

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

April 17, 2014, 3:00 P.M.

FINAL MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Gomez, Director Boch, Director Botelho, Director Muenzer, and Director Scattini

STAFF PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tim Gubbins, John Olejnik, Caltrans District 5; Heather Adamson, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG); Jennifer Donnelly, Alta Planning and Design; Patrick Dobbins, Harris Associates

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Gomez called the meeting to order at 3:00 P.M.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B. CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

Upon a motion duly made by Director Scattini, and seconded by Director Boch, the Directors acknowledged the Certificate of Posting. Vote: 3 yes/0 no/2 absent

Director Botelho and Director Muenzer arrived at 3:01 p.m.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Chair Gomez stated for the record that the COG Board received Joe Thompson's public comment correspondence dated February 16, 2013 through April 12, 2014. The correspondence was entered into the public record

Robert Scales, Parsons Transportation Group

Mr. Scales stated that there was a lot of discussion at the last meeting about the San Benito County Traffic Model. He wanted to clarify that the Model report was provided to the Council of Governments (COG) over 7 months ago and was a result from failure to act on a number of activities. 1) Incorrect traffic volume counts or reports of traffic volumes on Highway 101, for which they prepared a report on behalf of the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the COG. 2) They provided a second report on future volumes on Highway 101 to address the deficiencies of the Travel Forecasts being reported for the Highway 101 Widening project. 3) He stated that he had a record of many communications between himself, Caltrans, AMBAG, and COG, identifying deficiencies in the various travel forecasts that appear in reports and the processes and resulting consequences. He stated that this all came to light at the last

COG meeting because there has been no action to provide any of this information to the COG Board. Lastly, he provided handouts 1) 2035 Forecast Model Comparison San Benito County Subarea: Technical Supplement 2) AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model (Version 1.5) Hollister Subarea Validation: Technical Supplement 3) 2010 San Benito County Traffic Model Hollister Subarea: Technical Supplement.

Jeff Gilles, L+G, LLP

Mr. Gilles stated he is a business owner in downtown Hollister. He stated that he recently submitted a letter to Matt Granger with regard to a Brown Act violation that occurred yesterday. The Brown Act violation had to do with the removal of Jaime De La Cruz from the COG Board. Mr. Gilles stated that the Board should step back a second and make sure the Brown Act issue is resolved. He also stated that he would like to see the Board consider a resolution or a motion to postpone Item 5c. on the Agenda. Also, he 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 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.

Director Botelho stated that he conferred with County Counsel after the Brown Act issue was brought up and County Counsel's opinion was that there was no Brown Act violation on the part of the County. Director Botelho stated however, that in order to ensure that all parties are satisfied he would accept the recommendation to continue the item and schedule a special meeting within a week; with the stipulation that everything comes out and is transparent, with regard to the Regional Transportation Plan. He noted however, that at no cost could we jeopardize our federal monies.

D. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Rheinheimer

Ms. Rheinheimer reported that she attended a meeting with Caltrans, the California Transportation Commissioner, Fran Inman, and other colleagues along the US 101 Corridor. They had a very productive meeting and discussion about freight mobility needs on the Central Coast and in San Benito County. She was able to provide some insight as to what is happening nationally with regard to freight mobility, as well as what is going on nationally in terms of transportation funding looking into the future.

E. CALTRANS DISTRICT 5 REPORT: Gubbins

District 5 Director, Tim Gubbins reported that Caltrans recently released The Mile Marker – A Caltrans Performance Report that will be released periodically. The report is available on their website at www.dot.ca.gov

Mr. Gubbins announced that Caltrans has adopted a new Mission: Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy.

Mr. Gubbins announced that Caltrans has endorsed the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) bicycle and pedestrian design standards that are a little more stringent than Caltrans standards. However, Caltrans is recognizing that as a fairly good resource for people who are working within Caltrans right-of-way or for City and County streets.

Lastly, Mr. Gubbins announced that there is a call for projects for the new Active Transportation Program which has about \$360 million statewide for projects that support active modes goals, including bicycling

and walking trips, improving safety and mobility for non-motorized users, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, enhancing public health and ensuring disadvantaged communities fully share in the programs benefit. Applications are due Wednesday, May 21, 2014.

Director Botelho asked Mr. Gubbins when he thought Caltrans might respond to the San Benito County Resolution that was sent regarding Highway 156 and the request to work together on addressing some of the issues and concerns.

Mr. Gubbins stated that Caltrans will meet with San Benito County and will provide a written response to the County on how they can work together to address the County's concerns.

