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I. Executive Summary

Prior to constructing new facilities, recipients of federal transportation funding must consider how the location of the proposed facility may impact the affected minority and low-income community. While the impacts of constructing and operating a facility need to be environmentally analyzed for potential impacts, the selection of the site location must also be scrutinized to ensure that the site was selected in a non-discriminatory manner.

As required by Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964, MST has conducted a Fixed Facility Equity Analysis intended to ensure that the location is selected without regard to race, color, or national origin. Along with data and studies undertaken as part of the environmental process, MST has determined that the selection of the proposed South County Operating Facility in King City would not result in a disparate impact to minority populations.

II. Background

TITLE VI REQUIREMENT

Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. As a recipient of federal funds, MST is required to conduct a Fixed Facility Equity Analysis, highlighted in both the federal Title VI guidance1 and under Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulation,2 that is intended to ensure that the location is selected without regard to race, color, or national origin. This analysis must also “give attention to other facilities with similar impacts in the area to determine if any cumulative adverse impacts might result.”

TITLE VI POLICIES

MST has developed policies and procedures to satisfy all requirements established by federal guidance under the federal circular C4702.1B. The MST policies were established so that no person would be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity provided by MST. The policies also provide for meaningful access to programs for persons with Limited English Proficiency (LEP). MST provides public notice of its policy to uphold and assure full compliance with Title VI on their agency website (https://mst.org/contact-us/civil-rights/title-vi/). Information regarding MST’s Title VI policies and the procedures for filing civil rights complaints are provided in English, Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese and Korean.

AGENCY OVERVIEW

MST is a transit district that provides fixed route, demand-response, and special seasonal transit service to a 293.9-square mile area of Monterey County with connections to Santa Cruz County in Watsonville and Santa Cruz; Santa Clara County in Gilroy, Morgan Hill, and San Jose; and San Luis Obispo County in Paso Robles and Templeton. MST provides a variety of fixed-route services to meet the unique needs of the rural, small, and medium sized communities it serves. High frequency commuter services in Salinas, Monterey, and Seaside complement local and neighborhood services in Pacific Grove, Carmel, Marina, and Del Rey Oaks.

---

1 Federal Circular C4702.1B Chapter III-11
2 Title 49 CFR Section 21.9(b)(3) and Appendix C, Section (3) (iv)
MST operates 55 fixed-routes within a service area comprised of an estimated 433,898 people and has a total of 73 35- and 40-foot standard diesel buses, 6 MCI 45-foot commuter coaches, 7 diesel trolley style buses, one electric trolley style bus, 25 medium gasoline powered buses, and 4 hybrid diesel-electric medium buses. On the demand response side, MST operates 41 medium gasoline powered buses; 34 for paratransit and 7 for general public dial-a-ride service in the neighborhoods of Marina, Gonzales, Greenfield, Soledad, and King City.

The vehicles are maintained and stored in one of three bus yards: the Thomas D. Albert Division in Monterey, the Clarence J. Wright Division in central Salinas, and the MV Transportation (a contract transit service provider) facility in southwest Salinas near the city limits. Transit services operate through two major transit hubs in Monterey and Salinas as well as secondary hubs in Marina and at the Edgewater Shopping Center in Sand City. Annual boardings on the fixed-route system total 4.3 million (FY 2016).

**PROJECT CONTEXT**

Since 2002, MST has provided fixed-route transit service between the Salinas Valley communities of Chualar, Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield and King City. What began as a handful of round trips per day has grown into nearly hourly service along the Highway 101 corridor connecting these communities. Over the last five years, MST started and expanded long distance fixed-route services to further areas of southern Monterey County. The incorporated cities of Soledad, Greenfield, and King City, and the unincorporated communities of Fort Hunter Liggett, San Lucas, San Ardo, and San Miguel are served by these new routes, which also provide connections to the City of Paso Robles in San Luis Obispo County.

There are currently four long-distance commuter routes that serve approximately 10,000 passenger boardings each year, including one regional route with nearly 200,000 boardings last year, and four local general public dial-a-ride services, one in each of the incorporated cities of southern Monterey County, that in total carried over 40,000 passengers last year. MST complements this fixed-route service with equivalent paratransit service that is restricted to those individuals who are unable to access regular transit services due to their physical and/or cognitive difficulties as required by the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Currently, MST deploys these fixed-route buses from either its Monterey bus yard, which is 40 miles away, or from the Salinas bus yard, which is 30 miles away. This type of operation is inefficient due to significant deadhead miles and hours and causes unnecessary wear and tear on transit buses, which can drive up maintenance costs. Additionally, the South County communities are expected to grow in the coming years, as this is one of few areas of the county that has “water rights” to develop residential units. With increased development, there would be additional demand for public transit service. As a result, MST has considered building a bus maintenance and storage facility in southern Monterey County to accommodate the future transit needs of the area’s rural communities.

**SITE SELECTION CONSIDERATION**

The MST Facilities Committee meets twice each year to discuss agency issues, including operational and potential storage and maintenance yard needs. The following criteria were considered in selecting potential sites for the proposed operating facility:

- Existing Availability (shared use, or developable land)
- Functionality (size, ease of use)
- Service Efficiency (proximity to beginning/end of bus lines)
Based on a number of factors, King City was determined to be the most centrally located and economically feasible option that had the fewest impacts on residential areas, including those with primarily minority occupants. Multiple industrial parcels were considered within King City, but ultimately the proposed project site was selected because it has access to two public roads, allowing for alternate egress if one of the two roads were blocked due to a natural disaster or vehicular accident. The proposed site is also one mile from a planned multi-modal transit center that will be served by MST buses and future passenger rail. In addition, there are no easements or right-of-way issues. The proposed facility is described in Section II of this report.

