

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE  
ASSOCIATION OF MONTEREY BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS**

**August 12, 2020**

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Directors of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, President, Steve McShane presiding, convened at 6:00 p.m. Wednesday, August 12, 2020 via GoToWebinar.

**2. ROLL CALL**

<b><u>AMBAG Board of Directors</u></b>			
<b>PRESENT:</b>			
<b>Agency</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Representative</b>
Carmel-by-the-Sea	Bobby Richards	County of Monterey	Mary Adams
Del Rey Oaks	Louise Goetzelt	County of Monterey	John Phillips
Gonzales	Scott Funk	County of Santa Cruz	Greg Caput
Greenfield	Lance Walker	County of Santa Cruz	Bruce McPherson
Hollister	Carol Lenoir	County of San Benito	Mark Medina
King City	Carlos Victoria		
Marina	Lisa Berkley		
Monterey	Ed Smith	<b><u>Ex-Officio Members:</u></b>	
Pacific Grove	Jenny McAdams	Caltrans, District 5	Scott Eades
Salinas	Steve McShane	MBARD	Richard Stedman
San Juan Bautista	John Freeman	MBCP	JR Killigrew
Scotts Valley	Jack Dilles	MPAD	Michael LaPier
Seaside	Jon Wizard		
Soledad	Marisela Lara		
Watsonville	Felipe Hernandez		
<b>ABSENT:</b>			
Capitola	Kristen Petersen	<b><u>Ex-Officio Members:</u></b>	
Sand City	Mary Ann Carbone	MST	Lisa Rheinheimer
Santa Cruz	Justin Cummings	SBtCOG	Mary Gilbert
County of San Benito	Vacant	SCCRTC	Guy Preston
		SC METRO	Alex Clifford
		TAMC	Debbie Hale

**Others Present:** Dawn Hayes, MBNMS Deputy Superintendent; Beth Jarosz, PRB Consultant; Heather Adamson, Director of Planning; Amaury Berteaud, Special Projects Manager; Bhupendra Patel, Director of Modeling; Bobbie Grant, Office Assistant; Will Condon, Planner; Gina Schmidt, GIS Coordinator; Paul Hierling, Senior Planner; Maura Twomey, Executive Director; and Ana Flores, Senior Executive Assistant.

### **3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

There were no written comments or oral comments from the public.

### **4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE BOARD ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

There were no written comments or oral comments from the Board.

### **5. PRESENTATIONS**

#### **A. Draft Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) Management Plan**

Dawn Hayes, Deputy Superintendent, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) gave a presentation on the Draft Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) Management Plan. Ms. Hayes reported that the purpose of the presentation was 1) to provide an overview of the management plan review process and draft documents; 2) hear comments from the AMBAG Board of Directors; and 3) provide information about how to find the full documents and provide further comment. The Final Management Plan and supporting environmental documentation will be released in the winter of 2021. Ms. Hayes stated that the management plan review process is a public process which include 1) public scoping meetings; 2) a variety of Advisory Council Working Group meetings with input from both the MBNMS and the Greater Farallones National Marine Sanctuary (GFNMS) Advisory Councils; 3) presentations and discussions with Advisory Councils; and 4) the remaining public comment meetings which are to be held on August 21, 2020 at the MBNMS Advisory Council meeting and on August 24, 2020 at the GFNMS Advisory Council meeting. Ms. Hayes reported that the MBNMS Draft Management Plan consists of 13 different action plans that are broken down into 2 categories which include issue based action plans and programmatic action plans. The issue based plans include the following 1) the Wildlife Disturbance Action Plan; 2) the Climate Change Action Plan; 3) the Coastal Erosion and Sediment Management; 4) the Emerging Issues; 5) the Introduced Species Issue Plan; 6) the Marine Debris Action Plan; and 7) the Water Quality Action Plan. The programmatic plans include 1) the Education, Outreach and Communications Plan; 2) the Operations and Administration Plan; 3) the Marine Spatial Planning Action Plan; 4) the Maritime Heritage Plan; 5) the Research and Monitoring Plan; and 6) the Resource Protection Action Plan. The MBNMS proposed regulations are 1) the beneficial use of dredged material; 2) modifying the prerequisite conditions for motorized personal watercraft access to the riding zone at the Mavericks surf break; 3) changing the size and shape of four motorized personal watercraft zones to improve access; and 4) make a minor technical correction to the document list of exempted Department of Defense activities at the Davidson Seamount Management Zone. The MBNMS completed a draft environmental assessment with 3 alternative assessments 1) Alternative A with no changes and to continue with the current management plan; 2) Alternative B with a new management plan with no new regulations; and 3) Alternative C, which is the preferred alternative, with a new management plan and new regulations. The summary of conclusions are 1) the continued operation and management of the MBNMS, the revision of the sanctuary management plan and the adoption of revised regulations would have an overall beneficial effect on resources with the sanctuary; 2) the management plan is broad and is a guidance document, many of the anticipated beneficial effects would be indirect, resulting from the MBNMS efforts to a) improve public understanding of ocean stewardship issues; b) further scientific understanding of sanctuary ecosystems and cultural and historical resources; c) to implement resource protection and maritime heritage programs; and d) to implement regulations to limit

