AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL OF SAN BENITO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS

DATE: Thursday, November 21, 2019
3:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Board of Supervisors Chambers
481 Fourth St., Hollister, CA 95023

DIRECTORS: Chair César E. Flores, Vice Chair Jim Gillio
Directors, Anthony Botelho, Marty Richman, and Ignacio Velazquez
Alternates: San Benito County: Mark Medina;
City of Hollister: Rolan Resendiz; City of San Juan Bautista: Mary Vazquez Edge, Ex Officio: Caltrans District 5

Persons who wish to address the Board of Directors must complete a Speaker Card and give it to the Clerk prior to addressing the Board. Those who wish to address the Board on an agenda item will be heard when the Chairperson calls for comments from the audience. Following recognition, persons desiring to speak are requested to advance to the podium and state their name and address. After hearing audience comments, the Public Comment portion of the agenda item will be closed. The Opportunity to address the Board of Directors on items of interest not appearing on the agenda will be provided during Section C. Public Comment.

3:00 P.M. CALL TO ORDER

A. Pledge of Allegiance
B. Verification of Certificate of Posting
C. Public Comment (Opportunity to address the Board on items of interest on a subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Council of Governments and not appearing on the agendas. No action may be taken unless provided by Govt. Code Sec. 54954.2 Speakers are limited to 3 minutes.)
D. Executive Director’s Report
E. Caltrans Report – Gubbins/Loe
F. Board of Directors’ Reports

CONSENT AGENDA:
(These matters shall be considered as a whole and without discussion unless a particular item is removed from the Consent Agenda. Members of the public who wish to speak on a Consent Agenda item must submit a Speaker Card to the Clerk and wait for recognition from the Chairperson. Approval of a consent item means approval as recommended on the Staff Report.)

1. APPROVE Council of Governments Draft Meeting Minutes Dated October 17, 2019 – Gomez
2. RECEIVE Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan Oversight Committee Minutes Dated August 5, 2019 – Gomez
3. RECEIVE Construction Projects Report and SR 156 Project Status Report – Caltrans District 5
4. **APPROVE** COG Office Closure Days December 23rd, 24th, 30th, and 31st – Postigo

5. **APPROVE** Revised Council of San Benito County Governments Purchasing Policy – Postigo

---

**REGULAR AGENDA:**

6. **Measure G Update** – Gilbert
   a. **RECEIVE** Fiscal Year 2018/2019 Fourth Quarter (April, May, June) and Fiscal Year 2019/2020 First Quarter (July, August, September) Measure G Revenue Statements
   b. **RECEIVE** Update on Measure G Projects and Activities

7. **2020 Regional Transportation Improvement Program** – Gilbert
   a. **RECEIVE** Funding Presentation
   b. **ADOPT** 2020 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

---

*Adjourn to COG Meeting on December 19, 2019. Agenda Deadline is Tuesday, December 3, 2019 at 12:00 p.m.*

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if requested, the Agenda can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability. If an individual wishes to request an alternative agenda format, please contact the Clerk of the Council four (4) days prior to the meeting at (831) 637-7665. The Council of Governments Board of Directors meeting facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Clerk of the Council’s office at (831) 637-7665 at least 48 hours before the meeting to enable the Council of Governments to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility.
District Director’s Report

A quarterly publication for our transportation partners

**Fix-it-First**

In 2018, Caltrans completed more than 50 projects and began work on another 500 statewide—all funded through Senate Bill 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, and the State Highway Operation and Protection Program.

In District 5, these projects included:

- US 101 – 5.2 miles of repairs, shoulder pavement and striping, Santa Barbara County, $4.4 million
- US 101 – 4.5 miles of pavement, San Benito County, $1.4 million
- US 101, revamp two bridges, Santa Barbara County, $1.2 million
- Highway 41 – 9.32 miles of pavement preservation, San Luis Obispo County, $4.8 million
- US 101 – 16.2 miles of pavement, San Luis Obispo County, $9.1 million
- US 101 – 367 miles of striping, Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo counties, $4.9 million
- US 101 – 379 miles of striping, San Luis Obispo and Monterey counties, $5.2 million
- US 101 – 281 miles of striping, Monterey and San Benito counties, $4.4 million

SB 1 invests $5.4 billion annually to fix the state’s transportation system. More information: [http://rebuildingca.ca.gov/](http://rebuildingca.ca.gov/)

**District 5 Kicks Off Active Transportation Plan**

Caltrans is developing active transportation plans in all 12 districts statewide. Its consultant, Toole Design Group, will create and implement a route prioritization—emphasizing social equity—to identify bicycle and pedestrian network gaps, performance metrics and improvements. District 5 will work with multiple stakeholders and the public to identify needs and develop active transportation solutions on, across, and parallel to, the state highway system. The District plan will establish a vision with local partners for a safe network supporting healthy communities for all users, especially in disadvantaged areas. Main goals for the plan include safety improvements, developing long-term strategies for multimodal options, better connectivity and accessibility, exploring shared mobility systems for short trips, identifying needs unique to rural and main street corridors, coordinating with trail networks, and maintaining long-term active transportation facilities. The District will roll out the major planning effort in early spring 2019. For more information, contact Terri Persons, District 5 Active Transportation Coordinator at [terri.person@dot.ca.gov](mailto:terri.person@dot.ca.gov)

**Asset Management Coming**

District 5 is engaging local partners in asset management implementation. The District’s strategies are based on the Caltrans 2018 California Transportation Asset Management Plan developed in partnership statewide. Nearly $2.7 billion in SB 1 funding is expected to be available statewide through 2027 to address pavement, culverts and transportation management systems as well as office buildings, roadside rest facilities and weigh stations.

Asset management calls for investing in highway infrastructure based on total life-cycle costs from design to long-term upkeep. It also stresses the fix-it-first approach using preventive maintenance to improve or preserve existing assets and not expand highway capacity. More information: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/assetmgmt/documents/TA-MP_Final_03_30_18.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/assetmgmt/documents/TA-MP_Final_03_30_18.pdf)

Please Submit Maintenance Service Requests at the Following Link: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/msrsubmit/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/msrsubmit/)
Innovating Safety
District 5 is now using automated flagging assistance devices for temporary traffic control with high visibility signal heads. Just one person is needed to operate the hand-held remote control while standing well beyond the roadway and moving traffic. These devices are used in the daytime for short-term lane or road closures for bridge maintenance, haul road crossing, and guardrail and pavement repairs. They do not replace the need for trained flaggers and should only be used in locations where just one lane of approaching traffic needs control, according to the Federal Highway Administration. This equipment furthers Caltrans' high safety goal toward zero worker and user fatalities in all travel modes. More information: [https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop37042/fhwahop37042.pdf](https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop37042/fhwahop37042.pdf)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWARD ZERO DEATHS</th>
<th>TARGETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALTRANS SAFETY &amp; HEALTH OBJECTIVES</strong></td>
<td><strong>Zero worker fatalities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce user fatalities and injuries by adopting a Toward Zero Deaths practice</strong></td>
<td>Maintain 0.5 or less fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled on the state highway system every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote health through active transportation and reduced pollution in communities</strong></td>
<td>10 percent reduction in number of fatalities every year for each mode: vehicle, transit, pedestrian and bicycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Rail Plan Serves Central Coast
The Caltrans 2018 California State Rail Plan sets a long-term vision for prioritizing state investment in an efficient, effective passenger and freight rail system consistent with the California Transportation Plan 2040. The plan’s regional goals support:
- Running two daily intercity trains connecting the San Francisco Bay Area to Salinas via San Jose plus new stations in Pajaro, Watsonville and Castroville.
- Adding local stops along the coastal route in Soledad and King City.
- Enhancing rail connections to Gilroy.
- Providing express bus service to:
  - San Jose, Salinas, San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara.
  - Central Valley to Paso Robles.
  - Hollister, Monterey and Santa Cruz to the statewide rail network.


Sea level rise, Highway 1 in San Luis Obispo County.

D5 Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment
District 5 recently kicked off its first climate change vulnerability assessment. The study will identify specific locations for likely impacts of rising sea levels, increasing storm and wildfires, coastal erosion, changing precipitation patterns and higher temperatures. The report will feature a GIS database with online interactive mapping for public use. Caltrans will evaluate other modal vulnerabilities with local partners. Agency partners include: California Department of Water Resources, California Energy Commission, California Geological Survey, Federal Emergency Management Agency, UC-Berkeley, UC-Davis and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Caltrans is producing assessments for each District. District 5’s report is scheduled for completion in fall 2019. [http://www.dot.ca.gov/transplanning/ocp/vulnerability-assessment.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/transplanning/ocp/vulnerability-assessment.htm)

Caltrans Funds Multimodal Plans
Downtown Multimodal Streetscape Plan
The City of Santa Maria recently completed its downtown multimodal plan. The $265,590 grant project emphasizes beautification efforts, activities and partnerships to connect the downtown’s retail and civic areas to Allan Hancock College, the transit center and surrounding residences. The comprehensive plan also identifies Complete Streets priorities for these locations with recommendations for future funding and implementation.

