monterey Bay Area Public Participation Plan provides the direction for public participation activities. It outlines the processes and strategies the Council of Governments uses to reach out to a broad range of stakeholders to gain their input.

The Monterey Bay Area Public Participation Plan is intended to guide all public involvement activities of the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, including the Council of Governments. It also complies with federal and state legislation.

To ensure compliance with federal and state requirements, the Council of Governments implements a public involvement process to provide information, timely public notice, and to support early and continuing public engagement in developing its regional plans. In order to develop an effective public participation process that is specific to the needs of San Benito County residents, it is important to acknowledge the community’s demographics. To help inform the public of opportunities for input on the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan, the Council of Governments developed a comprehensive public outreach plan to meet the needs of its community demographics.

In San Benito County more than 56.4 percent of the residents are Hispanic; however, Spanish is...
not always the primary language spoken in these households. According to the U.S. Census, 39.5% of households in San Benito County speak a language other than English at home. As such, the majority of Regional Transportation Plan announcements, surveys, and general information were provided in both English and Spanish. The Council of Governments has strived to ensure that the public have the opportunity to voice their thoughts and concerns during the development of the Regional Transportation Plan.

TECHNIQUES TO ENHANCE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
Using strategies identified in the Public Participation Plan, the Council of Governments has enhanced the techniques and strategies for Regional Transportation Plan outreach, by the following efforts:

- Developing presentation materials for public outreach in a variety of formats to reach broad audiences, including PowerPoint presentations, fact sheets, surveys, and maps.
- Enhancing website capabilities to allow posting of all Regional Transportation Plan related information on its website to ensure that it is accessible and transparent to the public.
- Coordinating outreach efforts with other stakeholder organizations and community groups to maximize outreach opportunities.
- Involving multiple committees and task forces of the Council of Governments partners, stakeholders, and interested groups to develop the key components of the Regional Transportation Plan.
- Holding multiple public workshops before the release of the Draft Regional Transportation Plan to allow direct participation by interested parties.
- Reaching out to traditionally underrepresented and/or underserved audiences.
- Considering comments received during the outreach activities regarding proposed plans and programs.
- Evaluating public participation activities to continually improve the outreach process.

The Council of Governments considered an array of options for public participation, especially for those of underserved or underrepresented minorities, low income, elderly, and disabled communities.
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63 U.S. 2010 Census, San Benito County
64 U.S. 2010 Census, San Benito County
populations within San Benito County. The Council of Governments sought input from the following advisory committees:

- Social Services Transportation Advisory Council members represent various social service agencies and transit providers representing the elderly, persons with disabilities and persons of limited means.
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee members advise the Council of Governments Board on bicycle and pedestrian issues in the San Benito County region.
- Technical Advisory Committee advises the Council of Governments on matters related to transportation planning and project development.
- Regional Transportation Plan Advisory Committee members advise the Council of Governments on the development of the San Benito Regional Transportation Plan.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES**
The Council of Governments conducted the following outreach activities both prior and post the Regional Transportation Plan.

**OUTREACH ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED POST REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**
For this Regional Transportation Plan, the Council of Governments sought public participation through various forms. This input helped provide direction on regional priorities for the Regional Transportation Plan’s policy element and influenced the list of projects that are included in the Plan. The public participation findings helped identify issues that require more study outside the Regional Transportation Plan and as projects move forward.

**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PUBLIC SURVEY**
In 2010, the Council of Governments conducted a Regional Transportation Plan Public Survey to gather input on the transportation policies and projects most important to the community. The survey results provided imperative insight to existing and future transportation needs of the community, which are addressed in this Final Regional Transportation Plan.

A total of 78 people responded to the Regional Transportation Plan Public Survey. The public survey was published in The Pinnacle Newspaper, on the Council of Governments website, and distributed to various locations and to community groups. Survey results are graphically depicted in Figure 8-3.
Figure 8-3: 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Public Survey Results

Source: San Benito County 2010 Regional Transportation Plan
The following top four transportation needs were identified in the Public Survey:

1. Repairing and Maintaining Local Streets and Roads
   The most pressing transportation need, according to survey respondents, was repairing and maintaining local streets and roads. Respondents felt that there is either a great need or some need. There were 55 respondents that indicated that this was the greatest need and 22 respondents who indicated that there is some need. No respondent indicated that there is either no need or didn’t know.

2. Adding and Improving Bicycle Lanes and Trails
   Respondents were enthusiastic on the question about adding and improving bicycle lanes and trails. There were 40 respondents who indicated that there is a great need, 26 respondents who indicated that there is some need, 10 respondents who indicated that there is no need, and one respondent who didn’t know.

3. Improving Street and Sidewalk Design In New Developments
   Respondents were supportive of the question about improving streets and sidewalk design when new developments are constructed. There were 42 respondents who indicated that there is a great need, 24 respondents who indicated that there is some need, 8 respondents who indicated that there is no need, and 2 respondents who didn’t know.

4. Widening and Improving Major Highways
   Respondents were supportive on the question about widening and improving major highways (such as Highways 25, 156, 101, and 152). There were 36 respondents who indicated that there is a great need, 24 respondents who indicated that there is some need, 12 respondents who indicated that there is no need, and no respondents who didn’t know.

**METROQUEST SURVEY**

As part of the Regional Transportation Plan and Association of Monterey Bay Area Government’s Sustainable Communities Strategy process, a survey was made available online using a comprehensive assessment tool. MetroQuest is an online community engagement platform used by local agencies for planning purposes.

The Survey consisted of several topics of interest, including:

- Future transportation improvements (i.e. projects)
- Public investments and financing
- Land use and transportation coordination

Based the survey results, people ranked their priorities in order of preference. Those items that
received a 1 were ranked most desirable, while those that received a ranking of 13 were considered the least desirable. The results allowed the Council of Governments to obtain valuable insight on the community’s opinion about their preferences regarding roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities over the next 20 years. The survey results are summarized above, in Figure 8-4.

TELEPHONE SURVEY
The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) in partnership with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the Council of Governments, and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conducted a Priorities and Preferences Survey. The survey targeted local voters in the tri-county region about priorities for funding and projects.

In San Benito County, 301 people responded to the telephone survey, which was made available in English or Spanish. San Benito County voters identified their top priorities to include the following:

- Road safety and maintenance
- Preserving farmland and agriculture
- Preserving open space and wildlife habitat
- Making it easier and safer for people to walk

In addition to the top priorities, residents were concerned about jobs and the economy, which outweigh those about the environment or greenhouse gas emissions. Commuters also noted that commuters are spending a lot of time in their cars and many would like to drive less. However, most people believed that people will continue to need their cars to get around the San Benito County region.

Although, voters favored improvements to the transportation network just under half of San Benito County voters would conceptually support a sales tax for transportation improvements.
FARMERS MARKET
The Council of Governments created a paper version of the MetroQuest survey in both English and Spanish. Surveys were distributed and administered by staff to interested patrons of the Hollister Farmers Market on two separate occasions.

SOCIAL MEDIA
The MetroQuest survey and all Regional Transportation Plan information was uploaded on the Council of Governments’ Facebook and Twitter pages in both English and Spanish. Staff also posted this information on the Facebook pages of local community groups. The Local Transportation Authority and the Rideshare program also helped distribute the survey and the Regional Transportation Plan information.

OUTREACH ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED POST REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
The Council of Governments has continued to consult with a range of interested parties to refine the agency’s public participation strategies, procedures and techniques. This was accomplished by soliciting comments from a diverse number of stakeholders through email correspondence, workshops, presentations, meetings, telephone communications, and website postings. Specifically, the Council of Governments conducted the following outreach activities:

IN Volving OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES
The Council of Governments contacted government agencies during the development of the Regional Transportation Plan and provided an opportunity to other agencies to comment on the Draft Regional Transportation Plan. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments provided an opportunity for comment on its Metropolitan Transportation Plan and joint Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Regional Transportation Plan Environmental Impact Report to other agencies. A list of these agencies is included in Appendix D.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS
The Council of San Benito County Governments distributed the Draft Regional Transportation Plan to various public and private community organizations to gather input on transportation needs facing San Benito County (Figure 8-6.)

These organizations were also notified of the Public Hearing for the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

WEBSITE
The Council of Governments maintains a website that provides timely information about the agency, its programs, and special projects. Meeting notices and agendas with minutes and staff reports are also posted and available for review at www.SanBenitoCOG.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Chamber of Commerce – Government Relations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Farmer’s Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hollister Rotary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lunch with Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hollister Downtown Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic Restructuring Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• San Juan Rotary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• San Benito County Farm Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8-6 Participatory Non-Governmental Organizations
The Regional Transportation Plan Public Workshop, Notice of Preparation, and Public Hearing meetings were posted in the “What’s New” section of the website. The information was intended to provide the public with updates on the development and environmental review of the Regional Transportation Plan.

PUBLIC WORKSHOPS AND HEARING
As part of development of the San Benito Regional Transportation Plan and the Sustainable Communities Strategy, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) in partnership with the San Benito, Monterey, and Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Planning Agencies conducted a series of collaborative community workshops in May and July 2013. The purpose of the workshops was to initiate a regional dialogue about future growth and how we should prioritize future transportation improvements.

The Council of Governments also conducted a public hearing for the Draft San Benito Regional Transportation Plan. The purpose of the Public Hearing was to present information and obtain input from the public on transportation issues, policies, programs, plans, and/or projects. The Council of Governments conducted the Public Hearing on May 29, 2014 in Hollister. A bilingual interpreter was available at the public hearing. There were no public comments at the Public Hearing.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
In addition to the public input and review process required by the federal government, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) conducted an extensive environmental review process, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which also includes public review and a public hearing.

The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) established a Memorandum of Understanding between the Council of San Benito County Governments, Transportation Agency for Monterey County, and Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission to prepare one Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which included each Regional Transportation Plan collectively in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The decision to participate in a joint Environmental Impact Report was at the discretion of the board of directors for each agency. The completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Report was the result of an extensive 55-day public review period, in which the Association, as the lead agency, responded to written public comments. The Council of Governments Board of Directors adopted a resolution certifying the Environmental Impact Report at its meeting on June 19, 2014.

MITIGATION BANKING STRATEGIES
The Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires Regional Transportation Plans to include a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and identify potential strategies that have the least environmental impacts affected by the Regional Transportation Plan.
As part of the development of the San Benito Regional Transportation Plan and the Environmental Impact Report, California Environmental Quality Act Findings of Fact, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program was prepared by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments as the Lead Agency.

