

**SAN BENITO COUNTY
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
REGULAR MEETING**

March 20, 2014, 3:00 P.M.

FINAL MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Gomez, Director Boch, Director Botelho, Director De La Cruz, and Director Scattini

STAFF PRESENT:

Deputy County Counsel, Shirley Murphy; Executive Director, Lisa Rheinheimer; Administrative Services Specialist, Kathy Postigo; Transportation Planner, Betty LiOwen; Transportation Intern, Regina Valentine; Secretary, Monica Gomez

OTHERS PRESENT:

Heather Adamson, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG);
Aileen Loe, John Olejnik, Caltrans District 5; Steve Wittry, Director of Public Works

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Gomez called the meeting to order at 3:01 P.M.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B. CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

Upon a motion duly made by Director Scattini, and seconded by Director Botelho, the Directors unanimously acknowledged the Certificate of Posting.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Marty Richman

Mr. Richman provided his comments in writing. He mentioned that in his opinion AMBAG is not addressing San Benito County's critical issues with the priority our situation demands; that has to change or it will be a waste of time and money. He stated that AMBAG may be able to help San Benito County if they address its most critical problem, economic underdevelopment and recognize that San Benito County has special needs and is not the same as the rest of the region.

D. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Rheinheimer

Ms. Rheinheimer announced that the Highway 25 in downtown Hollister has been relinquished to the City of Hollister. The City of Hollister now owns San Benito, San Felipe, Nash, and Tres Pinos Roads. She mentioned that she's been working with the Hollister Downtown Association on a celebration party. The Board received an invitation to help celebrate the change of ownership which will take place March 29th, from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. In addition, the California Transportation Commission was scheduled to vote to transfer the Highway 25 Bypass over to Caltrans today. The plan is that the Bypass would be transferred to Caltrans within 30 days and it would no longer be in ownership of COG and the City of

Hollister.

Ms. Rheinheimer announced that COG will host a public meeting for Calaveras Elementary School Safe Routes to School on Tuesday, April 8th, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. at the Calaveras School library.

E. CALTRANS DISTRICT 5 REPORT: Loe

Aileen Loe congratulated the City Hollister on the ownership of the downtown section of the former Highway 25.

Ms. Loe announced that other action taking place at the California Transportation Commission's meeting is to adopt the Active Transportation Planning Program Guidelines to increase active modes of transportation, bicycling, walking. A call for projects will be expected as early as tomorrow.

Ms. Loe mentioned that due to the current drought condition in California, Caltrans will be reducing irrigation activities by at least 50 percent, delaying all new landscaping projects, and foregoing washing vehicles except when necessary for safety. Ms. Loe encouraged the public to call or use the maintenance service request form on their website to advise Caltrans of any areas that are being irrigated and perhaps should not be.

Chair Gomez mentioned that he has used the maintenance service request form located on the Caltrans website and stated that it is very easy to use. He encouraged the public to use it as well.

Director Botelho and Scattini inquired about the water resources that are used for the landscaping along the highways.

Ms. Loe stated that Caltrans water resources vary. Most of the time they have agreements with municipalities and other water purveyors that may include some well water use.

Director Boch inquired on behalf of the City of San Juan Bautista's City Council about whether a State 4-lane Highway is required to have a speed limit of 65mph. He stated that the City of San Juan Bautista is very concerned about the speed limit at the Alameda and Highway 156 intersection. They just approved an ARCO gas station and eastbound traffic is going to have to make a right turn off of the Highway. The City would like to see Highway 156 traffic slowed down eastbound to possibly 35 mph at the Alameda intersection. The City of San Juan Bautista is very concerned and would like to see more signalization in place in the area to reduce the speed of traffic.

Ms. Loe stated that it is not a simple question to answer, however, a 4-lane expressway is designed for 65 mph speed.

Chair Gomez asked Caltrans if they could address Director Boch's concern via a phone call or letter.