stressors on marine resources; 3) some of the actions proposed under all alternatives would have adverse effects on resources including the disturbance of the seafloor and benthic habitat from marker buoy deployment and sampling activities and the disturbance of wildlife through research and monitoring of species. In all cases, the adverse effects were found to be less significant because NOAA conducts the activities on a small scale; and 4) cumulative effects of the actions proposed would be less than significant because the actions which are both beneficial and adverse are small in scale and localized. The timeline for the review process are as follows 1) the documents were released on July 6, 2020; 2) the close of the comment period is September 4, 2020; 3) and scheduled public meetings on July 24, 2020 for public comments, August 21, 2020 at the MBNMS Advisory Council Meeting and on August 24, 2020 at the GFNMS Advisory Council Meeting. Ms. Hayes also reported that comments can also be submitted at the [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) website at any time. Next steps include 1) completing the public comment period; 2) compile, categorize and analyze comments; 3) draft responses to comments and submit for approval; 4) revise the Management Plan, Regulatory and the Draft Environmental Assessment documents where appropriate; 5) release the Final Management Plan and Environmental Assessment documents in the Fall of 2020; and 6) publish the Record of Decision of the Final Regulatory document in the Spring of 2021. Ways to comment include 1) at the August 12, 2020 AMBAG Board of Directors meeting; 2) comments can be submitted online directly to [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) using docket number NOAA-NOS-2020-0094; 3) comments can also be emailed to [mbnmsmanagementplan@noaa.gov](mailto:mbnmsmanagementplan@noaa.gov); and 4) at the [www.montereybay.noaa.gov](http://www.montereybay.noaa.gov) website. Brief discussion followed.

#### **B. Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) Draft Management Plan Comment Letter**

Maura Twomey, Executive Director gave a report on the MBNMS Draft Management Plan Comment Letter. Ms. Twomey reported that AMBAG staff prepared the draft comment letter at the direction of the AMBAG Sanctuary Subcommittee. The AMBAG Sanctuary Subcommittee is composed of Directors Steve McShane, Kristen Petersen, John Freeman, Ed Smith, Bruce McPherson and Public Member Steve Scheiblauer, former Harbor Master, City of Monterey. The AMBAG Sanctuary Subcommittee met on August 3, 2020 and reviewed the Draft Management Plan and referenced to the comments that were submitted to the MBNMS during their scoping process in 2015. The Sanctuary Subcommittee and AMBAG staff felt that the MBNMS had made great progress on the issues and concerns that AMBAG had raised in 2015 during the scoping process. The comments proposed by the Sanctuary Subcommittee for the MBNMS Draft Management Plan comment letter focus on the following issues of importance to the region which include 1) consistency with the intent of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act 2) citizen science; 3) desalination; 4) permit process for beach nourishment; 5) representation of the Sanctuary Advisory Council; 6) personal water craft; 7) stakeholder collaboration; and 8) artificial reefs. Lengthy discussion followed.