Director Boch inquired about a response to his request from last month's meeting regarding concern with the speed limit at the Alameda and Highway 156 intersection.

Mr. Gubbins apologized and stated that he would have to get back to Director Boch.

F. BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORTS:

Chair Gomez addressed Director Botelho's recommendation to postpone Item 5 and schedule a special meeting within one week. He asked Director Botelho to clarify what would happen between now and one week.

Director Botelho stated that within that time the Board of Supervisors could schedule a Special meeting and re-confirm the appointment of Director Muenzer, and hopefully schedule a Special meeting to discuss Item 5.

Chair Gomez stated that the soonest he could clear his schedule for a special meeting would be two weeks however, he added that he did not see the need for a Special meeting with the Board of Supervisors if Director Botelho was confident that their action was legitimate.

Director Botelho stated that he was confident that the Board of Supervisors action was legitimate, however, for sake of some public concern it would be better to reinforce it.

Chair Gomez mentioned that he had a City commitment at 4:30 p.m. and would have to excuse himself and allow the Vice-Chair to take over around 4:15 p.m. He also asked to move Item 4 after Item 6 on the Agenda.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Scattini, and seconded by Director Boch, the Directors unanimously approved moving Item 4 after Item 6 on the Agenda. Vote: 5/0 motion passes.

CONSENT AGENDA:

- 1. APPROVE** Council of Governments Draft Meeting Minutes Dated February 20, 2014 and March 20, 2014 – Gomez
- 2. APPROVE** COG Transaction Report (Financial Claims) dated March 2014 (Postigo)
- 3. RECEIVE** Construction Projects Report – Caltrans District 5

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Item 1

Robert Scales, Parsons Transportation Group

Mr. Scales noted a correction to Item 1 Draft Minutes dated March 20, 2014, under Item 6?7 last paragraph before Public Comment (3rd sentence) states: *Mr. Scales stated that the Model they prepared is calibrated to a better level of goodness than the AMBAG 2014 Model.* He stated that the sentence was not

true because they do not have the AMBAG 2014 Model, they do have the AMBAG 2010-2011 Model Version 1.5, which is what that remark referred to. He also noted a correction to the last sentence in the same paragraph which states: *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.* He stated that the comment refers to every single county in the San Francisco Bay area.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Muenzer, and seconded by Director Botelho, the Directors unanimously approved Items 1-3 from the Consent Agenda. Vote: 5/0 motion passes.

REGULAR AGENDA

TRANSPORTATION ITEMS:

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

- 5. *On the Move: 2035 San Benito Regional Transportation Plan Public Hearing* – Rheinheimer**
 - a. OPEN** Public Hearing on the Draft 2014 Regional Transportation Plan,
 - b. CLOSE** Public Hearing, and
 - c. DIRECT** Staff Regarding the Draft Regional Transportation Plan and the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Ms. Rheinheimer stated that the purpose of this item is to conduct a Public Hearing on the Draft 2014 Regional Transportation Plan which was released for public review March 21, 2014, following Board action. The public comment period ends on April 21, 2014. The public hearing is intended to be an opportunity for members of the public to comment on the Draft Regional Transportation Plan.

Ms. Rheinheimer stated that in terms of comments, she provided a letter from Caltrans after the March meeting regarding the Regional Transportation Plan. She stated that it would be appropriate to ask Mr. Gubbins from Caltrans District 5 to address that letter after the public hearing.

Chair Gomez opened the Public Hearing at 3:20 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Robert Scales, Parsons Transportation Group

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.

Jeff Gilles, L+G, LLP

Mr. Gilles reiterated his comments regarding Item 5c. He recommended that any action on 5c. 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.

Walt Allen, Parsons Transportation Group

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 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 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.

Director Botelho responded to Mr. Allen's comments. He stated that he has been on the COG Board for 10 years and wanted to clarify that the COG Board took the Highway 25 Widening project off the list because the Caltrans design was a \$350 million project. The COG Board thought it was valid at the time to reconsider the Highway 25 Widening project to try to lower the cost and Impact fees. He stated that at no time did COG staff remove the project on their own. Director Botelho stated that what he did find interesting was how the Shore Road Extension was placed on the project list in the March revision of the RTP without any discussion or studies done at all on the project.

Chair Gomez also responded to Mr. Allen's comments. He stated that in 2010 or 2011 the COG Board instructed their respective agencies and COG to reevaluate the Traffic Impact Fees because they wanted to encourage development. He stated that the COG Board directed COG's Executive Director, Lisa Rheinheimer to reevaluate the Traffic Impact Fees and clarified that the removal of the Highway 25 Widening project was also at the direction of the COG Board and not by the Executive Director.