Director Botelho stated that he was also concerned about the speed limit, as this has been an ongoing issue. He asked if this item could be agendized and addressed as a future meeting once Caltrans has the appropriate information and options to slow down the traffic at the Alameda intersection.

Chair Gomez stated that he would like to have all of the facts as far as speed and accident data from Caltrans before placing the item on a future agenda. Caltrans will work with COG's Executive Director to agendize this item.

F. BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORTS:

Director Botelho inquired about the possibilities of having signs placed in each direction along Highway 156 promoting the DeAnza Trail as a way to encourage people to stop by and visit the local parks in the

County.

Director Botelho also reported that the County Board of Supervisors passed a Resolution requesting Caltrans to enter into a Joint Authority Agreement regarding concerns about a significant delay in the Highway 156 project in the acquisition of some properties. The Resolution will be forwarded to Caltrans for consideration as well as the State Representative and Governor's office.

Director De La Cruz stated that it was brought to his attention at Tuesdays Unmet Needs Hearing meeting to have an additional centralized location for the sales of tokens and passes to better meet the needs of transit riders. He suggested working with the business community for possible sales locations, such as the Hollister Supermarket.

Director De La Cruz stated that he has made several requests to City staff, Mayor Velazquez, and to Lisa Rheinheimer regarding what can be done at the intersection of 4th Street, Meridian and McCray. Drivers on the left side of the lane have a tendency to go into the right lane cutting off drivers on the right lane.

Chair Gomez stated that he will make sure to bring the issue up to the City Manager to address Director De La Cruz's concern about alignment markings to mark the direction of traffic at that intersection.

Chair Gomez took the opportunity to thank COG staff, Veronica Lezama, Betty LiOwen, Kathy Postigo, Regina Valentine, and Monica Gomez for their cooperation and work over that past 10-14 days in getting the agenda put together under the direction of the Chair.

CONSENT AGENDA:

1. **APPROVE** Council of Governments Draft Meeting Minutes Dated February 20, 2014 – Gomez
2. **APPROVE** COG Transaction Report (Financial Claims) dated February 2014 (Postigo)
3. **RECEIVE** Construction Projects Report – Caltrans District 5
4. **ADOPT** Resolution 14-04 Authorizing the Executive Director to Apply for and Accept Federal Transit Act Section 5311 Funds for Federal Fiscal Year 2014 – Lezama
5. **San Benito Vanpool Program** – Lezama
 - a) **Approve** Vanpool Budget Adjustment/Transfer Totaling an Amount Not to Exceed \$35,000 for the Purchase of one 15-passenger Ford Van; and
 - b) **Declare** Vanpool Vehicle as Surplus Property, VIN No. 1GAHG39R721187843; and
 - c) **Donate** Vanpool Vehicle Surplus Property, VIN No. 1GAHG39R721187843, to the San Benito County American Legion/Veterans of Foreign Wars, a 501 (c) 3 Non-profit.

Director De La Cruz asked to pull Items 1 and 5 for clarification.

There was no public comment on the Consent agenda.

Upon a motion duly made by Director De La Cruz, and seconded by Director Boch, the Directors unanimously approved Items 2-4 from the Consent Agenda. Vote: 5/0 motion passes

Item 1

Director De La Cruz asked to add more language to Item 7 of the February 20, 2014 meeting to give justice to the meeting. (Changes are in *italics*)

There was concern from some of the Board members about using AMBAG's 2013 *Population* forecast numbers of 81,000 instead of the projected *population estimate* from the County's Draft General Plan of 94,731. This was in response to a question by Director De La Cruz as to whether the *Regional Transportation Plan* should be changed to reflect the assumptions specified by the County Board of Supervisors.

Chair Gomez directed Director De La Cruz to work with the Executive Director, Lisa Rheinheimer, on making his amendments to the minutes and bring back to the next meeting for approval.