Director Lenoir asked what the issue is with the definition of “beach nourishment” and what is AMBAG’s side of the request for the enhanced wording?

Maura Twomey, Executive Director stated that the issue is in regards to the permit process for beach nourishment. AMBAG is supportive of the change. The new definition allows for the clean dredge to be used for habitat restoration. AMBAG is asking that the definition be broadened to allow for greater use of the dredge material than just for habitat restoration.

Director Smith stated that the Subcommittee reviewed the 500 page Draft Management Plan and also reviewed the sections that were significant to the tri-county region. Director Smith stated that there is a particular issue that is covered in the Coastal Erosion Sediment Management Action Plan which references the restoration of sediment balance in near shore habitats throughout the MBNMS. The intent is to be able to answer the problem of Mean Tide restoration and support the jurisdictions that are losing their shores and spaces needed for public access. A collaborative community approach would help develop a path forward to restore, preserve and maintain coastal beaches. A broadened definition would be necessary for the jurisdiction's to apply for the permits necessary for beach nourishment and not be limited to just habitat restoration. Director Smith stated that the comments made were made in recognition of all the work that has been completed and that there are no conflicts for the future for significant beach erosion in our region.

Director Berkley requested that a change be made to the comment letter on page 7 of the AMBAG Board of Directors agenda. Under the desalination comment it states that "AMBAG supports the MBNMS Plan's balanced approach to ocean environmental concerns with the need of residents who live and work in our region. We support a project that provides clean drinking water and does not bring environmental economic harm to any city or community."

Director McShane stated that the comment was recorded. Director McShane stated that the board would come back to comment and make a decision.

Director Adams stated that she is concerned with the permit process for beach nourishment and the beneficial use of the dredged materials and asked how can we ensure that the language that is being proposed will be for the kind of project that is being discussed? Director Adams stated that she is worried that by making the language less descriptive it could be used against us and understands that the whole point of the MBNMS is to ensure that any issues that occur would be beneficial to the long term protection of the sanctuary.

Director McShane stated that to begin any sort of beach nourishment or dredge would be a lot of work and that there is tremendous regulatory oversight.

Maura Twomey, Executive Director commented that the Subcommittee had a lengthy discussion on this item. It was also discussed at SAC committee meetings. Our request was for a slightly broader definition. Any beach nourishment project is required to undergo an extensive permitting process and requires an approval by the Sanctuary on a case by case basis. The Subcommittee felt that there was still adequate protection in the Management Plan as well as in the regulation documents.

Director Wizard asked what we are attempting to support or the intended project we are attempting to support by submitting this comment.

Maura Twomey, Executive Director stated that the coastal cities have concerns. The coastal cities do beach nourishments for habitat restoration and also have the need for beach nourishment to protect assets along the coast.

Director Wizard asked what would happen if NOAA rejects this proposed comment that we are planning to submit.

Director Smith commented that once the Management Plan is passed it will be the law of the land and if we disagree with the law our opportunity for remedy would be through applications and the permitting process. The MBNMS has the authority to reject the permit.

Maura Twomey, Executive Director stated that there is a potential that the coastal cities would not be able to move forward with certain projects that are meant for protecting the assets along the coastline and with sea level rise there are many areas that are experiencing issues.

Director McPherson commented that he appreciates the great questions and thanked Director Smith for all that he has done through the years in regards to the Sanctuary. Director McPherson stated that the concern that we have is a local governing issue and it highlights the need to have more elected representatives on the MBNMS Advisory Council.

President McShane brought back the recommendation by Director Berkley to revise the desalination section of the comment letter. President McShane asked the clerk to read back the proposed changes to the comment letter.