PUBLIC PROCESS ON SITE SELECTION
Before taking the site selection to the public, it was necessary to ensure that the site would be available, cost effective, and eligible to receive grant funds or loans for development. As a result, conducting aspects of the site development such as seeking funding, consulting with local planning agencies regarding the ability to construct on the site, and considering the impacts to Title VI communities has delayed engaging the public-at-large until it was clear that the site should be further considered. Additionally, because the site is located within a former redevelopment area, it was necessary to conduct further consultation with the State of California and the City of King regarding its legal ability to sell the property.

Once funding was being secured and the City of King was given approval to sell the property, MST was able to commence its public engagement process. Along with the analysis of Title VI impacts to minority residents and businesses, the public engagement process set the stage for environmental clearance—both under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)—and will help frame any community issues that may arise as a result of the site development.

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE TIMELINE AND/OR ACTIVITIES
The project is currently undergoing both state and federal environmental review. The site is associated with a Site Specific Plan Initial Study Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) that was previously completed and analyzed in 2007. Technical studies were undertaken to determine if conditions and related data had changed from the IS/MND, resulting in additional impacts.

Several technical studies analyzing the potential environmental impacts of the proposed South County Operations and Maintenance Facility Project have been conducted. The analyses determined that the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to the environment. In accordance with the USDA’s National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Regulations, the proposed project could be classified under § 1970.53, “Categorical Exclusions (CE) Involving Small-scale Development.”

It is anticipated that the CE declarations and substantiating documentation would be available for public review fall 2017.
III. Project Description

The Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) South County Operations and Maintenance Facility Project (proposed project) consists of developing an approximately 4.8-acre, vacant parcel in King City, California, to construct an operations and maintenance facility for vehicles that primarily serve southern Monterey County. The proposed project would accommodate future transit needs in the surrounding rural communities of southern Monterey County. The proposed project includes a maintenance area; an administration area; an area for parts storage, mezzanine, steam cleaning and other miscellaneous uses; and parking.

The proposed project site is part of the existing industrial park site for which King City has approved the East Ranch Business Park Specific Plan (Specific Plan). The Specific Plan Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Final IS/MND) was certified as adequate and the Specific Plan was approved by the King City Council on August 14, 2007. The proposed project is allowed under the Specific Plan as an industrial type use pursuant to acquiring a Conditional Use Permit and Architectural Review approval.

PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed project is located at an approximately 4.8-acre, vacant parcel in King City, California (project site) (Figure 1). The site is bounded to the west by a vacant lot, to the south by San Antonio Drive, to the north by the King City Energy Center, and to the east by Don Bates Way (Figure 2). The site is flat, surrounded by industrial uses, and is heavily disturbed due to mowing and maintenance activities (Figure 3). The approximate elevation of the proposed project site is 340 feet above mean sea level.

The proposed project site is part of the existing industrial park site for which King City has approved the East Ranch Business Park Specific Plan (Specific Plan). The Specific Plan planning area consists of approximately 107 acres of industrial and related uses located northeast of King City. The Specific Plan planning area is bordered by Metz Road to the west, Bitterwater Road to the south, and Airport Drive to the east. San Antonio Road dissects the East Ranch Business Park.

The Specific Plan planning area is located in the M-1 (Industrial) District, and provides an area of larger land parcels with enhanced aesthetic standards where manufacturing and other industries can locate and operate away from the restricting influences of non-industrial uses. The Specific Plan planning area is characterized by industrial and commercial development (Specific Plan, 2007).

PLANNED USE

A 4,600 square foot (sq ft) maintenance area would be constructed with 3 maintenance bays to service buses. The one-story building would include services for drivers, mechanics, and equipment related to bus maintenance. The new facility would be capable of maintaining 40 buses of varying sizes and types, including vendor vehicles which have been serviced off site due to lack of facilities on-site. Additionally, the building would include: a machine and rebuild shop for engines, transmissions, and small components; overhead consumable services as required throughout the service bays; special dedicated HVAC and exhaust systems; parts storage areas; and utilities and parts cleaning facilities.

The southeast half of the building would include a 2,830 sq ft administrative area for office work stations, restrooms, break room, training room, storage, and a dispatch communication center. The drivers’ facilities would include: a drivers’ lounge with adjacent day lockers, a quiet room, kitchen with vending machine area, and toilet rooms with showers.
The northwest corner of the building would include an area (6,580 sq ft) for parts storage, mezzanine, steam cleaning, and other miscellaneous uses.

The parking area would accommodate 45 employee vehicles and 40 buses. Electrical infrastructure would be designed to accommodate as many as four all-electric buses and several all-electric agency cars.

IV. Project Benefits

As described above, the need to connect rural communities along the Highway 101 corridor has grown. As a result, MST needs to develop a bus maintenance and operations facility in southern Monterey County to accommodate future transit needs in these rural communities. The purpose of the proposed project is to support existing and future bus maintenance and operations needs to sustain public transportation service in South County and along the Highway 101 corridor. This includes ensuring that the service can be efficiently operated by reducing deadhead costs that would be required without a nearby operating facility.

The site provides a unique opportunity to construct a facility that meets the size and location needs of the agency, while fitting in with the context of the neighboring uses. Because the location was the subject of a Site Specific Plan, industrial uses such as those anticipated with a bus operating facility have already been considered and planned by local agencies.