Item 5 a), b), c)

San Benito Vanpool Program

Director De La Cruz inquired if this item is contingent upon that we purchase a vehicle and then donate or they are not related.

Ms. Rheinheimer stated that it would depend on the policy direction that the Board decides to take. If the Board surpluses the spare vehicle, then the spare would not be available to the other four vanpool groups when their vanpool vehicle needs servicing. They would be required to use their own vehicle during those days that their vanpool is being serviced. If the Board would like to provide a spare then they would have to purchase a new vehicle first. However, staff was under the impression from the Board that they were okay with donating the spare and having the vanpool groups use their own vehicles on the days when the van needs servicing.

Ms. Rheinheimer mentioned that on the LTA Agenda there is an invitation for bids for a van to replace this van.

Upon a motion duly made by Director De La Cruz, and seconded by Director Boch, the Directors unanimously approved Item 5 a), b), c) from the Consent Agenda. Vote: 5/0 motion passes

Upon a motion duly made by Director De La Cruz, and seconded by Director Boch, the Directors continued Item 1 from the Consent Agenda, with an abstention from Director Botelho. Vote:4/0/1 motion passes.

REGULAR AGENDA

TRANSPORTATION ITEMS:

3:00 P.M. Public Hearing (Or As Soon Thereafter As The Matter May Be Heard)

6. Unmet Transit Needs Hearing – Lezama

- a) **RECEIVE** Report on Unmet Transit Needs Hearing
- b) **OPEN** Public Hearing
- c) **CLOSE** Public Hearing
- d) **DIRECT Staff** to Return to Council of Governments with Recommendation.

Betty LiOwen presented this item on behalf of Veronica Lezama. Ms. LiOwen stated that COG holds two annual hearings to receive public testimony on the bus services provided by County Express and Jovenes de Antaño. The first hearing was held on March 18, 2014 at the Hollister Community Center.

Chair Gomez opened the Public Hearing at 3:38 p.m. There was no public comment. Chair Gomez closed the Public Hearing at 3:38 p.m.

The COG Board thanked staff for the way the Public Hearing process was structured on Tuesday. They were able to sit down and engage with the public and listen to their input. They stated that it was an effective experience that should be repeated in the future.

Ms. LiOwen stated that after the hearings process and review of testimony received, staff will return to the Board with a recommendation at a future meeting.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Botelho, and seconded by Director Scattini, the Directors unanimously approved Item 6. Vote: 5/0 motion passes

7. RECEIVE Updated 2010 San Benito County Traffic Model and DIRECT San Benito COG Staff to Use the Model for Transportation Planning Purposes – RTP Ad-Hoc Committee

Chair Gomez reported out on this item as part of the Ad-Hoc Committee, which consisted of himself and Director Scattini. He stated that they made some recommendations regarding the RTP and as part of the analysis of the Regional Transportation Plan update the Ad-Hoc Committee has been exploring alternatives using the AMBAG Travel Demand Model. The San Benito County Traffic Model was developed for COG and adopted in 1986 for the purpose of establishing the first traffic impact fee for the county. Parsons Transportation Group, Inc., has recently validated the model to Year 2010 conditions, and has updated the road network and land use variables to forecast future traffic associated with development growth within San Benito County, up to the year 2035. The Model has been used to analyze the Draft 2035 San Benito County Regional Transportation Plan and it's available for other documents and projects, such as the 2035 San Benito County General Plan, the next update of the Transportation Impact Mitigation Fee Study, and traffic impact studies for proposed land development projects. The San Benito Traffic Model is provided without cost to all San Benito COG and its member agencies'. Chair Gomez thanked Parsons for their collaboration and help on this item.

Director Botelho stated that he was not present at the last Board meeting when staff presented this item. He stated that although he could not defend AMBAG's projections, he could not defend Parsons projections either. He stated that he needed to understand how Parsons Model is that much different from the State of California or AMBAG's Models, as well as what Parsons qualifications were for injecting their forecast in the Model.