Alisal Corridor Complete Streets Plan
The City of Salinas is nearing completion on its corridor plan addressing pedestrian, transit, bicycle and vehicular needs along Alisal Street, a major local arterial. The $262,782 grant project focuses on improving safety and access for all users with recommendations for parking, infill development opportunities, funding and implementation.
SAN BENITO COUNTY
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
REGULAR MEETING

October 17, 2019, 3:00 P.M.

DRAFT MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Chair César E. Flores, Anthony Botelho, Jim Gillio, and Marty Richman
Ex Officio, John Olejnik, Caltrans District 5 Director

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Ignacio Velazquez

STAFF PRESENT:
Deputy County Counsel, Shirley Murphy; Executive Director, Mary Gilbert; Administrative Services Specialist, Kathy Postigo; Transportation Planner, Veronica Lezama; Secretary, Monica Gomez

OTHERS PRESENT:
David Leifer, KNN Public Finance; Walter Windus, Aviation Consultant; Leona Medearis-Peacher, MV Transportation; Harry Mavrogenes, San Benito County Resource Management Agency

CALL TO ORDER:
Chair Flores called the meeting to order at 3:00 P.M.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B. CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

A motion was made by Director Gillio, and seconded by Director Botelho, the Directors acknowledged the Certificate of Posting. Vote: 4/0 motion passes.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Chair Flores stated for the record that the COG Board received Joe Thompson’s public comment correspondence. The correspondence was entered into public record.

D. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT: Gilbert

Ms. Gilbert provided an update on SB277. She reported that the bill had just been vetoed by the Governor. Staff had been tracking it because it would determine how the formula funds vs. competitive funds would be broken down in the Local Partnership Program for SB1. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) now has control of it. Ms. Gilbert stated that she will be attending a workshop in Sacramento on Tuesday to get additional information about the fund source.

Ms. Gilbert reported that staff has been working with the Mobility Partnership regarding safety and congestion concerns at the Bolsa Road intersection. She has a meeting scheduled for tomorrow with the
E. **Caltrans District 5 Report: John Olejnik**

John Olejnik reported that in addition to having a new director of Caltrans, they now have a new Transportation Agency Secretary, David Kim. He stated that Mr. Kim has asked to convey a message to all of the partners in the different regions. It has to do with transportation funding related to SB1. It is true that the Governor plans to update his approach on spending up to $5 billion dollars of discretionary funding towards combatting climate change and the effects of it in California, however he wants to clarify that this executive order does not supersede the existing state laws, specifically gas taxes from SB1 are protected in the states constitution and we will honor the will of the voters and this is unchanged by any executive order by the Governor for that SB1 money. That means that the SB1 “fix it first” monies are still going on as the voters voted to approve it. There is still though the need for addressing the climate change issues in California and to support other assembly and senate bills specifically, AB32 and SB32. The Governor will continue to work with the agencies across the different departments to ensure that they are doing everything they can to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle miles traveled and other means in the state of California. Mr. Olejnik stated that within Caltrans District 5, there are several disadvantaged communities and District 5 staff will continue to work hard to help these communities to be represented and have access to transportation funding for local road type improvements

F. **Board of Directors’ Reports**

Director Botelho provided some comments regarding the Caltrans report. He stated that having SB277 vetoed was great news for smaller Counties. He asked what it means for transportation dollars for our County since we have some big projects like HWY 25 Widening and safety improvements at 156/25. He asked if the state would be providing additional funds to get HWY 25 widened sooner.

Mr. Olejnik stated that SB1 funds would go to “fix it first” deferred maintenance projects. At the direction of the California Transportation Commission, the core assets will go to repair bridges, pavement, culverts, and intelligent transportation systems. He said that the state is committed to put the money into fixing the existing road system, it is not intended to expand capacity.

Ms. Gilbert noted that at the next Board meeting staff will be going over the State Transportation Improvement Program and the state highway funding that is available for projects in San Benito County.

Director Botelho requested that staff provide a list of SB1 projects that will be completed in San Benito County.

Director Gillio thanked the Governor for vetoing SB277. He said that aside from having the list of SB1 projects from the individual jurisdictions he would also like to see a list of Caltrans projects that are to be completed with SB1 funds.

Director Gillio stated that he also wanted to thank COG Executive Director Mary Gilbert and Gus Khouri with the Central Coast Coalition for all of the work they did on setting up meetings with all the key stakeholders in Sacramento.

Director Richman also thanked the Governor for vetoing SB277. He also mentioned the fatality that occurred in the county a couple days ago. He said that he wanted to send a message to the public, “your life is in your hands”. If you’re frustrated and you take it out on the roadway it will eventually lead to an accident which only makes things worse when the roads end up closed for hours. He said we are a smaller county that has a much smaller revenue stream compared to the larger counties and we need extra help.
CONSENT AGENDA:

1. APPROVE Council of Governments Draft Meeting Minutes Dated September 19, 2019 – Gomez
2. RECEIVE Construction Projects Report – Caltrans District 5
3. ADOPT Resolution 2019-10 Authorizing the Filing of a Claim for Allocation of Transportation Development Act Funds for Fiscal Year 2018/2019 – Postigo
4. APPROVE Chairperson’s Appointment of County Supervisor Jim Gillio as Representative from the County of San Benito to the Central Coast Housing Working Group and CONFIRM SUPPORT of AMBAG as the Fiscal Agent of the Local Government Planning Support Grants Program for the Central Coast – Gilbert

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

A motion was made by Director Gillio, and seconded by Director Richman, the Directors approved Items 1-4 from the Consent agenda. Vote: 4/0 motion passes.

REGULAR AGENDA
TRANSPORTATION ITEMS:

Director Richman requested to swap items 5 and 6 in consideration of the KNN presenter’s time. Chair Flores concurred and moved Item 6 up on the agenda.

6. San Benito County Measure G – Gilbert
   a. RECEIVE Presentation on Revenue Projections and Cash Flow Model
   b. DISCUSS Measure G Strategic Plan

Mary Gilbert reported that COG has received approximately $2.25 million in disbursements of Measure G tax funds to date. No Measure G funds have been expended to date. Ms. Gilbert introduced David Leifer with KNN Public Finance who provided a summary presentation of revenue projections and funding scenarios.

Director Botelho inquired about the County sales tax numbers. He asked if the financial projections backed out all of the funds from the Panoche solar project. Mr. Leifer stated that he was not sure if they backed off the entire amount for the project but said that he would go back and check to ensure that they do not include it for the strategic plan.

Board members asked if the financial model included Impact Fee funds.

Ms. Gilbert stated that the “Other Funding” line item includes Impact Fee funds as well as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), SB 1, $5 million bonus incentive. She noted that those numbers are estimated.

There was discussion about bonding early on to be able to get some of the local road projects completed. Mr. Leifer pointed out that when an agency bonds for a project, it must expend the money within three years.

There was discussion about Tier I Highway 25 project funding approaches 1) Pay as you go: Measure Revenues or Cash Balances – requires ample cash balances and manageable capital program, does not allow
for acceleration and delivery of larger projects 2) Borrow: Loans or Bonds – Can accelerate delivery of “shovel-ready” projects, may minimize rising infrastructure/ construction costs 3) Matching Funds: Federal, State, & Local: Aimed to reduce the burden of local funds an maximize the Measure G investment, Directs excess funds to Tier II and Tier III project priorities.

Mr. Leifer went over alternative strategies to deliver the Tier I Highway 25 Project: 1) Direct greater percentage of Measure revenues to the Tier I program over the peak Highway 25 construction period. 2) Secure additional Funding (i.e. Federal and State grand funds) 3) Modify Highway 25 project approach.

There was discussion about an “Interim Highway 25 Widening” project approach and whether or not Caltrans would agree to this design alternative. It was identified in COG’s 2016 Alternatives Analysis, building two new lanes of highway and other improvements along the existing corridor with an estimated cost of $135,000,000.

Ms. Gilbert stated that at the last COG meeting Caltrans District Director Tim Gubbins recommended using the Value Analysis process to review the Highway 25 project. Caltrans will convene a group of Caltrans engineers, COG staff, and local agency staff to evaluate, advise, and come up with solutions/alternatives. A pre-study meeting has already been scheduled with team members.

Director Gillio stepped out of the meeting at 3:48 p.m.