Kristina Chavez-Wyatt, SBC Business Council

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.

Ms. Chavez-Wyatt read the letter that was presented to the Board from the San Benito County Business Council dated April 8, 2014.

Chair Gomez Closed the Public Hearing at 3:37p.m.

Caltrans District 5 Director, Tim Gubbins wanted to first clarify that the Caltrans letter that was included as one of the RTP comments in the Agenda packet, was not necessarily their comment letter on the RTP. Mr. Gubbins stated that Caltrans considers San Benito COG a partner and after the March meeting there were some actions taken by the Board that Caltrans considered inconsistent with other things that would jeopardize future funding. Caltrans wanted to make sure that they conveyed this to the COG Board as soon as possible.

Mr. Gubbins stated that Caltrans is largely focused on the risks with any Model that are inconsistent with the AMBAG Model and with the state and federal regulations that govern the RTP and MTP development. Mr. Gubbins assured the COG Board that Caltrans Deputy District Director, Aileen Loe, has been in close partnership with headquarters staff who do this on a statewide basis as well as with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Mr. Gubbins and Ms. Loe both spoke with individuals from FHWA last week because there were both project specific as well as generalized planning level concerns brought up. FHWA provided feedback stating that the letter from Ms. Loe could've been more specific on the magnitude of things. FHWA staff worked closely with AMBAG who is the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the past 2 ½ years, following the processes that FHWA sets forth for all MPO's. Mr. Gubbins stated that FHWA indicated that in addition to the inconsistencies that they see, there would be no interest in revisiting the process because it would be considered a duplication of services. There would be no state or federal participation to pay for a separate EIR (as was suggested) because they paid for it once and do not believe anything was wrong with the AMBAG Model since they followed the MPO process. Mr. Gubbins encouraged the COG Board to work closely with AMBAG and share any concerns that come up. He stated that there are ways to document differences even as the Model comes out. Caltrans is using the AMBAG Model as they have signed a user agreement stating that they will abide by all of its technicalities. He stated that Caltrans does not want to see any funding jeopardized for San Benito County. Mr. Gubbins stated that the intention of Caltrans letter was not meant as any type of threat, but as a way to make the COG Board aware of consequences that they saw coming because they believe it was their due diligence to let COG know.

Chair Gomez thanked Mr. Gubbins for his comments and stated that the Board appreciated the letter from Ms. Loe because they would not want to go down the wrong path. They want to make sure that they are working together as partners with AMBAG in a collaborative effort. Unfortunately, he stated that he has not seen which projects will be affected specifically, though he has requested this information. He stated that he has also requested that AMBAG provide him with the information of which Model they were using and they never provided that information either. Chair Gomez stated that as long as he has anything to do with it, the Board is not going to move forward with anything that is going to jeopardize any kind of funding for San Benito County.

Director Muenzer stated that he wanted to hear it one more time, and asked Mr. Gubbins if the action the COG Board took at last month's meeting could jeopardize funding, and if the action would also mean that there would be no state or federal funding to pay for any additional studies i.e. EIR's.

Mr. Gubbins stated that Director Muenzer was correct.

Director Botelho stated that this was one of the main reasons why he brought the issue to the Board of Supervisors for rescinding the action in March and returning it back to the February AMBAG Model. He stated that whether they agree with it or not, it is the Model that the MPO, that we belong to by federal

law, is required. He stated that based on what Mr. Gubbins stated, there would be additional environmental work that would have to be done, but there would be no state or federal funds to pay for it.

Mr. Gubbins repeated that he checked with the statewide for Caltrans, as well as with planning staff for FHWA and they stated that there is a prescribed process. Again, he encouraged the COG Board as well as the individual entities that they represent at other times, to share any concerns. There is a process which AMBAG is currently doing with the EIR they just had. He reiterated that since there has already been state planning and federal planning funds spent on the efforts that they've done, there would not be any funds available for a separate effort.

Director Botelho asked Mr. Gubbins to clarify if all or some of the funding will be jeopardized if the Board were to use the San Benito Traffic Model instead of the AMBAG Model.

Mr. Gubbins stated that if AMBAG is not able to include the changes in their MTP, the federal monies would not be available even for capital construction. So it is not just some planning efforts, it would also stem into the COG's operations.

Director Scattini stated that he believed that the meeting between Simon Salinas, AMBAG, and other interested parties will be able to solve and answer any issues or questions.

Director Botelho asked Chair Gomez what he thought the Board could expect to come from the meeting that was suggested by Mr. Gilles.