Chair Gomez asked Bob Scales from Parsons to come forward and try to address Director Botelho's questions and concerns.

Mr. Scales stated that back in 1986 COG hired Parsons dba Barton-Aschman Associates, to develop the Travel Forecast Model for the County. It was first used for the first Traffic Impact Fee (TIF). It has been used since that time for all other updates of the TIF up to the time of the 2011 TIF. Also, the same model was used for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), all RTP's subsequent to 1986 and prior to the current RTP. Also it has been used by most all of the traffic impact studies performed in the County, including the Santana Ranch and Fairview Corners Specific Plans and the City of Hollister County of San Benito Traffic Model. So you could say that it has been adopted and used for the last 20-25 years. Subsequent to 2008 no additional work was done on the model because the software that was being used known as Tran Plan, ceased to be supported by the manufacturer. The manufacturer created a new product called Cube or TP Plus (same thing) and Parsons converted by importing from one model to the other into the different software. They used the Census information that was available from the 2010 Census as of about 2012 at the black level.

Mr. Scales stated that the reason they did this was because they work on a lot of projects in this part of the world which include projects for extending the commuter rail service, most importantly they were preparing a environmental document for a small \$50 billion State sponsored transportation project in the nearby vicinity. They looked at the forecast for access on how many people were using Highway 101 and Highway 25 to get to Gilroy. They looked at the 2010 AMBAG Model, which was based on a 2008 demographic forecast, to try to get decent numbers for how many people are using Highway 101 and 25 arriving into the vicinity of Gilroy. They were checking the comparison of the traffic volumes predicted for 2010, actually for 2005 by the AMBAG Model 101 versus the more recent counts that they had done in 2011 and also by the permanent count station (located on 101, south of Hwy 156). The comparison showed that it is off by 50%, 35,000 cars difference between what is forecast by the AMBAG Model and what was actually counted via the permanent count station. AMBAG's Model was higher by about 85,000 versus 56,000 at that location and north of Hwy 25 it was 35,000 higher versus the actual counts.

Mr. Scales stated that the heart of the problem is that AMBAG was supplied faulty information, in terms of what they were calibrating their model to. The mile marker that was posted as being the permanent count station location was north of Hwy 156, whereas the actual count station location is south of Hwy 156. Another issue with the AMBAG 2010 Model is that it was not calibrated to peak hour conditions, so the peak hour forecasts were about double of what it should have been. Due to these problems, the only way they could make the forecast for Hwy 25 was to have a model for San Benito County, which was relatively easy for Parsons to update. The reason why they did it was because they had a lot of money on the line, in terms of the potential impact to another project.

Mr. Scales also mentioned that the 2011 Traffic Impact Fee Nexus Study was based on the 2010 AMBAG Model, which was over predicting traffic on Hwy 101; as a result, Hwy 101 was completely congested and was sending traffic from King City Hwy 101 via Hwy 25 coming 50 miles to the north to get through Hollister to get back around to head out to the Silicon Valley, as opposed to staying on Hwy 101. If you look at the table in the Traffic Impact Fee it shows the amount of expected through traffic for roads that are viewed to be deficient. It has 20% of the traffic on Hwy 25 on the Airline Hwy section as being external, which is not practical.

Director Botelho stated that he wanted to ensure that when it comes time for the Board to vote on this item, that they have the integrity of reasonable numbers. He stated that he is only concerned about San Benito County. The numbers that concern him in the General Plan update are setting the population numbers too high then it reflects back to the Traffic Impact Fees that would be too low per unit. If we don't meet that growth within a variance we are back in the same situation we were in back in the late 80's and 90's. Director Botelho stated that Parsons has done a lot of work acquiring these numbers; however, he wondered who is Parsons working for, the State of California or a developer, or is it to have data for future projects that they may acquire over the years.