Additionally, because this site is located in an area that allows MST to take advantage of specialized grants and/or funding mechanisms for the construction of the facility, the location is financially advantageous.

V. Site Selection Process

The primary project objective of the new facility is to accommodate the bus fleet and to provide maintenance services. However, the proposed project approach, design, and implementation must align with MST’s guiding principles. The MST 2018-2020 Strategic Plan Update established the organization’s overarching goals and objectives that ally with the project objectives that were developed through discussions with leadership and the site design team:

- Accommodate future transit needs in rural communities.
- Reduce operational costs, vehicle wear and tear, fuel consumption, and vehicle emissions relative to fleet size by providing a maintenance and operations facility in Monterey’s South County, thus reducing the effects of deadhead trips from Salinas and Monterey.
- Modernize facility and equipment to improve service efficiency and quality.
- Reduce potable water usage relative to fleet size.
- Increase facility energy efficiency.
- Provide a comfortable and safe environment within the building and around the usable site areas that promotes improved occupant health, safety, and productivity.

Because the proposed new facility location would need to meet important operational criteria including adequate size, geographic proximity to the service area, and access to major thoroughfares, MST staff studied potential geographic locations closer to the service area that would allow for efficient service operation while minimizing additional service time and fuel costs.
Based on this information, MST conducted a location site search that included property listings for sites currently for sale as well as sites in the necessary geographic area that would meet the criteria but were not for sale. MST staff also visited several sites to determine their potential for this use. The search was extensive, and MST is confident that it analyzed all locations in the acceptable geographic area that could meet the required criteria for the new site. This process led to staff identifying three sites as potential locations.

To address the site selection evaluation directly, MST staff discussed how to locate a potential new operational facility to meet the broader agency needs as well as ensure that the site was located in an area that would not result in unavoidable equity impacts. Toward that end, the MST Board adopted Site Selection Goals, described below and listed in Table 1, to assist in the process. These goals are also required under federal civil rights guidance, per Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which requires that agencies ensure that the location is selected without regard to race, color, or national origin.

**SITE SELECTION GOALS PUBLIC OUTREACH**

In addition to the public board meeting, two public scoping meetings were held in King City to solicit public input on the Site Selection Goals and to explain the reasons for seeking a location for a new facility. Public Information, including a slide deck, was produced in Spanish and English, and the meetings were noticed in both English and Spanish language newspapers. Appendix A contains the slide deck and public notices.

**SITE SELECTION GOALS AND RESULTS**

On September 19, 2016, the MST Board adopted the Site Selection Goals listed in Table 1, which include site functionality, site efficiency, site development and site equity to ensure that the location of the new facility would not result in avoidable discriminatory impacts based on race, color, or national origin. The goals below include the evaluative measures within each category. King City was selected as the preferred site based on how well it performed against these goals; however, two sites in addition to King City were evaluated but ultimately rejected.

- **Soledad Unified School District** – This location was considered but rejected because a joint agreement to use the school district’s bus yard was deemed financially infeasible. In addition, the City of Soledad has in excess of 20,000 residents according to the US Census, and, hence, is not eligible for a USDA rural assistance loan. In addition, this location was not large enough to accommodate a long-range buildout scenario. It was also located in a more densely populated residential area adjacent to a school, which could result in unavoidable impacts.

- **Greenfield** – This location was considered but rejected because of its close proximity to a residential area with a primarily minority population, which raised federal Title VI civil rights and environmental justice concerns. The parcel that was considered was bounded on three sides by residential areas, which could result in unavoidable impacts to the surrounding neighborhoods.

**SITE SELECTION EVALUATION MATRIX**

Table 1 presents the evaluation summary matrix, including the goals and evaluation metrics that were used to evaluate the three sites. Scores for each criteria range from 1 (least desirable) to 4 (most desirable).
### Table 1: Site Selection Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Functionality Goal: Accommodate Bus Operations</th>
<th>King City</th>
<th>Soledad</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Less than 3 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3 to 4 acres</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Greater than 4 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry/Exit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 No direct access to site (requires road construction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Direct access to site via one roadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Direct access to site via two roadways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Direct access to site via more than two roadways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE FUNCTIONALITY GOAL: TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Efficiency Goal: Reduce Deadhead Costs</th>
<th>King City</th>
<th>Soledad</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance From End of Line</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Greater than 10 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5-10 miles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1-5 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Less than 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity to Future Intermodal Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Greater than 5 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 4-5 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2-4 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 mile or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity to Multiple Service Types and Routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 No area serving routes within 1 mile of facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Most area serving routes within 1 mile of facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 All area serving routes within 1 mile of facility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 All area serving routes &amp; other carriers (e.g Greyhound) within 1 mile of facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to US 101</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 No access to US 101 within 5 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Access to one US 10 interchange within 1-5 miles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Access to two US 101 interchanges within 3 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE EFFICIENCY GOAL: TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Development Goal: Keep Development Costs Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistent with Local Plans</th>
<th>King City</th>
<th>Soledad</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Special variances required for construction and use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No special variances required for construction and use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Context Sensitive Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King City</th>
<th>Soledad</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Not zoned for industrial use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zoned for industrial use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Structures or Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>King City</th>
<th>Soledad</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Requires significant demolition and reconstruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Requires some modification to structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 No structures or utilities exist at or near location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 No structures exist, but site has access to utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>King City</th>
<th>Soledad</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Existing easements or Right of Way issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No existing easements or Right of Way issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King City</th>
<th>Soledad</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Existing environmental issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No existing environmental issues but site is sloped and/or requires significant grading and/or construction to accommodate bus operations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 No existing environmental issues and site is flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE DEVELOPMENT GOAL: TOTAL SCORE**  
13 | 6 | 10

