Regular Meeting of the
Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee

LOCATION
City of Atwater
Community Center
760 E. Bellevue Road
Atwater, CA 95301

DATE
Wednesday, April 17, 2019

TIME
2:00 pm

East Side Regional Projects Committee Members

City of Livingston       Juan Aguilar, Councilman
City of Atwater         Paul Creighton, Mayor
City of Merced          Mike Murphy, Mayor – Vice Chair
County of Merced, District 1  Rodrigo Espinoza, Supervisor
County of Merced, District 2  Lee Lor, Supervisor
County of Merced, District 3  Daron McDaniel, Supervisor - Chair
County of Merced, District 4  Lloyd Pareira, Supervisor
County of Merced, District 5  Scott Silveira, Supervisor
AGENDA

At least 72 hours prior to each regular Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee meeting, a complete agenda packet is available for review on the Measure V website at www.measurev-mcag.com and at the MCAG office, 369 W. 18th Street, Merced, CA 95340. All public records relating to an open session item and copies of staff reports or other written documentation relating to items of business referred to on the agenda are on file at MCAG. Persons with questions concerning agenda items may call MCAG to make an inquiry regarding the nature of items described on the agenda.

TRANSLATION SERVICES

Translation Services are not provided at MCAG’s public meeting unless requested at least three (3) business days in advance. Please contact Eva Garibay at (209) 723-3153 x 108 during regular business hours to request translation services.

Servicios de interpreté no son ofrecidos en las juntas públicas de MCAG al menos de que se soliciten tres (3) días de negociación en anticipación. Para solicitar estos servicios por favor contacte a Eva Garibay al (209) 723-3153 x 108 durante horas de oficina.

INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Representatives or individuals with disabilities should contact MCAG at (209)723-3153 at least three (3) days in advance of the meeting to request auxiliary aids or other accommodations necessary to participate in the public meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Members of the public wishing to address agenda items or comment on any item not on the agenda may do so during agenda item 2 – Public Comment. Persons may also address any item on the agenda during consideration of that item. Comments are limited to three (3) minutes per person. Please state your name and city or community of residence for the record. For items not on the agenda, no action will be taken. If it requires action, the item will be referred to staff and/or placed on the next agenda.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Measure V www.measurev-mcag.com
Merced County Association of Governments www.mcagov.org
Meeting of the  
Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee  
Wednesday, April 17, 2019 – 2:00 pm  
City of Atwater, Community Center  
760 E. Bellevue, Atwater, CA 95301

**AGENDA**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roll Call</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approval of Agenda</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Approval of Minutes from January 24, 2019 East Side Regional Projects Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Implementation Plan 2019 Process and Schedule</td>
<td>Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Revenue Projections</td>
<td>Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leverage Potential</td>
<td>Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regional Project Candidates</td>
<td>Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Implementation Plan Options</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
<td>Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting of the East Side Regional Projects Committee held on Thursday, January 24, 2019 at the Merced County Administration Building, Room 310, 2222 M Street, Merced, CA was called to order by Chair McDaniel at 2:00 p.m.

**DIRECTORS PRESENT**
- Director Juan Aguilar
- Director Brian Raymond for Paul Creighton
- Director Delray Shelton for Mike Murphy
- Director Rodrigo Espinoza
- Director Lee Lor
- Director Daron McDaniel
- Director Lloyd Pareira
- Director Scott Silveira

**DIRECTORS ABSENT**
None

**GUESTS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**
- Steve Carrigan, City Manager, City of Merced
- Stephanie Dietz, Assistant City Manager, City of Merced
- Ken Elwin, Public Works Director, City of Merced
- Michael Hayes, City Engineer, City of Atwater
- Dana Hertfelder, Director of Public Works/Road Commissioner, Merced County
- Noe Martinez, City Engineer, City of Livingston
- Alex Terrazas, City Manager, City of Los Banos

**MCAG STAFF PRESENT**
- Nav Bagri, Finance Director, MCAG
- Stacie Dabbs, Executive Director, MCAG
- Blake Dunford, Assistant Planner, MCAG
- Matt Fell, Transportation Planning Manager, MCAG
- Emily Haden, Legal Counsel
- Ty Phimmasone, Associate Planner, MCAG
- Mauricio Torres, Assistant Planner, MCAG
1. Roll Call

2. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

3. Approval of Agenda

Director Lor moved to approve the January 24, 2019 East Side Regional Projects Committee agenda. Seconded by Director Pareira.

Ayes – Directors Aguilar, Raymond, Shelton, Espinoza, Lor, McDaniel, Pareira, Silveira
Noes – None
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Approval of Minutes from the May 15, 2018 East Side Regional Projects Committee Meeting

Director Lor motioned to approve the minutes with the comment that she was pleased with the presentation and enjoyed the “Q&A” style. Seconded by Director Pareira.