Mr. Scales stated that they got started on this because Parsons is doing the environmental documents for the segment of the High Speed Rail between San Jose and Merced. They were originally directed to use the City of Gilroy Model which is based upon the 2004 AMBAG Model and demographics. Mr. Scales stated that the Model they prepared is calibrated to a better level of goodness than the AMBAG 2014 Model. He stated that San Benito County represents 8% of the AMBAG population, so their Model is paying attention mostly to the other 92%, it is best for Monterey and Santa Cruz County, and least good for San Benito County. He stated that it is not unusual for counties to have their own model within the umbrella of the regional agency. He stated that every single county has their own model because they don't trust the validity of the regional model for their projects and plans.

Public Comment

Heather Adamson

AMBAG

Ms. Adamson expressed appreciation for the information provided. She stated that AMBAG has worked very hard to update the old 2010 Transportation Model. Those improvements include a successful external peer review by outside experts of our new model and the new improvements. This was the model that was used for the recent draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan and its new element the Sustainable Communities Strategy. She stated that AMBAG welcomes the opportunity to continue working with San Benito County jurisdiction staff, as they have in the past, as well as COG staff on future improvements to the model.

Marty Richman

Mr. Richman stated that he had some discussion about the traffic data that was in the General Plan draft EIR, he asked if the figures he was using were the Parsons figures and not the AMBAG Model figures.

Mr. Richman stated that he would prefer that they use the actual traffic counts because they are more reliable than the model numbers.

Aileen Loe

Caltrans

Ms. Loe stated that traffic modeling is very complex and difficult to discuss in depth in a form like this. Local agencies do frequently have their own traffic models as was pointed out by Parsons, usually they are within the umbrella of a regional model. However, it was her understanding that the Board was proposing to adopt a model that is outside the umbrella of the AMBAG Model and for Caltrans purposes they would not be able to recognize a model that didn't use the AMBAG Model as a foundation. The reason is because the AMBAG Model is the adopted and official Regional Travel Demand Model for the three county region. All the practitioners use the regional model and can then adapt it for specific purposes. AMBAG maintains the Model and they have a system for transferring the Model use to others for the adaptation through a Model Users Agreement. Ms. Loe stated that there are risks of proceeding outside of the umbrella, which overtime could range from duplication of effort and ultimately, jeopardizing of funds down the line. Caltrans would not like to see that happen they would like to see the COG be successful.

Bob Scales stated that he works for Caltrans and Caltrans projects for maybe 95% of his existence. He just finished a \$2.5 million traffic study for the High Dessert Corridor with District 7 and 8. The public agencies have an unwritten rule that they are not going to criticize another public agency no matter what, so it becomes an uphill battle to get to the truth. Mr. Scales stated that by using the adopted model and demographics gives you a completely inaccurate result. He stated that the Federal Highway Administration has said that as part of every project it is incumbent upon the model user to review the land use forecast as well as the modeling tool, which is what they do for every project. Sometimes people don't like to hear it but the alternative is they make the wrong investment. The Model was at the forefront as the reason that three counties tried to dissolve AMBAG a few years ago.

Director Botelho expressed concern due to the comment from Caltrans about potentially losing funding for our roads. He asked why we have not asked AMBAG to review and adjust data for San Benito County. He expressed concern about the discrepancy between the 47% growth expected and the 71% growth expected by Parsons from 2010 to 2035. He stated that he was struggling with the integrity of these numbers and whether there are underlying motives. He stated that he understood that Parsons also works for big developers that have a lot at stake and wanted to be very impartial and sure that they're doing this for the right reasons and at the right time.