### Demographic & Title VI Goal: Ensure Minority Residents & Businesses are not Disproportionately Affected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King City</th>
<th>Soledad</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Facility creates disproportionate impacts to protected residents and/or causes minority business displacement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Facility does not create impacts to protected residents but causes minority business displacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Facility does not create impacts nor causes minority business displacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighborhood Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>King City</th>
<th>Soledad</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Facility does not fit into other neighborhood or area uses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Facility fits into neighborhood uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEMOGRAPHIC & TITLE VI GOAL: TOTAL SCORE**  
5 | 2 | 2

**TOTAL SITE SELECTION SCORE**  
38 | 20 | 24
VI. Analysis of Site Selection

To provide a comparison of the three sites in terms of ethnicity and income, MST conducted a geospatial analysis of the three sites that were considered. This allowed each site to be compared to one another as well as to the county as a whole. The analysis was conducted to ensure that a site was selected without regard to race, color, or national origin.

**METHODOLOGY AND DATA USE:**

The analysis for the sites was conducted using American Community Survey 5-year estimate (2011-2015) data at the block group level. The block group level was chosen for this analysis because it provides a more localized perspective than would the census tract level. Minority and low-income populations were identified in the block groups adjacent to the sites.

Using mapping software, a ¼ mile buffer was drawn around each site that was considered. Residents falling within the buffer were included for analysis. While ¼ mile may appear to be a fairly large area, it represents a conservative approach to analysis, as it identifies potential impact areas that may be greater than actually would be impacted. Maps 1-8 provide a visual depiction of the data presented below, including the census block groups used in the analysis.

The minority and low income population of the locations is significantly larger than the County of Monterey as a whole, as provided in Table 2, below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population in Poverty</th>
<th>Poverty Percentage</th>
<th>Minority Population</th>
<th>Minority Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King City</td>
<td>3,193</td>
<td>23.85%</td>
<td>12,307</td>
<td>91.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>4,406</td>
<td>24.72%</td>
<td>16,252</td>
<td>91.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>5,080</td>
<td>19.67%</td>
<td>22,482</td>
<td>87.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Monterey</td>
<td>72,835</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>293,420</td>
<td>68.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

It is expected that the three sites would have larger percentages of low income and minority residents than the county as a whole, because the new facility is intended to serve southern Monterey County, which has a greater percentage of low-income and minority residents.

However, in terms of minority impact, while the King City site has similar minority concentrations to Greenfield and is less minority than the Soledad location, the actual number of those within the ¼ mile buffer is the lowest of the three locations. Similarly, while the percentage of those in poverty in King City is similar to Greenfield and higher than the Soledad location, the actual numbers of those in poverty in King City is the lowest of the three locations. This is due to the location of the King City site, which is situated in an industrial area with no immediate residential areas nearby.

Overall, both Greenfield and Soledad are located in areas with a greater potential for all residents to be disrupted by bus related activities due to the density of residential development at those two sites. In particular, the Soledad location has the largest general population in the ¼ mile area due to residential areas immediately adjacent to the potential site. However, both the Greenfield site and the Soledad location have residences immediately neighboring the two sites, unlike King City, which has no immediately adjacent residential areas. As a result, impacts to residents at those two sites could be greater than near the King City site.
**IMPACT COMPARISON:**
As referenced below, the King City location has been analyzed for traffic, air quality, environmental justice, and historic property to determine site specific impacts associated with the construction and operation of a bus operating facility at that site. A broader impact comparison is provided below and includes information about the other two sites that were considered in order to ensure that the site was selected without regard to race, color or national origin. Table 3 presents an evaluation of the three sites for various impact characteristics.

**Table 3: Site Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>King City</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Soledad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Uses</strong></td>
<td>Located within an industrial area with no residential areas immediately adjacent to the site</td>
<td>Located in a mixed use environment with residential areas within 700 feet of the site</td>
<td>Not zoned for industrial use. Located on a school property with higher density residential areas immediately bordering the site on three sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Impacts</strong></td>
<td>No clear visible impacts from residential areas</td>
<td>Some visible impacts could occur for some of the residential areas</td>
<td>Visible impacts for residences on three sides of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Disruption</strong></td>
<td>No identifiable disruption, as industrial uses are compatible with bus operations</td>
<td>Some disruption anticipated as bus operations may not be compatible with some nearby residential areas</td>
<td>Disruption possible as bus operations may not be compatible with higher density residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Impacts</strong></td>
<td>No residential impacts anticipated. Construction Impacts would be addressed through best practices for industrial areas.</td>
<td>Some residential impacts may be experienced. Impacts would be addressed through best practices for mixed use environments.</td>
<td>Impacts may be experienced for adjacent residential developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Displacement of Minority Businesses</strong></td>
<td>No displacement anticipated</td>
<td>No displacement anticipated</td>
<td>No displacement anticipated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finding:** While the King City site does have a slightly greater percentage of minority and low income residents within the ¼ mile buffer, the absolute number of minority and low income residents is the lowest of the three locations. Additionally, by viewing the broader impacts of the three sites in combination with the Site Selection evaluation matrix, the King City site appears to have the least potential to disrupt the existing community both during construction and in an on-going manner.