PUBLIC REVIEW AND FINAL PLAN ADOPTION
The Draft Regional Transportation Plan included a 30-day period for public comment. The Council of Governments received five comment letters and four comments at its April meeting regarding the Draft Regional Transportation Plan. The letters and responses to the comments received are included in Appendix F. All public comment was considered and revisions to the Final Regional Transportation Plan were made as appropriate. The Final Plan was brought before the Council of Governments’ Board of Directors for adoption at the June 19, 2014 meeting.
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### Appendix C  San Benito County Regional Transportation Plan
#### Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE AGENCY</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST – YEAR OF EXPENDITURE ($000s)</th>
<th>Constrained</th>
<th>Year of Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB-A01-Caltrans</td>
<td>Highway 156 Widening – San Juan Bautista to Union Road</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane expressway</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$48,520</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A02-Caltrans</td>
<td>Highway 156/Fairview Road Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Construct new turn lanes at intersection</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$6,824</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A03-Caltrans</td>
<td>Highway 25 Operational Enhancements</td>
<td>Construct passing lanes</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$4,742</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A04-SB</td>
<td>Memorial Drive Extension – Meridian Street to Santa Ana Road</td>
<td>Construct 4-lane road extension</td>
<td>City of Hollister</td>
<td>$3,355</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A05-SB</td>
<td>Airline Highway Widening – Sunset Drive to Fairview Road</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane expressway,</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$41,326</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A06-SB/HL</td>
<td>Westside Boulevard Extension</td>
<td>Construct 2-lane road</td>
<td>City of Hollister &amp; San Benito County</td>
<td>$13,360</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A07-HL</td>
<td>North Street (Buena Vista)</td>
<td>Construct 2-Lane road</td>
<td>City of Hollister</td>
<td>$4,207</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A08-SB</td>
<td>Fairview Road Widening</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane arterial</td>
<td>San Benito County</td>
<td>$17,599</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A09-SB</td>
<td>Union Road Widening (East) – San Benito Street to Highway 25</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane arterial</td>
<td>San Benito County</td>
<td>$5,463</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A10-SB</td>
<td>Union Road Widening (West) – San Benito Street to Highway 156</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane arterial</td>
<td>San Benito County</td>
<td>$15,448</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A11-SB/HL</td>
<td>Meridian Street Extension to Fairview Road</td>
<td>Construct 4-lane road</td>
<td>City of Hollister &amp; San Benito County</td>
<td>$6,445</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Fiscally constrained projects are projects for which full funding is reasonably available for project implementation within the 2035 horizon year, based on reasonably available revenues identified in the plan.
2 Year of Expenditure is broken down in five-year increments based on the anticipated date of project completion. Multi-year projects are identified in year of completion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE AGENCY</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST – YEAR OF EXPENDITURE ($000s)</th>
<th>Constrained?</th>
<th>Year of Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained1 Year of Expenditure2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Improvements – Lump Sum</td>
<td>Add Signals or Make other Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>City of Hollister &amp; San Benito County</td>
<td>$4,944</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A12-Caltrans</td>
<td>Highway 25 4-Lane Widening – Phase I</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane expressway, San Felipe Road to Hudner Lane</td>
<td>Council of Governments &amp; Caltrans</td>
<td>$67,591</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A13-Caltrans</td>
<td>State Highway Operations and Protection Program Grouped Project Listing</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$90,427</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operations and Protection Program Grouped Project Listing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A14-SB</td>
<td>Highway 25 4-Lane Widening – Phase II</td>
<td>Widen from 2-4 Lanes from Hudner Lane to County Line</td>
<td>Council of Governments &amp; Caltrans</td>
<td>$181,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A15-HL</td>
<td>Memorial Drive Construction - Santa Ana to Flynn Road</td>
<td>New 4-lane roadway construction/extension</td>
<td>City of Hollister</td>
<td>$13,842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A16-SB</td>
<td>Fairview Road/San Felipe Road East-West Arterial (New Road)</td>
<td>New roadway construction north of McCloskey Road</td>
<td>Cities &amp; San Benito County</td>
<td>[To Be Determined]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A17-SB</td>
<td>Fairview Road/Memorial Drive East-West Collector (New Road)</td>
<td>New roadway construction south of McCloskey Road</td>
<td>Cities &amp; San Benito County</td>
<td>[To Be Determined]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A18-Caltrans</td>
<td>U.S. 101: Las Aromitas: Monterey/San Benito County Line to State Route 156, Widen to 6-Lanes</td>
<td>Highway widening from 4 to 6 lanes</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>[To Be Determined]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A19-</td>
<td>U.S. 101: SR 156 to SR</td>
<td>Highway widening</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>[To Be Determined]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID NO.</td>
<td>PROJECT TITLE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE AGENCY</td>
<td>ESTIMATED COST – YEAR OF EXPENDITURE ($000s)</td>
<td>Constrained¹</td>
<td>Year of Expenditure²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>129, Widen to 6-Lane Freeway</td>
<td>from 4 to 6 lanes and upgrade facility to freeway standards</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Council Governments, &amp; Caltrans</td>
<td>Determined]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A20-Caltrans</td>
<td>New State Route 152 Alignment: SR 156 to US 101</td>
<td>Construct new alignment of State Route 152 from State Route 156 to U.S. 101</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Council Governments, &amp; Caltrans</td>
<td>$848,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Vehicle Replacements</td>
<td>Replace fleet as needed</td>
<td>San Benito County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$3,140</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Technology Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>Improve transit infrastructure to accommodate operations</td>
<td>San Benito County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$385</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Service Operations</td>
<td>Ongoing operation of fixed route and other transit services</td>
<td>San Benito County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$45,761</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transit – Salinas</td>
<td>Regional Transit Connection to Salinas</td>
<td>San Benito County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$3,113</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transit – Gilroy Caltrain</td>
<td>Regional transit connection to Gilroy Caltrain Station</td>
<td>San Benito County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$1,249</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transit – Gavilan College</td>
<td>Regional transit connection to Gilroy Gavilan College Campus</td>
<td>San Benito County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$3,437</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transit - Watsonville</td>
<td>Regional transit connection to City of Watsonville</td>
<td>San Benito County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$3,124</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transit Planning</td>
<td>Planning for ongoing regional transit activities</td>
<td>San Benito County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$1,084</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Infrastructure – Bus Stop Facility Improvements</td>
<td>Improvements to transit bus stop facilities.</td>
<td>San Benito County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID NO.</td>
<td>PROJECT TITLE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE AGENCY</td>
<td>ESTIMATED COST – YEAR OF EXPENDITURE ($000s)</td>
<td>Constrained¹</td>
<td>Year of Expenditure²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A21-SB</td>
<td>Rideshare Program (TDM)</td>
<td>Promote the use of alternative modes of transportation</td>
<td>Council of Governments</td>
<td>$53</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanpool Program</td>
<td>Provide commuter vanpool services - lease program</td>
<td>Council of Governments</td>
<td>$364</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A27-SB</td>
<td>Bikeway and Pedestrian Master Plan Implementation – Tier II Projects</td>
<td>Implement projects identified in the adopted Bikeway and Pedestrian and master plan</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$10,391</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bikeway and Pedestrian Master Plan Implementation – Tier I Projects</td>
<td>Construct Class II and Class III Bikeway Improvements identified in the Bikeway and Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>City of Hollister</td>
<td>$903</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A22-SB</td>
<td>San Benito River Recreational Trail – Phase 1</td>
<td>Construct a portion of recreational bicycle/pedestrian/equestrian trail along the San Benito River</td>
<td>San Benito County</td>
<td>$5,627</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A22-SB</td>
<td>San Benito River Recreational Trail – Phase 2</td>
<td>Construct a portion of recreational bicycle/pedestrian/equestrian trail along the San Benito River</td>
<td>San Benito County</td>
<td>$8,538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A23-SB</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Construct a multi-use path adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad right of way</td>
<td>San Benito County</td>
<td>[To Be Determined]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems Lump Sum Projects</td>
<td>Implement projects identified in the Central Coast Intelligent Transportation Systems Plan</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$7,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Call Box Program</td>
<td>Provide emergency call box service throughout the County</td>
<td>Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways</td>
<td>$1,251</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A24-HL</td>
<td>West Gateway Improvement Project</td>
<td>Streetscape and intersection</td>
<td>City of Hollister</td>
<td>$7,389</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID NO.</td>
<td>PROJECT TITLE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE AGENCY</td>
<td>ESTIMATED COST – YEAR OF EXPENDITURE (s000s)</td>
<td>Constrained(^1)</td>
<td>Year of Expenditure²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A25-SB</td>
<td>San Benito County Regional Park Access Road</td>
<td>Construct new 2-lane roadway from Nash Road to San Benito Street south of San Benito High School</td>
<td>San Benito County</td>
<td>$565</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-A26-SB</td>
<td>Commuter Rail Extension to Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Extend commuter rail (currently Caltrain) from Hollister to Gilroy</td>
<td>San Benito County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>[To Be Determined]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hollister Airport Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>Ongoing airport operations and maintenance</td>
<td>City of Hollister</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hollister Airport Capital Improvements</td>
<td>Capital improvements at Hollister Municipal Airport</td>
<td>City of Hollister</td>
<td>$4,269</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 101 Widening- Monterey St. to SR 129</td>
<td>Widen from 4 to 6 lanes</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$246,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL ESTIMATED COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,885,647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CONSTRAINED COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$513,321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL UNCONSTRAINED COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$278,326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUNDED BY OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,094,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix D  Partner Agencies for Regional Transportation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education Program</td>
<td>Erika Sanchez</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>650 San Benito St. Ste. 130</td>
<td><a href="mailto:esanchez@hessd.org">esanchez@hessd.org</a></td>
<td>(831) 634-2000 ext. 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito County Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Liz Sparling</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>455 San Benito St. Ste. 21</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info1@sanbenitocountyamber.com">info1@sanbenitocountyamber.com</a></td>
<td>(831) 637-5315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJBC Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Halina Pochron Kleinsmith</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>1111 San Felipe Rd. Ste. 206</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sjbc@hollinet.com">sjbc@hollinet.com</a></td>
<td>(831) 623-2454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Downtown Association</td>
<td>Brenda Weatherly</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>439 Fourth St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kflores@hollinet.com">kflores@hollinet.com</a></td>
<td>(831) 637-7293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito County Health &amp; Human Services Agency Public Health Services</td>
<td>Enrique Arreola</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>391 Sunset Dr. Hollister, CA 95023</td>
<td><a href="mailto:garveybryne@hotmail.com">garveybryne@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>(831) 636-2863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Hawkins Hospitals Foundation</td>
<td>Leah Dowty</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>829 San Benito St. Ste. 200</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leighditz@charter.net">leighditz@charter.net</a></td>
<td>(831) 637-8399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Taskforce of San Benito County</td>
<td>Gary Byrne</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2710 Hollister, CA 95024</td>
<td></td>
<td>(831) 630-1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>CONTACT</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>PHONE NUMBER</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Gavilan College                                   | Rachel Perez       | Associate Dean, Community Development/Grants Management | Gilroy Campus  
5055 Santa Teresa Blvd.  
Gilroy, CA  95020  
Hollister - Briggs Building  
365 Fourth St  
Hollister, CA  95023 | Gilroy:(408) 848-4800  
Hollister:831-636-3783 | mickie@sbclulac.org |
| League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)   | Mickie Luna        | President                                  | San Benito County Council  
#2890  
P. O. Box 1446  
Hollister, CA  95024 | T: (831) 673-2009  
F: (831)637-0146 | mickie@sbclulac.org |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee         | Veronica Lezama    | Transportation Planner                     | 330 Tres Pinos Rd.  
Ste. C7  
Hollister, CA  95023 | (831) 637-7665 | veronica@sanbenitocog.org |
| Leadership San Benito County                      |                    |                                            | P. O. Box 1299. Hollister CA  95024 | (831) 636-7629 |                             |
| San Benito Child Care Association                 | Debbie Pereira     |                                            | 1700 Airline Highway  
PMB 446  
Hollister CA  95023 | T: (831)630-0977  
F: (831)637-6938 |                             |
| YMCA of San Benito County                         |                    |                                            | 351 Tres Pinos Road, #201a  
Hollister, CA  95023 |                             |                             |
| County of San Benito, Planning & Building Department | Byron Turner    | Interim Director                            | 2301 Technology Parkway  
Hollister, CA  95023 | (831) 637-5313 |                             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollister School District</td>
<td>John Teliha</td>
<td>Director of Student Nutrition, Maintenance, Operations and Warehouse Services</td>
<td>2690 Cienega Rd. Hollister, CA 95023</td>
<td>(831) 630-6315</td>
<td><a href="mailto:skurtz@hsd.k12.ca.us">skurtz@hsd.k12.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito High School</td>
<td>Krystal Lomanto</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1220 Monterey St. Hollister, CA 95023</td>
<td>(831) 637-5831</td>
<td><a href="mailto:srose@sbhsd.k12.ca.us">srose@sbhsd.k12.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito County Office of Education</td>
<td>Mike Sanchez</td>
<td>County Superintendent</td>
<td>460 Fifth St. Hollister, CA 95023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Hamilton Ct. Hollister, CA 95023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Field Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito County Farm Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>530 San Benito St., #201 Hollister, CA 95023-3955</td>
<td>(831) 637-7643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Mission San Juan Bautista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 400 San Juan Bautista, CA 95045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacles National Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5000 Highway 146 Paicines, CA 95043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Juan Bautista</td>
<td>Matt Leal</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1420 San Juan Bautista, CA 95045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Oaks Golf Club</td>
<td>Scott Fuller</td>
<td></td>
<td>3825 Union Rd. Hollister, CA 95023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>PHONE NUMBER</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>CONTACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Planning &amp;</td>
<td>2301 Technology Parkway</td>
<td>(831) 637-5313</td>
<td></td>
<td>Byron Turner</td>
<td>Mary Paxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Hollister, CA 95023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hollister</td>
<td>375 Fifth St. Hollister, CA 95023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F has been included in the CD attached to On the Move: 2035.
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## Appendix F  Public Comment and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>March 19, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Larry Barr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>San Benito County Business Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment format:</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter:</td>
<td>Various chapters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you very much for COG’s consideration of ensuring that local and regional planning organizations utilize the best available, realistic data, processes and community engagement efforts to ensure that all organizations adopt a better basis for planning that is both consistent with local directives as well as recognizes that we need to sustain and foster significant investment to be economically viable and sustainable as a community.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your consideration of population growth, the AMBAG MPO and SCS must be consistent with other plans prepared by local, state and federal agencies and reflective of the dramatic economic recovery being experienced in neighboring regions, especially our immediate neighbor to the north, Santa Clara County. Since June 23, 2009 (nearly 5 years) all analyses of the County General Plan have been based on AMBAG’s 2008 population forecast of 94,731 by 2035 based on numerous factors explained below. AMBAG’s current growth forecasts of 81,000 population by 2035 for their MTO/SCS are too low and are inconsistent with the County Board of Supervisors direction (June 23, 2009 and July 24, 2012) and growth factors available to AMBAG since 2009. For example, AMBAG has given insufficient consideration of the end of the Hollister sewer moratorium, elimination of growth contrail measures, a substantial uptick in the activity of private investment, current and active general plans in all jurisdictions especially in Hollister and San Benito County encouraging residential, commercial and industrial retention and expansion.

A similar comment was submitted to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments on the MTP/SCS on March 19, 2014. AMBAG responded to the commenter as a part of the 2035 MTP/SCS.

The 2008 Forecast used by the County of San Benito is not grounded in current 2010 Census data, nor does it make use of the most recently available data. In updating the MTP, AMBAG and San Benito COG are required to “base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion and economic activity.” (2010 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, p. 41: Title 23 CFR Part 450.322(e).)

By way of background, AMBAG staff met with staff from the County of San Benito on numerous occasions to discuss the updated forecast which has been in development since 2011. The County indicated they would use the prior 2008 forecast for the County General Plan since the updated forecast was not ready when the General Plan was first prepared. County staff was aware of the fact that the updated forecast would be lower for the County of San Benito and the region as a
whole given that the 2008 forecast was prepared prior to the recession and the projections have not come to fruition in any of the three counties. In August 2012, AMBAG representatives for the County of San Benito and the City of Hollister voted to approve the updated forecast with these lower numbers. The forecast is high enough to accommodate a nearly doubling of the population within the County and therefore is consistent with Plans for increased growth in the County of San Benito. It should be noted that the forecast will be updated every four years and as such will be revised again after the MTP/SCS is adopted.

We ask that COG, this Thursday, adopts Agenda item number 8, the growth forecast, scenario number 4, and that AMBAG be requested to adopt that forecast for its MTP/SCS.

Refer to response to comment above regarding the AMBAG Growth Forecast.

The San Benito County Business Council further asks that you encourage the COG board to release a SBC RTP consistent with these growth projections and direct the RTP ad hoc committee to continue its work with AMBAG, Caltrans and the Federal Department of Transportation’s Highway Administration Highway to extend the timeline for consideration of a final EIR and adoption of the MTP and SCS that allows proper engagement with the San Benito County community and agencies to review and for full consideration of transportation funding. The overly aggressive timelines and current processes have simply not provided adequate time for our undercompensated elected officials and understaffed agencies to review and analyze the sheer volume of information contained in those plans as well as our own regional transportation plan. Finally, as reflected in the low participation rate of San Benito County residents in AMBAG workshops, the public participation plan and process is inadequate and insufficient to reach our diverse and commute-reliant population.

AMBAG and San Benito COG continue to coordinate with state and federal agencies. The timeline for this Regional Transportation Plan and MTP/SCS is legally mandated and is used by other regions. In 2009, AMBAG and San Benito COG (COG Resolution 2009-13) elected to move to a four year cycle for the MTP and RTP, respectively, as provided by law, to be consistent with SB 375, the development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy, and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment. Despite the timeline, AMBAG and San Benito COG have exceed all public outreach requirements. There have been numerous opportunities for public and elected officials to comment during the development of the MTP and San Benito Regional Transportation Plan. To date, AMBAG, in coordination with San Benito COG, has conducted three series of public workshops, each of which included a workshop in Hollister. AMBAG staff held over one hundred one-on-one meetings with local cities and counties planning staff which included discussions about the forecast, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and local plans. In 2012, the Planning Directors Forum met on a regular basis and provided input on the planning process. The Planning Directors Forum includes representatives from all the cities and the counties in the region. AMBAG gave
presentations to the Technical Advisory Committees of the San Benito Council of Governments in addition to its Board of Directors. Online surveys and telephone surveys were conducted in all three of the counties, including more than 300 individuals in San Benito County, in order to capture the audience that is not likely to attend a workshop. All public workshops were held in the evening to accommodate commuter travel. Email blasts, Facebook posts, newspaper ads, flyers and website postings were used to notify people of events and opportunities to comment on the planning process. Additionally, San Benito COG partnered with the Hollister Downtown Association to help gather input on the San Benito Regional Transportation Plan and the AMBAG MTP/SCS. In 2013, San Benito COG staff presented at various community groups and solicited input at the Hollister Farmers Market on two occasions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As reflected in our comments on the County General Plan update, our comments and suggestions on this matter are intended to strike a balance between the need to sustain and protect important resources, which we support, with the need to permit the County to thrive, expand and enhance the community job base, improve the economic climate, support a superior quality of life and actively contribute to the wellbeing of the communities of San Benito County.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This letter is provided in a spirit of partnership and cooperation for the continued success of the Council of San Benito County Governments (San Benito COG) as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency addressing important transportation needs throughout the county.

The action by the San Benito COG Board of Directors at its March 20, 2014 meeting directed staff to use a recently updated version of the 2010 San Benito County Traffic Model. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) cannot support this decision. Because the county model is not consistent with the federally recognized Regional Travel Demand Model maintained by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), it will not be acceptable for state and federal transportation planning purposes. To remain eligible for state and federal funds for both planning activities and programming of capital improvements countywide, the San Benito COG must build upon the foundation provided by the AMBAG model. This is also fundamental for the validity of the Regional Transportation Plan.