Ana Flores, Senior Executive Assistant read back the proposed changes as follows: "AMBAG supports the MBNMS Plan's balanced approach to ocean environmental concerns with the needs of residents who live and work in our region. We support a project that supports clean drinking water and does not bring environmental or economic harm to any city or community".

Director Phillips stated that he opposes of the change to the comment letter and supports the original language. Director Phillips gave a motion to approve the AMBAG comment letter for the MBNMS draft Management Plan as presented with no revisions to the language.

Director Goetzelt stated that she understands Director Berkley's position and feels that the original language already emphasizes the information and does not need to be changed.

Director McAdams stated that she supports the rewrite of the comment and thinks the change is gracious, inclusive and that it is standing up for the residents. Director Adams stated that it is the kind of leadership we need.

Director Wizard stated that he does not understand why AMBAG is supporting a project that does not exist. Director Wizard suggests deleting the entire paragraph about desalination or discuss how we can support a project that provides clean drinking water.

Maura Twomey, Executive Director stated that the Subcommittee wanted to emphasize that AMBAG supports the Sanctuary in a permitting role and as a procedural partner.

Director Goetzelt suggested eliminating the second sentence of the desalination comment.

Director Berkley stated that she understood Director Phillips comment, however, everybody in the region is entitled to clean drinking water in ways that will not inflict harm. Director Berkley also stated that she does not understand why any member the AMBAG Board would be against including a sentence that will not bring environmental or economic harm.

Director Phillips stated that he supports Director Goetzelt's suggestion to strike the second sentence.

Director Berkley stated she wanted to make an amendment and delete the first two sentences and keep only the last sentence of the Desalination section of the comment letter.

President McShane asked Director Phillips if he would like to accept the friendly amendment to strike both the first and second sentences in the desalination section of the comment letter or keep the motion as is and strike the second sentence.

Director Phillips stated that he does not accept the proposed friendly amendment.

**Motion made by Director Phillips, seconded by Director Smith to approve the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) Draft Management Plan Comment Letter with revisions. Motion passed with Director Berkley abstaining.**

## **6. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **A. Executive/Finance Committee**

President McShane reported that the Executive/Finance Committee approved the consent agenda that included 1) the minutes of the June 10, 2020 meeting; 2) list of warrants as of June 30, 2020; and 3) accounts receivable as of June 30, 2020. The Executive/Finance Committee also received 1) the financial update report from Maura Twomey, Executive Director; and 2) an update on the Draft 2022 Regional Growth Forecast from Heather Adamson, Director of Planning.

### **B. Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) Advisory Council (SAC)**

President McShane reported that the SAC meeting is scheduled on August 21, 2020. President McShane stated that he would take the AMBAG Board comments and questions to the next SAC meeting regarding the 2020 MBNMS Draft Management Plan. The focus of the meeting will be on the MBNMS Draft Management Plan and a comment letter regarding an offshore wind energy project.

## **7. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Maura Twomey, Executive Director reported that AMBAG received the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) Certificate of Achievement for the Excellence in Financial Reporting for the Fiscal Year 2018-2019. It is the eighth consecutive year that AMBAG has received the award. Ms. Twomey also reported that AMBAG staff is continuing to telework consistent with the current state and local directives regarding COVID-19 and will continue to telework for the foreseeable

future. Ms. Twomey stated that limited essential staff has been in the office to maintain business operations as necessary.

## **8. CONSENT AGENDA**

### **A. Draft Minutes of the June 13, 2020 AMBAG Board of Directors Meeting**

The draft minutes of the June 13, 2020 AMBAG Board of Directors meeting were approved.

### **B. AMBAG Regional Clearinghouse Monthly Newsletter**

The AMBAG Regional Clearinghouse Monthly Newsletter was accepted.

### **C. AMBAG Sustainability Program Update**

The AMBAG Sustainability Program Update was accepted.