As a result, the King City site appears to have been selected with the goal of having the least impact possible to the neighboring areas and without regard to race, color or national origin.
VII. Analysis of Preferred Site

Detailed studies were conducted as part of the CEQA/NEPA analysis and have provided additional detailed input into the site selection decision. These studies have been used to determine if impacts associated with the construction or operation of the facility at King City would have significant environmental consequences to the minority and low income community in the area.

These studies include:

1. **Traffic Impact Analysis Draft Report**, which analyzes the impacts associated with the project, including traffic, pedestrian and bicycle circulation to the project area.
2. **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis**, which provides a description of the existing environment in the project area and identifies potential impacts associated with the proposed project in relation to regional and local air quality as well as increased emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs). Project impacts are evaluated relative to the applicable California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
3. **Draft Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice Analysis**, which identifies any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of the project on minority populations and low-income populations.

Highlights of each of the subject areas are stated below and provided by reference:

**TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS:**

**Finding:** Based on the traffic analysis, the project will not negatively impact the project area, as all the intersections in the study area would continue to operate at or better than their current operations. For the cumulative impacts, the project will not result in any additional decline in Level of Service, as generally the project will represent an imperceptible increase in delay at any study intersection. Also, because the project will not create any significant impacts, the project has no responsibility to implement or contribute to off-site mitigations for project or cumulative impacts.

The Traffic Impact Analysis includes both AM and PM peak generated trips created by the project as well as Level of Service (LOS) impacts at nine intersections within the project’s boundaries.

The project is estimated to generate 263 daily trips, with 4 trips (2 in, 2 out) during the AM peak hour and 4 trips (2 in, 2 out) during the PM peak hour. Because all of the study intersections would continue to operate at or better than their respective levels of service standards under Existing Plus Project Conditions, no improvements would be required. However, cumulative impacts without the project suggest improvements to several intersections in the area, and are to be implemented with the planned Downtown Addition, a mixed-use development.

Because the project area was already included in the East Ranch Business Park Specific Plan IS/MND, the following alternatives were analyzed included those with cumulative impacts based upon the King City project as well as other projects within the Specific Plan:

- Existing Conditions
- Existing Plus Project Conditions
- Background Conditions
- Background Plus Project Conditions
- Cumulative Without Project Conditions
- Cumulative Plus Project Conditions
The project is also unique in terms of land use in that it supports the development and operation of a transit system that will reduce overall traffic volumes throughout the study area. The introduction of enhanced transit service in King City as a result of the proposed South County Operations and Maintenance Facility would reduce traffic on the arterial street system by about 0.5%. This is not accounted for in the traffic operations analysis. However, the 0.5% traffic reduction will be credited toward the project’s contribution to mitigations identified in this analysis.

AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS IMPACT ANALYSIS

Finding: The proposed project would result in a relocation of some MST buses to the proposed facility which would result in an estimated reduction in regional bus travel of approximately 8,100 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per week (1,157 VMT/day), in comparison to existing conditions. While construction related emissions would increase, the impact of these emissions was determined to be less than significant.

Long-term operational emissions associated with the proposed project would result in a slight increase in emissions from area sources (e.g. maintenance activities, use of cleaning products, architectural coatings, etc.) and energy use. However, these slight increases would be more than offset by reductions in emissions due to the relocation of the buses to the proposed facility. In total, the proposed project would result in an overall net reduction in emissions of -0.2 lbs/day of ROG, -35.5 lbs/day of NOX, -68.3 lbs/day of CO, -0.1 lbs/day of SOX, -0.1 lbs/day of PM10. This impact would be considered less than significant.

Short-term construction generated emissions modeling was assumed to occur over an approximate one-year period. The demolition of existing structures and import/export of soil would not be required for this project. Long-term operational emissions were calculated for year 2019 operational conditions using the CalEEMod, version 2016.3.1, computer program. Sources evaluated included energy use, area, mobile, and stationary sources. Emissions associated with energy use and area sources were based on the default parameters contained in the model. Construction of the proposed project would generate maximum uncontrolled daily emissions of approximately 10.0 lbs/day of ROG, 48.3 lbs/day of NOx, 23.4 lbs/day of CO, 20.8 lbs/day of PM10, and 12.3 lbs/day of PM2.5. Estimated construction-generated emissions of PM10 would not exceed the significance thresholds of 82 lbs/day. This impact would be considered less than significant.

Based on the traffic analysis prepared for this project, the signalized intersections of Metz Road/Bitterwater Road is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS E, or worse, during a.m. peak-hour operations. However, implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to a substantial increase in vehicle delay (i.e., 10 seconds, or more) at this intersection. Furthermore, with implementation of proposed traffic improvements this intersection would operate at acceptable LOS C, or better, during the peak hours. As a result, the project’s contribution to localized CO concentrations would be considered less than significant.

DRAFT SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ANALYSIS

Finding: The proposed project will not result in any adverse socioeconomic and environmental justice effects. The proposed project would have a beneficial effect to the minority communities in the project vicinity by providing additional employment opportunities.