Board members expressed the need to look at it as a synergistic operation that includes looking at the critical areas of 25/156 Interchange and the 101/25 Interchange and all the flow in between.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Gilbert went over some of the next steps. There is a meeting scheduled in early November with Caltrans, COG staff, and City and County staff to talk about the approach to the Value Analysis and what they will be looking at. Staff will report back at the next meeting. There is also a Citizen’s Oversight Committee meeting scheduled for later this month.

5. **ADOPT** Resolution 19-11 Opposing a Roundabout at the Intersection of State Route 25 and 156 in San Benito County, Supporting the Implementation of Other Safety Improvements, Requesting Caltrans Stop All Work on the Roundabout, and Requesting SHOPP Funds be Reallocated to Other Safety Improvements at the Intersection – Gilbert

Ms. Gilbert reported that at its September meeting, the Board expressed opposition to the State Route 156/ State Route 25 roundabout project and directed staff to prepare a resolution opposing the project. She reviewed the main points of the resolution. Staff also met with Harry Mavrogenes, the San Benito County Resource Management Agency Director to discuss alternatives to the roundabout and funding. Ms. Gilbert introduced Mr. Mavrogenes and asked that he provide an overview of those alternatives.

Director Gillio returned to the meeting at 4:01 p.m.

Mr. Mavrogenes stated that he was in support of the Resolution. He stated that they’ve had conversations with Caltrans and advocated several alternatives to improve the safety on the interim but they’re also trying to work towards an interim grade separation that would separate the traffic. The smaller steps that they advocated include extending the auxiliary lanes on both highways for about a mile in each direction. In addition rumble strips to help warn people. He said the best solution is to not do the roundabout and instead focus on building a 2-lane Interchange grade separation that is estimated to cost about $15 million. He said if they can utilize the $10 million in SHOPP funds that is proposed for the roundabout and look at some of the local available early funding amongst us, they can make it happen. He said that he committed in the discussion that he and Mary would develop some initial plans that Caltrans could look at for that type of
interchange solution that hopefully will save lives. He said he’s hopeful that the November 8th meeting is helpful to get the Highway 25 options out there and that they set strong direction to Caltrans with an option that is doable in a much earlier time frame than twenty/thirty years from now. He urged the Board to send Caltrans the message that they are not in support of the roundabout and that they are interested in working on a more comprehensive option together.

The COG Board members stated that they were pleased and in support of the resolution without prejudice or any demeaning of Caltrans and their ability to do things. They said that COG’s funding position has changed with the passing of the Measure G sales tax and with it they promised a lot to the voters. They said that they would like to continue to work together to come up with a better solution for the community.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made by Director Botelho, and seconded by Director Gillio to adopt Resolution 19-11 and direct staff to send the Resolution to Caltrans District 5 and to the State Representatives. Vote: 4/0 motion passes.

A motion was made by Director Richman, and seconded by Director Gillio, the Directors Unanimously adjourned the COG meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m. Vote: 4/0 motion passes.

ADJOURN TO COG MEETING NOVEMBER 21, 2019 AT 3:00 P.M.
Agenda Item: __________

Council of San Benito County Governments
Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan Oversight Committee

REGULAR MEETING

August 5, 2019       6:00 PM

MINUTES

MEMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Attendance Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Boyd</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Eade</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Gomez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Latinx Community</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Gonzales</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Trade/Labor</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judi Johnson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Senior/Disabled Community</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Mario Ortega</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Burns</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>SBC District 1</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamdy Abass</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>SBC District 2</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hughes</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>SBC District 3</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Stopper</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>SBC District 4</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Rollins</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>SBC District 5</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF PRESENT:
Mary Gilbert; Executive Director, Veronica Lezama; Transportation Planner, Shirley Murphy; Deputy County Counsel, and Monica Gomez; Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:
Harry Mavrogenes; San Benito County Resource Management Agency Director, John Freeman; City of San Juan Bautista, and Jay Eade

CALL TO ORDER:
Executive Director, Mary Gilbert called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING:
Upon a motion duly made by Darlene Boyd, and seconded by Victor Gomez, the Committee acknowledged the Certificate of Posting. Vote: 11/0 motion passes.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

Introduction of Staff and Background on the Council of Governments:
COG staff introduced themselves. Executive Director Mary Gilbert provided background and overview on the Council of Governments. Ms. Gilbert mentioned that she would be providing a presentation on how projects get started at a future meeting.
Executive Director Announcements:
Mary Gilbert went over the meeting format and noted that meetings are conducted under the Brown Act rules and regulations. She noted that Committee members will be required to complete the California Fair Political Practices Commission’s (FPPC) Form 700 - Statement of Economic Interests at the required intervals. Staff will follow up with Committee members to complete the form on-line, once it’s available.

MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

REGULAR AGENDA:

1. ELECT Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan Oversight Committee Chairperson and Vice Chairperson

Transportation Planner, Veronica Lezama provided an overview of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson responsibilities.

Tim Burns nominated Victor Gomez as Chairperson
Darlene Boyd nominated Judi Johnson as Chairperson

Judi Johnson indicated she was interested in the Vice Chairperson position.

A motion was made by Hamdy Abass, and seconded by Tim Burns, to elect Victor Gomez as Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan Oversight Committee Chairperson. Vote 11/0 motion passes.

Darlene Boyd nominated Judi Johnson as Vice Chairperson.
Victor Gomez nominated John Eade as Vice Chairperson, if Judi Johnson declined.

A motion was made by Darlene Boyd, and seconded by Tim Burns, to elect Judi Johnson as Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan Oversight Committee Vice Chairperson. Vote 11/0 motion passes.

2. COMMENT on Draft Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan Oversight Committee Bylaws

Transportation Planner Veronica Lezama provided an overview of the Committee Bylaws and asked the Committee if they had any feedback for staff.

Staff was asked how far in advance Committee members would receive their agenda packets.

Staff stated that in accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act requirements, the agenda must be posted by COG at least 72 hours prior to the meeting date, however staff will strive to post the agenda the Wednesday (5 days) prior to the meeting. Those who prefer a hard copy of the agenda packet can come by the COG office to pick up the packet once it is available.

Committee members recommended having the agenda packet available to them in PDF format and/or as a zip file, along with a hyperlink to the website. They also recommended taking the meeting minutes to the COG Board for review.

The Committee noted a revision on page 6 of the Bylaws after section 5.1, Section 5.3 should be corrected to Section 5.2 Calling and Noticing of Meetings. Section 5.5 Thirty Minute Rule should be corrected to Twenty Minute Rule.
The Committee also recommended keeping the Measure G website frequently updated to be able to ensure members of the public that the funds are being monitored and that work is being done.

A suggestion was made to submit a quarterly or semiannual editorial report to the Freelance or Benitolink from the Oversight Committee as a way to keep members of the public informed.

Staff stated that the Measure G website is up and running and updates will be made to the site. Members were welcome to provide additional feedback on the website.

There was no public comment.

3. DISCUSS Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan Oversight Committee Member Initial Terms

Veronica Lezama asked the Committee to provide COG staff with direction on a preferred option for selecting the four members that will serve during the initial first year term.

Tim Burns recommended that the Chair and Vice-Chair serve two year terms.

There was consensus from the Committee that (4) members volunteer to serve during the initial first year term. The following members volunteered: Andrew Rollins, Hamdy Abass, Jose Mario Ortega, and Darlene Boyd. The four members would be eligible to reapply to be appoint by the COG Board of Directors to the Committee.

Ms. Lezama stated that procedures related to the selection of initial member terms will be confirmed in the final procedural bylaws that will be presented for the COG Board’s adoption.

There was no public comment.

4. DISCUSS Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan Oversight Committee 2019/2020 Fiscal Year Meeting Calendar

Veronica Lezama reported that the Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan calls for a Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan Oversight Committee to meet at least once per year, but no more than four times per year.

COG staff prepared a proposed fiscal year 2019/2020 meeting calendar for the Committee’s consideration and asked for their input.

After brief discussion there was consensus from the Committee to meet on Wednesday’s at 6:00 p.m., with the exception of the October 2019 meeting. The meetings will be held at the San Benito County Planning Department (upstairs conference room). The meeting schedule is as follows:

Monday, October 28, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.
Wednesday, January 29, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.
Wednesday, April 29, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.
Wednesday, July 29, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

Veronica Lezama stated that procedures related to the meeting calendar will be confirmed in the final procedural bylaws that will be presented for the COG Board’s adoption.

There was no public comment.
5. RECEIVE Presentation on Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan

Executive Director Mary Gilbert provided the Oversight Committee with an overview Power-point presentation of Measure G.

There followed discussion about the projects, funding, and priorities in the Plan.

Ms. Gilbert noted that COG and local jurisdictions will implement cost-effective improvements based on their Pavement Management Plans, General Plan Circulation Elements, and the Regional Transportation Plan. Local funds will be used to match with state gas tax funds already provided to the local jurisdictions.