I encourage San Benito COG to continue working in partnership with AMBAG for appropriate use of the Regional Travel Demand Model to meet the goals of San Benito County. Please contact me if you would like to discuss this further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This letter is provided in a spirit of partnership and cooperation for the continued success of the Council of San Benito County Governments (San Benito COG) as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency addressing important transportation needs throughout the county.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The action by the San Benito COG Board of Directors at its March 20, 2014 meeting directed staff to use a recently updated version of the 2010 San Benito County Traffic Model. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) cannot support this decision. Because the county model is not consistent with the federally recognized Regional Travel Demand Model maintained by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), it will not be acceptable for state and federal transportation planning purposes. To remain eligible for state and federal funds for both planning activities and programming of capital improvements countywide, the San Benito COG must build upon the foundation provided by the AMBAG model. This is also fundamental for the validity of the Regional Transportation Plan.</td>
<td>The draft and final Regional Transportation Plan uses the Regional Travel Demand Model maintained by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments as the basis for its performance evaluation. Throughout the document, reference to the Regional Travel Demand Model has been used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage San Benito COG to continue working in partnership with AMBAG for appropriate use of the Regional Travel Demand Model to meet the goals of San Benito County. Please contact me if you would like to discuss this further.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: April 14, 2014  
Name: Ben Tripousis and Mark McLoughlin  
Organization: California High-Speed Rail Authority  
Comment format: Letter  
Chapter: Regional Issues and Overall Policy Approach and Investments in Our Transportation Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the San Benito County Draft Regional Transportation Plan. The San Benito Council of Governments’ (SBCOG) Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) includes important goals for economic vitality, access and mobility, social equity, and promoting an integrated multimodal transit network and healthy communities. These same principals are shared by the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) and would be supported by the implementation of California’s high-speed rail system.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The construction and operation of the high-speed rail project is a reasonably foreseeable project in close proximity of the SBCOG planning area, and within the planning horizon of the proposed RTP. The Authority suggests that SBCOG consider the adopted planning and environmental documents for the high-speed rail project both the effects of its construction and its operation, in its evaluation of the cumulative impacts from implementation of the proposed RTP. The documents that may be used to describe the project include but are not limited to the following:  
- Draft 2014 Business Plan (anticipated to be adopted in May 2014);  
- Statewide Final Program EIR/EIS (adopted by the Board of Directors on November 2, 2005; Record of Decision received from Federal Railroad Administration on November 18, 2005).  
These documents are available on the Authority’s website: [www.hsr.ca.gov](http://www.hsr.ca.gov). | Connections to the Gilroy Caltrain and Greyhound station are included in the draft project list and further enhanced in the final project list. The Regional Transportation Plan is updated every four years. As the High-Speed Rail gets closer to fruition, SBCOG, in consultation with the San Benito County Local Transportation Authority, will consider more robust service to the rail and bus station in Gilroy. |
<p>| The Authority encourages the SBCOG to prioritize transit connectivity and to work with local transit | Comment noted. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>providers, especially intercounty service between Santa Clara County and San Benito County by San Benito County Express, to plan for transit connections to and from a future high-speed rail station in Gilroy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Authority is available to assist in the refinement of the proposed RTP for analysis or the development of alternatives regarding transit connectivity to reduce environmental impacts.</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Scales stated that at the recent Board of Supervisors meeting it was suggested by at least three of the members that the Regional Transportation Plan consider reporting a range of results. The range reflecting the AMBAG draft population projections and the projections that are reflected in the County General Plan. He stated that he took the initiative to provide editorial comments on the 8 or 9 pages in the Draft Regional Transportation Plan that would be affected. He provided copies for consideration with mark-ups showing highlighted text and underlined what was deleted and what was added. Mr. Scales mentioned that Parsons just completed the traffic study on a three billion dollar High Desert Corridor project in Southern California. He stated that they don’t use the recently adopted model, but the prior version of the regionally adopted model because the current version has a lot of controversy about it. They also use the prior version of the regionally adopted population forecast because no one in the High Desert Corridor area believes in the current version, which are driven solely by an effort to reduce vehicle miles of travel and cut down the population in the High Desert Corridor. He stated that his point was that flexibility is permitted in these project, Caltrans District 7 (Los Angeles County), Caltrans District 8 (San Bernardino County), and all of the member entities found what they did fine and it was all agreed upon by the project development team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Scales stated that at the recent Board of Supervisors meeting it was suggested by at least three of the members that the Regional Transportation Plan consider reporting a range of results. The range reflecting the AMBAG draft population projections and the projections that are reflected in the County General Plan. He stated that he took the initiative to provide editorial comments on the 8 or 9 pages in the Draft Regional Transportation Plan that would be affected. He provided copies for consideration with mark-ups showing highlighted text and underlined what was deleted and what was added. Mr. Scales mentioned that Parsons just completed the traffic study on a three billion dollar High Desert Corridor project in Southern California. He stated that they don’t use the recently adopted model, but the prior version of the regionally adopted model because the current version has a lot of controversy about it. They also use the prior version of the regionally adopted population forecast because no one in the High Desert Corridor area believes in the current version, which are driven solely by an effort to reduce vehicle miles of travel and cut down the population in the High Desert Corridor. He stated that his point was that flexibility is permitted in these project, Caltrans District 7 (Los Angeles County), Caltrans District 8 (San Bernardino County), and all of the member entities found what they did fine and it was all agreed upon by the project development team.</td>
<td>The 2008 Forecast used by the County of San Benito is not grounded in current 2010 Census data, nor does it make use of the most recently available data. In updating the MTP, AMBAG and San Benito COG are required to &quot;base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion and economic activity.&quot; (2010 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, p. 41: Title 23 CFR Part 450.322(e).) By way of background, AMBAG staff met with staff from the County of San Benito on numerous occasions to discuss the updated forecast which has been in development since 2011. The County indicated they would use the prior 2008 forecast for the County General Plan since the updated forecast was not ready when the General Plan was first prepared. County staff was aware of the fact that the updated forecast would be lower for the County of San Benito and the region as a whole given that the 2008 forecast was prepared prior to the recession and the projections have not come to fruition in any of the three counties. In August 2012, AMBAG representatives for the County of San Benito and the City of Hollister voted to approve the updated forecast with these lower numbers. The forecast is high enough to accommodate a nearly doubling of the population within the County and therefore is consistent with Plans for increased growth in the County of San Benito. It should be noted that the forecast will be updated every four years and as such will be revised again after the MTP/SCS is adopted. The Regional Travel Demand Model was used and provides the basis for the 2011 update of the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study and the basis for all Caltrans projects including the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project and the Highway 25 Widening Project. The draft and final Regional Transportation Plan use the Regional Travel Demand Model maintained by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments as the basis for its performance evaluation. Throughout the document, reference to the Regional Travel Demand Model has been used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Gilles reiterated his comments regarding Item 5(c). He recommended that any action on 5(c) be postponed until after there is an opportunity to meet with Simon Salinas, AMBAG and AMBAG’s Counsel, Chair Gomez, Director Muenzer, and Lisa Rheinheimer. This will allow time to determine if there is an issue with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) from AMBAG. He stated that he was confident that if everyone works together they will be able to resolve any issues and move forward.

During Public Comment on the April 17, 2014 COG Agenda, Mr. Gilles provided these comments which were referred to during his public testimony during the Public Hearing:

Mr. Gilles provided the Board a copy of a letter from him addressed to Simon Salinas. The letter is an effort to set up an all hands meeting with AMBAG, AMBAG’s General Counsel, with regard to this issue (growth forecast, Highway 25 Widening, and Shore Road extension) which seems to be growing between San Benito COG and AMBAG. He also recommended that Simon Salinas consider extending an invitation to the COG Chair, COG’s Executive Director, and the Chair of the Board of Supervisors to have a productive discussion with regard to the letter from Aileen Loe from Caltrans. He stated that he believed this issue could be resolved by everyone getting together and talking about solutions as opposed to advocating their respective differences. He mentioned that the meeting between Simon Salinas, AMBAG and other respective parties could occur April 28th, 29th, or 30th depending on everyone’s schedules.

The 2008 Forecast used by the County of San Benito is not grounded in current 2010 Census data, nor does it make use of the most recently available data. In updating the MTP, AMBAG and San Benito COG are required to “base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion and economic activity.” (2010 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, p. 41: Title 23 CFR Part 450.322(e).)

By way of background, AMBAG staff met with staff from the County of San Benito on numerous occasions to discuss the updated forecast which has been in development since 2011. The County indicated they would use the prior 2008 forecast for the County General Plan since the updated forecast was not ready when the General Plan was first prepared. County staff was aware of the fact that the updated forecast would be lower for the County of San Benito and the region as a whole given that the 2008 forecast was prepared prior to the recession and the projections have not come to fruition in any of the three counties. In August 2012, AMBAG representatives for the County of San Benito and the City of Hollister voted to approve the updated forecast with these lower numbers. The forecast is high enough to accommodate a nearly doubling of the population within the County and therefore is consistent with Plans for increased growth in the County of San Benito. It should be noted that the forecast will be updated every four years and as such will be revised again after the MTP/SCS is adopted.

The Highway 25 Widening Phase I project was on the 2010 Regional Transportation Plans because sufficient funding was identified to pay for the project. The funding outlook has changed since 2010. San Benito COG and AMBAG are required...
Comment | Response
---|---
to demonstrate fiscal constraint in preparing their RTP and MTP.

Title 23 CFR Part 450.104 provides the following definition of fiscal constraint or fiscally constrained: "(it) means that the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, and STIP includes sufficient financial information for demonstrating that projects in the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP and STIP can be implemented using committed, available or reasonably available revenue sources, with reasonable assurance that the federally supported transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained. For the TIP and the STIP, financial constraint/fiscal constraint applies to each programming year. Additionally, projects in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas can be included in the first two years of the TIP or STIP only if funds are 'available' or 'committed'."

The Highway 25 Widening Phase I and Phase II projects are included on the project list as unconstrained in the Final Regional Transportation Plan.

Staff did not propose the Highway 25 Widening Phase I and II in the Draft San Benito Regional Transportation Plan on the constrained list of projects due to four prior COG Board actions described below:

1. In February 2013, the COG Board directed COG staff to include only core financial assumptions as a part of the RTP update. The COG Board specifically discussed a mileage base user fee/vehicle mileage fee and local sales tax for transportation as possible additional funding sources. The COG Board directed staff to assume that additional funding beyond the core funding available today would not be available in the 20-year planning horizon.

   Based on this Board direction, there are only three major core sources of funding eligible for Highway 25 Widening: 1) Traffic Impact Mitigation Fees, 2) State
Transportation Improvement Program, and 3) Regional Surface Transportation Program. These funding sources are further detailed below.

2. The COG Board, Hollister City Council, and County Board of Supervisors removed the largest funding source for Highway 25 Widening in 2011 when they approved the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study without the Highway 25 Widening project on the list. This document is available on the Council of Governments website at: www.sanbenitocog.org.

3. The Council of Governments Board has advanced State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for the Highway 156 Project. Returning to a $0 balance will likely take 4-6 years. The Council of Governments is advancing over $6 million for the San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project.

Additionally, future STIP funding does not raise enough to pay for the deficiency share of the Highway 25 Widening Project. The Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study shows an existing deficiency on Highway 25 which could not be paid for through the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee program by new development per state law.

Government Code Section 66001(g) states “A fee shall not include the costs attributable to existing deficiencies in public facilities, but may include the costs attributable to the increased demand for public facilities reasonably related to the development project in order to (1) refurbish existing facilities to maintain the existing level of service or (2) achieve an adopted level of service that is consistent with the general plan.”

4. The COG Board in August 2013 provided direction to COG staff to prioritize local streets and roads maintenance in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Strategy and San Benito RTP. This action directed Regional Surface Transportation Program funding to local streets and roads maintenance and repair needs rather than for funding the Highway 25 Widening Phase I or II projects. The Hybrid Scenarios project list was presented to the San Benito COG Board and action was taken at the meeting to direct staff to prioritize local streets and roads maintenance. The list represented the constrained projects for inclusion in the Draft Regional Transportation Plan and Draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The Board of Directors accepted the project list presented at the meeting as a handout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While funding is not identified in the Regional Transportation Plan for fiscal constraint reasons, the Highway 25 corridor is still important. San Benito COG will work with the Federal Highway Administration and Caltrans to grant an extension to complete the environmental document. If the Federal Highway Administration grants an extension on completing the environmental document, the project team will work on the project design, environmental, funding and schedule over the next several years. The Shore Road extension was not proposed on the project list because there have been no adopted plans to support its inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Allen stated that he worked for the San Benito COG for three years starting in 1998. He was appointed Interim Executive Director for six months to replace Mr. Max Bridges and prior to the Board appointing Mr. George Lewis. Mr. Allen stated that he left COG in 2001 to work for the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and joined Parsons in 2007. Mr. Allen stated that during his time at COG he was responsible for hiring Lisa Rheinheimer and Mary Gilbert and they were all actively involved in efforts to make Highway 25 safer. He stated that he pledged to work to make Highway 25 as safe as possible in honor of 12 people who were killed on Highway 25 in 2000. He mentioned that improvements have been made to Highway 25 in 2003 and 2011, which have substantially reduced collisions and fatalities. He stated that as part of the continued effort to improve safety and mobility on Highway 25, COG has made Highway 25 Widening a high priority since 2000. He stated that COG’s Executive Director, George Lewis personally obtained a commitment for $2 million from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) in 2001 and COG has since obtained various amounts of funds totaling $6.8 million in Federal, VTA, and COG sources to prepare an environmental document, which will approve the ultimate alignment and allow construction of projects. Mr. Allen stated that he was appalled that COG’s Executive Director did not specify that the Highway 25 Widening project was going to be removed from the constrained list of projects to be built in the San Benito Transportation Plan, and did so without informing the Board of this action. Mr. Allen stated that the project has been in the San Benito Regional Transportation Plan as a constrained project since 2005, since that time the COG Board has never voted to take Highway 25 off the list. Mr. Allen stated that on February 21, 2013 the COG Board accepted the Regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Allen stated that he worked for the San Benito COG for three years starting in 1998. He was appointed Interim Executive Director for six months to replace Mr. Max Bridges and prior to the Board appointing Mr. George Lewis. Mr. Allen stated that he left COG in 2001 to work for the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and joined Parsons in 2007. Mr. Allen stated that during his time at COG he was responsible for hiring Lisa Rheinheimer and Mary Gilbert and they were all actively involved in efforts to make Highway 25 safer. He stated that he pledged to work to make Highway 25 as safe as possible in honor of 12 people who were killed on Highway 25 in 2000. He mentioned that improvements have been made to Highway 25 in 2003 and 2011, which have substantially reduced collisions and fatalities. He stated that as part of the continued effort to improve safety and mobility on Highway 25, COG has made Highway 25 Widening a high priority since 2000. He stated that COG’s Executive Director, George Lewis personally obtained a commitment for $2 million from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) in 2001 and COG has since obtained various amounts of funds totaling $6.8 million in Federal, VTA, and COG sources to prepare an environmental document, which will approve the ultimate alignment and allow construction of projects. Mr. Allen stated that he was appalled that COG’s Executive Director did not specify that the Highway 25 Widening project was going to be removed from the constrained list of projects to be built in the San Benito Transportation Plan, and did so without informing the Board of this action. Mr. Allen stated that the project has been in the San Benito Regional Transportation Plan as a constrained project since 2005, since that time the COG Board has never voted to take Highway 25 off the list. Mr. Allen stated that on February 21, 2013 the COG Board accepted the Regional</td>
<td>The Highway 25 Widening Phase I and Phase II projects were on previous Regional Transportation Plans because sufficient funding was identified to pay for the project. The funding outlook has changed since 2010. San Benito COG and AMBAG are required to demonstrate fiscal constraint in preparing their RTP and MTP. Title 23 CFR Part 450.104 provides the following definition of fiscal constraint or fiscally constrained: “(it) means that the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, and STIP includes sufficient financial information for demonstrating that projects in the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP and STIP can be implemented using committed, available or reasonably available revenue sources, with reasonable assurance that the federally supported transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained. For the TIP and the STIP, financial constraint/fiscal constraint applies to each programming year. Additionally, projects in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas can be included in the first two years of the TIP or STIP only if funds are ‘available’ or ‘committed’.” The Highway 25 Widening Phase I and Phase II projects are included on the unconstrained project list in the Final Regional Transportation Plan. Staff did not propose the Highway 25 Widening Phase I and II in the Draft San Benito Regional Transportation Plan on the constrained list of projects due to four prior COG Board actions described below: 1. In February 2013, the COG Board directed COG staff to include only core financial assumptions as a part of the RTP update. The COG Board specifically discussed a mileage base user fee/vehicle mileage fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transportation Plan list and core financial assumptions and there were two Highway 25 Widening Projects on this list. He stated that the June 2013 TAC minutes show that they reviewed and recommend approval of the revised project list and also identified that staff add a constrained and unconstrained project list for 2020 and 2035. The TAC directed COG staff to present this list of projects to the COG Board, the COG Board never received or voted on that list. | and local sales tax for transportation as possible additional funding sources. The COG Board directed staff to assume that additional funding beyond the core funding available today would not be available in the 20-year planning horizon.  

Based on this Board direction, there are only three major core sources of funding eligible for Highway 25 Widening: Traffic Impact Mitigation Fees, the State Transportation Improvement Program, and the Regional Surface Transportation Program. These funding sources are further detailed below.  

2. The COG Board, Hollister City Council, and County Board of Supervisors removed the largest funding source for any Highway 25 Widening in 2011 when they approved the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study without the Highway 25 Widening project on the list. This document is available on the Council of Governments website at: www.sanbenitocog.org.  

3. The COG Board has advanced State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for the Highway 156 Project. Returning to a $0 balance will likely take 4-6 years. The Council of Governments is advancing over $6 million for the San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project. Additionally, future STIP funding does not raise enough to pay for the deficiency share of the Highway 25 Widening Project. The Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study shows an existing deficiency on Highway 25 which could not be paid for through the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee program by new development per state law.  

Government Code Section 66001(g) states "A fee shall not include the costs attributable to existing deficiencies in public facilities, but may include the costs attributable to the increased demand for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>public facilities reasonably related to the development project in order to (1) refurbish existing facilities to maintain the existing level of service or (2) achieve an adopted level of service that is consistent with the general plan.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The COG Board in August 2013 provided direction to COG staff to prioritize local streets and roads maintenance in the Sustainable Communities Strategy and San Benito RTP. This action directed Regional Surface Transportation Program funding to local streets and roads maintenance and repair needs rather than for funding the Highway 25 Widening Phase I or II projects. The Hybrid Scenarios project list was presented to the San Benito COG Board and action was taken at the meeting to direct staff to prioritize local streets and roads maintenance. The list represented the constrained projects for inclusion in the Draft Regional Transportation Plan and Draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The Board of Directors accepted the project list presented at the meeting as a handout.

While funding is not identified in the Regional Transportation Plan for fiscal constraint reasons, the Highway 25 corridor is still important. San Benito COG will work with the Federal Highway Administration and Caltrans to grant an extension to complete the environmental document. If the Federal Highway Administration grants an extension on completing the environmental document, the project team will work on the project design, environmental, funding and schedule over the next several years.
Date: April 17, 2014  
Name: Kristina Chavez Wyatt  
Organization: San Benito County Business Council  
Comment format: Public Testimony  
Chapter: Investments in Our Transportation Future (Action Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ms. Chavez -Wyatt stated that she wanted to reiterate some of the comments and requests that were made by the SBC Business Council regarding population forecasts and the process and procedure for developing the Regional Transportation Plan in cooperation with the AMBAG Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) moving forward. | See response to San Benito County Business Council letter dated March 19, 2014 above.  
Ms. Chavez-Wyatt read the letter that was presented to the Board from the San Benito County Business Council dated April 8, 2014. |
I am writing to provide comments on the draft 2035 San Benito Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). I believe that it is essential for the 2035 San Benito RTP to include the SR 25 Widening project, that was described in the March 20 draft RTP which RTP represents a major improvement over the February 20, 2014 San Benito RTP that was initially proposed by COG staff.

The February 20 draft RTP mentioned the SR 25 Widening project and even put it on an illustration, but clearly mislead the public into thinking that the SR 25 widening project would be a funded part of the 2035 San Benito RTP.

You, of course knew that the February 20 draft RTP lacked a separate list for Constrained and Unconstrained Projects, leaving it unclear to the general public which projects, making it certain that Caltrans could actually not approve the proposed RTP, much less ever widen SR 25.