The draft memorandum provides an analysis of the potential socioeconomic and environmental justice effects that may result from the proposed project in King City. For the purposes of environmental justice analysis, federal agencies are required to identify whether a proposed project will possibly have disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations within the proposed
project vicinity. The proposed project vicinity, or the affected environment for the environmental justice analysis, consists of the proposed project site and adjacent census blocks. For the purposes on this analysis, an impact is considered to be significant and require mitigation if it would result in any of the following:

- **Impact 1.** Substantially affect employment, industry, or commerce, including requiring the displacement of businesses or farms;
- **Impact 2.** Substantially affect property values or the local tax base;
- **Impact 3.** Substantially, disproportionately affect minority, low-income, elderly, disabled, transit-dependent, or other specific interest group(s); or
- **Impact 4.** Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Based on all of the impact areas, the proposed project will not result in any adverse socioeconomic and environmental justice effects. Additionally, the proposed project would have a beneficial effect to the minority communities in the project vicinity by providing additional employment opportunities.

**VIII. Conclusions**

In accordance with both federal and state environmental law and federal guidance, MST has conducted an evaluation of the proposed South County Operations and Maintenance Facility Project. This has included both technical studies and analysis associated with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as well as a qualitative site selection evaluation and public review that is required by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Based upon the analyses conducted, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to the environment. In accordance with the USDA’s National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Regulations, the proposed project could be classified under § 1970.53, “Categorical Exclusions Involving Small-scale Development.

Additionally, based on the qualitative site selection evaluation and public review of the proposed sites, the site appears to have been chosen without regard to race, color or national origin.
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Figure 2

Photo 1. View of the proposed project site looking north from San Antonio Drive onto existing energy facility.

Photo 2. View of the proposed project site looking west from Don Bates Way.

Photo 3. View from the site of industrial/commercial buildings bordering the south, southwest of the site.

Photo 4. View of the proposed project site looking east from San Antonio Drive onto Don Bates Way.
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To: MST Board of Directors

From: Lisa Rheinheimer, Director of Planning and Development

Subject: Site Selection Goals for South County Bus Facility

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve draft site selection goals for the proposed South County bus maintenance and operations facility to fulfill FTA Title VI requirements.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Board is required to approve the draft site selection goals for the proposed South County bus maintenance and operations facility.

DISCUSSION:

In May of 2002, MST introduced bus service to Salinas Valley communities as far south as King City. What began as approximately 5 roundtrips per day on Line 23 between Salinas and King City has grown significantly over the last 14 years, to nearly hourly service today. During this same period, MST expanded its bus service even further south of King City, augmenting Line 23 trips with the following routes:

- Line 82 Fort Hunter Liggett – Salinas Express
- Line 84 Soledad – Paso Robles
- Line 85 Fort Hunter Liggett – Templeton
- Line 86 King City – San Jose Express

In addition to these fixed-route bus lines, MST now operates local general public dial-a-ride service (South County OnCall) in each of the four cities in southern Monterey County – Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield and King City. With this expansion of service, along with the anticipated population, housing and employment growth forecast for this part of the county, staff has been contemplating the need for an additional bus maintenance and operations facility in the area.

Many of the buses that serve these southern Monterey County routes are based at MST’s bus facilities in Monterey and Salinas. Both labor and fuel cost savings could be realized by servicing, maintaining, inspecting, and storing many of these vehicles at
a facility located in southern Monterey County. Based on current service levels, staff has estimated combined labor, fuel and maintenance expense savings of approximately $170,000 per year by deploying buses out of a garage in southern Monterey County. MST would also benefit from reduced capital replacement costs given that fewer miles would be put on the buses if they did not have to travel empty from Monterey and Salinas to their starting points in southern Monterey County.

Under your Board’s direction, MST staff has kept your Board informed of its efforts over the past year to identify vacant properties in southern Monterey County as potential sites for a bus operations and maintenance facility. As a recipient of federal transit funding, MST is required to comply with Title VI guidelines during all stages of planning, purchasing, designing and building transit facilities that are funded with federal dollars. Title 49 CFR Section 21.9(b) (3) states:

“In determining the site or location of facilities, a recipient or applicant may not make selections with the purpose or effect of excluding persons from, denying them the benefits of, or subjecting them to discrimination under any program to which this regulation applies, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin...”

FTA Title VI Circular 4702.1B further requires that, “The recipient shall complete a Title VI equity analysis during the planning stage with regard to where a project is located or sited to ensure the location is selected without regard to race, color, or national origin.”

To comply with FTA Title VI equity analysis regulations, MST has developed the following draft site selection goals with which to evaluate potential vacant properties in southern Monterey County:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Site Selection Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accommodate Bus Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reduce Deadhead Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Keep Development Costs Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ensure Minority Residents and Businesses are not Disproportionately Affected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MST will also review potential locations in Soledad, Greenfield, and King City as a part of an alternatives analysis required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The King City property which your board authorized for purchase for $470,500 with State of California Proposition 1B Bond funds will be a part of the CEQA alternatives analysis as well as the FTA Title VI equity analysis.
As required for the FTA Title VI equity analysis, staff held two public scoping meetings on August 11 and August 13 at the King City Recreation Center to inform the public of the proposed south county facility and the site selection goals, and to seek input on the project and its potential location. The public presentation materials and public notices are attached. Minutes of these meetings are included under agenda item # 5-6.

At this time, per FTA guidelines, MST staff is recommending the adoption by your Board of the draft site selection goals. Upon adoption of these goals, staff will continue to identify and secure funding for the remainder of this project.

Attachment 1: PowerPoint presentation for public scoping meeting

Attachment 2: Proof of Public Notice advertising scoping meetings

Prepared by: [Signature]  Approved by: [Signature]
Public Scoping Meeting
Junta de Observación del Publico
King City Recreation Center
401 Division Street, King City, CA 93930

Thursday, August 11, 2016, 6pm
Saturday, August 13, 2016, 11am

Jueves, 11 de Agosto, 2016, 6pm
Sábado, 13 de Agosto, 2016, 11am

Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of the public scoping meeting is to collect public input on site selection goals for a bus maintenance facility in southern Monterey County.