Director De La Cruz commented in response to Director Botelho's comments. He stated that he understood Director Botelho's comments and concerns and agreed with him on some points however, he had to ask for clarification because in the past he has been a strong opponent and critic of Caltrans and now he is saying that we have to trust and believe Caltrans. He stated that maybe Director Botelho was using this as one of his points and premises, but he had always looked up to his criticism of Caltrans. Director De La Cruz stated that they have used this model for a long time, projects like Santana Ranch and San Juan Oaks all have complied with this model, so he was confident that this can stand that criticism. He stated that we will continue to move on and it is up to us and our replacements that we approve projects and move forward in the best interest of San Benito County. He stated that it has been discussed at previous meetings that AMBAG's model pertains to that part of the community.

Public Comment

Steve Wittry

Director of San Benito Co. Public Works

Mr. Wittry stated that he wanted to set the record straight on few things. He stated that the Santana Ranch and Fairview Corners projects did in fact use the San Benito County Model because their processes began prior to the 2011 limitation of that process. They didn't believe it was fair for the developers to have to go back and change models. Right now, the current County model is the AMBAG Model. The Dell Webb Community, which is currently undergoing review, is using the AMBAG Model for their traffic studies. The General Plan is also using the AMBAG Model for the General Plan process. He mentioned that one of the difficulties that they had when they made the switch in 2011 from the San Benito Model to the AMBAG Model was that the San Benito Model was being updated by a private consultant firm, who also worked for development. There is an apparent conflict of interest, or lack of transparency, when the person who was creating the model was also working for development. He stated that in this particular instance, since Parsons works primarily for Caltrans and Gilroy and where they got their numbers from, if this is the model that is going to be chosen to move forward he suggested for clarity and for transparency of Government that they not be allowed to work for development here in San Benito County.

Mr. Wittry pointed out another concern and brought it to the attention of the Board under appendix C of the RTP. He stated that there is a project listed as the Shore Road Extension project and is identified as a San Benito County Project. He stated that the reality is that in the transportation mode for San Benito County there would never be a need to construct a Shore Road Extension to Hwy 101, if not for a development project that may or may not occur in that area. The County would not go out and place that project on their Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee (TIMF) list for construction because there is no need for it, unless development was there. The concern he had as a responsible agency shows San Benito County as \$38 million project. If that project does move forward he would ask that it be changed to a developer driven project and have the developer install that per process. He noted a similar situation for the Union Road Extension at the top of the page, the Union Road Extension is a developer driven project that is being put forward through the City process. The similarity and precedent to have the developer fund and construct the project if the development would go in that particular area. He stated that he was aware that there were some issues with the 2011 model in terms of transparency. The way that the agencies resolved it at that time was by going to a more public model and public domain. He stated that in fact, the person who did their update for the TIMF, in their agreement identified that they would not work for private development in San Benito County for the duration of that TIMF. He suggested that the Board do the same in this situation.

Chair Gomez stated that there are a lot of questions and concerns. He stated that the intention of the Board today was to release this model and start receiving some input from respective agencies. He stated that Board had no intention of approving this model today. This item is to direct COG staff to use the Model for transportation planning purposes and release it to the public. He recommended that if this does move forward that COG's Executive Director provide input to the Board to ensure that they are doing the right thing.

Director Botelho asked for clarification regarding the release of this draft RTP document. He asked if we would be using the private consultant's model and foregoing AMBAG's model.

Chair Gomez stated that Director Botelho was correct and they would be directing COG staff to use this model for transportation purposes.

Director Botelho asked if the Board fully understood the consequences and risks that they are taking if they move forward. He stated that they could possibly be losing funding that is essential.

Chair Gomez responded by stating that the Ad-Hoc Committee was formed last month and approved by the COG Board to address the housing and employment figures that the Board believed were important and needed to be modified in the AMBAG Model. The Ad-Hoc Committee came together and this is one of those steps needed so we can support the steps that are coming next in the agenda. It is important to the Ad-Hoc committee that this moves forward. He stated that he does have concerns, but his primary concern is San Benito County just as Director Botelho had stated. The Ad-Hoc's desire is to use and adopt this plan. He expressed his frustration about the comment from Caltrans about possibly losing funding. He stated that he wanted to hear facts, specific items that are at risk of being lost. He mentioned for example, last month the Board was told that the Regional Transportation Plan could not be delayed and they only had one meeting to do this, and that was a lie, there was time to do it. He stated that he was going to stand up for San Benito County and for the City of Hollister. He stated that the AMBAG numbers were erroneous and they had to make a change. He mentioned that there are not enough funds and he was grateful that Bob Scales with Parsons was helpful and provided the information to ensure that they were doing the right thing for the future of San Benito County.