The Highway 25 Widening Phase I and Phase II projects are included on the unconstrained project list in the Final Regional Transportation Plan.

In August 2013, the COG Board of Directors reviewed the constrained project list as a part of a discussion on the Sustainable Communities Strategy and Hybrid Scenarios prepared by AMBAG.

Appendix C has been revised in the Final RTP to provide clarity to the project list with respect to constrained, unconstrained, and funded by others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You also knew but buried the fact that the SR 25 widening project was also omitted from the AMBAG 2035 MTP/SCS and the EIR for the AMBAG 2035 MTP/SCS. These projects could clearly never be built in San Benito County within the next 25 years.</td>
<td>The Highway 25 Widening Phase I and Phase II projects are included on the unconstrained project list in the Final Regional Transportation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The COG Board needs to work with AMBAG to make sure that this project also appears in the AMBAG 2035 MTP/SCS and its EIR.</td>
<td>At this moment, Highway 25 Widening Phase I and Phase II projects cannot be added to the AMBAG 2035 MTP/SCS and EIR or the San Benito Regional Transportation Plan for fiscal constraint reasons as provided in Title 23 CFR Part 450.104.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As you well know the SR 25 Widening project was included as a constrained project in 2005 and 2010 San Benito RTPs. The project also appeared in the AMBAG MTP/EIR project lists for those years. Since that time, the COG Board has never voted to take the SR 25 Widening project off the RTP list. It is unconscionable that the COG staff decided unilaterally to take the SR 25 Widening project off the RTP list of funded projects and therefore ensure that the SR 25 Widening project is not going to expeditiously move forward for another 10 years or more. You cannot operate in the haphazard reckless manner you have in the past few months without inviting certain legal consequences.</td>
<td>The Highway 25 Widening Phase I project was on the previous 2010 Regional Transportation Plan constrained project list because sufficient funding was identified to pay for the project. The funding outlook has changed since 2010. San Benito COG and AMBAG are required to demonstrate fiscal constraint in preparing their RTP and MTP. Title 23 CFR Part 450.104 provides the following definition of fiscal constraint or fiscally constrained: “(it) means that the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, and STIP includes sufficient financial information for demonstrating that projects in the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP and STIP can be implemented using committed, available or reasonably available revenue sources, with reasonable assurance that the federally supported transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained. For the TIP and the STIP, financial constraint/fiscal constraint applies to each programming year. Additionally, projects in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas can be included in the first two years of the TIP or STIP only if funds are ‘available’ or ‘committed’.”  The Highway 25 Widening Phase I and Phase II projects are included on the project list as unconstrained in the Final Regional Transportation Plan. Staff did not propose the Highway 25 Widening Phase I and II in the Draft San Benito Regional Transportation Plan on the constrained list of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects due to four prior COG Board actions described below:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. In February 2013, the COG Board directed COG staff to include only core financial assumptions as a part of the RTP update. The COG Board specifically discussed a mileage base user fee/vehicle mileage fee and local sales tax for transportation as possible additional funding sources. The COG Board directed staff to assume that additional funding beyond the core funding available today would not be available in the 20-year planning horizon. Based on this Board direction, there are only three major core sources of funding eligible for Highway 25 Widening: 1) Traffic Impact Mitigation Fees, 2) State Transportation Improvement Program, and 3) Regional Surface Transportation Program. These funding sources are further detailed below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The COG Board, Hollister City Council, and County Board of Supervisors removed the largest funding source for any Highway 25 Widening in 2011 when they approved the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study without the Highway 25 Widening project on the list. This document is available on the Council of Governments website at: <a href="http://www.sanbenitocog.org">www.sanbenitocog.org</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The COG Board has advanced over $6 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for the Highway 156 Project since 2008. Returning to a $0 balance will likely take 4-6 years. Additionally, future STIP funding does not raise enough to pay for the deficiency share of the Highway 25 Widening Project. The Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study shows an existing deficiency on Highway 25 which could not be paid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The COG Board in August 2013 provided direction to COG staff to prioritize local streets and roads maintenance in the Sustainable Communities Strategy and San Benito RTP. This action directed Regional Surface Transportation Program funding to local streets and roads maintenance and repair needs rather than for funding the Highway 25 Widening Phase I or II projects. The Hybrid Scenarios project list was presented to the San Benito COG Board and action was taken at the meeting to direct staff to prioritize local streets and roads maintenance. The list represented the constrained projects for inclusion in the Draft Regional Transportation Plan and Draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The Board of Directors accepted the project list presented at the meeting as a handout.

While funding is not identified in the Regional Transportation Plan for fiscal constraint reasons, the Highway 25 corridor is still important. San Benito COG will work with the Federal Highway Administration and Caltrans to grant an extension to complete the environmental document. If the Federal Highway Administration grants an extension on completing the environmental document, the project team will work on the project design, environmental, funding and schedule over the next several years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for through the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee program by new development per state law. Government Code Section 66001(g) states “A fee shall not include the costs attributable to existing deficiencies in public facilities, but may include the costs attributable to the increased demand for public facilities reasonably related to the development project in order to (1) refurbish existing facilities to maintain the existing level of service or (2) achieve an adopted level of service that is consistent with the general plan.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 1-3, First Paragraph. In discussing transportation funding, this section states that there are “<em>constraints imposed by laws and guidelines which prevent optimizing transportation dollars</em>...” A discussion of the institutional barriers and limitations is appropriate as it relates to San Benito COG policies.</td>
<td>Additional explanatory text has been added to Chapter 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Page 3-1, Federal and State Planning Goals. Regional plans are guided by the goals, policies, and performance measures consistent with the State’s long-range plans; along this line we recommend references to California Transportation Plan (CTP) in Draft RTP. Suggested wording to introduce the CTP 2040 may include:  

*The California Transportation Plan (CTP 2040) is a state-level transportation plan that combines statewide transportation goals with regional transportation and land use plans to produce a unified multimodal transportation strategy. The CTP defines performance-based goals, policies, and strategies to achieve a collective vision and recommendations for California’s future, statewide, integrated, multimodal transportation system over the next 25 years.*  

Also, adding references to the Caltrans five modal plans—California Aviation System Plan, California Freight Mobility Plan, California State Rail Plan, Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan, and California Statewide Transit Strategic Plan can also add context to this section.  

Generally speaking, along with the goals listed throughout the document, a vision statement can complement policy approaches. Potential language could include:  

*The San Benito County Regional Transportation Plan calls for a safe, sustainable, globally competitive multimodal* | The suggested text has been added to Chapter 3. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A transportation system that provides reliable and efficient mobility and accessibility of people, goods and services. | |}

| Relationship to CTP Goals (various). The Draft RTP references five of the six CTP 2040 goals—access and mobility, safety and health, environmental stewardship, social equity, and economic benefit (Page 1-1). Another very important goal to consider adding is "Preserving the Multimodal Transportation System." This will likewise be a major goal of the CTP 2040. | Comment noted. The Regional Transportation Plan includes the goal of "System Preservation and Safety". The Council of Governments commitment to system repair and maintenance is reflected in investments identified in the action plan. |

| It was clearly demonstrated from the results of the voting survey that San Benito County residents agreed the most pressing transportation need, according to survey respondents, was repairing and maintaining local streets and roads (Page 8-5). This is consistent with the California State Transportation Agency's infrastructure report which strongly recommends California implements the state’s “fix it first” approach to the highway system. California is ranked 48th in the nation in terms of highway conditions, with more than half of the highway lanes either in distressed condition or in need of preventive maintenance. Poor roadway conditions are not only costly to motorists but affect the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians. Maintaining the highway system has a 10 to 1 return on investment over delayed rehabilitation replacement. | |

| Page 3-3, Figure 3 Policy Objectives. Additional details for these policy statements should be provided, including the methodology used for developing and any significant changes from previous versions. In addition, this element should include objectives that link to both long and short-term goals and horizons. The RTP Checklist (Appendix H) states that this is not applicable, but is actually a requirement of California Government Code Section 65080. | Additional explanatory text has been added to Chapter 3. |

<p>| Page 3-4, Social Equity. The Draft RTP seems to be missing key demographic information that would allow the reader to ascertain the prevalence, makeup, and location of its | Additional explanatory text has been added to Chapter 3. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disadvantaged populations. This data is needed to support the social equity goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4-4, Bicycle and Pedestrian (Active Transportation). The second bullet in this section refers to the Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA). Please note that the BTA was replaced by the Active Transportation Program (ATP) on September 26, 2013, when Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 99, Chapter 359, and Assembly Bill (AB) 101, Chapter 354. The ATP consolidates existing federal and state transportation programs, including the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), and State Safe Routes to School (SR2S), into a single program. Reference to ATP should also be updated in section starting on Page 4-17, Active Transportation in Action.</td>
<td>The text in Chapter 4 has been modified to reflect this change to the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4-9, Highway 25 Widening. Please change last sentence of paragraph (Page 4-9) to read, &quot;This project is intended to add capacity along the corridor.&quot;</td>
<td>The suggested text has been added to Chapter 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4-10, State Route 146. Please change reference from a 'rural road' to a 'two-lane conventional highway.'</td>
<td>The suggested text has been added to Chapter 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4-10, State Route 156. Please consider revising the statement in the second paragraph, &quot;As such, the route has a high priority for completion to facility standards in order to assure a statewide truck system that can handle higher volumes of interregional trip movements.&quot; We recommend, &quot;As such, the route has a high priority for completion to facility standards in order to handle higher volumes of interregional trip movements and connect all urban areas, goods movement gateways, and rural areas.&quot;</td>
<td>The suggested text has been added to Chapter 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4-11, first paragraph. Please add the following changes the last sentence to read, &quot;Once constructed, the existing State Route 156 will become a county road and will serve as access for residents living on the north side and a bicycle and pedestrian multi-use path connecting bicyclists traveling between Hollister and San Juan Bautista.</td>
<td>The suggested text has been added to Chapter 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 4-11, Goods Movement. It would be beneficial to include a map of the</td>
<td>The suggested map has been added to Chapter 4. Additional text has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regions’ highly impacted freight and goods movement routes. Further</td>
<td>added to Chapter 4 relating to freight and goods movement routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion on the two categories as it relates to project prioritization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be helpful as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4-22, Transportation System Management. Please add &quot;weigh-in-motion&quot;</td>
<td>The suggested text has been added to Chapter 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;at-speed&quot; truck scales in the first paragraph of Page 4-22. Also,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please remove the word &quot;recently&quot; from the first sentence of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second paragraph referencing the implementation of the Corridor System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4-25, Aviation Services. The fourth paragraph, second sentence</td>
<td>The suggested change has been made to Chapter 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reads, &quot;Some land uses are more susceptible to the effects of airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development; as such, an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was prepared for Hollister Municipal Airport and Frazier Lake Airpark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This sentence does not accurately portray an ALUCP. An ALUCP is not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an effect of land uses; it is a plan that is used as a guideline in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an effort to prevent incompatible land uses around airports. We</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommend this sentence be changed to add more explanation of an ALUCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4-26, first paragraph, last sentence, states that there are 112</td>
<td>The number of aircraft based at the Hollister Municipal Airport has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aircraft currently based at the Hollister Municipal Airport. The chart</td>
<td>modified to reflect the California Aviation Systems Plan, Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below was excerpted from a database in the California Aviation</td>
<td>Element, database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Plan, Inventory Element, which is posted on the Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Aeronautics website. References to aircraft figures are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not consistent with Draft RTP figures. Please advise us if there are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes needed to our data base. The numbers below were reported by the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Municipal Airport Manager or representative when surveyed in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Based Aircraft:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>91 Glider 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>5 Military 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet</td>
<td>4 Ultralight 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Based Aircraft:</strong> 167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 5-5, Intelligent Transportation Systems. Additional information to clarify the role San Benito COG has regarding ITS would be appropriate.</td>
<td>Additional explanatory text has been added to Chapter 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 5-5, Figure 6-4. It appears that three areas (Active Transportation, Transportation Demand Management, and Aviation) are disproportionately affected by a lack of funding availability. This table indicates four areas that are funded at over 50% of their projected need, but the three aforementioned areas are scheduled to receive less than 25% of the funding needed to carry out the plan, including two that are funded less than 10% of their projected need. Those three areas constitute 12% of the projected need, but represent 27.6% of the unfunded needs in the region. Please explain this disparity, particularly considering that many of the Draft RTP stated goals appear to prioritize these categories.</td>
<td>Figure 6-4 has been updated. Only a small percentage of funding identified in the Regional Transportation Plan is flexible and the Council of Governments Board in August 2013 voted to prioritize system preservation. Programs available through State and federal governments preclude broad discretion for flexible use across funding programs. In general, transit funding is limited to transit projects and programs and cannot be used for bicycle lanes or aviation projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7, Climate Change. The Draft RTP recognizes concerns that less rainfall has for the long-term planning of the region. We encourage further discussion how extreme weather events impacts agriculture and the related industries.</td>
<td>Additional explanatory text has been added to Chapter 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7, Legislative References. There is no specific reference to SB 391, although GHG emission reduction goals AB 32 and SB 375 are referenced throughout the RTP. A summary of SB 391 could enhance the context of this section. SB 375 addresses the regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the transportation sector and SB 391 addresses the statewide GHG emissions from the transportation sector of AB 32. The following is an example of potential language to include: SB 391, 2009, requires the California Department of Transportation to prepare the California Transportation Plan (CTP), the long-range transportation plan, by December 2015, to reduce GHG emissions. This system must reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels from current levels by 2020, and 80 percent below the 1990 levels by 2050, as described by AB 32 and Executive Order 5-03-05. The upcoming CTP 2040 will</td>
<td>Additional explanatory text has been added to Chapter 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>demonstrate how major metropolitan areas, rural areas, and state agencies can coordinate planning efforts to achieve critical statewide goals.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When asked about protecting the environment in the MetroQuest survey, the results showed that voters were not as concerned about air pollution as an environmental issue (Pages 8-6). The Draft RTP could be a good medium to inform San Benito County residents of these issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other potential language could include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The California Interregional Strategic Plan states, “It is widely accepted that carbon dioxide forms approximately 84 percent of all GHG emissions; this is true in California as in the rest of the world. The impacts from a change in global climate can be felt throughout the region. California has adopted the public policy position that global climate change is ‘a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California.’”</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 7-9, Figure 7-8 Performance Targets. We recommend that the “Targets” and “Performance Measures” columns be reversed in the table. As written, the ‘pragmatic objective and policy statements’ as required by Government Code Section 65080 are not met.</td>
<td>The suggested revision has been made to Figure 7-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C – Please consider including expected dates of completion in the project list. Without project dates, gauging the “year of expenditure” for cost purposes is not possible. Providing the project completion dates will also better establish project priorities for the life of the plan.</td>
<td>The suggested addition has been made to Appendix C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix H, RTP Checklist. In addition to Chapters, please incorporate specific page numbers as reference as well.</td>
<td>The suggested addition has been made to Appendix H.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councilmember Victor Gomez, Chairman
Council of San Benito County Governments
330 Tres Pinos Road, Suite C7
Hollister, CA 95023

Re: AMBAG DRAFT METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP) & SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY (SCS)

March 19, 2014

Dear Chairman Gomez,

Thank you very much for COG’s consideration of ensuring that local and regional planning organizations utilize the best available, realistic data, processes and community engagement efforts to ensure that all organizations adopt a better basis for planning that is both consistent with local directives as well as recognizes that we need to sustain and foster significant investment to be economically viable and sustainable as a community.

In your consideration of population growth, the AMBAG MTP and SCS must be consistent with other plans prepared by local, state and federal agencies and reflective of the dramatic economic recovery being experienced in neighboring regions, especially our immediate neighbor to the north, Santa Clara County. Since June 23, 2009 (nearly 5 years) all analyses of the County General Plan have been based on AMBAG’s 2008 population forecast of 94,731 by 2035 based on numerous factors explained below. AMBAG’s current growth forecasts of 81,000 population by 2035 for their MTP/SCS are too low and are inconsistent with County Board of Supervisors direction (June 23, 2009 and July 24, 2012) and growth factors available to AMBAG since 2009. For example, AMBAG has given insufficient consideration of the end of the Hollister sewer moratorium, elimination of growth control measures, a substantial uptick in the activity of private investment, current and active general plans in all jurisdictions especially in Hollister and San Benito County encouraging residential, commercial and industrial retention and expansion.

We ask that COG, this Thursday, adopt Agenda item number 8, the growth forecast, scenario number 4, and that AMBAG be requested to adopt that forecast for its MTP/SCS.

The San Benito County Business Council further asks that you encourage the COG board to release a SBC RTP consistent with these growth projections and direct the RTP ad hoc committee to continue its work with AMBAG, Caltrans and the Federal Department of Transportation’s Highway Administration Highway to extend the timeline for consideration of a final EIR and adoption of the MTP and SCS that allows proper engagement with the San Benito County community and agencies and for full consideration of transportation funding. The overly aggressive timelines and current processes have simply not provided adequate time for our undercompensated elected officials and understaffed agencies to review and analyze the sheer volume of information contained in those plans as well as our own regional transportation plan. Finally, as reflected in the low participation rate of San Benito County residents in AMBAG workshops, the public participation plan and process is inadequate and insufficient to reach our diverse and commute-reliant population.

