

ROUTE INVENTORY REPORT


PRUNEDALE AREA

DISTRICT 05

OCTOBER 2019



For the Rescission of the Route Adoption for the Unconstructed Portions Between Espinosa Road to State Route 156



Approved By:


TIMOTHY M. GUBBINS
District Director

10/11/19
Date


AILEEN K. LOE
Deputy District Director
Planning & Local Assistance

10/10/19
Date


MARSHALL GARCIA
Central Region Office Chief,
Right of Way, San Luis Obispo

10/10/19
Date

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 ROUTE DESCRIPTION	5
2.0 ROUTE ADOPTION	6
2.1 Historical Context	6
2.2 Bypass Project Abandoned.....	7
2.3 Operational Improvements Constructed	8
2.4 Planned Projects	9
3.0 SYSTEM PLANNING	12
4.0 DESIGN	12
5.0 EXISTING HIGHWAY	12
6.0 EXISTING AND FORECASTED TRAFFIC.....	13
7.0 ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERATIONS	18
7.1 Other State Highway System Alternative Projects.....	18
8.0 LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS.....	18
9.0 RIGHT OF WAY	18
10.0 LOCAL AGENCY COORDINATION.....	19
11.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	19
APPENDICES.....	20
APPENDIX 1: 1964 Report of Route Studies	20
APPENDIX 2: Notice of Intention on Freeway Location 1964	31
APPENDIX 3: Route Adoption Map.....	32
APPENDIX 4: Resolution Notes Alignment C-E is the Monterey County's Preferred Alignment Alternative for Adoption of US 101	33
APPENDIX 5: Resolution Notes Alignment C-E is the San Benito County's Preferred Alignment Alternative for Adoption of US 101 5	
APPENDIX 6: Resolution Changing Location of State Highways and Declaring a Freeway	37
APPENDIX 7: US 101 Design Route Characteristics	38
APPENDIX 8: Prunedale State Property Inventory.....	39
APPENDIX 9: Local Resolution (TAMC)	40
APPENDIX 10: Local Resolution (SBtCOG)	42

APPENDIX 11: Local Resolution (Monterey County) 44
APPENDIX 12: Local Resolution (San Benito County) 45

FIGURES

FIGURE 1: Prunedale Area Location Map..... 5
FIGURE 2: Map from the 1964 Report of Route Studies Illustrates Alignment C-E..... 6
FIGURE 3: Exhibit excerpted from the Draft EIR 1993 for the Prunedale Bypass Project.
Alternative 3 coincides with the Adopted Route..... 7
FIGURE 4: Prunedale Improvement Project Completed Fall 2014 8
FIGURE 5: US 101 Expressway to Freeway Conversion Concept Analysis in Monterey
County 10
FIGURE 6: Prunedale Improvement Project Completed Fall 2014 11
FIGURE 7: Base & Horizon Year Peak Hour Congestion..... 15
FIGURE 8: Base Year Peak Hour Congestion 16
FIGURE 9: Horizon Year Peak Hour Congestion..... 17

TABLES

TABLE 1: Planned Projects in Corridor 10
TABLE 2: Route Designations and Characteristics 12
TABLE 3: Segment 9 Daily System Operations 13
TABLE 4: Segment 10 Daily System Operations 14

1.0 ROUTE DESCRIPTION

US 101 is a primary north-south link in the California State Highway Network, serving regional and interregional traffic. The 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan identifies US 101 as part of the interregional road system, and as the key coastal link between the two major metropolitan regions of Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area. Within District 5, US 101 is a major arterial providing access to urban areas and the agricultural production areas of the Salinas Valley. It also serves recreational trips associated with the Monterey Peninsula, the Pacific Coast, and the Los Padres National Forest. For residents in the Prunedale Area, it provides the only major arterial for the community. Other mobility purposes served include business, government, recreation, tourism, and daily living, including the journey-to-work.




Figure 1: Prunedale Area Location Map

2.0 ROUTE ADOPTION

2.1 Historical Context

Deficiencies on US 101 in the Prunedale area were recognized in the 1960s when a project was initiated to improve the corridor by constructing a new alignment that bypassed the community of Prunedale. Route adoptions, freeway agreements, and substantial right-of-way for the adopted bypass alignment were acquired in conformance with procedures at that time. The procedures did not include requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the California Environmental Quality Act, or other environmental laws now in effect.

A Report of Route Studies was prepared and presented to the California Highways Commission (CHC), the pre-cursor to the current California Transportation Commission (CTC), by the State Highway Engineer on April 3, 1964, where different alignment alternatives and cost estimates were developed (Appendix 1). The different alignment alternatives are presented in Figure 2. On April 15, 1964, the State Highway Engineer presented a resolution (Appendix 2) to the CHC for authorization to give a public notice of intent to adopt an alignment based on the Report of Route Studies. While the alignment is not identified by name in the resolution, it is shown on the Route Adoption map (Appendix 3). This resolution also gave notice to Monterey and San Benito Counties of the Department's intent to adopt an alignment and provided the entities an opportunity to determine whether a public hearing with the CHC would be necessary. A Monterey County Resolution from April 20, 1964 (Appendix 4) notes that "Alignment C-E" (Figure 2) is the County's preferred alignment alternative for adoption of US 101, based on route studies for the relocation of US 101. A San Benito County Resolution from June 8, 1964 (Appendix 5), notes similarly. Alignment "C" is the portion known as the Prunedale Bypass and "E" as the portion crossing the Monterey/San Benito County line near the Rocks Road area.




Figure 2: Map from the 1964 Report of Route Studies Illustrates Alignment C-E.

On June 15, 1964, the Department's State Highway Engineer made a recommendation to the CHC to adopt the US 101 freeway route based on the Report of Route Studies and local resolutions. The Route Adoption was passed by the CHC on June 24, 1964 resolution (Appendix 6). There have been no other route adoptions for US 101 in this area since then.

In April, 1973, the Prunedale Bypass Project was in the final design phase when it was determined that federal funding could not be secured, and the project was delayed indefinitely.


2.2 Bypass Project Discontinued

The Prunedale Bypass Project was re-initiated as locally-funded (Measure B sales tax) in the late 1980s. Under the Federal and State environmental laws at the time, alternative alignments, including the adopted route were developed and evaluated.

A Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/EIR) was circulated to the public in 1993. Following the public circulation period, Alternative 4 began to emerge as the environmentally-preferred alternative. While no decision was finalized, the emergence of Alternative 4 as the likely preferred alternative clouded any future potential for an alignment to be approved along the Adopted Route, as represented by Alternative 3 (Figure 3).

The local sales tax measure was challenged and overturned in court, and lack of funding again halted the project. A Final EIS/EIR was never completed. This indicated that any construction on the Adopted Route (Alternative 3) would be unlikely, even if funding were available.

Figure 3: Exhibit excerpted from the Draft EIR 1993 for the Prunedale Bypass Project. Alternative 3 coincides with the Adopted Route.



2.3 Operational Improvements Constructed

As a result of halting the Prunedale Bypass Project, a series of operational improvements were completed in Fall 2014 to improve safety. This project, referred to as the Prunedale Improvement Project (PIP), upgraded the existing four-lane facility to partially access controlled with construction of ten miles of median barrier, two new interchanges, and an overcrossing.




Figure 4: Prunedale Improvement Project Completed Fall 2014

The PIP eliminated vehicle conflict points associated with turning and crossing movements. The PIP was considered to be Phase 1 of conversion to a full access controlled freeway. The Prunedale Freeway was envisioned as Phase 2 on either the existing alignment or on the adopted bypass alignment.

As of 2019, the Phase 2 project is no longer identified in the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) Regional Transportation Plan. However, existing conditions within the Prunedale area include approximately 60 at-grade intersections with private driveways and public roads having right-turn only access. Current and future travel demands also indicate the need for additional capacity. Additional investment is needed to convert the facility to the 6-lane freeway concept identified in the 2014 US 101 Transportation Concept Report (TCR). As for the adopted route portion located in San Benito County, there are no local or regional planning studies existing or underway that would have a bearing on existing route adoption.

2.4 Planned Projects In Corridor

Route 156 West Corridor Project: TAMC has worked with Caltrans District 5 on the Route 156 West Corridor Project for many years. The overall goal of the project is to improve safety, improve traffic operations, relieve traffic congestion, and seek the least impacts to the surrounding community and environment.

The project is divided into three segments. Segment 1 is the SR 156-Castroville Boulevard Interchange (New Interchange), Segment 2 is the SR 156-Expressway Conversion project (4-miles of expressway conversion), and Segment 3 is the SR 156/US 101 Interchange (Reconstruct Interchange). Segment 3 will reconstruct the interchange at the junction of US 101 and SR 156. It will improve operational and safety benefits within the Prunedale area by consolidating access to US 101, removing local road intersections, removing private driveways along US 101, and converting 3-miles of expressway highway into freeway.

South of Salinas Corridor Improvement: TAMC and Caltrans District 5 are also working on converting US 101 from an expressway to a freeway from the Main Street overcrossing in Chualar to the Airport Boulevard overcrossing in the City of Salinas. US 101 between Salinas and King City consists of four lanes of either rural expressway or rural freeway with intermittent frontage roads. The existing Union Pacific railroad line runs alongside the west side of US 101. Along this stretch of US 101, there are numerous at grade intersections with public and private railroad crossings. Fresh packaged produce from agricultural operations in the area requires immediate movement to markets after harvesting and packaging. The agricultural operations contribute to traffic conflicts between high speed through traffic and slow-moving vehicles entering or exiting the adjacent agricultural fields and related services as well as conflicts with crossing the railroad tracks.




Figure 5: US 101 Expressway to Freeway Conversion Concept Analysis in Monterey County

In San Benito County, there are two projects that plan to widen US 101 to 6-lanes but are currently categorized in their Regional Transportation Plan as unconstrained.

Table 1: Planned Projects in Corridor

County	Beg PM	End PM	Project Name	Project Description	Estimated Cost (\$1000)
MON	R1.6	R2.1	SR 156 - Castroville Blvd Interchange	Construct new interchange	\$55,200
MON	R1.6	T5.2	SR 156 - Expressway Conversion Project	Convert to four-lane expressway	\$106,225
MON	3.9	T5.2	SR 156 / US 101 Interchange	Reconstruct interchange	\$250,890
MON	R1.6	R1.6	Blackie Road Extension	Construct new road to the Castroville Boulevard/SR 156 interchange	\$9,000
SBT	0.00	2.998	US 101: Las Aromitas	Widen to 6 lanes	\$246,000
SBT	2.998	4.898	US 101: SR 129 to SR 156	Widen to 6 lanes	TBD




Figure 6: Route 156 West Corridor Project

3.0 SYSTEM PLANNING

The US 101 TCR identifies the area by the 1964 Route Adoption as Segments 9 and 10. Segment 9 is approximately 9.4 miles, Sala Road (PM R92.205) to Monterey/San Benito County Line (PM 101.316). Segment 9 is a 4-6 lane expressway with terrain progressing from relatively flat at the southern end of the project limits to mountainous at the northern end. There are two interchanges in this segment, SR 156 West and San Miguel Canyon Road. The Ultimate Concept is a 6-lane freeway to achieve full access control and to address current and future demand.

Segment 10 is 7.4 miles within rural terrain, from Monterey/San Benito County Line to the San Benito/Santa Clara County Line. This segment is four lanes containing truck climbing lanes on the northbound only and alternates between rural freeway and expressway. The AMBAG 2040 MTPSCS (2018) identifies 6-lane widening of US 101 from SR 156 to SR 129 and from SR 129 to the Monterey/San Benito County line. This concept also matches the plans in Santa Clara County to extend between the San Benito County line to Gilroy.

4.0 DESIGN

Design activities were not completed. The original plan was for a 4-lane freeway on the bypass alignment and a draft EIR was circulated to the public in 1993. Following the public circulation period, Caltrans was working toward identifying a Preferred Alternative. When the local sales tax measure was overturned in court, lack of funding halted the project. A Final EIR was never completed, and approval of a Preferred Alternative was not obtained. Existing US 101 route design characteristics in the limits of the halted project can be seen in Appendix 7.

5.0 EXISTING HIGHWAY

The following is the existing highway route designation and characteristics.