### **D. Formal Amendment No. 15 to the Monterey Bay Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP): FFY 2018-19 to FFY 2021-22**

The Formal Amendment No. 15 to the Monterey Bay Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP): FFY 2018-19 to FFY 2021-22 was approved.

### **E. Delegation of Authority to Disburse Regional Early Action Planning Grants**

The Delegation of Authority to Disburse Regional Early Action Planning Grants was approved.

### **G. Financial Update Report**

The financial update report was accepted.

**Motion made by Director Goetzelt, seconded by Director Lenoir to approve the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **9. ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION**

None.

## **10. PLANNING**

### **A. Draft 2022 Regional Growth Forecast Update**

Heather Adamson, Director of Planning gave a report on the 2022 Revised Draft Regional Growth Forecast (RGF). Ms. Adamson reported that the AMBAG region is continuing to grow at a slow pace. The population numbers in the region are slightly lower in growth in the 2022 Draft RGF than what was reported in the 2018 RGF. The 2022 Draft jobs numbers in the AMBAG region are slightly higher than what was reported in the 2108 RGF for jobs. The RGF is the forecast for the tri-county area and forecasts population, housing and employment. The base year is 2015 but use some data through 2019 and partially through 2020. The horizon year is 2045 and is the basis for planning for growth in

the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (MTP/SCS), transportation project level analysis, corridor studies, and economic analysis. The forecast numbers are input for the Regional Travel Demand Model which forecasts travel patterns. Ms. Adamson stated that the forecast alone does not guide the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The RHNA methodology for disaggregation also considers 1) fair share (avoiding disproportionate income categories); 2) lack of service capacity such as water (by statute); 3) market demands for housing; 4) needs of farm workers; and 5) needs generated by a university or college. RHNA discussions will begin in 2021 following the development of the growth forecast. The purpose of the RGF is to show what is likely to occur for transportation planning purposes. General Plans often look at the full potential of build out in order to address potential environmental impacts. Ms. Adamson reported that the forecast is based on an employment driven forecast model which starts with 1) employment; 2) population; 3) group quarters and household populations; 4) households; and 5) housing units. The AMBAG region's slowing growth rate reflects broader demographic trends as compared with the State of California and the United States. Ms. Adamson reported that the revised Draft 2022 Regional Growth Forecast numbers are slightly revised compared to the 2018 Regional Growth Forecast to reflect the new data that was received and the numbers will be used to work on the subregional allocation. Unlike the regional forecast, the subregional allocation and the employment forecast is separate from the population and housing forecast and that the separation reflects the differing economic and demographic forces at the regional and local levels. The population trends are driven by three factors which include 1) historical trends; 2) anticipated future developments that are likely to be occupied within the forecast period; and 3) external factors such as universities and prisons. Household trends and demographic factors also play a role in the subregional growth forecast. Ms. Adamson reported that the subregional forecast numbers were reviewed with all the jurisdictions and the feedback was incorporated in the revised draft subregional forecast. AMBAG staff conducted more than 60 one-on-one meetings with local jurisdictions and agencies as well as discussions at the Planning Directors Forums. AMBAG staff will schedule additional meetings with local jurisdictions in August or September 2020 as needed. Forecast work to date includes 1) work on the Preliminary Draft RGF in March 2020; 2) the Preliminary Draft Subregional Growth Forecast input and review with local jurisdictions in May 2020 through July 2020; 3) revise forecasts to reflect updated 2020 estimates from the State of California Department of Finance in July 2020; and 4) continue Round 4 of one-on-one meetings with local jurisdictions in August 2020. Next steps include 1) AMBAG staff will continue to meet with local jurisdictions and universities in late Summer 2020; and 2) the AMBAG Board is scheduled to accept the 2022 Regional Growth Forecast and subregional allocation in the of Fall 2020.

Director McAdams asked how it was determined which homes were counted as second homes and third homes.

Heather Adamson, Director of Planning stated that in terms of housing units, all housing units are counted and it does not matter if the units are a second home, an Airbnb or anything similar. They are all accounted for as part of the forecast. Ms. Adamson also stated that in terms of vacancy they are also all accounted for.