As reflected in our comments on the County General Plan update, our comments and suggestions on this matter are intended to strike a balance between the need to sustain and protect important resources, which we support, with the need to permit the County to thrive, expand and enhance the community job base, improve the economic climate, support a superior quality of life and actively contribute to the well-being of the communities of San Benito County.

Sincere regards,
Larry Barr
President

CC: COG board of directors, COG staff, AMBAG
March 21, 2014

Victor Gomez, Chairperson
Council of San Benito County Governments
330 Tres Pinos Road, Suite C7
Hollister, CA 95023

Dear Chair Gomez:

This letter is provided in a spirit of partnership and cooperation for the continued success of the Council of San Benito County Governments (San Benito COG) as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency addressing important transportation needs throughout the county.

The action by the San Benito COG Board of Directors at its March 20, 2014 meeting directed staff to use a recently updated version of the 2010 San Benito County Traffic Model. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) cannot support this decision. Because the county model is not consistent with the federally recognized Regional Travel Demand Model maintained by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), it will not be acceptable for state and federal transportation planning purposes. To remain eligible for state and federal funds for both planning activities and programming of capital improvements countywide, the San Benito COG must build upon the foundation provided by the AMBAG model. This is also fundamental for validity of the Regional Transportation Plan.

I encourage San Benito COG to continue working in partnership with AMBAG for appropriate use of the Regional Travel Demand Model to meet the goals of San Benito County. Please contact me if you would like to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

AILEEN K. LOE
Deputy District Director

cc Lisa Rheinheimer, Executive Director
    Maura Twomey, Executive Director AMBAG

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
April 14, 2014

Ms. Mary Gilbert
Transportation Planning Manager
San Benito Council of Governments
330 Tres Pinos Road, Suite C7
Hollister, CA 95023

Re: 2014 Draft Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Ms. Gilbert:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the San Benito County Draft Regional Transportation Plan. The San Benito Council of Governments' (SBCOG) Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) includes important goals for economic vitality, access and mobility, social equity, and promoting an integrated multimodal transit network and healthy communities. These same principles are shared by the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) and would be supported by the implementation of California's high-speed rail system.

The construction and operation of the high-speed rail project is a reasonably foreseeable project in close proximity of the SBCOG planning area, and within the planning horizon of the proposed RTP. The Authority suggests that SBCOG consider the adopted planning and environmental documents for the high-speed rail project, both the effects of its construction and its operation, in its evaluation of the cumulative impacts from implementation of the proposed RTP. The documents that may be used to describe the project include but are not limited to the following:

- Draft 2014 Business Plan (anticipated to be adopted in May 2014);
- Statewide Final Program EIR/EIS (adopted by the Board of Directors on November 2, 2005; Record of Decision received from Federal Railroad Administration on November 18, 2005).

These documents are available on the Authority’s website: www.hsr.ca.gov.

The Authority encourages the SBCOG to prioritize transit connectivity and to work with local transit providers, especially intercounty service between Santa Clara County and San Benito County by San Benito County Express, to plan for transit connections to and from a future high-speed rail station in Gilroy.

The Authority is available to assist in the refinement of the proposed RTP for analysis or the development of alternatives regarding transit connectivity to reduce environmental impacts.

100 Paseo de San Antonio, San Jose, CA 95113 • www.hsr.ca.gov
If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (408) 447-5631 or ben.tripousis@hsr.ca.gov or Ricci Graham, Information Officer at (408) 227-1086 or ricci.graham@hsr.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Ben Tripousis
Northern California Regional Director
High-Speed Rail Authority

Mark McLaughlin
Director of Environmental Services
High-Speed Rail Authority

cc: Barbara Gilliland, Director of Planning, Parsons Brinckerhoff
    Brian Porter, Senior Environmental Planning Manager, Parsons Brinckerhoff
    Caltrans District 5 Planning
JOHN W. EADE
4760 Santa Ana Valley Road
Hollister, CA 95023
johneade@garlic.com

April 21, 2014

Lisa Rheinheimer
Executive Director
San Benito Council of Governments
330 Tres Pinos Road, Suite C7
Hollister, California 95023

SUBJECT: Comments regarding 2035 San Benito Regional Transportation Plan approved for public release by the San Benito COG Board on March 20, 2014

Dear Ms. Rheinheimer:

I am writing to provide comments on the draft 2035 San Benito Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). I believe that it is essential for the 2035 San Benito RTP to include the SR 25 Widening project, that was described in the March 20 draft RTP which RTP represents a major improvement over the February 20, 2014 San Benito RTP that was initially proposed by COG staff.

The February 20 draft RTP mentioned the SR 25 Widening project and even put it on an illustration, but clearly mislead the public into thinking that the SR 25 widening project would be a funded part of the 2035 San Benito RTP. You, of course knew that the February 20 draft RTP lacked a separate list for Constrained and Unconstrained Projects, leaving it unclear to the general public which projects, making it certain that Caltrans could actually not approve the proposed RTP, much less ever widen SR 25. You also knew but buried the fact that the SR 25 widening project was also omitted from the AMBAG 2035 MTP/SCS and the EIR for the AMBAG 2035 MTP/SCS. These projects could clearly never be built in San Benito County within the next 25 years.

The COG Board needs to work with AMBAG to make sure that this project also appears in the AMBAG 2035 MTP/SCS and its EIR.

As you well know the SR 25 Widening project was included as a constrained project in 2005 and 2010 San Benito RTPs. The project also appeared in the AMBAG MTP/EIR project lists for those years. Since that time, the COG Board has never voted to take the SR 25 Widening project off the RTP list. It is unconscionable that the COG staff decided unilaterally to take the SR 25 Widening project off the RTP list of funded projects and therefore ensure that the SR 25 Widening project is not going to expeditiously move forward for another 10 years or more. You cannot operate in the haphazard reckless manner you have in the past few months without inviting certain legal consequences.

Please do all you can to help us “Keep 25 Alive” in San Benito County so that we can plan and implement the infrastructure necessary to improve the economic viability of the County.

Sincerely,

John W. Eade

CC COG Board of Directors
May 22, 2014

Lisa Rheinheimer  
Executive Director  
San Benito County Council of Governments  
330 Tres Pinos Road, Suite C7  
Hollister, CA 95023

Dear Ms. Rheinheimer:

COMMENTS TO 2035 SAN BENITO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the San Benito County Draft Regional Transportation Plan. We value our partnership and look forward to continuing to work with you to improve the mobility on all users of the transportation network in San Benito County.

Attached you will find specific comments that when incorporated we believe can further enhance the document. If you have any questions, or need further clarification on items attached, please don’t hesitate to contact me at (805) 549-3970.

Sincerely,

Brandy Rider  
Planning Branch Chief, North

Attachment

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Attachment

San Benito County Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Comments by California Department of Transpiration (Caltrans)

1. Page 1-3, First Paragraph. In discussing transportation funding, this section states that there are “constraints imposed by laws and guidelines which prevent optimizing transportation dollars...” A discussion of the institutional barriers and limitations is appropriate as it relates to San Benito COG policies.

2. Page 3-1, Federal and State Planning Goals. Regional plans are guided by the goals, policies, and performance measures consistent with the State’s long-range plans; along this line we recommend references to California Transportation Plan (CTP) in Draft RTP. Suggested wording to introduce the CTP 2040 may include:

The California Transportation Plan (CTP 2040) is a state-level transportation plan that combines statewide transportation goals with regional transportation and land use plans to produce a unified multimodal transportation strategy. The CTP defines performance-based goals, policies, and strategies to achieve a collective vision and recommendations for California’s future, statewide, integrated, multimodal transportation system over the next 25 years.

Also, adding references to the Caltrans five modal plans—California Aviation System Plan, California Freight Mobility Plan, California State Rail Plan, Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan, and California Statewide Transit Strategic Plan can also add context to this section.

Generally speaking, along with the goals listed throughout the document, a vision statement can complement policy approaches. Potential language could include: The San Benito County Regional Transportation Plan calls for a safe, sustainable, globally competitive multimodal transportation system that provides reliable and efficient mobility and accessibility of people, goods and services.

3. Relationship to CTP Goals (various). The Draft RTP references five of the six CTP 2040 goals—access and mobility, safety and health, environmental stewardship, social equity, and economic benefit (Page 1-1). Another very important goal to consider adding is “Preserving the Multimodal Transportation System.” This will likewise be a major goal of the CTP 2040.

It was clearly demonstrated from the results of the voting survey that San Benito County residents agreed the most pressing transportation need, according to survey respondents, was repairing and maintaining local streets and roads (Page 8-5). This is consistent with the California State Transportation Agency’s infrastructure report which strongly
recommends California implements the state's "fix it first!" approach to the highway system. California is ranked 48th in the nation in terms of highway conditions, with more than half of the highway lanes either in distressed condition or in need of preventive maintenance. Poor roadway conditions are not only costly to motorists but affect the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians. Maintaining the highway system has a 10 to 1 return on investment over delayed rehabilitation replacement.

4. Page 3-3, Figure 3 Policy Objectives. Additional details for these policy statements should be provided, including the methodology used for developing and any significant changes from previous versions. In addition, this element should include objectives that link to both long and short-term goals and horizons. The RTP Checklist (Appendix H) states that this is not applicable, but is actually a requirement of California Government Code Section 65080.

5. Page 3-4, Social Equity. The Draft RTP seems to be missing key demographic information that would allow the reader to ascertain the prevalence, makeup, and location of its disadvantaged populations. This data is needed to support the social equity goals.

6. Page 4-4, Bicycle and Pedestrian (Active Transportation). The second bullet in this section refers to the Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA). Please note that the BTA was replaced by the Active Transportation Program (ATP) on September 26, 2013, when Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 99, Chapter 359, and Assembly Bill (AB) 101, Chapter 354. The ATP consolidates existing federal and state transportation programs, including the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), and State Safe Routes to School (SR2S), into a single program. Reference to ATP should also be updated in section starting on Page 4-17, Active Transportation in Action.

7. Page 4-9, Highway 25 Widening. Please change last sentence of paragraph (Page 4-9) to read, "This project is intended to add capacity along the corridor."

8. Page 4-10, State Route 146. Please change reference from a 'rural road' to a 'two-lane conventional highway.'

9. Page 4-10, State Route 156. Please consider revising the statement in the second paragraph, "As such, the route has a high priority for completion to facility standards in order to assure a statewide truck system that can handle higher volumes of interregional trip movements." We recommend, "As such, the route has a high priority for completion to facility standards in order to handle higher volumes of interregional trip movements and connect all urban areas, goods movement gateways, and rural areas."
Page 4-11, first paragraph. Please add the following changes the last sentence to read, “Once constructed, the existing State Route 156 will become a county road and will serve as access for residents living on the north side and a bicycle and pedestrian multi-use path connecting bicyclists traveling between Hollister and San Juan Bautista.

10. Page 4-11, Goods Movement. It would be beneficial to include a map of the regions’ highly impacted freight and goods movement routes. Further discussion on the two categories as it relates to project prioritization would be helpful as well.

11. Page 4-22, Transportation System Management. Please add "weigh-in-motion" after "at-speed" truck scales in the first paragraph of Page 4-22. Also, please remove the word "recently" from the first sentence of the second paragraph referencing the implementation of the Corridor System Management Plans.

12. Page 4-25, Aviation Services. The fourth paragraph, second sentence reads, "Some land uses are more susceptible to the effects of airport development; as such, an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) was prepared for Hollister Municipal Airport and Frazier Lake Airpark." This sentence does not accurately portray an ALUCP. An ALUCP is not an effect of land uses; it is a plan that is used as a guideline in an effort to prevent incompatible land uses around airports. We recommend this sentence be changed to add more explanation of an ALUCP.

13. Page 4-26, first paragraph, last sentence, states that there are 112 aircraft currently based at the Hollister Municipal Airport. The chart below was excerpted from a database in the California Aviation Systems Plan, Inventory Element, which is posted on the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics website. References to aircraft figures are not consistent with Draft RTP figures. Please advise us if there are changes needed to our data base. The numbers below were reported by the Hollister Municipal Airport Manager or representative when surveyed in 2012-13.

Based Aircraft:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glider</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultralight</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Based Aircraft</strong></td>
<td><strong>167</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Page 5-5, Intelligent Transportation Systems. Additional information to clarify the role San Benito COG has regarding ITS would be appropriate.

15. Page 5-5, Figure 6-4. It appears that three areas (Active Transportation, Transportation Demand Management, and Aviation) are disproportionately affected by a lack of funding availability. This table indicates four areas that are funded at over 50% of their projected need, but the three aforementioned areas are scheduled to receive less than 25% of the funding needed to carry out the plan, including two that are funded less than 10% of their projected need. Those three areas constitute 12% of the projected need, but represent 27.6% of the unfunded needs in the region. Please explain this disparity, particularly considering that many of the Draft RTP stated goals appear to prioritize these categories.

16. Chapter 7, Climate Change. The Draft RTP recognizes concerns that less rainfall has for the long-term planning of the region. We encourage further discussion how extreme weather events impacts agriculture and the related industries.

17. Chapter 7, Legislative References. There is no specific reference to SB 391, although GHG emission reduction goals AB 32 and SB 375 are referenced throughout the RTP. A summary of SB 391 could enhance the context of this section. SB 375 addresses the regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the transportation sector and SB 391 addresses the statewide GHG emissions from the transportation sector of AB 32. The following is an example of potential language to include:

SB 391, 2009, requires the California Department of Transportation to prepare the California Transportation Plan (CTP), the long-range transportation plan, by December 2015, to reduce GHG emissions. This system must reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels from current levels by 2020, and 80 percent below the 1990 levels by 2050, as described by AB 32 and Executive Order S-03-05. The upcoming CTP 2040 will demonstrate how major metropolitan areas, rural areas, and state agencies can coordinate planning efforts to achieve critical statewide goals.

When asked about protecting the environment in the MetroQuest survey, the results showed that voters were not as concerned about air pollution as an environmental issue (Pages 8-6). The Draft RTP could be a good medium to inform San Benito County residents of these issues.

Other potential language could include:

The California Interregional Strategic Plan states, “It is widely accepted that carbon dioxide forms approximately 84 percent of all GHG emissions; this is true in California as in the rest of the world. The impacts from a change in global climate can be felt throughout the region. California has adopted the public policy position that global
climate change is 'a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California.'”

18. Page 7-9, Figure 7-8 Performance Targets. We recommend that the “Targets” and “Performance Measures” columns be reversed in the table. As written, the ‘pragmatic objective and policy statements’ as required by Government Code Section 65080 are not met.

19. Appendix C – Please consider including expected dates of completion in the project list. Without project dates, gauging the “year of expenditure” for cost purposes is not possible. Providing the project completion dates will also better establish project priorities for the life of the plan.