Table 2: Route Designations and Characteristics

	MON-101-R91.9/SBt-101-2.9
Freeway & Expressway	Yes
National Highway System	Yes
Strategic Highway Network	Yes
Scenic Highway	Eligible (MON-101-R92.205-101.316)
Interregional Road System	Yes
Goods Movement Route	Yes
Truck Designation	National Network
Primary & Secondary System	Primary

MON-101-R91.9/SBt-101-2.9	
Rural/Urban/Urbanized	Urban and Rural
Metropolitan Planning Organization	Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)
Regional Transportation Planning Agency	Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC); Council of San Benito County Governments (SBtCOG)
Local Agency	Monterey County and San Benito County.
Tribes	None
Air District	Monterey Bay Air Resources District
Terrain	Mountainous/Rolling

6.0 EXISTING AND FORECASTED TRAFFIC

Existing congestion is a result of capacity being exceeded in the northbound and southbound direction between SR 156 West and San Miguel Canyon Road. In 2035, traffic demands are expected to exceed capacity in the northbound and southbound directions from SR 156 West to the San Benito County line. High volumes are projected for most of the remaining corridor not already exceeding capacity. Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) on Segment 9 is expected to grow by up to 1,200 vehicles per day by 2035. In 1994 AADT volumes ranged from 45,000 to 66,000 vehicles per day. In 2017, AADT volumes increased to a range of 62,900 to 84,000. By 2035, volumes are expected to continue to increase to a range of 70,000 to 105,000 (Figure 6).

For Segment 10, the 1994 AADT volumes ranged from 35,000 to 46,000. In 2017, AADT volumes ranged from 52,700 to 64,000. AADT is expected to grow by up to 1,560 vehicles per day by 2035. Volumes are expected to increase to over 88,000 by 2035. By the 2035 horizon year, congestion is anticipated to increase to high levels between SR 129 and the San Benito/Santa Clara County line (Figure 7 and 8).

Table 3: Segment 9 Daily System Operations

Segment 9 Daily System Operations	
AADT Base Year 2017	62,900-84,000
AADT Horizon Year 2035	70,000-105,000
AADT: Growth Rate/Year	340-1,200
VMT Base Year 2017	613,000
VMT Horizon Year 2035	760,000

**2017 base year is established by Caltrans historic data and 2035 horizon year projections are based on the AMBAG regional traffic model.*

Table 4: Segment 10 Daily System Operations

Segment 10 Daily System Operations	
AADT Base Year 2017	52,700-64,000
AADT Horizon Year 2035	75,000-88,000
AADT: Growth Rate/Year	870-1,560
VMT Base Year 2017	429,000
VMT Horizon Year 2035	630,000

**2017 base year is established by Caltrans historic data and 2035 horizon year projections are based on the AMBAG regional traffic model.*




Figure 7: Base & Horizon Year Peak Hour Congestion



Figure 8: Base Year Peak Hour Congestion




Figure 9: Horizon Year Peak Hour Congestion

7.0 ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERATIONS

The following factors were considered when evaluating potential for route rescission:

- The adopted location no longer represents a viable project.
- The adopted location is not locally accepted and does not conform with recent local and regional plans.
- There are no local or regional planning studies under way, which could have a bearing on existing route adoptions or concepts.
- The right-of-way acquired cannot be utilized for an interim project in the reasonable future.
- The right-of-way acquired cannot be utilized to accomplish other state priorities such as environmental mitigation or sustainable growth in affordable housing.

Ultimately, there is little likelihood for any construction to occur on the unconstructed portions of the adopted route; therefore, rescission is appropriate.

7.1 Alternative State Highway Project

Pursuant to California Government Code Section 14528.7 and 14528.8, alternative State Highway project in the corridor include the Segment 3 of the Route 156 West Corridor Project SR 156/US101 Interchange and the South of Salinas Corridor Improvement. Both projects would provide significant operational and safety benefits to the US 101 corridor by controlling access.

8.0 LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS

The RTP's for Monterey and San Benito Counties do not include any constrained or unconstrained list of projects for the unconstructed portion of the 1964 Route Adoption. The Monterey County 2010 General Plan and the San Benito County 2015 General Plan also do not mention any projects for the unconstructed portion of the Route Adoption. The existing property surrounding the Prunedale area is predominately low density/rural/residential. For the San Benito portion there have been no properties acquired. In 2002, TAMC adopted a resolution that stated, in part, that TAMC and Caltrans would take a phased approach to addressing transportation needs along US 101 in the Prunedale area; therefore, Caltrans recommends all proceeds be reserved to a State Highway Project in Monterey County.

9.0 RIGHT OF WAY

As of 2019, State owned properties along the Adopted Route (Alignment C) number 109 parcels in Monterey County. No parcels were acquired along the portion of Segment E (Figure 2) in San Benito County. The market value of these properties, based on anticipated highest and best use assumptions, are roughly estimated to be worth between \$8,000,000 to \$16,000,000 (Appendix 8).

10. LOCAL AGENCY COORDINATION

Caltrans has coordinated with TAMC, Monterey County, San Benito Council of Governments, and San Benito County on the proposed route rescission. Meetings were held with each of the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and the county agencies coordination was through emails and phone calls. All local agencies have confirmed the adopted route is no longer part of any local or regional plans and it is appropriate to rescind (Appendix 9-12).

11.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Caltrans recommends that the CTC approve the rescission from the 1964 Route Adoption for the unconstructed portion between Espinosa Road to State Route 156. Caltrans also recommends that all proceeds of sales be reserved to another State Highway Project in Monterey County (California Government Code Section 14528.7 and 14528.8).

REPORT
OF
ROUTE STUDIES
RELATIVE TO
THE FREEWAY LOCATION OF
ROUTE 2 (NEW ROUTE 101)
SIGN ROUTE U. S. 101
IN
MONTEREY AND SAN BENITO COUNTIES
BETWEEN
ESPINOSA ROAD
AND
THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY LINE

ROAD V-Mon, Sbt-2-J;B,A
(NEW V-Mon, Sbt-101)

April 1964

PROPOSAL

Reconstruction and/or relocation to full freeway standards of a 17.7-mile portion of existing Route 2 (new Route 101; Sign Route U.S. 101) in Monterey and San Benito Counties between Espinosa Road and the Santa Clara County Line.

PRINCIPAL CITIES OR COMMUNITIES

The unincorporated community of Santa Rita, which is located approximately 0.3 mile south of the proposed project, has a population of approximately 850. The City of Salinas, with a population of about 50,000, is located on Route 2 about four miles to the south.

The unincorporated community of Prunedale, which has a population of about 3,200, is located about three miles north of the beginning of the proposed project.