Federal Transit Administration Circular 4701.2B states:

“The recipient (of federal funds) shall complete a Title VI equity analysis during the planning stage with regard to where a project is located or sited to ensure the location is selected without regard to race, color, or national origin. Recipients shall engage in outreach to persons potentially impacted by the siting of facilities. The Title VI equity analysis must compare the equity impacts of various siting alternatives, and the analysis must occur before the selection of the preferred site.”
El Propósito de esta Junta

El propósito de esta junta de observación es para pedir la opinión del público para seleccionar las metas de la nueva instalación de mantenimiento en el sur del Condado de Monterey.

Circular de Administración Federal de Transito 4701.2B dice:

"El Destinatario (de los fondos federales) debe de completar un análisis equitativo del Título VI durante la fase de planeación respecto a donde será instalado el proyecto para asegurarse que será escogido sin importar a la raza, color, u origen. Destinatarios deben de contactar a personas que potencialmente pudieran ser afectadas por la existencia de esta instalación. Análisis equitativo del Título VI debe comparar los impactos por igual en distintas alternativas de ubicación, y el análisis debe de ocurrir antes de seleccionar el sitio recomendado."

Map of South County Lines

Mapa de La Lineas del Condado Sur
Buses used to serve south Monterey County are serviced and stored at a bus yard as far as 60 miles away. This type of operation is inefficient and causes unnecessary wear and tear on the transit buses.

Los autobuses usados para dar servicio al sur del condado de Monterey son almacenados a 60 millas de retirado. Este tipo de operaciones es inefficiente y causa desgasto innecesario el los autobuses.

MST needs to construct a bus maintenance and storage facility in southern Monterey County to accommodate future transit needs in the rural communities.

MST necesita construir una instalación de mantenimiento en el área del sur del condado de Monterey para almacenar los autobuses y dar cabida a futuros servicios de transito para la comunidad rural.
Draft Goals

Goals of a New Facility:
1. Accommodate Bus Operations
2. Reduce Deadhead Costs
3. Keep Development Costs Low
4. Ensure Minority Residents and Businesses are not Disproportionately Affected

Objetivos del Proyecto

Objetivos de la Nueva Instalación:
1. Mejorar El Servicio de Autobús
2. Reducir el Costo del Viaje
3. Mantener el Desarrollo a Bajo Costo
4. Asegurar que los Residentes de Minorías y Negocios no Sean Afectados Desproportionadamente
Locations Under Consideration
Lugares Bajo Consideracion

- Soledad
- Greenfield
- King City

Timeline

Fall 2016  MST board adopts site selection goals
Fall 2016  Project funding notification
Early 2017  Environmental analysis begins
Early 2018  Environmental and fixed facility analyses completed
2018      Construction begins
2019      South county facility opens for service
Cronología de Tiempo

Otoño 2016  Directores de MST aprueban las metas del proyecto
Otoño 2016  Notificación de fondos del proyecto
Principio 2017  Comienza el análisis del medio ambiente
Principio 2018  Termina análisis la instalación y medio ambiente
2018  Comienza la construcción
2019  La instalación del condado sur comienza su servicio

Questions & Comments

Preguntas y Comentarios
Contact / Datos

1. 888-678-2871
2. (TTY/TDD 831-393-8911)
3. clerk@mst.org
4. 19 Upper Ragsdale Suite 200, Monterey, CA 93940

If information is needed in another language, contact 888-678-2871
Si necesita información en otro idioma, llame al 888-678-2871
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Text of Ad:

**MST**

MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) will hold two public scoping meetings to develop site selection goals for a future bus maintenance and operations facility to serve south Monterey County.

The public is invited to attend either or both meetings and provide input. The scoping meetings will be held at the following locations:

- **Thursday, August 11, 2016**
  - 6:00 p.m.
  - King City Recreation Center
  - 401 Division Street, King City, CA 93930

- **Saturday, August 13, 2016**
  - 11:00 a.m.
  - King City Recreation Center
  - 401 Division Street, King City, CA 93930

Interested businesses or persons wishing to comment but who are unable to attend the public scoping meetings may submit written comments to:

- **Monterey-Salinas Transit**
- **Attn: Carl Sedoryk, General Manager / CEO**
- **19 Upper Ragsdale Drive, Suite 200**
- **Monterey, CA 93940**
- **Fax to 831-899-3954 or email: clerk@mst.org**

*ATTACHMENT 2*

---

**Order Confirmation for Ad #: 0001441573**

**PO number:** Public Scope Mtg

---

**Customer:** MONTEREY SALINAS TRANSIT

**Address:** 1 RYAN RANCH RD

MONTEREY CA 93940 USA

**Acct #:** SNA-601400

**Phone:** 8313938114

**MONTEREY SALINAS TRANSIT**

**Ordered By:** Deanna Smith

---

**Order Start Date:** 07/29/2016

**Order End Date:** 07/29/2016

---

**Tear Sheets** | **Affidavits** | **Blind Box** | **Promo Type** | **Materials** | **Special Pricing** | **Size**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0