20. Appendix H, RTP Checklist. In addition to Chapters, please incorporate specific page numbers as reference as well.
Appendix G  Regional Transportation Plan Checklist

Regional Transportation Plan Checklist
(Revised February 2010)

(To be completed electronically in Microsoft Word format by the MPO/RTPA and submitted along with the draft RTP to Caltrans)

Name of MPO/RTPA: Council of San Benito County Governments

Date Draft RTP Completed: April 30, 2014

RTP Adoption Date: Anticipated June 19, 2014

What is the Certification Date of the Environmental Document (ED)? Anticipated June 19, 2014

Is the ED located in the RTP or is it a separate document? Yes, Appendix E

By completing this checklist, the MPO/RTPA verifies the RTP addresses all of the following required information within the RTP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN CONTENTS</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the RTP address no less than a 20-year planning horizon? (23 CFR 450.322(a))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the RTP include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions? (23 CFR part 450.322(b))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chapters 3,5,6,7, Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the RTP address issues specified in the policy, action and financial elements identified in California Government Code Section 65080?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chapters 3,5,6,7, Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the RTP address the 10 issues specified in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) component as identified in Government Code Sections 65080(b)(2)(B) and 65584.04(i)(1)? (MPOs only)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region? (MPOs only)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation and employment growth? (MPOs only)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN CONTENTS</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Page #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Government Code Section 65584? <strong>(MPOs only)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region? <strong>(MPOs only)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Government Code Section 65080.01? <strong>(MPOs only)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Consider the state housing goals specified in Sections 65580 and 65581? <strong>(MPOs only)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Utilize the most recent planning assumptions, considering local general plans and other factors? <strong>(MPOs only)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the ARB? <strong>(MPOs only)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Provide consistency between the development pattern and allocation of housing units within the region (Government Code 65584.04(i)(1))? <strong>(MPOs only)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Section 7506)? <strong>(MPOs only)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the RTP include Project Intent i.e. Plan Level Purpose and Need Statements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the RTP specify how travel demand modeling methodology, results and key assumptions were developed as part of the RTP process? **(Government Code 14522.2) <strong>(MPOs only)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation/Cooperation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the RTP contain a public involvement program that meets the requirements of Title 23, CFR part 450.316(a)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chapter 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did the MPO/RTPA consult with the appropriate State and local representatives including representatives from environmental and economic communities; airport; transit; freight during the preparation of the RTP? (23CFR450.316(3)(b))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did the MPO/RTPA who has federal lands within its jurisdictional boundary involve the federal land management agencies during the preparation of the RTP?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>D-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Where does the RTP specify that the appropriate State and local agencies responsible for land use, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation consulted? (23 CFR part 450.322(g))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did the RTP include a comparison with the California State Wildlife Action Plan and (if available) inventories of natural and historic resources? (23 CFR part 450.322(g))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Appendix E, 4.4-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did the MPO/RTPA who has a federally recognized Native American Tribal Government(s) and/or historical and sacred sites or subsistence resources of these Tribal Governments within its jurisdictional boundary address tribal concerns in the RTP and develop the RTP in consultation with the Tribal Government(s)? (Title 23 CFR part 450.316(c))</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the RTP address how the public and various specified groups were given a reasonable opportunity to comment on the plan using the participation plan developed under 23 CFR part 450.316(a)? (23 CFR 450.316(i))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does the RTP contain a discussion describing the private sector involvement efforts that were used during the development of the plan? (23 CFR part 450.316(a))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does the RTP contain a discussion describing the coordination efforts with regional air quality planning authorities? (23 CFR 450.316(a)(2)) (MPO nonattainment and maintenance areas only)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is the RTP coordinated and consistent with the Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Were the draft and adopted RTP posted on the Internet? (23 CFR part 450.322(j))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Did the RTP explain how consultation occurred with locally elected officials? (Government Code 65080(D)) (MPOs only)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Did the RTP outline the public participation process for the sustainable communities strategy? (Government Code 65080(E) (MPOs only)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Modal Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the RTP discuss intermodal and connectivity issues?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chapters 4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the RTP include a discussion of highways?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the RTP include a discussion of mass transportation?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the RTP include a discussion of the regional airport system?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the RTP include a discussion of regional pedestrian needs?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the RTP include a discussion of regional bicycle needs?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the RTP address the California Coastal Trail? (Government Code 65080.1) (For MPOs and RTPAs located along the coast only)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional Transportation Plan Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does the RTP include a discussion of rail transportation?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does the RTP include a discussion of maritime transportation (if appropriate)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the RTP include a discussion of goods movement?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programming/Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is a congestion management process discussed in the RTP? (23 CFR part 450.450.320(b)) <strong>(MPOs designated as TMAs only)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the RTP consistent (to the maximum extent practicable) with the development of the regional ITS architecture?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the RTP identify the objective criteria used for measuring the performance of the transportation system?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the RTP contain a list of un-constrained projects?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the RTP include a financial plan that meets the requirements identified in 23 CFR part 450.322(f)(10)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the RTP contain a consistency statement between the first 4 years of the fund estimate and the 4-year STIP fund estimate? (2006 STIP Guidelines, Section 19)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-1, 6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do the projected revenues in the RTP reflect Fiscal Constraint? (23 CFR part 450.322(f)(10)(iii))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the RTP contain a list of financially constrained projects? Any regionally significant projects should be identified. (Government Code 65080(4)(A))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do the cost estimates for implementing the projects identified in the RTP reflect &quot;year of expenditure dollars&quot; to reflect inflation rates? (23 CFR part 450.322(f)(10)(iv))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. After 12/11/07, does the RTP contain estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to operate and maintain the freeways, highway and transit within the region? (23 CFR 450.322(f)(10)(v))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chapter 6, Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the RTP contain a statement regarding consistency between the projects in the RTP and the ITIP? (2006 STIP Guidelines section 33)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does the RTP contain a statement regarding consistency between the projects in the RTP and the FTIP? (2006 STIP Guidelines section 19)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does the RTP address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the identified TCMs from the SIP can be implemented? (23 CFR part 450.322(f)(10)(vi) <strong>nonattainment and maintenance MPOs only</strong>)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1. Did the MPO/RTPA prepare an EIR or a program EIR for the RTP in accordance with CEQA guidelines?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Does the RTP contain a list of projects specifically identified as TCMs, if applicable?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Does the RTP contain a discussion of SIP conformity, if applicable? (MPOs only)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Does the RTP specify mitigation activities? (23 CFR part 450.322(f)(7))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Where does the EIR address mitigation activities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Did the MPO/RTPA prepare a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the RTP in accordance with CEQA guidelines?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Does the RTP specify the TCMs to be implemented in the region? (federal nonattainment and maintenance areas only)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have reviewed the above information and certify that it is correct and complete.

Lisa Rheinheimer  
Print Name

June 13, 2014  
Date

Executive Director  
Title
WHEREAS, the Council of San Benito County Governments is the State-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency for San Benito County; and

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 6580(d) requires that each RTPA adopt and submit an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the California Transportation Commission and the Department of Transportation every four years; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Transportation Plan has been prepared in accordance with California Transportation Commission (CTC) Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, pursuant to Government Code Section 14522; and

WHEREAS, COG held a duly noticed public hearing on May 29, 2014, at which hearing the COG heard and received all oral and written testimony and evidence that was made, presented, or filed, and all persons present at the hearing were given ample opportunity to hear and be heard with respect to the merits of the proposed RTP, pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(d); and

WHEREAS, from May 2012 through June 2014, through the conduct of a continuing, comprehensive, and coordinated transportation planning process in conformance with all applicable federal and state requirements, COG developed its latest RTP “On The Move: 2035 – San Benito Regional Transportation Plan”, with a 2035 horizon year; and

WHEREAS, the RTP contains an integrated set of public policies, strategies, and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the transportation system in San Benito County through the year 2035 and calls for development of an integrated intermodal transportation system that facilitates the efficient, economic movement of people and goods; and

WHEREAS, the required consultation with other agencies was conducted and adequate opportunity for public review and comment was provided, pursuant to State and federal law;

WHEREAS, the RTP was developed through a strategic, proactive, comprehensive public outreach and involvement program, which included: an adopted public participation plan; advertising in local and regional newspapers; distribution of public information materials; information on COG’s website; presentations to local community groups, and interagency coordination and involvement; and
WHEREAS, prior to reaching a decision regarding the RTP, the Council of San Benito County Governments Board of Directors reviewed the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), considered the environmental effects of the project, as shown in the EIR, and adopted COG Resolution No. 2014-06, adopting CEQA findings, a statement of overriding considerations and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program, in full compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Public Res. Code, §21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000 et seq.).

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY the Council of San Benito County Governments Board of Directors that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and incorporated by this reference; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of San Benito County Governments Board of Directors does hereby adopt, authorize, and approve the Final On The Move: 2035 – San Benito Regional Transportation Plan.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF SAN BENITO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS THIS 19TH DAY OF JUNE, 2014 BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: Director(s)
NOES: Director(s)
ABSENT: Director(s)
ABSTAIN: Director(s)

By: ____________________________
Victor Gomez, Chair

ATTEST:
Lisa Rheinheimer, Executive Director

By: ____________________________

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM
San Benito County Counsel’s Office

By: ____________________________
Shirley L. Murphy, Deputy County Counsel
Date: June 13, 2014
Staff Report

To: Council of San Benito County Governments
From: Lisa Rheinheimer, Executive Director
Date: June 19, 2014
Subject: Highway 25 Widening Project

Recommendation:

APPROVE Caltrans Proposed Cost and Schedule to Complete the Highway 25 Route Adoption Environmental Document.

Summary:

In order to conclude with the Highway 25 Route Adoption environmental document, Caltrans is seeking funding approval from the Council of Governments. At this point, a request for an extension from Federal Highway Administration has been made as a first step in moving this project forward. Additionally, Caltrans has proposed a cost and schedule to ensure that the project can meet an extension deadline.

Financial Impact:

There are several financial impacts regarding the Highway 25 Widening Project and Route Adoption. COG staff time spent on this project is paid through Planning, Programming, and Monitoring and/or Rural Planning Assistance funds distributed by the State.

The environmental document was paid with Federal Highway Administration and Valley Transportation Authority funding in the amount of $6.8 million. There is a need for $365,000 of additional funding to conclude work associated with the environmental document and route adoption. Part of the recommended action for consideration by the COG Board is to review and approve a cost and schedule for Caltrans to complete the environmental document. A potential funding source to pay for this work is from monies in the Highway 25 Safety project account. There is a $750,000 balance in the account.

The most pressing financial challenge is paying for the Highway 25 Project right-of-way and construction phases. Caltrans has identified a cost of over $60 million to complete Phase I from San Felipe Road to Hudner Lane. Alternative designs may cost less but were not considered as a part of CEQA and the public review process nor by the COG Board.

Both regional development impact fees and public investment must be made in order to pay for the project. New developments are not responsible for existing deficiencies (eg congestion) (Government Code 66000). The Council of Governments is contemplating an update of the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study and will analyze the Highway 25 Widening project for future funding.
The 2011 Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee identified an existing deficiency on the Highway 25 Passing Lanes project of 52.6 percent. Based on Caltrans estimated project costs for Phase I, new development would be responsible for $29 million. The remaining project cost, $32 million must come from a public source.

As a part of updating the Traffic Mitigation Impact Fee study, COG staff and the consultant team will review these assumptions, projects and costs and provide that information to the Board.

The Council of Governments received a presentation on the outlook of transportation monies potentially available for this project at its May 2014 meeting including State Transportation Improvement Program, Regional Surface Transportation Program, and a potential sales tax measure.

Background:

The Council of Governments has reaffirmed its commitment to Highway 25 on several occasions by way of resolutions. The Highway 25 Widening project has been on the list of project in the Regional Transportation Plan for many years. This support does not diminish simply because the funding is not available at this time.

In 2010, the COG Board selected Route Adoption 2 and Build Alternative B as the project to move forward.

The COG Board took three important actions which resulted in the project moving from the constrained list to the unconstrained list of projects in the 2014 San Benito Regional Transportation Plan:

1. In 2011, the COG Board, City of Hollister and County removed the Highway 25 Widening project from the list of funded projects in the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study.
2. In February 2013, the COG Board directed staff to only consider the core funding programs in existence today in projecting potential funding for transportation projects in the Regional Transportation Plan.
3. In August 2013, the Board selected system preservation as a priority for transportation projects to be included in the Hybrid Scenarios discussion of the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

As a result of the January 2014 COG Board action on the Highway 25 Widening project, there have been many discussions amongst COG staff, Caltrans, and FHWA. A COG ad-hoc committee, Caltrans, and Parsons Transportation Group also met to discuss an alternative design idea.

Discussion:

In order to move this project forward, an extension to complete the environmental document must be obtained from the Federal Highway Administration. If the Federal Highway Administration approves the extension request, there will be many more items of work to be completed.

The attached a schedule (Attachment 1) will help keep the project on track while providing time for continued conversations about the design, funding, corridor needs, etc…
Caltrans prepared a range of options for consideration in concluding the environmental document (Attachment 2). Caltrans staff will be available at the COG meeting to answer questions and further explain the next steps.

Executive Director Review: ____________________  Counsel Review: ____ N/A ____

Supporting Attachment(s):
1. Schedule
2. Options Comparison Table
05-485400
ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE
Option 4,
TIER I- Route Adoption (Assumes Alignment 2),
TIER II (Build Alternative) - No Longer Proposed

- FHWA approves Time Extension 6/30/14
- Cooperative Agreement signed 7/31/14
- FED written, studies updated as needed, all Reviews complete on FED 7/17/15
- Federal Register Notice of Availability & Newspaper Notice 9/17/15
- EIR distribution 9/30/15
- EIS 30 day circulation completed 1/17/15
- Response letters to commenting agencies 12/1/15
- FINDINGS, ROD publication 12/30/15
- Project Report signing 2/17/16
- Freeway Agreement / Route Adoption mapping / agreements 3/17/16
- Agendized on CTC calendar before 4/17/16
- CTC Route Adoption June 2016
- Time Extension DEADLINE 7/17/2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Scenario/Approach</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Schedule (begins once Coop agreement is signed)</th>
<th>E-76 extension new deadline 7/17/16 to reach next milestone</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
<th>Viability (least disadvantages)</th>
<th>PA&amp;ED Support Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 4</strong></td>
<td>TIER I- Route Adoption (Alternative 2) TIER II- no longer fundable, no longer proposed</td>
<td>Update studies as needed Final Environmental Document &amp; Project Report (ED &amp; PR) CTC adoption</td>
<td>18 months - Env. compliance (8/17/14 to 3/17/16) CTC approval of Route Adoption before 7/17/2016 deadline</td>
<td>Meet deadline. Avoids paying back $4.6 million</td>
<td>Pick up with new TIER II project when funds are available</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td>TIER I- No Action TIER II- No Build</td>
<td>Final Environmental Document &amp; Project Report CTC Adoption</td>
<td>12 months-Env. Compliance</td>
<td>Meet deadline. Avoids paying back $4.6 million</td>
<td>Possibly need to move forward in the future with STATE/local funds only</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td>TIER I- Route Adoption (Alignment 1) or modified New TIER II Build Alt. added - on existing</td>
<td>Develop new alternative New/Update old studies New/revised Draft ED Circulate DED/Hearing Respond to comments Final ED &amp; PR CTC adoption PS&amp;E/permits R/W construction</td>
<td>24-36 months + Env compliance alone Will not be ready to move to next phase before 7/17/16</td>
<td>Miss deadline Need to pay back $4.6 million if new deadline is 7/17/16</td>
<td>Secure Private Funds for new Build Alt. Build it</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HOLLISTER TO GILROY STATE ROUTE 25 WIDENING AND ROUTE ADOPTION - OPTIONS COMPARISON TABLE- 05-484500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Tier 1 - Route Adoption (Alternative 2)</th>
<th>Cannot move forward. Caltrans has NEPA designation and without funding source, Tier II component is fatal flaw</th>
<th>May not receive approval of document since no funding source for build alternative</th>
<th>Miss deadline Need to pay back $4.6 million if new deadline is 7/17/16</th>
<th>Not viable</th>
<th>Not Viable. Cannot accomplish within timeline. No funding source - No Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tier II - Build (Alternative B) (No Changes to current document)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PA&ED – Project Approval & Environmental Document**  
**Note:** This table assumes a 3 year time extension by FHWA 06/12/14
Staff Report

To: Council of San Benito County Governments
From: Mary Gilbert, Transportation Planning Manager
Date: June 19, 2014
Subject: Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Study Update

Recommendation:

a. RECEIVE Information about Timing of the San Benito County General Plan Update;

b. SELECT an Option to Hire a Consulting Firm to Update the Study; and

c. CONSIDER Appointment of COG Director to Interview Consultants to Update the San Benito County Transportation Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study

Summary:

The Council of Governments has prepared a traffic impact fee study for the City of Hollister and San Benito County since the mid-1990s, on a 4-5 year update schedule. The last comprehensive update was completed in 2011. Given new conditions in 2014, COG staff is proposing that the study be updated. Staff will pursue a contract with a consultant to complete the work.

This item was continued at the Board’s direction at the May 15 Board meeting.

Financial Considerations:

The budget for the last update to the fee study was $100,000. Staff anticipates that a 2014 update will require a smaller budget of up to $90,000. Traditionally, the study update has been paid for with impact fees collected by the City of Hollister and San Benito County. In the past, the City of San Juan Bautista has not participated in the funding and development of the study.

Background:

Traffic impact mitigation fees are collected from retail, commercial, industrial, and residential developers as a requirement for a building permit. The primary objective of the program is to ensure that new development pays its fair share of the transportation costs associated with growth. Authority to impose fees is granted in the Mitigation Fee Act contained in California Government Code Sections 66000 et. seq. The fee study provides necessary findings required by the Act for adoption of the fees.
Staff Analysis:

The last report was prepared in 2010 and finalized in March 2011. The report was based on the 2008 growth forecast and traffic model developed by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. Since that time, several factors have changed:

- **New Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) Growth Forecast**: In 2012, AMBAG began developing a new population, employment and housing forecast for the region. The final growth forecast was adopted June 11, 2014. Because this forecast is used in development of the fee study, changes may impact the outcome of the study and possibly the fee structure.

- **AMBAG Model Improvement Plan Implementation**: Since 2011, AMBAG has embarked on a comprehensive improvement plan for the Regional Travel Demand Model. The Improvement Plan enhanced the data that the model uses to predict vehicular travel and use of the new model could enhance the identification of growth impacts on the transportation network. As part of this update effort, staff will request that AMBAG give a presentation to the COG Board detailing the assumptions and functions of the AMBAG model.

- **Changing Economic Climate**: The upswing in the economy has led to an increase in economic development and new construction activity. This upswing is expected to continue and the new economic climate will affect the development of a Nexus Study.