The City of Gilroy, with a population of about 8,400, is located about five miles to the north of the Santa Clara County Line.

EXISTING HIGHWAY

A. General

The Legislative description of Route 2 is from:

- (a) The junction of Route 56 (Funston Approach) and the approach to the Golden Gate Bridge in the Presidio of San Francisco to the international boundary line near Tijuana via San Diego and National City;
- (b) Orcutt to Route 2 north of Santa Maria;
- (c) Harriston to Route 2 near Los Alamos.

The portion of Route 2 under consideration is a segment in the northerly part of the unit under (a) above.

The existing facility for the most part is a 4-lane divided expressway except for the portion between 1.2 miles southerly and 1.0 mile northerly of the junction with Route 22 (near San Juan Bautista), which is a 4-lane full freeway.

This portion of Route 2 passes through terrain varying from mountains to flat valleys. Areas adjacent to the existing highway are used primarily for farming and rural type residences. The farm lands are used mainly for grazing with minor use for orchards and cultivated crops. There are numerous small commercial establishments between Espinosa Road and Tustin Road adjacent to the existing highway.

The subject portion of Route 2 is included in the Federal Aid System of Highways under the designation of FAP 7. It is signed as U.S. 101.

B. Principal Deficiencies

In addition to substandard alignment and grade, the principal deficiencies of the present expressway facility are frequent private access openings, numerous intersections at grade and narrow medians. Existing right of way widths are not adequate to accommodate any additional expansion in number of lanes.

Although 2.2 miles of 4-lane freeway have been constructed in the vicinity of the Route 2/22 (San Juan Bautista) Interchange, pavement and shoulder widths and grades are substandard and there is no provision for addition of lanes to accommodate anticipated future traffic.

TRAFFIC

The 1963 average daily traffic volumes range from about 21,000 vehicles in the first portion of the project to 14,500 vehicles at the Monterey-San Benito County Line to 11,700 vehicles at the San Benito-Santa Clara County Line. Trucks represent approximately 2 per cent of the traffic on weekends and about 12 per cent on weekdays.

ACCIDENTS

During a three-year period, 1960 through 1962, there has been a total of 576 accidents within the limits of the project. There were 170 accidents and seven fatalities in 1960, 183 accidents and six fatalities in 1961, and 223 accidents and seven fatalities in 1962. The average accident rate for the three-year period is 2.42 accidents per million vehicle miles and 8.50 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles. The statewide average accident rate on freeways is 1.22 accidents per million vehicle miles and 4.88 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles.

There are three locations which have a high accident concentration. These are the intersections with Route 22 at Prunedale, San Miguel Canyon Road and San Juan-Watsonville Road.

ROUTE PLANNING

The subject portion of Route 2 is included as part of the California Freeway and Expressway System.

The portion of Route 2 between junction with Route 22 near Prunedale and junction with Route 22 near San Juan Bautista is included in the State Scenic Highway System as enacted by the 1963 Legislature. It is believed that the studied locations can be developed to appropriate scenic standards.

Bids have been recently opened for full freeway construction for the contiguous portion of Route 2 at the south end of the project.

To the north of the Santa Clara County Line, it is planned to convert the existing expressway to full freeway standards along the existing adopted alignment.

State Route 22 junctions with Route 2 in the vicinity of Prunedale near the south end of the project and also near San Juan Bautista in the northerly part of the project. Studies relative to the freeway location of the portion of Route 22 west of Prunedale have not yet been initiated. Studies covering freeway development on Route 2 easterly from the junction of Route 2 near San Juan Bautista have been completed with the portion between Route 2 and San Juan Bautista to be converted to a 4-lane expressway as a part of the 1964-65 fiscal year budget.

If Alternate C is adopted as the freeway location for Route 2, it will be necessary to extend Route 22 from its present terminus at Prunedale Junction to the new alignment of Route 2. It would be possible to connect to Route 22 by utilizing the portion of existing Route 2 between Prunedale and Mallory Canyon Road or by a relocation such as shown on the Monterey County Master Plan (see attached Exhibit "C") which indicates a location for Route 22 along Vierra Canyon Road.

State Route 67 junctions with Route 2 just south of the San Benito River. There are no plans at this time relative to improvement of this route.

MASTER PLANS

On January 13, 1964, the Board of Supervisors of Monterey County adopted a general plan for the northern part of the County. This plan, which is attached as Exhibit "C", shows a freeway along the general alignment of studied alternates C and E.

PROPOSED TYPICAL SECTION

Cost estimates are based on initial construction of six lanes within an 8-lane right of way on alternates A, D and E south of the junction with Route 22 near San Juan Bautista. Estimates for Alternate C are based on initial construction of four lanes within a graded roadbed for six lanes. It is proposed that right of way for Alternate C provide for widening on the outside to accommodate a possible eight lanes.

On the portion of Route 2 north of the Route 2/22 (San Juan Bautista) Interchange, cost estimates have been based on initial construction of four lanes with provision for ultimate expansion to eight lanes.

STUDIES OF ALTERNATE ROUTES

Studies relative to freeway development of the subject portion of Route 2 were initiated in January 1961.

Two basic alternates for freeway development have been investigated south of the junction with Route 22 near San Juan Bautista. These alternates have a common junction or crossover near Crazy Horse Road--thus providing for four possible alignment combinations. These alternates are shown on the attached map, Exhibit "B".

Alternates A and D are based on development along the general location of the existing expressway facility. Because of substandard alignment and grade and narrow median, very little of the existing facility except rights of way can be incorporated into full freeway development.

Alternate C is a more direct alignment across the hills between Espinosa Road and Crazy Horse Road. It is 0.7 mile shorter than Alternate A. If Alternate C were adopted, it would be necessary to extend Route 22 from the Prunedale vicinity to a new junction with Route 2. For purposes of a proper comparison, the cost of such a Route 22 extension should be added to project costs for Alternate C. It is believed that such an extension should be on the basis of a 4-lane freeway and a figure of \$2,125,000 has been included in the cost estimate for alternates utilizing the C location.

Between Crazy Horse Road and junction with Route 22 near San Juan Bautista, Alternate E passes through the mountainous area on a considerably more direct alignment than the existing highway. It is 1.5 miles shorter than Alternate D between common points.

North of the San Juan Bautista junction, development along the general alignment of existing highway appears to offer the most feasible plan of development and thus no alternate locations have been presented.