Chair Gomez stated that today was the first time he saw the letter from Mr. Gilles. Chair Gomez stated that the issue isn't about what transportation funding is going to be in jeopardy, this is 100% political. It is about the "no-growthers against the pro-business guys" and either you're going to take an anti-business no-growth position on this or you're going to take a pro-business pro-growth position on this. He stated that the ultimate issue is with the population figures and it has nothing to do with transportation funding. He stated that he had no problem with them trying to use that for political reasons, but to take an anti-business approach to this is disheartening. He stated that as a small business owner for ten years and as somebody who is going to reinvest in this community, he is tremendously concerned with the direction that the San Benito County Board of Supervisors is heading in.

Director Botelho responded to Chair Gomez' comments. He stated that the issue has everything to do with transportation funding just as Mr. Gubbins and the letter from Caltrans explained it's about the transportation dollars. He stated that \$122 million in projects is what is at risk, for the most part in San Benito County. He stated that this is not about business or population. The County could move forward with the 94,000 population in its General Plan just as it is doing and as project evolve, in four years you could add it to the RTP. He asked for an explanation on how adding the Shore Road Extension to the list is good for business in Hollister, when there hasn't been a project that has submitted one dollar in an application. He stated that this has to be done right now because there is a deadline as far as what is going to happen with these funds. He stated that he should let this happen and the Highway 156 project would disappear. He asked what would happen to the business climate and the City's population growth then. He stated that instead of advocating for a Shore Road extension, he would have been advocating a 25 Bypass to Fairview Road connection which would be more beneficial to Hollister citizens and business.

Director Botelho stated that the reason why he was so upset was because a lot of the stuff took place behind closed doors. They got a draft with a change in projects, and a population projection that the region does not accept. He stated that he asked AMBAG how they came up with the population forecast of 82,000 or 83,000. He was told that they take the current General Plan and all of the projects that have been approved and are in the till, then they evaluate the Department of Finance's projections for State growth and knowing that there is a population potential that would be above average in San Benito County, they added 10%, which is the most they can add. Director Botelho stated that if the Board goes

back and tries to redo the work they will be stuck with the environmental work and they jeopardize the operations of COG and projects.

There was no further discussion from the Board.

Director Botelho made the motion to rescind the action that the COG Board took in March, rescind the RTP, and direct staff to move forward with the February version of the RTP.

Chair Gomez inquired if the direction could be taken based on what was written on the agenda.

Deputy County Counsel, Shirley Murphy stated that the agenda was written broadly to hold the public hearing and direct staff. She stated that it was broad enough to cover one of the requests which came from the Board of Supervisors in the form of a resolution.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Botelho, and seconded by Director Boch, the Directors rescinded the action that the COG Board took in March, rescinded the RTP, and Directed staff to move forward with the February version, with Chair Gomez and Director Scattini opposed. Vote: 3/2 motion passes

Chair Gomez called for a 5 minute recess at 4:02 p.m.

The COG Board returned from recess at 4:07 p.m. Chair Gomez and Director Scattini were excused to attend a City meeting and did not return.

Deputy County Counsel, Shirley Murphy stated that per COG's rules of procedure, when the Chair and Vice-Chair are absent, the procedure calls to appoint a Chair pro-tempore just for this meeting. In addition, the Vice-Chair should be agendized on the next Board meeting.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Botelho, and seconded by Director Muenzer, the Directors appointed Director Boch as Chair Pro-tempore.

6. SR 25 Widening Project, Environmental Document Continuation – SR 25 Widening Project Ad-Hoc Committee

- a. APPROVE Moving Forward with Option 2, as Identified in the SR 25 Widening Project Environmental Document Options Comparison Table;
- b. REQUEST that Caltrans Obtain from FHWA, a 3-year Time Extension of the 10-Year Rule for the SR 25 Widening Project;
- c. DIRECT Staff to Work with the Committee to Develop an Implementation Plan; and
- d. DIRECT Staff to Coordinate with the Committee and Report Progress to the Board in May.

Ms. Rheinheimer asked to continue Item 6 to the May meeting since the Ad-Hoc Committee members were not present.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Muenzer, and seconded by Director Botelho, the Directors continued Item 6 to the May meeting. Vote: 3/0 motion passes.

4. Safe Routes to School Program – Lezama

- a. RECEIVE Presentation on the Safe Routes to RO Hardin and Calaveras Schools Project; and
- b. ADOPT Resolution No. 2014-05 Wholeheartedly Supporting the City of Hollister's Active Transportation Program Safe Routes to School Grant to the California Department of Transportation for Funding of the Activating Safe and Equitable Connections in West Hollister Project.