Following discussion amongst staff and Committee members, staff stated that they will be bringing a Highway 25 project update at a future meeting. Staff will be requesting Pavement Management Index (PMI) studies from City’s and County to better understand why some roads are prioritized. In addition, staff will be getting an update on the Pavement Management Plan and inviting representatives from both cities and County to provide updates on what’s going on at their local jurisdictions. COG staff will work on a public information strategy to help Committee members report out to the public. In addition, staff will provide updates from the Mobility Partnership meetings on the broader picture of Highway 101, 25, and 156 projects.

There was no public comment on this item.

Upon a motion duly made by Darlene Boyd, and seconded by Andrew Rollins, the Committee voted to Adjourn the Measure G Transportation Safety and Investment Plan Oversight Committee meeting at 7:33 p.m.

ADJOURN TO MEETING OF OCTOBER 28, 2019 AT 6:00 P.M.
## CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location/Post Mile (PM)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Highway 25 Repair and Replace Culverts Project (1K340)</td>
<td>From south of San Benito River to south of Murphy Road in the town of Paicines (PM 29.9-32.0.5)</td>
<td>Drainage project to repair and replace 2 culverts</td>
<td>Summer 2019 – October 15, 2019</td>
<td>$120K</td>
<td>Highway Maintenance SB1</td>
<td>Kelly McClain (TBD)</td>
<td>Conley General Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location/Post Mile (PM)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location/Post Mile (PM)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Highway 25 Expressway Conversion Project (48540)</td>
<td>Near Hollister and Gilroy in Sbt &amp; SCL Counties (PM Sbt 51.5 to SCL 2.6)</td>
<td>Conversion of 2-lane conventional highway to a 4-lane expressway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Brandy Rider</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Highway 156 Improvement Project (34490)</td>
<td>In and near San Juan Bautista, from The Alameda to slightly east of Fourth Street (PM 3.0/R8.2)</td>
<td>Construct four-lane expressway</td>
<td>Summer 2020 - Summer 2022</td>
<td>$57.4 million</td>
<td>STIP/Local</td>
<td>Brandy Rider</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT:**

- PA&ED: Project Approval and Environmental Document
- PS&E: Plans, Specifications, and Estimate
- ROW: Right of way
- SB1: Senate Bill 1
- Sbt: San Benito County
- SCL: Santa Clara County
- SR: State Route
- SHOPP: Statewide Highway Operation and Protection Program
- STIP: Statewide Transportation and Improvement Program
**Project Cost**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>$3.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$5.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way</td>
<td>$23.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction:</td>
<td>$57.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$105.9 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project is fully funded through construction with local Traffic Impact Fees, local funding State and Interregional Improvement Program.

**Project Schedule**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental ENV</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way:</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction start</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction end</td>
<td>August 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to public</td>
<td>August 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design**—Project design is at 95% complete. Project plans, specifications and estimates are being finalized for advertising. Some outstanding items related to final Right of Way contracts and Utility Agreements are needed to finalize the plan sets. Final delivery milestone “Ready to List” is anticipated for December 2019, this is dependent of Right of Way being finalized.

**Right of Way**—90% of the right of way contracts are complete. There are three larger parcels that are ongoing negotiations. Original schedule for completion of Right of way was October 2019 this will result in schedule delays for award. We have moved this date to December 2019.

Utility Agreements with PG&E, ATT, San Benito Water District are all underway. Anticipating Utility Agreements to be finalized in November/December 2019.

**Environmental**—All permit packets to Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Board and Department of Fish & Wildlife have been submitted. Permits are anticipated for completion by November/December 2019. Mitigation measures related to Ag mitigation and California Tiger Salamander are on track.

**Potential Risks to Schedule**—Risk still remains related to Right of Way acquisitions and Utility Agreements, should we be unable to obtain the necessary right of way requirements it could result in a delay. At this time the utility companies and property owners are actively working with our team; understand our schedule; and are working to resolve outstanding issues. Team is optimistic, however risks still remain.
Staff Report

To: Council of San Benito County Governments
From: Kathy Postigo, Administrative Services Specialist Telephone: (831) 637-7665
Date: November 21, 2019
Subject: Office Closure Days

Recommendation:

APPROVE COG office closure days December 23rd, 24th, 30th and 31st.

Summary:

Staff recommends closing the COG Office on December 23rd, 24th, 30th and 31st. December 25th and January 1st are paid holidays already scheduled for closure.

Financial Considerations:

There are minimal fiscal impacts related to closing the COG office during the proposed dates.

Background:

The COG Board has authorized closure days in the past for some of the days surrounding the winter holidays. In 2019, SEIU and Management Employee Group employees are granted 2 additional paid days December 26th and 27th. To accommodate these schedules, staff is proposing to have the COG office closed. This is consistent with COG’s schedules in previous years.

Staff Analysis:

Staff recommends authorizing the closure of the COG office for six days in December 2019. The office would be closed to the public and staff would not be working on these days. There is little anticipated impact to the public from this closure.

The office closures on December 23rd, 24th 30th and 31st will require COG staff to use paid time off because these days are not covered by the bargaining unit’s agreements. COG staff has indicated willingness to use paid time off for the closure. If paid time off is not available staff will have the option to work with the office closed to the public, minimizing the number of staff to provide coverage.

County Express dispatch on Southside Road will be open for information and token sales for transit users and Token Transit is also available from customer’s cell phones.

Executive Director Review:__________ Counsel Review: _N/A__
Staff Report

To: Council of Governments
From: Kathy Postigo, Administrative Services Specialist
Date: November 21, 2019
Subject: Council of San Benito County Governments Purchasing Policy

Recommendation:

APPROVE Revised Council of San Benito County Governments Purchasing Policy.

Summary:

COG is revising its purchasing policy to provide more flexibility in purchases and to expedite project and program delivery. San Benito County recently updated their Purchasing Policy. COG’s new policy is consistent with San Benito County’s new policy.

Financial Considerations:
There are no fiscal impacts related to these changes.

Background:

COG’s existing purchasing policy has been in effect for over 20 years. It currently allows COG’s purchasing agent to enter into contract for services up to $10,000. All other purchases and agreements must be approved by the COG Board, which can lead to delays in project starts as the COG Board only meets once a month.

In May 2019, the County Board of Supervisors approved an ordinance updating San Benito County’s Purchasing Ordinance. To be consistent with the County, staff has updated COG’s Purchasing Policy.

The new COG policy mirrors the County’s with only minor differences; the COG Executive Director is designated as the purchasing agent rather than the County Administrative Officer and the designation of an assistant purchasing agent is made to a deputy or assistant rather than County department head.
The primary changes to COG’s prior policy are made to Sections D2 and D4, as outlined below:

D. 2. **Professional Service Contracts** - To engage independent contractors to perform professional services through contracts for the COG with or without furnishing of material where the aggregate cost does not exceed $10,000. Contracts shall not be split between fiscal years to circumvent this dollar limitation.

D. 4. **Rental of Real Property** – To negotiate and execute in the name of COG, contracts to lease or rent for the COG real property or storage space where funding has been approved by the COG Board, with an annual rent not to exceed $10,000.

**Staff Analysis:**

Staff recommends that the Board APPROVE the revised Council of San Benito County Governments Purchasing Policy.

Executive Director Review: ___________  Counsel Review: _No_

Attachment: Revised Purchasing Policy
Section 3. PURCHASING POLICY

A. DEFINITIONS
For the purpose of this article, the following words and phrases shall have the meaning respectively ascribed by this section:

1) Agency: Council of San Benito County Governments

2) Board of Directors: The governing body of the agency.

3) Contractual services: Any telephone, gas, water, electric light and power services; the rental of equipment and machinery; insurance; the services of attorneys, physicians, electricians, engineers, consultants or other individuals or organizations possessing a high degree of technical skill; and all other types of agreements under which the contract provides services which are required by the agency, but not furnished by its own employees. Purchase of space for legal advertising shall not be subject to the provisions of this chapter.

4) Fixed Assets: Any piece of tangible personal property having an estimated useful life of one calendar year or more, capable of being permanently identified as an individual unit of property, and belonging to one of the general classes of property considered a fixed asset in accordance with generally accepted accounting practices (i.e., equipment, machinery, vehicles, furnishings,) with an accounting value of $3,000 or more.

5) Professional Services: An independent contractor’s expert advice or professional services that involve extended analysis, personal expertise, the exercise of discretion and independent judgment in their performance, which are of an advisory nature, provide a recommended course of action, and have an end product transmitting information which is related to COG programs. Providers are selected on the basis of qualification, subject to the negotiation of a fair and reasonable compensation. Classification as professional services may also require an advanced, specialized type of knowledge, expertise, technical skill or training customarily acquired either by a prolonged course of study or equivalent experience, such as accountants, financial advisors, auditors, grant writers, program specialists, labor consultants and negotiators, investigators, law enforcement retained certified laboratories, attorneys and other litigation-related specialist, environmental consultants, appraisers, architects, landscape architects, surveyors, engineers, design professionals, and construction project management firms.
6) Supplies and equipment: Any personal property, such as physical articles, materials or things, which property shall be furnished to, or shall be used by the agency.