Total project costs range from \$21,790,000 to \$23,150,000. Because of inclusion of Route 22 extension costs, alternates utilizing the C alignment are generally somewhat more expensive than other alternate combinations. However, user benefits are considerably higher on combination alignments utilizing either or both alternates C and E--ranging from \$7,600,000 to \$34,750,000 higher. The highest user benefit is provided by alternate combination CE. Project costs and user benefits are included in the Summary of Engineering and Economic Data on attached Exhibit "A".

ACTION TAKEN SUBSEQUENT TO INITIATION OF STUDIES

A. Conferences

A number of preliminary meetings or conferences were held with local officials and affected agencies to discuss the project and to receive information in return.

B. Local Authorities Notified of Section 75.5 of the Streets and Highways Code

The Monterey and San Benito County Boards of Supervisors were notified of the provisions of Section 75.5 of the Streets and Highways Code by letters dated January 5, 1961.

No information was submitted prior to nor during the public hearing pursuant to this section of the Code.

C. Other State Agencies Contacted in Conformance with Section 84 of the Streets and Highways Code and SCR 19 (1958)

The Department of Conservation, the Division of Forestry, the Division of Beaches and Parks and the State Lands Division were notified of the project

studies by letters dated January 5, 1961. The Department of Parks and Recreation and the Division of Small Craft Harbors were informed of the project in letters dated April 2, 1962.

No replies have been received from any of these agencies indicating any conflicts in planning.

D. Other Necessary Contacts with State and Federal Agencies

In letters dated July 28, 1961, the Department of Fish and Game and the Division of Aeronautics were advised of the routing studies. The Department of Agriculture and the Department of Water Resources were notified of these studies by letters dated April 2, 1962. The U. S. Bureau of Reclamation and the U. S. Corps of Engineers were informed of the studies in letters dated April 19, 1962, while the Federal Aviation Agency was advised by letter dated May 15, 1963.

By letter dated August 21, 1961, the Department of Fish and Game replied that the proposed highway project could possibly harm the steelhead trout in the Pajaro River. In a letter dated August 31, 1961, the Division replied that full consideration would be given to this problem and that every reasonable effort will be made to accommodate their requirements during the design stage if there were any conflict with the river. (Current planning is based on new construction away from the river and thus the only place the river would be affected would be at the crossing of the river itself.)

No other replies have been received indicating any conflict in planning with any of these agencies.

E. Public Hearing

A well publicized public hearing was held by the Division of Highways in the Prunedale Grange Hall on January 17, 1964. Approximately 70 persons were in attendance including Supervisor Deaver of Monterey County; Mr. E. W. DeMars, Planning Director of Monterey County; and Mr. Lester Bisho, representing the San Benito County Planning Commission. A representative of the Bureau of Public Roads was also present.

The District Engineer, District V, presided at this hearing at which the studied alternates were presented without an expression of preference. The project was well received with very little comment from those attending the hearing.

Mr. Lester Bisho, Manager of the Chamber of Commerce of San Benito County, reported that "the San Benito County Planning Commission had no objection to any of the changes on the 101 projects in San Benito County."

Mr. E. W. DeMars, Planning Director of Monterey County, stated on behalf of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, that the County favored Alternate CE as it coincides with the freeway location shown on the County's adopted Master Plan.

Copies of the transcript of proceedings and the report of this public hearing were forwarded for the attention of the members of the Commission under date of March 10, 1964.

ATTACHMENTS

- Exhibit A - Summary of Engineering and Economic Data
- Exhibit B - Project Map showing Alternates
- Exhibit C - North County General Plan (Monterey County)

SUMMARY OF ENGINEERING AND ECONOMIC DATA

Between Espinosa Road and the Santa Clara County Line

Alt. (Miles)	Length (Miles)	Hwy. Cost (\$ Thousands)		Traffic Service		Improvements Required			Total	
		Const.	R/W	20-Year User Benefits (\$ Millions)	Unit Cost of Traffic Service	Benefit Ratio	Residential	Comm. Bldgs		Agric. Bldgs.
Exist	17.7									
AD	17.7	\$17,415	\$4,375	\$22,330	0.0073	1.0	101	28	11	140
AE	16.2	18,060	3,850	49,470	0.0076	2.3	95	25	9	129
CD	17.0	18,830	4,200	29,930	0.0085	1.3	71	17	11	99
CE	15.5	19,475	3,675	57,100	0.0092	2.5	65	14	9	88

17.7
15.7
2.0

*Includes \$2,125 to convert existing Route 2 between Prunedale Junction and Mallory Canyon Road to freeway for Route 22

EXHIBIT "A"
V-Mon, SBt-2-J;B,A
(new V-Mon, SBt-101)




EXHIBIT B

North County General Plan

Legend

- Community Centers**
- Urban - as den. in ac/family
- Rural - as den. A ac/family
- Agricultural - as den. in ac/family
- Agriculture
- Industry
- Light Industry
- Recreation and Flood Plain
- Roads**
- Scenic/highway
- Freeways
- Major
- Minor
- Connection
- Riding and Hiking Trail
- Public Facilities
- Existing
- Proposed
- Schools
- * Schools



ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF MONTEREY COUNTY ON JANUARY 13, 1964

EXHIBIT C

Attachment 2: Notice of Intention on Freeway Location 1964

Passed by C.H.C.


APR 15 1964

NOTICE OF INTENTION ON FREEWAY LOCATION, ROAD V-Mon, SBT-2-J;B,A

WHEREAS, memorandum dated April 3, 1964, by J. C. Womack, State Highway Engineer, reporting to the California Highway Commission that studies for a freeway along a revised location of State highway in Monterey and San Benito Counties between Espinosa Road and the Santa Clara County Line, Road V-Mon, SBT-2-J;B,A have been completed and submitting therewith a map showing the location which is recommended for adoption; having been read and discussed,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Highway Engineer be authorized and directed to give public notice of the Commission's intention to consider the adoption of a location of a freeway on State highway in Monterey and San Benito Counties between Espinosa Road and the Santa Clara County Line, Road V-Mon, SBT-2-J;B,A and also to give written notice to the Boards of Supervisors of Monterey and San Benito Counties of such intention. Such notice to the Boards of Supervisors of Monterey and San Benito Counties shall specify that if either of these bodies considers a public hearing on the matter necessary, the Commission will hold or cause to be held such hearing, if requested by such local legislative body within thirty days after the first regular meeting of such local legislative body following receipt of written notice by the State Highway Engineer.