At the May meeting, the Board expressed concern regarding timing of the update and the San Benito County General Plan Update currently in progress. The County General Plan is being updated and new information included in the update may affect the assumptions and conclusions in the Nexus Study. County planning staff has indicated that the General Plan is scheduled to be before the Board of Supervisors for adoption in approximately six months. Because administrative and draft documents will likely be available sooner than that, staff feels it is reasonable to initiate the Nexus Study now and use drafts for development prior to the General Plan’s adoption.

Staff has also identified other considerations for implementation and administration of the Fee program. This includes the timing of identified projects and disbursement of collected fees.

The 2011 Study took approximately 12 months to complete. Staff anticipates that this update would take up to nine months. The update will require participation of staff from engineering and planning at each jurisdiction, as well as COG, through a technical working group.

As part of the fee study update, staff will bring regular reports to the Board on its development and ensure that the Board has the opportunity to vote on key decisions including the project list. A proposed timeline is included in Attachment 1. This timeline shows the relationship between the different components of the program development and key points when the Board will be involved with development. This schedule may change once a contract is approved.

At the May Board meeting, there was discussion among the Board to consider negotiating a contract with an On-Call Consultant from COG’s approved list of qualified on-call consulting firms to...
complete this type of work (Attachment 2). At the direction of the Board, COG staff would solicit cost, schedule, and staffing proposals from one or many of the firms on the list to complete a scope of work for the fee program update. Staff has attached a proposed scope of work for the Board’s review (Attachment 3).

A second option is to issue a Request for Proposals for the update: in previous years, COG staff has developed and released a Request for Proposals for the completion of the fee study. An RFP process will incur costs to COG in the form of staff time to develop the RFP, review proposals, and complete the consultant selection process. The total time required for this process would be approximately 3-4 months. The COG Board will have approval authority over the scope included in the RFP as well as approval of the final consultant contract.

To facilitate Board involvement in the consultant selection, staff is requesting that the Board appoint a representative to interview consultants prior to contract negotiation.

Executive Director Review: ____________ Counsel Review: _ N/ A ____________

Supporting Attachments:  
1. 2014-2015 Traffic Impact Fee Update Milestone Schedule
2. COG On-Call Consulting Firm List
3. Proposed Scope of Work for Fee Program Update
# 2014-2015 Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Update

## Milestone Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Consultant Solicitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| August | • Board Approves Contract  
          • Kickoff Meeting | Proposals Due |
| September | • Background Analysis & Assumptions | • Review Proposals  
          • Consultant Interviews |
| October | • Background Assumptions to COG Board for Review and Comment | • Select Consultant  
          • Negotiate Contract |
| November | • Regional Travel Demand Model Analysis | • Board Approves Contract  
          • Kickoff Meeting |

**November/December: Draft San Benito County General Plan Target Date**

| December | • Formulate Draft Project List  
          • Advisory & Stakeholder Meetings | • Background Analysis & Assumptions |
<p>| January | • Draft Project List to COG Board for Review and Comment | • Background Assumptions to COG Board for Review and Comment |
| February | • Additional Analysis—Select Link | • Regional Travel Demand Model Analysis |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October-November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>Fee Calculation</td>
<td>Preparation and Review of Draft Report</td>
<td>Advisory &amp; Stakeholder Meetings</td>
<td>Draft Project List to COG Board for Review and Comment</td>
<td>Advisory &amp; Stakeholder Meetings</td>
<td>Additional Analysis—Select Link</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Advisory Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Council of San Benito County Governments
## On-Call Consultants
### Valid for 3 years
#### February 21, 2013 - February 21, 2016
(not ranked)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant Name</th>
<th>San Benito Firm?</th>
<th>Name of local sub consultant</th>
<th>Responsive 2011 Impact Fee Study Proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BKF</td>
<td>No, San Jose</td>
<td>No local sub consultants</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris &amp; Associates</td>
<td>No, Gilroy</td>
<td>San Benito Engineering, Hollister Earth Systems Pacific, Hollister</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch Mott MacDonald</td>
<td>No, Gilroy</td>
<td>San Benito Engineering, Hollister</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>No, San Jose</td>
<td>No local sub consultants</td>
<td>Yes (Subconsultant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Thomas &amp; Company</td>
<td>No, San Jose</td>
<td>San Benito Engineering, Hollister</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS Engineers Inc</td>
<td>No, San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>No local sub consultants</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV5 Beyond Engineering</td>
<td>No, San Jose</td>
<td>No local sub consultants</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy Engineering</td>
<td>No, Sacramento</td>
<td>No local sub consultants</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBF Consulting</td>
<td>No, Walnut Creek</td>
<td>No sub consultants</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJKM</td>
<td>No, Pleasanton</td>
<td>No sub consultants</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYLin International</td>
<td>No, San Jose</td>
<td>No local sub consultants</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URS Corporation</td>
<td>No, San Jose</td>
<td>No local sub consultants</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sub Consultants</td>
<td>Has Local Subs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Group</td>
<td>No, San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>San Benito Engineering, Hollister Earth Systems Pacific, Hollister</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMH</td>
<td>No, San Jose</td>
<td>No local sub consultants</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Rodgers</td>
<td>No, Sacramento</td>
<td>No sub consultants</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Benito County Transportation Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study Scope of Work

Task 1: Define Study Area

Consultant will review background documentation, traffic analyses, and traffic data provided by Council of San Benito County Governments (SBCOG) staff, including the Draft Regional Transportation Plan and the Draft County General Plan to identify the fee program study area.

Task 2: Define Benefit Zones

Consultant will work with SBCOG staff to determine the benefit zone structure for the fee program. The benefit zone structure will align with TAZ boundaries and be generally consistent with supervisorial districts, city limits, or current traffic impact fee zone boundaries.

Task 3: Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments Regional Travel Demand Model Analysis

Task 3.1: Baseline Horizon Year Model Forecast

Consultant will project volumes at the study roadways and intersections for Horizon Year conditions based on the AM peak period, PM peak period and daily model outputs. Model volumes will be calibrated using existing count volumes obtained in Task 1. PM peak hour volumes will be calculated for state highway facilities within the study area, daily roadway segment volumes will be calculated for local roadways within the study area, and AM and PM peak hour turning movement volumes will be calculated for intersections within the study area.

Task 3.2: Conduct Deficiency Analysis

Consultant will conduct a Baseline existing conditions and Horizon Year deficiency analysis on the study area roadways and intersections. Consultant will prepare a table showing roadway deficiencies on the Existing and Horizon Year Baseline networks.

Task 4: Draft Project List

Task 4.1: Identify Project List

Based on the deficiencies identified in Task 3, and relying on the list of projects included in the 2035 San Benito County General Plan, the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and various published Capital Improvement Programs, a list of proposed projects to be included in the fee program will be prepared. Consultant will work closely with SBCOG staff to identify the projects that should be included in the fee program.

Cost estimates for the fee program projects will be provided by SBCOG.

Task 4.2: With Improvements Analysis

Each project included in the fee program will be incorporated into the Baseline roadway network within the model utilized in Task 3.1 to create the Improved roadway network. Using this Improved...
roadway network, the model will be run to determine traffic volumes with Base Year and Horizon Year land uses on the study area roadway network with the fee program projects

**Task 4.3: Project Year of Expenditure**

Consultant will work with staff to identify year of expenditure for projects identified in Task 4.1.

**Task 4.4: Address Existing Deficiencies**

For existing deficiencies, the share of traffic associated with future development will be calculated by identifying the proportional change in volumes on each segment between Base Year and Horizon Year with Improved network forecasts. The proportional cost of existing deficiencies will not be applied to impact fees assessed to future development.

**Task 5: Select Link Analysis**

For each project identified to be included in the fee program, Consultant will conduct two “select link” analyses to identify the origin and destination of each trip traversing a segment incorporated in an improvement project. One select link analysis will utilize the Improved network with Base Year land uses and the other will utilize the Improved network with Horizon Year land uses.

The trips will be categorized using the benefit zone structure determined in Task 2.

**Task 6: Regional/Local Fee Calculation**

Consultant will calculate travel demand by land use category.

A table indicating the fees by land use type and benefit zone will be prepared. Consultant will research traffic impact fees currently being imposed on development in nearby communities and counties of similar size and demographics that have instituted traffic impact fees. Consultant will prepare a comparison table for discussion with SBCOG staff.

**Task 7: Advisory, Stakeholder & Policy Board Workshops**

The Consultant project manager will prepare for, and attend, meetings with an advisory stakeholder group selected for review of this project. SBCOG staff will arrange the meeting location and be responsible for inviting participants and sending meeting notices.

The Consultant project manager will prepare for, and attend, meetings a minimum of one study session to include policymakers and development interests to discuss the fee program. SBCOG staff will arrange the location and be responsible for inviting participants and sending meeting notices.

The Consultant project manager will prepare for, and attend public presentation meetings of the fee program, potentially including Planning Commission, City Council, and/or Board of Supervisors meetings.
**Task 8: Team Meetings and Project Management**

The Consultant project manager or technical task manager(s) will attend up to five in-person meetings with SBCOG staff. Additional teleconference meetings may occur as needed.

Consultant will coordinate with SBCOG on the preparation of any environmental documentation and update to the fee program ordinances.

**Task 9: Nexus Study Report**

Task 9.1 Administrative Draft Report

Consultant will document the analysis and results of Tasks 1 through 8 in an Administrative Draft Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study report. The Nexus Study will be compliant with the requirements of California Government Code Section 66001. Consultant will submit the Administrative Draft to SBCOG staff for review and comment.

Task 9.2 Prepare Draft and Final Reports

Consultant will prepare responses to one round of staff comments on the Administrative Draft report and prepare a public review Draft Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study report.

It is anticipated that the draft report would be presented to project stakeholders and the public, as well as the City and County Planning Commissions, City Council, and County Board of Supervisors. Consultant will respond to up to one round of non-conflicting, consolidated comments on the Draft Report and prepare a Final Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study report.

**Optional/ Contingency Tasks**

Consultant will notify COG staff of any potential contingencies needed for development of the final report and provide cost estimates for completion of the work upon request.
Staff Report

To: Council of San Benito County Governments
From: Lisa Rheinheimer, Executive Director
Date: June 19, 2014
Subject: Caltrans as Ex-officio Member of COG

Recommendation:

CONSIDER Reaffirming Caltrans as Ex-Officio Member of COG and RECOMMEND that Cities and County Approve Amended Joint Powers Agreement.

Summary:

The Council of San Benito County Governments Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement provides for the membership of the Board of Directors. At the May 2014 meeting, the COG Board expressed interest in adding Caltrans as an ex-officio member.

Financial Considerations:

There is no financial impact to COG by adding Caltrans as an ex-officio member.

Background:

Membership of Council of Governments Directors is found in a Joint Powers Agreement executed by the Cities of Hollister and San Juan Bautista and the County of San Benito pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act in California Government Code 6500-6536. The last time the Council of San Benito County Governments Joint Powers Agreement was amended was in 2005.

In December of 2011, the COG Board considered and approved adding Caltrans as an Ex-officio member of COG. An amended Joint Powers Agreement was never taken before the local jurisdictions for approval.

Staff Analysis:

The Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement can be amended from time to time provided that the participating jurisdictions approve any changes. The County of San Benito and Cities of Hollister and San Juan Bautista must approve the amendment for it to become legitimate.

The benefit of adding Caltrans as an ex-officio member is that it strengthens the partnership between the two agencies on transportation projects and programs of mutual interest. This action
would allow for a meaningful discussion of items of interest without the limitations of the 3-minute public comment period.

Should the Board desire to add Caltrans as an ex-officio member, staff prepared an Amended Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement that would be brought before the County Board of Supervisors and the City Councils of Hollister and San Juan Bautista for approval (Attachment).

Executive Director Review:       Counsel Review:  Yes

Supporting Attachment: Amended Joint Powers Agreement
AMENDED JOINT EXERCISE OF POWERS AGREEMENT

FOR

THE COUNCIL OF SAN BENITO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS

This AMENDED JOINT EXERCISE OF POWERS AGREEMENT (hereinafter “Agreement”) is made and entered into in the County of San Benito, State of California the ___ day of ____, 2014, by and among the following public entities:

- The County of San Benito, a political subdivision of the State of California,
- The City of Hollister, a municipal corporation located in San Benito County, and
- The City of San Juan Bautista, a municipal corporation located in San Benito County

(hereinafter collectively referred to as “Member Entities”) pursuant to the joint exercise of powers provisions of California Government Code Sections 6500-6522 and the California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.140.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, on December 31, 1973, the County of San Benito, the City of Hollister, and the City of San Juan Bautista entered into a Joint Powers Agreement for Council of San Benito County of Governments; and

WHEREAS, on May 6, 1974, the County of San Benito, the City of Hollister, and the City of San Juan Bautista entered into an Amendment to Joint Powers Agreement for Council of San Benito County Governments; and

WHEREAS, on July 26, 2005, the County of San Benito, the City of Hollister, and the City of San Juan Bautista entered into an Amendment to Joint Powers Agreement for Council of San Benito County Governments; and

WHEREAS, the San Benito County Local Roads and Highways Improvement Ordinance (“Measure A”) was approved by the County’s electors in June 1988; and

WHEREAS, Measure A designated the Council of San Benito County Governments as responsible for administering Measure A should it be approved by the County’s electors; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 180050 of the Public Utilities Code, the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Benito also designated the Council of San Benito County Governments as the local agency to administer Measure A; and

WHEREAS, each of the Member entities is a California public entity having the power to plan for, expend funds for, construct, operate, and take all other necessary actions in favor of
projects benefitting the members, inhabitants, and/or population of the respective Member Entities; and

WHEREAS, each of the Member Entities herein recognize that the County of San Benito is experiencing continued expansion of its incorporated cities and the development of formerly undeveloped areas; and

WHEREAS, by reason of this growth, governmental problems involving incorporated and unincorporated areas jointly are arising and are expected to increase in the future; and

WHEREAS, the Member Entities herein recognize that there exist planning problems which require area wide consideration; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary and desirable that a single agency be created and has been created with the responsibility and authority to:

1. Provide a forum for discussion and study of area wide problems of mutual interest to the member governments;

2. Insure through cooperation, coordination, and the pooling of common resources, maximum efficiency and economy in governmental operation;

3. Identify, inventory, and comprehensively plan for the solution of regional problems requiring multi-governmental cooperation;

4. Develop area wide plans and policies for growth and development;

5. Facilitate agreements among the governmental units for specific projects or other inter-related developmental actions or for the adoption of common policies with respect to problems which are common to its members;

6. Attain the greatest degree of intergovernmental cooperation possible in order to prepare for future growth and development of San Benito County;

7. Adopt, implement, and construct projects that are referred to it by the Member Entities and that are of mutual interest and beneficial to them; and

8. Conduct other area wide functions as the Member Entities deem appropriate; and

WHEREAS, creation of the Council of San Benito County Governments and action by it upon development projects appear necessary to qualify the County, its various cities and special public agencies and districts, for allocations of State and Federal funds necessary to carry out such projects; and
WHEREAS, by this Amended Agreement, the Member Entities intend to clarify, reaffirm, and expand the powers of the Council of San Benito County Governments created on December 31, 1973 and to provide for the general direction of the policies of such joint exercise of powers authority without invalidating any prior actions of the Council of San Benito Governments, its Member Entities, Measure A Authority, and/or any of the Council of San Benito Government’s related entities.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises, covenants, conditions, and benefits hereinafter set forth, it is agreed by and among the Member Entities hereto as follows:

ARTICLE I
DEFINITIONS

Unless the context otherwise requires, the terms defined in this Article I and initially capitalized in the text shall for all purposes of this Agreement have the following meanings:

1.1 Act. The term “Act” means Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 6500) of Division 7 of Title 1 of the Government Code of the State and all laws amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto.

1.2 Agreement. The term “Agreement” means this Amended Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement, as it may from time to time be amended.

1.3 COG. The term “COG” means the Council of San Benito County Governments created by the Joint Powers Agreement for Council of San Benito County of Governments entered into on or about December 31, 1973 and re-authorized by this Agreement.

1.4 Board. The term “Board” or “Board of Directors” means the governing body of COG.

ARTICLE II
PURPOSE

This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Act relating to the joint exercise of powers. Each of the Member Entities possesses the common powers referred to in the recitals hereof. Each is duly authorized and by law vested with the authority to exercise the power of eminent domain to acquire property necessary to carry out any of its powers and functions. Through this Agreement the Member Entities are confirming their desire to enter into an agreement for the joint exercise of their respective powers of eminent domain, whether or not possessed in common, for the acquisition of property as a single parcel. This Agreement is also entered into in order to exercise their other common powers, and the additional powers granted to COG under the Act, or under any other applicable law, for the purpose of effectuating any project undertaken pursuant hereto, to determine housing needs for the Member Entities and to
assist in regional planning by preparing congestion management plans, transportation plans, and/or air quality plans. Such purpose will be accomplished and the powers exercised in the manner herein set forth.

**ARTICLE III**

**COG**

3.1 Creation of COG. The Council of San Benito County Governments was created on December 31, 1973 and is being re-authorized and its powers expanded by this Agreement. As authorized by the Act, COG shall be and is a public entity separate from the Member Entities and shall be responsible for the administration of this Agreement. The debts, liabilities and obligations of COG shall not constitute debts, liabilities or obligations of the Member Entities, unless assumed in a particular case by resolution or other action of the governing body of the Member Entity to be charged.