Beth Jarosz, Consultant, Population Reference Bureau stated that all of the data is benchmarked to the census. The 2000 census and the 2010 census that was conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau are all self-reported. If an individual has chosen not to respond to the census at a residence in the AMBAG region then that home becomes listed as vacant.



## **B. Central Coast Highway 1 Climate Resiliency Study**

Heather Adamson, Director of Planning, gave an overview of the Central Coast Highway 1 Climate Resiliency Study. The Study was funded by the Caltrans SB 1 Adaptation Planning Grant and State Rail funds with local match. The study will develop a transportation corridor concepts and sea level rise adaptation approaches that 1) improve transportation safety and efficiency; 2) promote healthy coastal habitats; and 3) provide economic security and benefits to the community. The Steering Committee is made up of 1) AMBAG; 2) Caltrans; 3) The Nature Conservancy; 4) Environmental Science Associates; 5) TAMC; 6) Center for the Blue Economy; 7) County of Monterey; 8) Ocean Protection Council; 9) California Coastal Commission; 10) Elkhorn Slough Foundation; 11) Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve; 12) U.S. Fish & Wildlife; 13) Central Coast Wetlands Group; 14) Coastal Conservancy; and 15) Moss Landing Harbor District. Public workshops were held in August 2019 and February 2020 as well as stakeholder meetings and presentations. The timeline of the study consisted of identifying existing conditions, developing adaptation concepts and scenarios, the evaluation of adaptation scenarios and benefit-cost analysis, and the acceptance of the final study report in August 2020. Ms. Adamson reported that the No Action Scenario shows 1) flooding of Highway 1, the rail corridor, and adjacent areas; 2) without action, we may lose up to 85% of marsh and 50% mudflat areas; and 3) without action, transportation infrastructure and services would be severely impacted. The evaluation of adaptation scenarios included 1) Climate modeling which models future potential flooding conditions; 2) Ecological conditions which examine the changes in habitat extents over time; 3) Transportation modeling which models future highway traffic conditions and; 4) Cost Benefit Analysis which weighs potential gains and losses, including ecosystem services. Roadway improvements and adaptation options include 1) integrating solutions that enhance the resilience of the roadway and neighboring ecology; 2) the highway to be elevated on piles or fill, depending on opportunities for improvement in ecology and habitat quality in specific reach and flood plain management. Railway improvements and adaptation actions include 1) elevating the rail corridor on trestle; 2) the railway would be single track through the slough; 3) marsh restoration to support marsh habitat as sea level rises; and 4) using existing railway embankment to retain sediment for restoration. The key transportation findings are 1) the No Action Scenario would increase congestion and delay, and limit access; 2) Scenario C3 (4-lane elevated Highway 1) would best suit the transportation needs of the corridor and would provide the greatest relief to congestion and delay; 3) Scenario C2 (improving the G12 inland corridor as a main route) limits access to the coastal corridor and does not out perform Scenario C3 under any transportation metric; and 4) Scenario C1 (2-lane elevated Highway 1) does not meet the corridor's travel needs but does present viable operational and safety improvements that can be made through the corridor. The habitat key findings are 1) no action results in habitat loss (~85% of estuarine marsh); 2) the benefits of restoration is greater if occurs before habitat conversion; 3) the marsh restoration east of the railway and ecotone creation at the Highway 1 reduce the rate of habitat loss; 4) transportation adaptation is one of the several strategies needed to maintain habitat in the face of level rise; and 5) only the 4-lane Highway 1 and marsh restoration scenario has benefits that exceed costs. Major takeaways include 1) choosing not to adapt to sea level rise would result in wipe spread loss of coastal habitat, significant transportation impacts and economic losses; 2) adaptation of the highway with nature based elements help to reduce the loss of habitat; 3) adaptation needs to be in place by the 2050's to ensure benefits to transportation and habitats; 4) multi-sector cooperation and planning is key; and 5) planning for ecosystem migration is critical to increase future habitat and overall resilience of the Elkhorn Slough. The considerations for future planning include 1) integrate