Appendix 4: Resolution Notes Alignment C-E is the Monterey County's Preferred Alignment Alternative for Adoption of US 101



*Before the Board of Supervisors in and for the
County of Monterey, State of California*

4-20-64

Resolution No. 64-121 --
Determining No Further Public Hearing
Necessary on Freeway Routing of U.S. 101
Between Espinosa Road and San Benito
County Line }

WHEREAS, the Division of Highways of the State of California has conducted studies relative to the relocation of U.S. Highway 101 between Espinosa Road and San Benito County Line, said highway being described as Route V-Mon-2-J (New V-Mon-101), and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by said Division of Highways on January 17, 1964, in Prunedale, relative to said proposed relocation, and

WHEREAS, the California Highway Commission has requested the State Highway Engineer to advise this Board of the Commission's intention to consider the adoption of said Freeway routing of U.S. Highway 101 between Espinosa Road and San Benito County Line, in accordance with the routing described at said public hearing as "Alternate C-E", and

WHEREAS, said State Highway Engineer has requested this Board to determine whether or not an additional public hearing by the California Highway Commission is in the public interest, and

WHEREAS, this Board feels that the public has been sufficiently informed of the said Freeway routing and has determined that an additional public hearing in this matter is not necessary, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that since the California Highway Commission has indicated its intention to adopt the Freeway routing of U.S. Highway 101 between Espinosa Road and San Benito County Line,

Before the Board of Supervisors in and for the
County of Monterey, State of California

known as Route V-Mon-2-J (New V-Mon-101), in accordance with the routing described at the public hearing as "Alternate C-E" and since this Board approves of said routing along said "Alternate C-E", this Board has determined that it is not in the public interest for the California Highway Commission to hold an additional public hearing on this matter and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Clerk is directed to so advise the State Highway Engineer.

Upon motion of Supervisor Deaver, seconded by Supervisor Hudson, and unanimously carried, the foregoing resolution is adopted by the following vote, to-wit:

AYES: Supervisors Deaver, Atteridge, Henry, Echeberria and Hudson.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: None.

COUNTY OF MONTEREY, }
STATE OF CALIFORNIA. }

I, EMMET G. McMENAMIN, County Clerk and ex-officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Monterey, State of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of an original order of said Board of Supervisors duly made and entered in the minutes thereof at page --- of Minute Book 16, on the 20th day of April, 1964, and now remaining of record in my office.
Witness my hand and the seal of said Board of Supervisors this 20th day of April, 1964.

EMMET G. McMENAMIN,
County Clerk and ex-officio Clerk of the Board
of Supervisors, County of Monterey, State of
California.

By Elizabeth S. Brown
Deputy.

Appendix 5: Resolution Notes Alignment C-E is the San Benito County's Preferred Alignment Alternative for Adoption of US 101

Office of the Board of Supervisors
 County of San Benito, State of California

RECEIVED
 JUN 12 1964
 PLANNING DEPT.

The Board of Supervisors of San Benito County met at the Court House, Hollister, California, at its usual place of meeting on May 18, 1964 in adjourned regular session.

RESOLUTION DETERMINING THAT NO)
 FURTHER PUBLIC HEARINGS ARE) RESOLUTION NO. 63-46
 NECESSARY RE ALTERNATE C-E ON)
 HIGHWAY 101)

WHEREAS, the Division of Highways of the State of California has conducted studies relative to the relocation of U.S. Highway 101 between Monterey County Line and Santa Clara County Line, said highway being described as Route V-SBt-2-B,A (New V-SBt-101); and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by said Division of Highways on January 17, 1964, in Prunedale, relative to said proposed relocation; and

WHEREAS, the California Highway Commission has requested the State Highway Engineer to advise this Board of the Commission's intention to consider the adoption of said Freeway routing of U.S. Highway 101 between Monterey County Line and Santa Clara County Line, in accordance with the routing described at said public hearing as "Alternate C-E"; and

WHEREAS, said State Highway Engineer has requested this Board to determine whether or not an additional public hearing by the California Highway Commission is in the public interest; and

WHEREAS, this Board feels that the public has been sufficiently informed of the said Freeway routing and has determined that an additional public hearing in this matter is not necessary;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that since the California Highway Commission has indicated its intention to adopt the Freeway routing of U.S. Highway 101 between Monterey County Line and Santa Clara County Line, known as Route V-SBt-2-B,A (New V-SBt-101), in accordance with the routing described at the public hearing as "Alternate C-E" and since this Board approves of said routing along said "Alternate C-E", this Board has determined that it is not in the public interest for the California Highway Commission to hold an additional public hearing on this matter; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk is directed to so advise the State Highway Engineer.

The foregoing resolution was passed and adopted by unanimous vote of the San Benito County Board of Supervisors this 18th day of May, 1964.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of an order made or resolution adopted and entered on the 18th day of May, 1964, in Book 17 of Supervisors Minutes, at page 259 thereof.

WITNESS my hand and seal of said Board of Supervisors affixed this 8th day of June, 1964.

RALPH G. TOWLE, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,
in and for the County of San Benito,
State of California

By Marie Hernandez Deputy

Appendix 6: Resolution Changing Location of State Highway and Declaring a Freeway

V-Mon,SBt-2-J;B,A
(New V-Mon,SBt-101)

RESOLUTION CHANGING LOCATION OF STATE HIGHWAY
AND DECLARING A FREEWAY

Passed by C.H.C.
JUN 24 1964

RESOLVED by the California Highway Commission that pursuant to the authority vested in it by law, this Commission does hereby alter and change the location of a section of State highway in Monterey and San Benito Counties between Espinosa Road and the Santa Clara County Line, and officially designated as Road V-Mon,SBt-2-J;B,A, as said location is shown on the map submitted on April 3, 1964, by J. C. Womack, State Highway Engineer; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that said section of State highway, as so altered and changed, is adopted as the location of said section of State highway provided, however, that the existing traversable highway shown on said map as the existing State highway shall remain as the State highway location until the section of State highway adopted by this resolution has been constructed and is opened for traffic and appropriate disposition of the existing State highway has been made as provided by law; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that said section of State highway is declared to be a freeway, as said term is defined in the Streets and Highways Code, and shall have the status of a freeway for all purposes provided by law and is designated as a part of the California Freeway and Expressway System.