B. PURPOSE OF CHAPTER
The purpose of this chapter is to adopt policies and procedures governing purchases of supplies, equipment and contractual services by the agency in accordance with section 54200 et seq. of the Government Code. This chapter is not intended to conflict with applicable provisions of state law and shall be interpreted as supplementary thereto.

C. DESIGNATION OF THE PURCHASING AGENT
The Board of Directors appoints the Executive Director or designee to serve as the Purchasing Agent for Council of San Benito County Governments.

D. PURCHASING AGENT – POWERS AND DUTIES
The Purchasing Agent shall have all the duties and powers prescribed by the laws of the state including the following duties:

1. Acquisition of Personal Property – To purchase equipment, materials, supplies and all other personal property and services for COG where funding has been approved and budgeted by the Board, unless specified otherwise in the Purchasing Policy.

2. Professional Service Contracts – To engage independent contractors to perform professional services through contracts for the COG with or without furnishing of material where the aggregate cost does not exceed $10,000. Contracts shall not be split between fiscal years to circumvent this dollar limitation.

3. Renewal/Extension of Contracts – To renew or extend contracts for professional services that are critical to ongoing COG projects provided the financial obligation falls within his/her preview of authority.

4. Rental of Real Property – To negotiate and execute in the name of COG, contracts to lease or rent for the COG real property or storage space where funding has been approved by the COG Board, with an annual rent not to exceed $10,000 $50,000.

E. DESIGNATION OF ASSISTANT PURCHASING AGENTS
The Purchasing Agent has the authority to designate such assistants and limit or rescind authority. The Purchasing Agent may delegate the authority to purchase to a deputy or assistant.

F. ASSISTANT PURCHASING AGENT – POWERS AND DUTIES
The Assistant Purchasing Agent shall have all the duties and powers prescribed by laws of the state relating to COG purchasing agents, and orders of the Board of Directors to include the following duties:
1. **Acquisition of Personal Property** - To purchase, equipment, materials, supplies and all other personal property and services for COG where funding has been approved and budgeted by the Board unless specified otherwise in the COG Purchasing Policy.

2. **Professional Service Contracts** – To engage independent contractors for professional services through contracts where the cost does not exceed $3,000, where funding has been approved and budgeted. Contracts shall not be split between fiscal years to circumvent this dollar limitation.

3. **Rental of Real Property** – To negotiate and execute in the name of COG, contracts to lease or rent for COG real property or storage space, with an annual rent not to exceed $3,000, where funding has been approved and budgeted by the Board.

**G. PURCHASING METHODS AND PROCEDURES**

In the performance of his/her function hereunder, the Purchasing Agent or Assistant Purchasing Agent shall comply with all applicable statutes and regulations. Purchases shall be made using such methods and procedures to secure the lowest price consistent with the quality desirable for the use intended. The Purchasing Agent and Assistant Purchasing Agent shall comply with standards set forth in the Council of Governments Rules & Regulations, Section 3 – Purchasing Policy.

**H. EXCEPTIONS TO THE COMPETITIVE PROCESS**

Except as otherwise directed by law, or as directed by the Board of Directors, competitive process is not required for the following purchases:

1. Expert and professional services which involve extended analysis: the exercise of discretion and independent judgment in their performance; and an advanced, specialized type of knowledge, expertise, or training customarily acquired either by a prolonged course of study or equivalent experience as defined under Definitions – Professional Services.

2. Legal brief printing, stenographic services, and transcripts.


4. Insurance.

5. Contracts for services which by law when some other office or body is specifically charged with obtaining.

6. Public utility services.
7. Ordinary travel expenses.

8. Personal property or services obtainable through master contracts or purchasing association pools identified for the use and benefit of all local agencies.

9. Where law fixes the price of property or services.

10. Training, seminars, and classes for COG personnel.

11. Sole source procurement, defined as an award for a commodity or service which can only be purchased from one supplier, usually because of its technological, specialized, or unique character.

12. Emergency purchases necessary when unforeseen circumstances require an immediate purchase in order to avoid a hazard to life or property or serious interruption of the operation of COG, or the necessary emergency repair of COG equipment.

13. When the product/services are needed by COG pending a contract award and a contractor agrees to provide such product/services at the same contract price as a previous award, until a new contract has been awarded. Such interim period contracts shall not exceed six months.

I. CONTRACTUAL PROCEDURES
All Contracts are binding legal documents that are subject to the following provisions:

1. All contracts, leases and any amendments or modifications shall be reviewed and approved as to legal form by the County Counsel’s Office prior to execution of the Purchasing Agent, Assistant Purchasing Agents and/or Board of Directors.

2. Prior approval shall be obtained from County Counsel’s Office before any contracts for professional services relating to outside attorney services are executed.

J. PREFERENCE FOR PRODUCTS CONTAINING RECYCLED MATERIALS

1. The Purchasing Agent shall establish and maintain procedures and specifications to ensure that COG gives preference, in its purchasing decisions, to products containing the maximum amount of recycled materials, where the quality and fitness of such products is equal to those of products containing no recycled materials, or a lesser amount of recycled materials, and where the total cost of such products is reasonable in comparison to the total cost of those products is reasonable
in comparison to the total cost of those products containing no recycled materials, or a lesser amount of recycled materials.

2. “Product containing recycled materials” means, with respect to a paper product, a “recycled paper product” as that term is defined in Section 12301© of the Public Contract Code, and means, with respect to other products, a “recycled product,” as that term is defined in Section 12301(d) of the Public Contract Code.

3. To the extent that the Public Contract Code or other provisions of state law provide for purchasing preferences which are more extensive than those established herein, or for additional procedures to increase the use of recycled materials, the provisions of state law shall prevail.

K. PREFERENCE FOR LOCAL BUSINESSES
Local business preference shall be considered for purchases of supplies, equipment and services, when all other factors are determined to be equal to individuals or firms having a bona-fide place of business within the County of San Benito.

Local businesses are encouraged to submit quotations, bids or proposals for supplies, equipment and services; are also encouraged to submit quotations, bids or proposals for fixed assets that are normally procured through a master contract, if they can meet the pricing of the master contract proposed and all factors are determined equal.

L. UNLAWFUL PURCHASES
Failure of the Purchasing Agent or Assistant Purchasing Agent to adhere to the provisions of this policy may incur costs not meriting the definition of county charges and therefore becoming the personal responsibility of the Purchasing Agent or Assistant Purchasing Agent. Except as otherwise provided by law, no purchase of Materials, supplies, furnishings, equipment, other personal property or contractual services shall be made in excess of the amount of the appropriations allowed by the budget.

M. EMERGENCY PURCHASES WITHOUT PRIOR APPROVAL
Emergency purchases may be made by the Purchasing Agent or Assistant Purchasing Agent when a generally unexpected occurrence or unforeseen circumstances require an immediate purchase of material, supplies or equipment:

1. in order to avoid a hazard to life or property;

2. in order to avoid a serious interruption or discontinuance of essential services or operation of COG;

3. in order to make necessary emergency repairs of COG equipment required to provide essential services or for the operation of COG; or
4. in order to avoid economic loss to COG.

Emergency purchases shall be submitted to the Board of Directors for ratification at its next meeting.

N. PROTEST PROCEDURES
Any aggrieved potential provider of supplies, equipment or contractual services may file a written protest against a potential purchase by the board of directors. The protest shall be filed with the Executive Director one (1) day before the day of the meeting at which the board of directors is initially scheduled to consider the subject purchase. The exact basis for the protest and proof that the protester is a viable and responsible provider of the supplies, equipment or services sought shall be specified in writing and filed with the Executive Director who shall render a written decision in response to the protest not later that five (5) days after the day of the meeting at which the board of directors is initially scheduled to consider the subject purchase. Any protester disagreeing with the decision of the Executive Director may file an appeal not later than five (5) days after the date of the Executive Director’s decision. The appeal shall state the basis of error that the Executive Director allegedly made. The board of directors shall hear the appeal at the next meeting when the appeal may be placed on the agenda.