Ms. Lezama introduced Jennifer Donnelly with Alta Planning and Design, who provided a Power-Point presentation, and Patrick Dobbins with Harris Associates, who provided the engineering services for Safe Routes to Schools.

Ms. Rheinheimer mentioned that she presented this item to the Hollister School Board and they were very excited about the prospect of getting some enhanced crosswalks. Some of the other schools were very interested in this type of work as well. COG staff is excited to partner with the City of Hollister in trying to get some of this work accomplished.

Ms. Lezama provided a report on three items: Safe Routes to RO Hardin and Calaveras Schools, the West Gateway project, and the Active Transportation Program grant opportunity.

Ms. Lezama reported that the City of Hollister is working closely with COG staff to prepare the grant application. The Hollister City Council is scheduled to consider applying for the grant at its April 21, 2014 meeting. Grant applications are due to Caltrans on May 21, 2014 and the California Transportation Commission is scheduled to select projects in November 2014.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Kristina Chavez-Wyatt

SBC resident and Farmhouse Communications, President

Ms. Chavez-Wyatt stated that she has been working with the County Public Health Department and the Community Foundation, on what is called the Healthy San Benito Initiative and launch with Benito Link of the new Healthy Communities Dashboard. A lot of the work that was done in identifying obstacles for healthy measures to walking and biking to work and to school. She stated that it would be great to see the work that was done by the consultants folded into the initiative and also that their studies be uploaded to the Dashboard that is now available at [BenitoLink.com\communitydashboard](http://BenitoLink.com/communitydashboard). This way all organizations, coalitions, and community members have access to the data and the data can also be used to leverage and acquire future funding for grants for infrastructure improvements. This will help ensure that our families have the right kind of accommodations to be out and moving.

Director Botelho asked if once the grant was accepted and adopted could it then be made available on the dashboard.

Ms. Rheinheimer stated that she could work with Ms. Chavez-Wyatt on making sure that the information is available for the dashboard. She mentioned that COG staff has been trying to do their part as well to help with the community and have also been working with the Healthy San Benito Initiative over the last year or so.

There was no further discussion.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Muenzer, and seconded by Director Botelho, the Board adopted Item 4b. as noted above Vote: 3/0 motion passes.

7. RELEASE Draft Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan for Public Comment and SET Public Hearing for May 15,2014 - Rheinheimer

Ms. Rheinheimer reported on the Draft Regional Housing needs Allocation Plan. COG adopted its proposed methodology for distributing the regional housing need to the Cities of Hollister, San Juan Bautista, and the County of San Benito in February 2014. The methodology applied AMBAG's employment forecast in 2025 to the distribution of housing units to the Cities and County.

Ms. Rheinheimer noted that in order to address the Board's concern at the December 2013 and February 2014 meetings, staff included language throughout the document encouraging the local jurisdictions to

plan for growth that meets the needs of the jurisdictions. The housing need determination is meant to represent a minimum, not a maximum.

In terms of timeline, the Council of Governments must follow a schedule outlined in statute which include the following next steps:

- April 17, 2014 – COG issues draft allocation of Regional Housing need to each jurisdiction
- July 17, 2014 - COG adopts Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan

All of this work is the precursor for the subsequent General Plan Housing Element update which will be due December 31, 2015. The December 2015 date is 18 months after the anticipated Regional Transportation Plan adoption date of June 2014.

Director Muenzer asked if the numbers were based on AMBAG's 2010 numbers.

Ms. Rheinheimer stated that the allocation of housing units by Housing and Community Development is based on Department of Finance projections to the year 2023, not AMBAG's numbers.

There was no public comment on this item.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Botelho, and seconded by Director Muenzer, the Directors approved Item 7 as noted above. Vote: 3/0 motion passes.

8. RECEIVE Presentation on FY 2014/15 Council of Governments Draft Budget – Postigo

Ms. Postigo provided a Power-Point presentation on the FY 2014/15 Council of Governments Draft Budget. In summary, the COG Draft Budget meets the goals and objectives of the agency and matches revenues with expenses.

Ms. Postigo stated that staff will bring the Draft Budget back in May for a public hearing and then back in June for approval from the Board.

Chair Boch inquired about the Vanpool Program. He asked staff to clarify that staff would not be purchasing a new van unless they receive a grant to do so.

Ms. Postigo confirmed Chair Boch's comment.

There was no public comment on this item or further discussion on this item.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Botelho, and seconded by Director Muenzer, the Directors unanimously adjourned the COG meeting at 4:40 p.m. Vote: 3/0 motion passes.

ADJOURN TO COG MEETING MAY 15, 2014.