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Commission has found and determined and hereby declares, that such alteration and change of the location of said State highway is for the best interest of the State.

July 989


Appendix 7: US 101 Route Design Characteristics (MON_101_R91.91_101.3)

BPM	EPM	Left Lanes	Left Special Features	Left Outside Shoulder Width	Left Inside Shoulder Width	Median Type	Median Barrier Code	Median Width	Right Lanes	Right Special Features	Right Outside Shoulder Width	Right Inside Shoulder Width	Highway Access Code	Terrain	Design Speed	Population Code	Total Lanes	Total Lanes in Miles	Center Line Miles
R91.91	91.98	3		8	5	Unpaved	No Barrier	16	3		5	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	6	0.42	0.07
R91.98	92.025	3		8	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	3		7	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	6	0.27	0.045
91.68	92.057	3		10	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	3		7	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	6	2.262	0.377
92.057	92.23	3		10	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		7	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	5	0.865	0.173
92.23	92.46	2		10	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		7	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.92	0.23
92.46	92.64	2		10	7	Paved	No Barrier	16	2		7	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.72	0.18
92.64	92.67	2		10	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		7	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.12	0.03
92.67	92.986	2		7	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		7	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	1.264	0.316
92.986	93.01	2		7	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	3		7	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	5	0.12	0.024
93.01	93.1	2		7	7	Paved	No Barrier	16	3		7	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	5	0.45	0.09
93.1	93.19	2		7	7	Paved	No Barrier	16	2		7	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.36	0.09
93.19	93.327	2		7	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		7	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.548	0.137
93.327	94.2	2		7	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2	Lane Transition	7	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	3.492	0.873
94.2	94.59	2		7	7	Paved	No Barrier	16	2		7	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	1.56	0.39
94.59	95.33	2		7	10	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	2		10	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	2.96	0.74
95.33	95.494	3		7	10	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	2		10	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	5	0.82	0.164
95.494	95.588	2		10	10	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	2		10	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.356	0.089
95.588	95.592	2		6	10	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	2		10	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.036	0.009
95.592	95.617	2		10	6	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	3		6	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	5	0.125	0.025
95.617	95.855	3	Aux Lane Inc	10	6	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	3		6	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	6	1.428	0.238
95.855	96.021	3	Aux Lane Inc	10	6	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	2		6	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	5	0.83	0.166
96.021	96.12	3	Aux Lane Inc	10	6	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	3		6	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	6	0.594	0.099
96.12	96.138	2	Aux Lane Inc	10	8	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	3		6	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	5	0.09	0.018
96.138	96.225	2	Aux Lane Inc	10	8	Paved	Concrete Barrier	14	3		6	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	5	0.435	0.067
96.225	96.331	2		10	8	Paved	Concrete Barrier	14	2		6	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.424	0.091
96.331	96.356	2		10	8	Paved	No Barrier	14	2		6	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.1	0.025
96.356	96.48	2		6	7	Paved	No Barrier	16	2		7	10	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.496	0.124
96.48	96.8	2		6	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		7	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	1.28	0.32
96.8	96.894	2		6	7	Paved	No Barrier	16	2		7	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.376	0.094
96.894	96.998	2		4	7	Paved	No Barrier	16	2		7	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.344	0.086
96.998	96.996	2		4	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		7	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.064	0.016
96.996	97.72	2		6	7	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		7	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	2.896	0.724
97.72	98.081	2		6	0	Paved	No Barrier	16	2		0	8	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	1.444	0.361
98.081	98.414	2		6	2	Unpaved	No Barrier	16	2		2	6	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	1.332	0.333
98.414	98.6	2		6	2	Paved	Metal Beam Barrier	16	2		2	6	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.744	0.186
98.6	98.69	2		6	2	Paved	No Barrier	16	2		2	6	E	Rolling	65	Urban	4	0.36	0.09
98.69	98.73	2		6	2	Paved	No Barrier	16	2		2	6	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.16	0.04
98.73	99.679	2	Lane Transition	6	2	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		2	6	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	3.796	0.949
99.679	99.74	2	Lane Transition	4	2	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		2	6	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.244	0.061
99.74	99.771	2	Lane Transition	4	2	Unpaved	No Barrier	16	2		2	6	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.124	0.031
99.771	99.772	2		6	2	Unpaved	No Barrier	16	2		2	6	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.004	0.001
99.772	100.175	2		8	5	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		9	6	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	1.612	0.403
100.175	100.257	2		8	12	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	2		5	8	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.328	0.082
100.257	100.391	2		8	11	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	2		11	8	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.536	0.2
100.391	100.393	2		8	11	Paved	No Barrier	22	2		11	8	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.008	0.002
100.393	100.554	2		8	15	Paved	Concrete Barrier	22	2		5	8	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.644	0.161
100.554	100.62	2		8	6	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		2	8	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.264	0.066
100.62	100.9	2		8	7	Unpaved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		7	8	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	1.12	0.28
100.9	101.022	2		10	10	Unpaved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		6.5	10	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.488	0.122
101.022	101.129	2		10	10	Unpaved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		6.5	6	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.428	0.107
101.129	101.145	2		10	10	Unpaved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		10	6	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.064	0.016
101.145	101.164	2		0	10	Unpaved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		10	6	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.076	0.019
101.164	101.3	2		0	10	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		10	6	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.544	0.136
101.3	101.316	2		6	2	Paved	Concrete Barrier	16	2		2	6	E	Rolling	65	Rural	4	0.06396	0.01599

Appendix 8: Prunedale State Property Inventory



Appendix 9: Local Resolution (TAMC)



55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, CA 93901-2902 • Tel: (831) 775-0903 • Website: www.tamcmonterey.org

RESOLUTION NO. 2019-10 OF THE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY (TAMC) TO SUPPORT ROUTE RESCISSION AND DISPOSITION OF EXCESS PROPERTIES ORIGINALLY PURCHASED FOR THE PRUNEDALE BYPASS PROJECT.