O. ACCEPTANCE OF GRATUITIES
The acceptance of any gratuity in the form of cash, merchandise or any other thing of value by an official or employee of the agency, or by an official or employee of a public agency contracting with the agency, from a vendor or contractor, or prospective vendor or contractor, is prohibited and shall be a cause for disciplinary action in the case of an agency employee or official, or in the case of an official or employee of the contracting public entity, cause for termination of the contract between the agency and the public entity.
Staff Report

To: Council of San Benito County
From: Mary Gilbert, Executive Director Phone Number: (831) 637-7665 x.207
Date: November 21, 2019
Subject: San Benito County Measure G

Recommendation:

a. RECEIVE Fiscal Year 2018/2019 Fourth Quarter (April, May, June) and Fiscal Year 2019/2020 First Quarter (July, August, September) Measure G Revenue Statements

b. RECEIVE Update on Measure G Activities

Background:

Measure G is a 1% sales tax approved by voters in the November 2018 election. COG is responsible for implementation of the measure and ensuring delivery of the projects in the approved expenditure plan.

Financial Impact:

The State Board of Equalization has collected and remitted a total of $2,717,680.53 to the Council of San Benito County Governments’ Measure G fund, which is housed at the County of San Benito Auditor’s Office. Interest on Measure G funds has not yet been allocated by the County Auditor’s Office.

Summary

Staff is continuing steps for implementation of Measure G. The tax has been collected since April 1, 2019 and COG has received approximately $2.7 million in the separate tax account. No Measure G funds have been expended to date, with first distributions to local agencies and COG administration anticipated later this year.

Staff Analysis

Since the passage of Measure G, the CDTFA has collected $2,717,680.53. Once collected, funds are remitted to the Council of San Benito County Governments’ Measure G account, which is housed by the County of San Benito. The first payment of Measure G funds was deposited in May of 2019. The funds collected to date are detailed below:
• Fiscal Year 2018/2019 Fourth Quarter (April, May, June) – Revenue: $2,193,232.77.

• Fiscal Year 2019/2020 First Quarter (July, August, September) – Revenue: $524,447.76. Funds for the First Quarter FY 2019/20 only reflect revenue received for the month of July. The DTFA has not yet disbursed funds to COG for any revenues collected in August and September.

The enclosed Detailed General Ledger Reports do not include distribution of fund activity, as Measure G funds have yet to been distributed to local agencies or projects. COG staff is currently working on finalizing the local agency agreements with the Cities and County, which will specify the distribution quantities/percentages and terms for obtaining Measure G funds.

The Measure G Strategic Plan includes updating financial forecasting and receiving support in developing a plan for distribution of funds from the Measure. KNN Public Finance, under contract to COG, provided a detailed presentation to the Board at its November meeting. Staff is updating revenue forecasts while matching forecasts to anticipated expenditures.

**Tier 1: Highway 25 4-Lane Expressway**

The Expressway project is currently included in the model at full build-out from San Felipe Road to the San Benito/Santa Clara County line. In September, COG requested review of the proposed project design. Staff has initiated a contract with WMH Engineering to provide engineering consulting services to COG for the project review. WMH Engineering previously completed the Council of Governments Alternatives Analysis for the highway.

Caltrans has committed to complete a Value Analysis of the project with representatives from Caltrans functional units, COG staff, County and City staff, and regional partners at Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to review project delivery alternatives. The expressway widening project must be coordinated with other regional projects including the Highway 101/State Route 25 Interchange, Bolsa Road & Highway 25 intersection improvement needs, and the State Route 152 Trade Corridor project.

The Value Analysis effort is tentatively scheduled for February 2020. Staff met with Caltrans in early November. Representatives from the City of Hollister and San Benito County were also present. At the meeting, the group identified action items, including the need to designate appropriate representatives to attend the Value Analysis effort.
In addition to State Route 25 planning, staff is working on the following priorities for the Measure:

- Finalize Local Agency Funding/Tax Sharing Agreements
- Submit request for programming Local Partnership Program Bonus/Incentive funds to the California Transportation Commission
- Hold Required Annual Public Hearing - December

Executive Director Review: ___________  Counsel Review: ___ N/A___

Attachments:

1. Fiscal Year 2018/2019 Fourth Quarter (April, May, June) Measure G Revenue Statement
2. Fiscal Year 2019/2020 First Quarter (July, August, September) Measure G Revenue Statement
### MEASURE G

#### 4TH QUARTER FISCAL YEAR

2018/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G/L Date</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sub Ledger</th>
<th>Description/Project</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Debit Amount</th>
<th>Credit Amount</th>
<th>Actual Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sub Ledger</td>
<td>Description/Project</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Debit Amount</td>
<td>Credit Amount</td>
<td>Actual Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>634.95.7391.101.990000000 Cash Cash</td>
<td>05/24/2019</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>WF Receipt Deposit Batch 06.12.19</td>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>19,797.72</td>
<td>19,797.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$457,137.14</td>
<td>$457,137.14</td>
<td>$2,193,232.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>634.95.7391.113.116 Receivables Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>06/30/2019</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>accrue Measure G May 2019</td>
<td>Year-End JE - Year-End</td>
<td>571,405.49</td>
<td>571,405.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>634.95.7391.1000.512.001 Sales Tax Sales and Use Tax</td>
<td>05/24/2019</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>WF Receipt Deposit Batch 06.12.19</td>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>19,797.72</td>
<td>(19,797.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sub Ledger Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G/L Account Number</th>
<th>Cash Cash</th>
<th>Year-End JE - Year-End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.101.990000000</td>
<td>05/24/2019</td>
<td>Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.113.116</td>
<td>06/30/2019</td>
<td>Year-End JE - Year-End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.1000.512.001</td>
<td>05/24/2019</td>
<td>Collections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Ledger Report

**G/L Date Range:** 04/01/19 - 06/30/19

**Include Sub Ledger Detail**

**Exclude Accounts with No Activity**

**Account** | **Cash Cash** | **Receivables Accounts Receivable** | **Sales Tax Sales and Use Tax** | **Grand Totals**
|-----------|--------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Balance To Date: | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $2,193,232.77

**Program/Section/Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration Totals</th>
<th>$0.00</th>
<th>$2,193,232.77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Sales Tax Meas G Totals</th>
<th>$2,193,232.77</th>
<th>$2,193,232.77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust and Agency Totals</th>
<th>$2,193,232.77</th>
<th>$2,193,232.77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Sales Tax Meas G Totals</th>
<th>$2,193,232.77</th>
<th>$2,193,232.77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Grand Totals**

| $2,193,232.77 | $2,193,232.77 |

---

Run by Kathy Postigo on 10/23/2019 12:20:13 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G/L Account Number</th>
<th>Description/Project</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Debit Amount</th>
<th>Credit Amount</th>
<th>Actual Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.101.990000000 Cash Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td>571,405.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>$457,137.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.113.116 Receivables Accounts Receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,164,690.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,193,232.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.100.512.001 Sales Tax Sales and Use Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td>524,447.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,717,680.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.100.512.001 Sales Tax Sales and Use Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td>524,447.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,717,680.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.101.990000000 Cash Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td>571,405.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,028,542.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.113.116 Receivables Accounts Receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,164,690.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.100.512.001 Sales Tax Sales and Use Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td>524,447.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G/L Date Description/Project**
- WF Receipt Deposit Batch
- 07/24/2019
- 08/26/2019
- 09/24/2019
- 08/19/2019
- 09/19/2019
- 09/24/2019

**Account**
- Cash Cash
- Receivables Accounts Receivable
- Sales Tax Sales and Use Tax

**Program/Section/Activity**
- Administration
- Transportation Sales Tax Meas G
- Trust and Agency

**Division**
- Transportation Sales Tax Meas G

**Department**
- Transportation Sales Tax Meas G

**Fund**
- Transportation Sales Tax Meas G

**Grand Totals**
- $2,260,543.39
- $2,260,543.39

---

**Run by Kathy Postigo on 10/23/2019 12:30:33 PM**
Staff Report

To: Council of San Benito County Governments
From: Mary Gilbert, Executive Director  Telephone: (831) 637-7665
Date: November 21, 2019
Subject: 2020 State Transportation Improvement Program

Recommendation:
   a. RECEIVE Presentation on State Funding for Transportation
   b. APPROVE 2020 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

Summary:

The California Transportation Commission manages the State Transportation Improvement Program throughout California. Funding for the Program is issued every two years with a Regional Transportation Improvement Program due to the Commission in December. The Program covers five years of projected programming capacity.

Financial Considerations:

Since 2008, the Council of Governments has advanced funding to pay for a share of the construction cost of the San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project. The proposed amount to be programmed to the project by the Council of Governments has increased to $10,562,000.

The total project cost is $105,893,000. Caltrans has committed $81,554,000 in Interregional funds to the project including environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction. The remaining $9.639 million would come from Traffic Impact Fees collected by the City and County.

In addition, COG is proposing continued programming of $148,000 in Planning, Programming, and Monitoring funds over the five-year STIP cycle. These funds are used to support Council of Governments staff time in a broad range of activities to support transportation planning, funding, and monitoring.