Within thirty (30) days after the effective date of this Agreement, or any amendment hereto, COG will cause a notice to be prepared and filed with the office of the Secretary of State in the manner set forth in Section 6503.5 of the Act. Within seventy (70) days after the effective date of this Agreement, and within ten (10) days after any change of facts required to be stated pursuant to California Government Code Section 53051(b), COG shall cause a notice to be prepared and filed with the Secretary of State, and with the County Clerk of San Benito County in the manner set forth in California Government Code Section 53051.

3.2 Governing Board. COG shall be administered by a Board of Directors, which shall consist of a five (5) member Board of Directors selected from the legislative bodies of the Member Entities as follows:

3.2.1 Each legislative body shall appoint one (1) director and one (1) alternate for its own membership.

3.2.2 Other directors, if any, and other alternates, if any, shall be appointed by the respective legislative bodies of the Member Entities on the basis of population. Each City’s population shall be determined by the percentage its population has to the County as a whole. The County’s population shall be determined by the percentage population of the unincorporated areas of the County have to the County as a whole. The County or any City having in excess of seventy-five (75) per cent of the population of the County as a whole shall appoint all such directors and alternates. The County or any City or Cities having less than twenty-five (25) per cent of the population of the County as a whole shall not appoint any such directors or alternates. Population is to be determined by the latest United States Decennial Census or later California Department of Finance figures.
In the absence of a director or directors, an alternate or alternates appointed by the legislative body whose director or directors as absent shall have the right to participate in and vote on all matters pending before COG.

3.2.3 Except for the term of office of the initial directors and alternates which shall expire June 30, 1975, the term of office of each director and alternate shall be one (1) year commencing at the first COG meeting in January of each year and until the appointment and qualification of a successor. The body which originally appointed a director or alternate whole term has expired shall appoint a successor. Any director or alternate may be removed at any time and without cause by the body appointing him. Any vacancy in the membership of the Board of Directors shall be filled for the unexpired term by appointment by the body which originally appointed the director or alternate whose office has become vacant.

3.2.4 Ex-officio membership. The purpose of ex-officio membership is to permit the ex-officio member(s) to participate in COG discussions before and after a matter is allowed for discussion by the public. Ex-officio members shall have no vote on matters brought before the COG. Ex-officio membership is not intended to evolve into full voting membership.

3.2.4.1 The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) may appoint one member to the COG to serve as an ex-officio member. An ex-officio member may be added or deleted by amending the AMENDED JOINT EXERCISE OF POWERS AGREEMENT. Additional ex-officio members shall be limited to public agencies. This restriction to public agencies does not affect the permanent ex-officio members described in the first sentence of paragraph 3.2.4.1. As used here, “public agency” means the State of California or any department or agency thereof, a county, city, public corporation, municipal corporation, public district, or special district.

3.3 Quorum. A majority of the voting members of the Board of Directors shall constitute a quorum. Such a quorum shall be necessary for the purpose of conducting official business. A majority vote of those voting shall be sufficient to carry any measure. A roll call vote shall be conducted at the request of any representative.

3.4 Rules and Regulations. The Council of San Benito Governments Rules and Regulations adopted in April 2003, as previously amended from time to time, remain in full force and effect.

3.5 Executive Director. COG may employ an Executive Director and such additional staff it deems necessary to perform its function. The Executive Director shall serve at the pleasure of COG and shall be directly responsible to it.
ARTICLE IV
POWERS

COG shall have the power to make and enter contracts; to employ agents, consultants, and employees; to acquire, condemn, hold, lease, and dispose of property; to incur debts, liabilities and obligations; to approve, implement, and construct Projects that are referred to it by the Member Entities that are of mutual interest and beneficial to them; to pass resolutions; to exercise jointly the common powers of its Member Entities in studying, planning, and implementing projects benefitting the inhabitants and/or population of the respective Member Entities; to sue and be sued in its own name; to receive gifts, contributions and donations of property, funds, services, and other forms of assistance from persons, firms, corporations and any governmental entity; to apply for an appropriate grant or grants and/or loan or loans under any federal, state, or local programs for assistance in developing any Project it adopts; to obtain in its own name all necessary permits and licenses, opinions and rulings; to procure public liability and other insurance as it deems advisable to protect COG and each of its Member Entities hereto and to change the costs thereof to the operating costs of COG. COG also has the power to ratify prior actions and adopt as its own any actions of its related entities and/or advisory or administrative bodies/entities. COG shall also have any additional powers conferred under the Act, insofar as such additional powers may be necessary or desirable to accomplish the purposes of COG as set forth herein.

The powers designated above shall be exercised subject only to such restrictions upon the manner of exercising such powers as are imposed upon the County of San Benito in the exercise of its powers as required by Government Code Section 6509.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, COG shall have any additional powers conferred under the Act, insofar as such additional powers may be necessary or desirable to accomplish the purposes of COG as set forth herein.

ARTICLE V
FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF COG

Each Member Entity shall contribute to the financial support of COG. Each city’s share of financial support shall be determined by the percentage its population has to the County as a whole. The County’s share of financial support shall be determined by the percentage of the population of the unincorporated areas of the County have to the County as a whole. Population is to be determined by the latest United States Decennial Census or later California State Department of Finance Figures. The fiscal year of COG shall commence on July 1 of each year and shall terminate on June 30 of the following year. Each Member Entity shall deposit its share of financial support with COG’s treasurer no later than August 1 of each year.
ARTICLE VI

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS

6.1 The Treasurer of the County of San Benito shall be the depositary and shall have custody of all COG’s money, and shall comply with the provisions of Section 6505.5 of the California Government Code.

6.2 The Auditor of the County of San Benito shall draw warrants to pay demands against COG when approved by COG.

6.3 All funds received by COG shall be strictly accounted for and the Auditor of the County of San Benito shall make or contract for an annual audit of the accounts and records of COG as prescribed in Section 6505 of the California Government Code.

6.4 The Executive Director of COG is hereby designated as the person who shall have charge of, handle and have access to any property of COG, including any property acquired as the result of the joint exercise of powers.

ARTICLE VII

REGIONAL REVIEW AGENCY

COG has and is hereby designated by the Member Entities as the regional review agency for the purposes of acting on any appropriate proposals which may be presented to it for consideration, and as the sole regional planning representative for transmission of proposed recommendations to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development or such other agency of the Federal Government or State Government as may be designated to receive such recommendations for COG, and as to the area wide planning organization (APO) for the County of San Benito as such APO is defined in pertinent State and/or Federal directives and regulations.

ARTICLE VIII

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY

COG has and is hereby designated by the Member Entities as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency and is responsible for the development of the Regional Transportation Plan. It is also responsible for the annual allocation of funds from the Transportation Development Act to local jurisdictions and transit operators. From time to time, COG may be asked to adopt and be lead agency for road projects, bike lane construction projects, and other types of transportation projects (non-motorized and motorized) that are of mutual interest and beneficial to them. COG can utilize any of its designated powers to serve in this capacity and to ensure the completion of these projects.
ARTICLE IX

ADMINISTRATION OF MEASURE A

COG has been and is hereby designated as the local agency responsible for administering Measure A and any Projects funded thereby, including but not limited to, the Highway 25 Hollister By Pass Project. The Administration of said Projects shall include utilizing any of its designated powers to complete the Projects. COG also has the power pursuant to Government Code Section 6508 to delegate its functions to an advisory body or administrative body, such as the Measure A Authority, for the purposes of program development, policy formulation, and/or program implementation provided, however, that any annual budget of the agency to which the delegation is made must be approved by the Board of Directors of COG.

ARTICLE X

LIMITATIONS

Nothing herein shall be construed as limiting in any manner the power of any of the respective parties to initiate and complete a local project within their respective jurisdictions with their own funds. Furthermore, nothing herein shall be construed as invalidating any prior actions of COG, its Member Entities, The Measure A Authority, or any of COG’s related entities.

ARTICLE XI

MEMBERSHIP IN COG

Any incorporated city within San Benito County and the County may become a member of COG by properly executing this Agreement. Any Member Entity which has withdrawn from COG in accordance with the provisions of Article XII of this Agreement may resume its membership upon thirty (30) days written notice to the then members, which notice may be waived by a majority vote of COG.

ARTICLE XII

WITHDRAWAL FROM COG

Any Member Entity may withdraw from this agreement upon sixty (60) days written notice to the other Member Entities. A Member Entity withdrawing shall not be liable for the payment of further contributions and shall have no right to reimbursement of any monies previously paid to COG, provided, however, that the Board of Directors may authorize a reimbursement, if in its judgment, such reimbursement is fair and equitable, and can be done without jeopardy to the operation of COG.
ARTICLE XIII

TERM

This Agreement shall become effective as the date hereof and shall continue in full force and effect until terminated by the Member Entities, but may not be terminated until such time as all evidences of COG’s indebtedness herein provided for, and the interest thereon, shall have been paid in full. Any surplus money shall be returned to the Member Entities in proportion to the contributions made.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this agreement and affixed their hands hereto.

COUNTY OF SAN BENITO

By ______________________________
Name ____________________________
Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, County of San Benito

CITY OF HOLLISTER

By ______________________________
Name ____________________________
Mayor of the City of Hollister

CITY OF SAN JUAN BAUTISTA

By ______________________________
Name ____________________________
Mayor of the City of San Juan Bautista
Staff Report

To: Council of San Benito County Governments
From: Lisa Rheinheimer, Executive Director
Date: June 19, 2014
Subject: Highway 25 Bypass Operations at Santa Ana and Meridian

Recommendation:

RECEIVE Information about Highway 25 Bypass Operations at Santa Ana and Meridian.

Summary:

At the Council of San Benito County Governments meeting in May, the Board requested an agenda item on the subject of Highway 25 Bypass operations at Santa Ana and Meridian. The Board received correspondence from a concerned resident about the safety of the intersections.

Financial Considerations:

There is no financial impact at this time.

Background:

The Highway 25 Bypass was transferred to Caltrans in late May.

Correspondence from a concerned resident was sent to the Council of Governments in May and the Board asked for an agenda item to discuss the concern raised.

Staff Analysis:

The issue is the left turn movement from Santa Ana and Meridian onto the Bypass. There is a signal at both intersections which do not include a green arrow dedicated and protected for left turn movements. Drivers are required to yield to straight through traffic before making a left turn.

The aerial images in Figures 1 and 2 below show the intersections of Santa Ana and the Bypass and Meridian and the Bypass. The ovals indicate the turning movement at issue.
Figure 1: Aerial View - Intersection of Santa Ana and Highway 25 Bypass

Figure 2: Aerial View - Intersection of Meridian and Highway 25 Bypass
The image below shows the intersection of Meridian and Highway 23 Bypass as a driver would see it.

![Intersection Image]

Figure 3: Street View - Intersection of Meridian and Highway 25 Bypass

This type of “permissive phasing” is allowable per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2012) published by Caltrans and reviewed and approved by the Federal Highway Administration. This type of operation is normal and reduces overall delay at the intersection.

Chair Gomez asked for accident data for the two intersections which was requested from the Hollister Police Department. The information was not available at the time of agenda preparation.

Preliminary information available to Caltrans indicated that one accident occurred at each intersection over a 4-year period. However, when the Police Department releases the requested accident data, COG staff will forward the information to Caltrans for further analysis.

Caltrans has also indicated that their traffic operations team will make a site visit, collect relevant data including accident history and traffic volumes, and analyze the possibility of a protective left turn phase.

Executive Director Review: __________  Counsel Review: N/A

Supporting Attachment(s): Email Correspondence from Jennifer Huxtable
Hi,

I have contacted my councilmember representative, Victor Gomez, about my concern with the intersection at Santa Ana Rd. and the Hwy. 25 bypass, as well as the intersection at Meridian and the Hwy 25 bypass. He agrees with my concerns, is giving his support, and said he will bring up this issue at this Thursdays Transportation (COG) meeting. He suggested that I contact the San Benito Council of Governments directly also.

Our daughter was in an accident at Santa Ana & Hwy 25 about a week ago, and not only is it very scary, it is also very frustrating that there have been many accidents at these intersections and yet nothing has been done to improve the safety of these intersections. And, the accidents continue to occur. A police officer at the scene of the accident even told me that in his opinion it is a horribly dangerous intersection having the designated left turn lane from Santa Ana onto Hwy 25, without having an accompanying left turn arrow and he has even seen police officers almost get in accidents there. Again, this is the same at Meridian. But, at the intersection at Hillcrest and Hwy 25, there is the left turn arrow with the designated left turn lane.

When this accident occurred, someone posted about it on the facebook Hollister Neighborhood Watch page, and many of the comments were, "Not again" "This intersection needs to be fixed"..... So, the community knows this is unsafe, police know it’s unsafe, and yet nothing has been done.

Ideally, I think that there needs to be a left turn arrow at both those intersections, on Santa Ana Rd. and on Meridian Rd., and change the cycling of the lights to reflect that. If that can’t be done immediately, then I think that, at the very least, signs should be posted at those lights saying Yield on Green. I don’t know the process to getting this done, and I must admit I wonder why it wasn’t done when the Hwy 25 bypass was originally built several years ago. They are both busy intersections, and I have also heard that it’s very nerve-wracking at that Santa Ana intersection when the school has morning and afternoon pick-ups.

I want to know if there’s anything we can do to help begin and speed up the process, before more accidents occur there, and God forbid any with serious injuries and/or deaths. It’s not worth it when there really is an easy fix.

Unfortunately, I can’t attend this Thursday’s Transportation (COG) meeting, but Mr. Gomez said he will bring up this issue and let me know what needs to be done to try to get this fixed ASAP. ---

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Huxtable
Staff Report

To: Council of Governments Board of Directors  
From: Kathy Postigo, Administrative Services Specialist  
Date: June 19, 2014  
Subject: Council of Governments Office Facilities Lease

**Recommendation:**

**DIRECT** staff to negotiate a new five year lease with cost savings between Council of San Benito County Governments and The Pivetti Company for office space located at 330 Tres Pinos Road, Suite C7.

**Summary:**

The lease for COG’s office facilities is set to expire on July 31, 2014. Because the current office space location and size meets the needs of both customers and employees, staff recommends that a new lease be negotiated for a five year term for a cost savings of $2,412.

**Financial Considerations:**

The current monthly lease is $3,099.34 per month for 1,879.2 square feet. The lease includes no Common Area Maintenance fees (CAM) or Triple Net fees (NNN). The current lease amount is $1.60 per square foot.

COG staff asked The Pivetti Company for a reduction of rent and they offered the amounts below if COG agreed to a five year lease:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>MONTHLY RENT</th>
<th>SQUARE FOOT COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/01/2014 - 07/31/2015</td>
<td>$2,593.30</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/2015 - 07/31/2016</td>
<td>$2,781.22</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/2016 - 07/13/2017</td>
<td>$2,969.14</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/2017 - 07/31/2018</td>
<td>$3,157.05</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/2018 - 07/31/2019</td>
<td>$3,344.97</td>
<td>$1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cost savings for a new five year lease is $2,412 compared to paying the current amount for another five years.
Background:

The Council of Governments' moved to 330 Tres Pinos Road, Suite C7 in November 2007 and bought out the lease from Kasavan & Pope for nine months. Starting with August 1, 2008 the rent went to $2,950.24 per month with a two percent increase each year. In August of 2011, staff requested a reduction and Hidalgo, Inc. (now The Pivetti Company) agreed to the current amount of $3,009.34.

Last year, the COG Board extended the current lease for one year, in order to look for less expensive rent and to evaluate the possibility of moving to the old courthouse when renovations occur. The Courts completed their move to the new location. However, the old courthouse space is not anticipated to be available for at least two years.

Staff Analysis:

Staff has been in conversations with the Public Works Department regarding the move to the courthouse space and were informed that it would take at least two years for the remodel. Staff then approached the current landlord and they offered extending the lease for another five years with a reduction for the first three years and an increase in year four and five. The cost to extend the lease for two years would remain at the current rent of $3,009.34. The cost to enter a new lease with The Pivetti Company for five years would start at $2,593.30 for the first year and ending at $3,344.97 for the fifth year.

Staff has looked into the costs associated with the courthouse space and has come to the conclusion that the courthouse space could be more expensive to rent, although no formal negotiations have occurred. COG is also in the process of purchasing a new phone system with Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Program (PTMISEA) funds. This system will be installed in the next six months. Moving this system to a new facility would be costly, and there may be a question of compatibility with the county phone system.

The current space is convenient and meets the needs for both customers and employees. It has adequate parking, adequate office space and is close to bus stops. If the COG Board directs staff to negotiate a new five year lease, at the July meeting staff will bring to the Board the lease for approval.

Staff recommends that the Board direct staff to negotiate a new five year lease between Council of San Benito County Governments and The Pivetti Company for office space located at 330 Tres Pinos Road, Suite 7.