study results into Regional/State Transportation Plans; 2) continue planning processes that combine multi-objective and multi-benefit focus in each stage of adaptation planning; 3) integrate the best available science and modeling into future analysis; and 4) pathways, triggers and strong partnerships must be in place to ensure effective climate change adaptation for the Moss Landing area and the Elkhorn Slough. Ms. Adamson reported that the draft study report was released for public comment in May 2020. More than 100 written comments were received on the draft report. The comments received and the responses to the comments can be found in Appendix G of the report. The draft study report has been modified based on the comments and input received. Next steps after the Board's acceptance include 1) working with Caltrans to close out the study grant; and 2) develop a virtual reality experience to visualize seal level rise impacts, adaptation scenarios and study results which is anticipated to be completed by September 2020.

Director Phillips stated that this study pertains to his jurisdiction and he receives complaints on the condition of Highway 1. We have four lanes all through Santa Cruz County and as soon as you enter the Monterey County line the highway drops down to two lanes. Director Phillips stated that Highway 1 need to be fixed.

Director Berkley asked about the virtual reality tool and where will that tool be available?

Heather Adamson, Director of Planning reported that the virtual reality tool is not available. Once the virtual reality tool is available, a link to the tool will be posted to the Central Coast Highway 1 Climate Resiliency Study page on the AMBAG website as well as The Nature Conservancy website. AMBAG staff will send the information to the AMBAG Board via the newsletter and send out an email.

**Motion made by Director Phillips, seconded by Director Goetzelt to approve the Final Central Coast Highway 1 Resiliency Study. Motion passed unanimously.**

## **11. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Directors meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

**AMBAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING ATTENDANCE & VOTING RECORD**

**BOARD MEETING DATE: August 12, 2020**

<b>Attendance (X= Present; AB= Absent) Voting (Y= Yes; N=No; A=Abstain)</b>					
<b>MEMBER</b>	<b>AMBAG REP</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>Item# 5.B</b>	<b>Item# 8</b>	<b>Item# 10.B</b>
Capitola	Kristen Petersen	AB	N/A	N/A	N/A
Carmel-by-the-Sea	Bobby Richards	X	Y	Y	Y
Del Rey Oaks	Louise Goetzelt	X	Y	Y	Y
Gonzales	Scott Funk	X	Y	Y	Y
Greenfield	Lance Walker	X	Y	Y	Y
Hollister	Carol Lenoir	X	Y	Y	Y
King City	Carlos Victoria	X	Y	Y	Y
Marina	Lisa Berkley	X	A	Y	Y
Monterey	Ed Smith	X	Y	Y	Y
Pacific Grove	Jenny McAdams	X	Y	Y	Y
Salinas	Steve McShane	X	Y	Y	Y
San Juan Bautista	John Freeman	X	Y	Y	Y
Sand City	Mary Ann Carbone	AB	N/A	N/A	N/A
Santa Cruz	Justin Cummings	AB	N/A	N/A	N/A
Scotts Valley	Jack Dilles	X	Y	Y	Y
Seaside	Jon Wizard	X	Y	Y	Y
Soledad	Marisela Lara	X	Y	Y	Y
Watsonville	Felipe Hernandez	X	Y	Y	Y
County-Monterey	Mary Adams	X	Y	Y	Y
County-Monterey	John Phillips	X	Y	Y	Y
County-Santa Cruz	Bruce McPherson	X	Y	Y	Y
County-Santa Cruz	Greg Caput	X	Y	Y	Y
County-San Benito	Vacant	AB	N/A	N/A	N/A
County-San Benito	Mark Medina	X	Y	Y	Y

(\* = Board Member(s) arrived late or left early, therefore, did not vote on the item. Please refer the minutes)