Background:

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a biennial five-year plan adopted by the California Transportation Commission for future allocations of certain state transportation funds for state highway improvements, intercity rail, and regional highway and transit improvements. State law requires the California Transportation Commission to update the Program every two years, in even-numbered years, with each new cycle adding two new years to prior programming commitments.
Since 2008, the Council of Governments has asked that the California Transportation Commission advance money from the San Benito County share of funding for the State Route 156 Improvement Project.

**Staff Analysis:**

The 2020 STIP will cover the period from fiscal year 2016/2017 to 2020/2021. The CTC released their 2018 Report of STIP Balances and County and Interregional Shares in August.

Staff proposes to continue funding the State Route 156 Improvement Project. In 2018, COG increased its project contribution to $14,700,000 an increase from the previous $10,562,000. COG does not currently have any other highway projects that would be eligible for STIP funding and therefore staff is recommending continuing to fund the State Route 156 project. Caltrans has maintained its commitment of Interregional Transportation Improvement Program funding for the project to fund 77% of the project cost.

Staff is also proposing to maintain Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) funding in the first three years of the STIP at $55,000 per year.

This proposed programming continues the existing commitment to the State Route 156 Project that has been carried since 2008. It is likely that reducing San Benito County’s advance of State Transportation Improvement Program funding back to $0 will take another two to three cycles (four to six years). At that point, future State Transportation Improvement Program cycles will add to San Benito’s share again.

Staff is recommending approval of funding as presented in the RTIP (Attachment). The RTIP is due to the California Transportation Commission on December 15, 2019.

Executive Director Review: __________ Counsel Review: N/A

Supporting Attachment: Proposed San Benito County 2020 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
Regional Transportation Improvement Program

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP)
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A. Overview and Schedule

Section 1. Executive Summary

The Council of San Benito County Governments transmits the enclosed 2018 San Benito County Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) proposal. The Council of Governments has proposed two priority projects for inclusion in the 2020 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The 2020 RTIP proposes programming STIP funds to high priority projects. Projects included in the 2018 RTIP are based on the San Benito County Regional Transportation Plan and a region-wide assessment of transportation needs and deficiencies as identified in the STIP Guidelines.

Section 2. General Information

Insert contact information in the text fields below.

- **Regional Agency Name**
  Council of San Benito County Governments

- **Agency website links for Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).** (insert links below)
  Regional Agency Website Link: [http://www.sanbenitocog.org](http://www.sanbenitocog.org)

- **Regional Agency Executive Director Contact Information**
  Name Mary Gilbert
  Title Executive Director
  Email mary@sanbenitocog.org
  Telephone 831.637.7665

- **RTIP Manager Staff Contact Information**
  Name Mary Gilbert
  Title Executive Director
  Address 330 Tres Pinos Rd. Ste. C-7
  City/State Hollister, CA
  Zip Code 95023

- **California Transportation Commission (CTC) Staff Contact Information**
  Name Teresa Favila
  Title Associate Deputy Director
  Address 1120 N Street
  City/State Sacramento, CA
  Zip Code 95814
  Email teresa.favila@catc.ca.gov
  Telephone 916-653-2064
  Fax 916-653-2134
Section 3. Background of Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

A. What is the Regional Transportation Improvement Program?

The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is a program of highway, local road, transit and active transportation projects that a region plans to fund with State and Federal revenue programmed by the California Transportation Commission in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The RTIP is developed biennially by the regions and is due to the Commission by December 15 of every odd numbered year. The program of projects in the RTIP is a subset of projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a federally mandated master transportation plan which guides a region’s transportation investments over a 20 to 25 year period. The RTP is based on all reasonably anticipated funding, including federal, state and local sources. Updated every 4 to 5 years, the RTP is developed through an extensive public participation process in the region and reflects the unique mobility, sustainability, and air quality needs of each region.

B. Regional Agency’s Historical and Current Approach to developing the RTIP

Provide narrative on your historical and current approach to developing the RTIP in the text field below.

San Benito COG develops its RTIP based on available funding and identified project needs for the region. For several RTIP cycles, the State Route 156 Improvement project has been the highest priority project in the region and COG has responded by identifying STIP funding for the project. COG coordinates with local jurisdictions and Caltrans to ensure consistency of the RTIP with goals and policies in the region.

Section 4. Completion of Prior RTIP Projects (Required per Section 68)

Since the 2018 RTIP, San Benito COG has completed Planning, Programming, and Monitoring activities each fiscal year.

Insert project information for completed projects in table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name and Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Summary of Improvements/Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Benito County</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>Funds were used to support Council of Governments staff time in a broad range of activities to support transportation planning, funding, and monitoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5. RTIP Outreach and Participation

A. RTIP Development and Approval Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTC adopts Fund Estimate and Guidelines</td>
<td>August 14, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans identifies State Highway Needs</td>
<td>September 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans submits draft ITIP</td>
<td>October 1, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC ITIP Hearing, North</td>
<td>October 8, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC ITIP Hearing, South</td>
<td>October 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Agency adopts 2020 RTIP</strong></td>
<td><strong>RTPA Board Approval Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions submit RTIP to CTC (postmark by)</td>
<td>December 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans submits ITIP to CTC</td>
<td>December 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC STIP Hearing, South</td>
<td>January 30, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC STIP Hearing, North</td>
<td>February 6, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC publishes staff recommendations</td>
<td>February 28, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Adopts 2020 STIP</td>
<td>March 25-26, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Public Participation/Project Selection Process

San Benito COG has completed extensive public outreach regarding state highway priorities for the region. Since 2008, COG has advanced its STIP share to fund the State Route 156 improvement project. At this time, COG is proposing continued support of this project as it meets the goals of the agency and the public.

C. Consultation with Caltrans District (Required per Section 17)

Caltrans District: 5

Provide narrative on consultation with Caltrans District staff in the text field below as is required per Section 17 of the STIP Guidelines.

Initial consultation with Caltrans began in May 2019. At that time it was reiterated that San Benito COG’s STIP priority was funding construction of the San Benito Route 156 Improvement project. COG and Caltrans met to discuss and set priorities for future STIP projects in August 2019.
B. 2020 STIP Regional Funding Request

Section 6. 2020 STIP Regional Share and Request for Programming

A. 2020 Regional Fund Share Per 2020 STIP Fund Estimate

Insert your agency’s target share per the STIP Fund Estimate in the text field below.

Click here to enter text.$2,962,000

B. Summary of Requested Programming – Insert information in table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name and Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Requested RIP Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Benito State Route 156 Improvement Project</td>
<td>Widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>$14,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, programming and Monitoring</td>
<td>Transportation funding and monitoring activities</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                  |                                            |                      |
|                                  |                                            |                      |
|                                  |                                            |                      |
|                                  |                                            |                      |
|                                  |                                            |                      |
**Section 7. Overview of Other Funding Included With Delivery of Regional Improvement Program (RIP) Projects**

Other funding includes ITIP funding and local funds from development impact fees. These funds do not require Commission approval for non-proportional spending allowing for the expenditure of STIP funds before other funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed 2020 RTIP</th>
<th>Total RTIP</th>
<th>Other Funding</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ITIP</td>
<td>RSTP/ CMAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project</td>
<td>$14,700</td>
<td>$81,554,000</td>
<td>$9,639,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Programming and Monitoring</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$14,803,000</td>
<td>81,554,000</td>
<td>9,639,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** ITIP Funding includes IIP – National Highway System and IIP – State Cash
Section 8. Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) Funding

The purpose of the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) is to improve interregional mobility for people and goods in the State of California. As an interregional program, the ITIP is focused on increasing the throughput for highway and rail corridors of strategic importance outside the urbanized areas of the state. A sound transportation network between and connecting urbanized areas ports and borders is vital to the state’s economic vitality. The ITIP is prepared in accordance with Government Code Section 14526, Streets and Highways Code Section 164 and the STIP Guidelines. The ITIP is a five-year program managed by Caltrans and funded with 25% of new STIP revenues in each cycle. Developed in cooperation with regional transportation planning agencies to ensure an integrated transportation program, the ITIP promotes the goal of improving interregional mobility and connectivity across California.

If requesting ITIP funding, provide narrative on your request in the text field below. Or state that no ITIP funding was requested.

Click here to enter text.

San Benito COG is requesting that the Interregional Improvement Program (ITIP) funding as programmed by Caltrans is approved to fully fund the State Route 156 Improvement Project.

Section 9. Projects Planned Within Multi-Modal Corridors (per Sections 11 and 20e)

This project does not impact other projects in the corridor at this time. No other projects are planned or underway on the State Route 156 corridor in San Benito County.