Director Scattini stated that he was grateful that Parsons was able to answer his questions.

There was no further discussion.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Scattini, and seconded by Director De La Cruz, the Board approved Item 7 directing San Benito COG staff to use the updated 2010 San Benito County Traffic Model for transportation planning purposes, with Directors Boch and Botelho opposed. Vote: 3/2 motion passes.

8. ADOPT the San Benito County Population, Employment and Housing Projections for 2035 and **DIRECT** San Benito COG Staff to Forward this Data to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) for Transportation Planning Purposes and Inclusion in the 2014 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) – RTP Ad-Hoc Committee

Chair Gomez introduced this item as a continuation from Item 7. He stated that the Board received a letter from the San Benito Business Council and asked that a representative share the letter.

Ms. Rheinheimer noted that the letter from the San Benito County Business Council was provided to the Board.

Kristina Chavez –Wyatt from the San Benito County Business Council stated that what they basically wanted to do is avoid some of the issues that they have had in the community with the General Plan and miscalculations with emissions numbers, etc. and move forward with the best available data. Also, they would like to include county residents as much as possible in public participation.

Ms. Chavez –Wyatt read the letter that was presented to the Board from the San Benito County Business Council dated March 19, 2014.

Chair Gomez thanked the SBC Business Council for their comments.

Director Botelho inquired about the per year percentage of growth for the City and County based on the population growth percentages from the State of California.

Ms. Rheinheimer stated that the current population from the 2010 Census has 55,269 people. Ms. Rheinheimer stated that by using the AMBAG forecast for 2012 which is 81,392 people and subtract the current population of 55,269 you get 26,123 population between 2010 and 2035. It is a 39,462 population increase versus a 26,123 population increase.

Public Comment:
Marty Richman

Mr. Richman stated that he concurred with the comments from the San Benito County Business Council. He stated that it points out that we do not look like the rest of AMBAG. He stated that it is not a personal attack on AMBAG, they're model simply is not reasonable for our County.

There was no further discussion.

*Upon a motion duly made by Director Scattini, seconded by Director De La Cruz, the Directors unanimously approved Item 8 to **ADOPT** the San Benito County Population, Employment and Housing Projections for 2035 and **DIRECT** San Benito COG Staff to Forward this Data to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) for Transportation Planning Purposes and Inclusion in the 2014 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and include the recommendation from the San Benito County Business Council to adopt Agenda Item 8, the growth forecast scenario number 4, and that AMBAG be requested to adopt that forecast for its MTP/SCS. *Vote: 5/0 motion passes.**

9. DRAFT 2014 Regional Transportation Plan – Rheinheimer

- 1) **RECEIVE** and **COMMENT** on the Draft 2014 Regional Transportation Plan
- 2) **AUTHORIZE** Release of the Draft Plan for a 30-Day Public Review Period, Starting March 21, 2014,a and ending April 21, 2014; and
- 3) **SET** Public Hearing Date on the Draft Plan for April 17, 2014

Ms. Rheinheimer stated that before she started her presentation she wanted to thank COG staff, Betty LiOwen, for all of her hard work and spending countless hours revising the Draft RTP.

Ms. Rheinheimer stated that she met with the Ad-Hoc Committee and they went through a number of changes of which are listed below. She also provided the Board with a copy of track changes so that they could see exactly what changes were made.