WHEREAS, the Transportation Agency for Monterey County is the State-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency and Local Transportation Commission for Monterey County; and

WHEREAS, The California Department of Transportation is proposing to rescind the route adoption, dispose of excess properties originally purchased for the Prunedale Bypass Project, and apply proceeds of sales to an alternative highway project in the US 101 corridor within Monterey County; and

WHEREAS, the Prunedale Bypass Project properties were acquired with the intent to address deficiencies on US 101 in the Prunedale area, but a lack of funding halted the project; and

WHEREAS, a series of operational improvements were completed in Fall 2014 to improve safety. This project, referred to as the Prunedale Improvement Project (PIP), upgraded the existing four-lane facility to partially access-controlled with construction of ten miles of median barrier, two new interchanges, and an overcrossing in the vicinity of the original Prunedale Bypass Project; and

WHEREAS, the Prunedale Bypass Project is no longer needed due to the Prunedale Improvement Project and future projects in the US 101 corridor;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the Board of Directors of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County requests that the California Transportation Commission rescind the state highway route location between Espinosa Road north to the San Benito County line; and


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: the Board of Directors of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County supports disposition of excess real properties originally purchased for the Prunedale Bypass Project with land sale proceeds to be reinvested into projects in the US 101 corridor in Monterey County per Government Code Section 14528.7.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, State of California this 25th day of September 2019, by the following votes:

AYES: L. Alejo, P. Barba, A. Chavez, B. Delgado, R. Huitt, A. Kerr, M. LeBarre, M. Orozco, J. Parker, D. Potter, J. Phillips E. Smith and A. Untalon

NOES:

ABSENT: M. Adams, S. Davis, G. Hawthorne, I. Oglesby



ROBERT HUITT, CHAIR
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY

ATTEST:



DEBRA L. HALE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY

Appendix 10: Local Resolution (SBtCOG)

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF SAN BENITO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF)
SAN BENITO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS) Resolution No. 19-08
SUPPORTING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S)
PROPOSAL TO RESCIND THE ROUTE ADOPTION)
AND DISPOSE OF EXCESS PROPERTIES)
FOR THE PRUNEDALE BYPASS PROJECT AND)
APPLY PROCEEDS OF SALES TO AN ALTERNATIVE)
PROJECT IN THE US 101 STRATEGIC)
INTERREGIONAL CORRIDOR SYSTEM WITHIN)
THE MONTEREY COUNTY REGION)

WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) previously identified an adopted alignment of US 101 for the US 101 Prunedale Bypass Project; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans is proposing to rescind the prior route adoption for the US 101 Prunedale Bypass Project, dispose of excess properties originally purchased for the project, and apply the proceeds of sales to an alternative highway project in the US 101 Strategic Interregional Corridor System within the Monterey County region; and

WHEREAS, some portions of the Prunedale Bypass Project route adoption are located in San Benito County; and

WHEREAS, the adopted route no longer represents a viable project; and

WHEREAS, the adopted route is not locally supported and does not conform with local and regional plans; and

WHEREAS, there is no route segmentation needed for system continuity to join adjacent completed or programmed segments of US 101; and

WHEREAS, the functional classification of the overall route will not be affected; and

WHEREAS, there are no local or regional planning studies underway that would have a bearing on existing route adoptions or concepts; and

WHEREAS the right-of-way acquired cannot be utilized for an interim project in the reasonable future; and

WHEREAS, the right-of-way acquired cannot be utilized to accomplish other state priorities such as environmental mitigation or sustainable growth in affordable housing.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of San Benito County Governments hereby supports Caltrans' proposal to rescind the route adoption for the US 101 Prunedale Bypass Project, dispose of excess properties originally purchased for the project, and apply the proceeds of sales to an alternative highway project in the US 101 Strategic Interregional Corridor System within the Monterey County region.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE SAN BENITO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS THIS
19th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2019 BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:**

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAINING:
ABSENT:



César E. Flores, Chair

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM:
SAN BENITO COUNTY COUNSEL'S OFFICE


Dated: Sept. 13, 2019

By: 

Shirley L. Murphy, Deputy County Counsel

ATTEST:
Mary Gilbert, Executive Director


Dated: 9/19/19

By: 

Appendix 11: Local Resolution (Monterey County)

MONTEREY COUNTY

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS



168 West Alisal Street, 1st Floor
SALINAS, CA 93901
(831) 755-5066, Fax: (831) 755-5888
cttb@co.monterey.ca.us

October 15, 2019

Aileen K. Loe, Deputy District Director
Planning & Local Assistance, Caltrans District 5
50 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Re: Intention to Consider Rescinding the Route Adoption for the Unconstructed Portions Between Espinosa Road and Santa Clara County Line

Dear Ms. Loe:

On September 5, 2019, Monterey County staff were made aware of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) intent to rescind the Route Adoption for the unconstructed portions between Espinosa Road and Santa Clara County line in Monterey and San Benito County.

Monterey County supports Caltrans rescission efforts on the parcels previously acquired for the Prunedale Bypass Project, but no longer needed for of any local or regional projects. Pursuant to California Government Code section 14528.7 and 14528.8 we support all proceeds of sales be reserved to another State Highway Project in Monterey County.

We greatly appreciate your continuing coordination with us regarding the US 101 corridor issues and look forward to coordinating with Caltrans on any excess right of way that may be made available as part of this process. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact at Carl Holm, Monterey County Resource Management Agency Director, at (831) 755-5103 or HolmCP@co.monterey.ca.us.

Sincerely,


John M. Phillips
Chair, Board of Supervisors

Cc: Transportation Agency for Monterey County

Appendix 12: Local Resolution (San Benito County)



County of San Benito RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

2301 Technology Parkway, Second Floor
Hollister, CA 95023
Email: sbcpw@cosb.us
Fax: 831-636-4176

Harry Mavrogenes
RMA Director
Phone: 831-636-4170

October 9, 2019

Aileen K. Loe, Deputy District Director
Planning & Local Assistance, Caltrans District 5
50 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Dear Ms. Loe:

On September 4, 2019, San Benito County staff were made aware of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) intent to rescind the Route Adoption for the unconstructed portions between Espinosa Road and Santa Clara County line in Monterey and San Benito County.

San Benito County supports Caltrans proposal to rescind the existing route adoption on US 101. There are no local or regional planning studies underway that would have bearing on existing route adoption along Alignment E.

We greatly appreciate your continuing coordination with us regarding the US 101 corridor issues and look forward to coordinating with Caltrans on any excess right of way that may be made available as part of this process. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 831-636-4170.

Sincerely,

Harry Mavrogenes,
RMA Director

CC: Orchid Monroy-Ochoa/ via email -orchid.monroy@dot.ca.gov
Kelly McClendon/via email - McClendon, Kelly D@DOT