**Net Amount:** $238.94

**Tax Amount:** $0.00

**Total Amount:** $238.94

**Payment Method:** Invoice

**Payment Amount:** $0.00

**Amount Due:** $238.94

---

**Ad Order Notes:** emailed order conf to Deanna 7/18am

**Sales Rep:** ccclark

**Order Taker:** ccclark

**Order Created:** 07/18/2016

---

**Product** | **# Ins** | **Start Date** | **End Date**
---|---|---|---
SNA-The Salinas Californian | 1 | 07/29/2016 | 07/29/2016
SNA-The Californian.com | 1 | 07/29/2016 | 07/29/2016

---

*ALL TRANSACTIONS CONSIDERED PAID IN FULL UPON CLEARANCE OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION*
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The Californian

Order Confirmation for Ad #: 0001441643
PO number: Spanish Public Scoping Mtg

Customer: MONTEREY SALINAS TRANSIT
Address: 1 RYAN RANCH RD
MONTEREY CA 93940 USA
Acct #: SNA-601400
Phone: 8313938114

MONTEREY SALINAS TRANSIT
Ordered By: Deanna Smith

Order Start Date: 07/29/2016
Order End Date: 07/29/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tear Sheets</th>
<th>Affidavits</th>
<th>Blind Box</th>
<th>Promo Type</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Special Pricing</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x 4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Amount: $244.00
Tax Amount: $0.00
Total Amount: $244.00
Payment Method: Invoice
Payment Amount: $0.00
Amount Due: $244.00

Ad Order Notes: emailed order conf! Deanna 7/18am
Sales Rep: cclark
Order Taker: cclark
Order Created: 07/18/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th># Ins</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNA-The Salinas Californian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>07/29/2016</td>
<td>07/29/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNA-TheCalifornian.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>07/29/2016</td>
<td>07/29/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ALL TRANSACTIONS CONSIDERED PAID IN FULL UPON CLEARANCE OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

Text of Ad:

MST
MONTEREY-SALINAS TRANSIT

JUNTA DE OBSERVACION DEL PUBLICO

Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) tendrá dos juntas de observación para desarrollar metas para como servir con su futura instalación en la área del sur del condado de Monterey.

El público está invitado para asistir a las dos juntas y dar su opinión. La junta de observación se dará a cavo en las siguientes localidades:

Jueves, 11 de agosto de 2016
6:00 p.m.
King City Recreation Center
401 Division Street, King City, CA 93930

Sábado, 13 de agosto de 2016
11:00 a.m.
King City Recreation Center
401 Division Street, King City, CA 93930

Personas o negocios interesados que deseen dar sus comentarios pero que no pueden asistir a la junta de observación del público pueden mandar sus comentarios por escrito a:

Monterey-Salinas Transit
Attn: Carl Sedoryk, General Manager / CEO
19 Upper Ragsdale Drive, Suite 200
Monterey, CA 93940.
Fax to 831-899-3954 or email: clerk@mst.org

July 26, 2016 (1441643)
**Order Confirmation for Ad #: 0001441614**

**PO number:** Spanish Public Scoping Mtg

**Customer:** MONTEREY SALINAS TRANSIT  
**Address:** 1 RYAN RANCH RD  
MONTEREY CA 93940 USA  
**Acct #:** SNA-601400  
**Phone:** 8313938114  
**MONTEREY SALINAS TRANSIT**  
**Ordered By:** Deanna Smith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tear Sheets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affidavits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind Box</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo Type</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Pricing</td>
<td>2 x 4.03</td>
<td>$244.00</td>
<td>$244.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$244.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ad Order Notes:** Email order conf t Deanna 7/18am  
**Sales Rep:** cclark  
**Order Taker:** cclark  
**Order Created:** 07/18/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th># Ins</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNA-El Sol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>07/30/2016</td>
<td>07/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNA-TheCalifornian.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>07/30/2016</td>
<td>07/30/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ALL TRANSACTIONS CONSIDERED PAID IN FULL UPON CLEARANCE OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION*

**Text of Ad:**

**MST**  
**MONTEREY SALINAS TRANSIT**  
**JUNTA DE OBSERVACION DEL PUBLICO**

Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) tendrá dos juntas de observación para desarrollar metas para como servir con su futura instalación el área del sur del condado de Monterey.

El público está invitado para asistir a las dos juntas y dar su opinión. La junta de observación se dará a cavo en las siguientes localidades:

- **Jueves, 11 de agosto de 2016**  
  6:00 p.m.  
  King City Recreation Center  
  401 Division Street, King City, CA 93930

- **Sábado, 13 de agosto de 2016**  
  11:00 a.m.  
  King City Recreation Center  
  401 Division Street, King City, CA 93930

Personas o negocios interesados que deseen dar sus comentarios pero que no pueden asistir a la junta de observación del público pueden mandar sus comentarios por escrito a:

Monterey-Salinas Transit  
Attn: Carl Sedoryk, General Manager / CEO  
19 Upper Ragsdale Drive, Suite 200  
Monterey, CA 93940.  
Fax to 831-899-3954 o email: clerk@mst.org

*July 30, 2016 (1441614)*
MONTEREY SALINAS TRANSIT
Account No. 3578998
ATTN: ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
1 RYAN RANCH ROAD
MONTEREY, CA 93940

Legal No. 0005777227
Junta De Observacion Del Publico
Total Cost: $152.11
Ordered by:

MST AGENDA / SEPTEMBER 19, 2016 / 98

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid. I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of The Monterey Herald, a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published daily and Sunday in the City of Monterey, County of Monterey, and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Monterey, State of California. I execute the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than 6 point), has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

07/29/16

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 07/29/2016 at Monterey, California.

Signature
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