Changes to the Draft Regional Transportation Plan are outlined below:

Regional Growth Forecast: Reference to the AMBAG Regional Growth Forecast has been replaced with the San Benito County Growth Forecast throughout the document.

Traffic Counts: Traffic counts on area highways referenced on page 2-5 have been replaced with more recent count data from May 2011 provided by Parsons by way of work performed on the Route 152 Trade Corridor Project.

Transportation Funding: The financial projections have been updated and provide for a higher level of funding from the Traffic Impact Fee program. This change is made on page 2-10, page 6-4 and throughout the document. Development Mitigations were also added to the list of revenue sources for transportation projects.

Transportation Projects: The Highway 25 widening project was moved from the unconstrained list of projects to the constrained list. Shore Road extension was also added to the list of constrained projects. These projects and other updates are found in Appendix C.

Ms. Rheinheimer stated that the Council of Governments new schedule for updating the Regional Transportation Plan is as follows:

1. Public hearing on the Draft Regional Transportation Plan
April 17, 2014 at 3:00 p.m.
Board of Supervisors Chambers
481 Fourth Street, Hollister, CA
2. Close of public review period for San Benito Regional Transportation Plan
April 21, 2014
3. Adopt Final Regional Transportation Plan and Certify EIR
June 19, 2014

Ms. Rheinheimer stated that it was her obligation to let the Board know that San Benito COG is not the lead agency for the Environmental Document, COG is the responsible agency. She will have to work with AMBAG to see if the changes in this document would trigger supplemental work that would be paid for by San Benito COG.

Director Scattini stated that they spent a lot of time on this and he hoped that in the future COG staff makes an effort to make sure that things are correct before they come before the Board.

Director De La Cruz thanked Ms. Rheinheimer for working with the Board on this item.

Chair Gomez reiterated his comments from the beginning of the meeting thanking Ms. Rheinheimer and COG staff for working under a lot of pressure from the Ad-Hoc Committee and getting the job done.

Director Botelho stated that he would support the release of this document, however, he agreed with Chair Gomez about needing facts in terms of what funding may be lost. He stated that between now and the 17th he would like some information as to what funding is tied to this and how it interacts with the decisions that the Board is making. He stated that this would be for his own education because he believed that there is more to this than meets the eye. However he felt it was time to move on this and set the public hearing for next month

Chair Gomez asked Director Botelho to follow up with the Executive Director on that information.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Scattini, and seconded by Director De La Cruz, the Directors approved Item 9. 1), 2), 3) as noted above. Vote:5/0 motion passes.

- 10. DIRECT** San Benito COG Staff to Transmit the Draft 2035 San Benito Regional Transportation Plan (“draft RTP”) to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) Along with the Attached Transmittal Letter from COG Chair Gomez – RTP Ad-Hoc Committee

Chair Gomez introduced this item as part of the RTP Ad-Hoc Committee, directing COG staff to transmit the “Draft RTP” to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) along with the attached transmittal letter from the COG Chair.

Public Comment:

Kristina Chavez Wyatt

San Benito County Business Council

On behalf of the San Benito County Business Council, Ms. Chavez Wyatt requested an addendum to the letter reiterating the request from the Business Council letter that COG work with AMBAG, Caltrans, and the Federal Department of Transportation Highway Administration to extend the timeline for consideration of the final EIR and adoption of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy in consideration of the compression of the approval of our own local Plan, the closing of the EIR comment period in early April for those two Plans, and a hard deadline that AMBAG has set for early June, under the threat of not to receive the Federal Funding for the Transportation Projects.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Scattini, and seconded by Director De La Cruz, the Directors unanimously approved Item 10 with the inclusion of the addendum noted above from the San Benito County Business Council. Vote: 5/0 motion passes.

Upon a motion duly made by Director De La Cruz, and seconded by Director Scattini, the Directors unanimously adjourned the COG meeting at 4:56 p.m.

ADJOURN TO COG MEETING APRIL 17, 2014.