C. Relationship of RTIP to RTP/SCS/APS and Benefits of RTIP

Section 10. Regional Level Performance Evaluation (per Section 19A of the guidelines)

The projects proposed in the RTIP support the goals of the adopted 2018 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Table in Appendix Section 17–indicates the benefits demonstrated by the RTIP projects as they relate to the Regional Transportation Plan.
Section 11. Regional and Statewide Benefits of RTIP

1. The San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project meets a statewide need for improved east-west connections. The project will increase capacity, improve safety and operations of the Route 156 corridor. The project saves accident and vehicle operating costs by $34.6 million over 20 years. The project reduces congestion delay by 1,902 hours daily or 694,257 hours annually.

2. Planning, Programming, and Monitoring funding will allow the Council of San Benito County Governments staff to monitor performance of all projects in the Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

D. Performance and Effectiveness of RTIP

Section 12. Evaluation of Cost Effectiveness of RTIP (Required per Section 19)

The Council of Governments has analyzed the cost-effectiveness of the State Route 156 Improvement project on a regional level. The project provides a $102.8 million return on investment over 20 years. The project will reduce delays, vehicle emissions, congestion, and preserve environmental resources by improving the Route level of service and reducing delay. The Project will improve access to jobs and services in the San Juan and Salinas Valleys, and will reduce delay for freight, agricultural goods movement, commuters, and residents of San Benito County.
Section 13. Project Specific Evaluation (Required per Section 19D)

As required by the STIP Guideline, this evaluation is included in the PPRs (Section 15 of the RTIP Template).

Detailed Project Information

Section 14. Overview of projects programmed with RIP funding

Provide summary of projects programmed with RIP funding including maps in the text field below as required per Section 19 of the STIP Guidelines.

San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project

Project Summary

Roadway Name State Route 156
Segment Location Route 156 from the Alameda to 0.2 Miles East of 4th Street
Improvement Description Widen to 4-lane Expressway
Responsible Agency Caltrans
Estimated Total Cost $105,893,000

This proposed project will widen State Route 156 to four lanes between The Alameda and 0.2 miles east of Fourth Street/Business Route 156. The objective of this project is to provide a safer route with more roadway capacity for travel between the Hollister area and U.S. 101. Connecting to Route 156 is Union Road which is a major arterial route connecting the developing residential neighborhoods in south Hollister to State Route 156. State Route 156 is a designated inter-regional highway route, and Caltrans has completed several major improvements to the portion of the route within San Benito County. These improvements include construction of a bypass route west of Hollister that allows through traffic to travel between State Route 152 and U.S. 101 without going through the City of Hollister. The proposed widening project will further improve the quality of service along approximately 5.2 miles of State Route 156 by improving both inter-regional connectivity and an important regional commuter route.

The Route 156 project between San Juan Bautista and Hollister was proposed as a part of the Council of San Benito County Governments Regional Transportation Plan in 1994. The project was also included as a part of the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Update as early as 1993.
Planning efforts began in earnest in 1997 when Caltrans approved a Project Study Report. The Project Study Report outlined the cost, scope, and schedule of the project. This overview document provided the purpose of the project, identified the need for the project, outlined the general environmental issues to be investigated and disclosed, and estimated the funding need.

The purpose and need for the project as identified in the Project Study Report is to improve traffic conditions and improve safety. It was estimated in the 1997 Project Study Report that traffic volumes would increase to 22,600 average daily vehicles by 2005. The Environmental Impact Report reported that traffic volumes had risen to 26,200 average daily vehicles by 2008. At this level of congestion, motorists can expect an increase in the total number of accidents and heavy congestion where demand exceeds the roadway's capacity at 20,000 vehicles per day. Vehicle speeds vary greatly and significant delays occur at this level of congestion. The most congested times occur during the morning and afternoon peak commute.

In 2008, Caltrans approved an Environmental Impact Report which further expanded on the purpose and need of the project. The purpose was identified as follows:

- Reduce existing congestion and provide for future traffic needs
- Improve safety
- Improve route continuity

The need for the project in the Environmental Impact Report was based on the following:

- Increasing congestion
- Lack of passing opportunities when slower trucks and agricultural vehicles conflict with passenger vehicles
- The existing non-standard compound curve (at Union and Mitchell roads)
- Lack of continuous expressway on the route
- A history of flooding along the route

The Project details are as follows:

- Includes four new lanes of roadway south of and parallel to the existing route, two in the eastbound direction and two in the westbound direction
- Located between The Alameda in San Juan Bautista and 4th street/Business Route 156 near Hollister
- Total project length is 5.2 miles
- Existing road converted, in part, into an access road for Flint, Lucy Brown, Cagney, and multiple driveways as part of a separate future county project
- Existing road also converted to a multi-use recreational trail as part of a separate future county project
- Continuation of two lanes of travel from San Juan Hollister Road going westbound and two new lanes of travel from northbound Union Road to westbound Route 156
Caltrans conducted a cost benefit analysis and evaluated the project on performance in the area of safety, reduction of congestion and delay, and return on investment. The following is a result of that cost benefit analysis:

- Saves accident and vehicle operating costs, $34.6 million over 20 years
- Reduces congestion delay by 1,902 hours daily, 694,257 hours yearly
- Provides $102.8 million return on investment over 20 years

Project Map (Next Page):
Planning, Programming, and Monitoring

Roadway Name: N/A
Segment Location: County-wide
Improvement Description: Planning, Programming, and Monitoring Activities
Responsible Agency: Council of San Benito County Governments
Estimated Cost: $102,000

The Council of Governments proposes to maintain the programming of funds to Planning, Programming and Monitoring in the first three fiscal years of the 2020 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), for a total of $148,000.

E. Appendices

Section 15. Projects Programming Request Forms

Section 16. Board Resolution or Documentation of 2020 RTIP Approval (Provide Cover Sheet)

Section 17. Regional Transportation Plan Performance Measures
### Project Title
San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project

### Location (Project Limits), Description (Scope of Work)
In San Juan Bautista, from The Alameda to 0.2 mile east of Fourth Street. Widen to 4 lanes.

### Purpose and Need
State Route 156 is an east-west interregional facility connecting the Monterey Peninsula to State Route 101 and 152. It provides a moderate level of service for agricultural truck travel out of the Castroville, Monterey Bay, Salinas Valley, Hollister area to the San Joaquin Valley. Route 156 also provides for recreational travel to the Monterey Bay Area from points north and south via State Route 101 and to other regions via Interstate 5 and State Route 99. It is the only direct agricultural goods movement and recreational route south of the Bay Area connecting the coast and the San Joaquin Valley. Route 156 has been designated as a Focus Route in the Category Outputs/Outcomes

### Project Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Outputs/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA Improvements</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Improvements</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc. Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional: 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADA Notice
For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in alternate formats. For information call (916) 654-6410 or TDD (916) 654-3880 or write Records and Forms Management, 1120 N Street, MS-89,
## Project Title:
San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project

### Existing Total Project Cost ($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>22-23</th>
<th>23-24</th>
<th>24-25</th>
<th>25-26+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>3,936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>8,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>22,488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>57,339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>105,893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105,893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Total Project Cost ($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>22-23</th>
<th>23-24</th>
<th>24-25</th>
<th>25-26+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>3,936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>8,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>22,488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>57,339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>105,893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105,893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Funding ($1,000s)

#### Fund No. 1: RIP - National Hwy System (NH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>22-23</th>
<th>23-24</th>
<th>24-25</th>
<th>25-26+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Funding ($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>22-23</th>
<th>23-24</th>
<th>24-25</th>
<th>25-26+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fund No. 2: IIP - National Hwy System (NH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>22-23</th>
<th>23-24</th>
<th>24-25</th>
<th>25-26+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Funding ($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>22-23</th>
<th>23-24</th>
<th>24-25</th>
<th>25-26+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fund No. 3: IIP - State Cash (ST-CASH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>22-23</th>
<th>23-24</th>
<th>24-25</th>
<th>25-26+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>3,936</td>
<td>3,936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>8,410</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>22,488</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>37,554</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Funding ($1,000s)**

**Funding Agency:** Caltrans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Funding ($1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

### Fund No. 4: Local Funds - Traffic Impact Fees (TRA FEE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>22-23</th>
<th>23-24</th>
<th>24-25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Funding ($1,000s)**

**Funding Agency:** San Benito County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Funding ($1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
SECTION 1 - All Projects

Project Background

Programming Change Requested

Reason for Proposed Change

If proposed change will delay one or more components, clearly explain 1) reason the delay, 2) cost increase related to the delay, and 3) how cost increase will be funded

Other Significant Information

SECTION 2 - For SB1 Projects Only

Project Amendment Request (Please follow the individual SB1 program guidelines for specific criteria)

SECTION 3 - All Projects

Approvals

I hereby certify that the above information is complete and accurate and all approvals have been obtained for the processing of this amendment request.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Print or Type)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Attachments

1) Concurrence from Implementing Agency and/or Regional Transportation Planning Agency
2) Project Location Map