Ayes – Director Aguilar, Raymond, Shelton, Espinoza, Lor, McDaniel, Pareira, Silveira
Noes – None
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Implementation Plan 2019 Process and Schedule

Stacie Dabbs presented the overview of the 2019 Update to the Implementation Plan. The singular goal of this meeting was to get direction on preferred Implementation Plan approach. Ms. Dabbs gave an overview of the definition of the Implementation Plan, its requirements, and planning process. Ms. Dabbs reminded the committee that the 2018 Implementation Plan only allocated for two years and that the updated plan is required for future funding and to align the Measure V cycle with the STIP cycle. All candidate project forms included were created by jurisdiction staff and not MCAG. Ms. Dabbs reiterated that today’s meeting would focus on choosing an approach, reviewing the revenue outlook, and an initial review of candidate projects. Ms. Dabbs also explained that while the next meeting was planned in February with advisors from KNN, the meeting time was flexible based on the needs of the committee. Ms. Dabbs also commented that the City of Atwater is the first to complete their funding agreement.

Steve Carrigan requested a brief overview of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) which Matt Fell provided.

There was no further discussion on this item.

6. Select an Implementation Approach for the Eastside

Ms. Dabbs presented the committee five different options for the committee to pursue in their policy.

- Option A: Major Projects and Leveraging
- Option B: Something-For-Everyone (which was chosen for the 2018 plan)
• Option C: Complete Existing Commitments
• Option D: Hybrid
• Option E: Clean Future

Ms. Dabbs also reminded the committee that each approach could affect the outlook range.

Director McDaniel explained that his understand was that project completion was the focus so that voters would appreciate the measure. He also believed that all entities had funding set aside to finish the project rather than return for additional funding. Director Pareira commented that he believed this was not the case. Director McDaniel asked if the committee should fund the projects again. Director Pareira replied that it was an option. Ms. Dabbs added that the option was to continue to utilize funds to move the project forward, but there was nothing preventing or promising additional funding.

Director McDaniel stressed the committee should consider a longer outlook to be able to be a truly regional committee. He also thanked Mike Murphy for speaking to Senator Feinstein about the importance of the Atwater-Merced Expressway, who voiced her support and made suggestions. Director McDaniel advocated a 75-25 split with the larger share for large projects.

Director Aguilar agreed and pushed for the committee to look for the greatest benefits for the Eastside as a region. He believed in a major focus, but would like to see the local jurisdictions benefit as well. He expressed hope that the jurisdictions would cooperate and work as a team. Finally, he supported the 75-25 split.

Director Espinoza was in agreement.

Director Silveira stated that the intent of the Measure was to have local money for local projects and regional money for regional projects. He supported the 75-25 split, though he added he wanted to make sure that local jurisdictions are able to move their projects forward. He said that if the committee pursues the completion of prior commitments, there would be $15.7 million dollars needed, which would prevent funding for other projects for at least four years. For major projects to be possible, he stressed that some money must be saved.

Director Shelton commented that the City of Merced has an interest in the Atwater-Merced Expressway and wants to support the project. While he supported Option A as the Measure was designed for leveraging, he expressed that the City hoped for a hybrid option for some of their own projects. He asked Stephanie Dietz to comment.

Ms. Dietz added that the intent of allocation in the 2018 Implementation Plan was to allow Merced to move projects to a “shovel-ready” status. She acknowledged that some concessions were made and that the City would return to request construction funding. She expressed that a hybrid approach would allow for some projects to be ready to move. Mr. Carrigan added that the City was committed to the Eastside Loop projects. With the Campus Parkway in place, the Atwater-Merced Expressway was a critical project for regional growth. He further added that Merced requires a connection to Highway 59 for future growth.

Director Raymond deferred to Michael Hayes. Mr. Hayes expressed that he preferred to see projects completed. On behalf of Atwater, he appreciated the funding received in the 2018
Implementation Plan, which helped to move Phase 1 of Winton Way. He added that Atwater was already committed to programming another million to Phase 2. Regional and local projects of regional significance are both important, and he encouraged the committee to consider the difference. While he said he couldn’t speak for the committee, he again expressed his gratitude for the earlier funding and hoped they would continue to support Atwater’s projects. He also commented that the Atwater-Merced Expressway was important and he would like to see it completed.

Director Lor commented that Option A was fine, but that she would like to see Option E folded into the hybrid approach.

Director Espinoza commented that a hybrid is important and that the committee couldn’t fund every project. He hoped to see more funding for Livingston, but he understood the needs of the regions. He stressed that he wants to make sure that the public sees progress and results. He hoped that the local jurisdictions would still receive support, but supports the regional view.

Director McDaniel asked for a clarification on the alternative modes requirements, which Ms. Dabbs clarified as only necessary for the local share and not regional.

Ms. Dabbs further commented that the Westside was interested in a split, but had not set the specific percentages. She reminded the committee that they may choose to set the percentage however they like and that Staff could return next month with different projections.

Director McDaniel asked if adding bike lanes to projects could be a way of incorporating Option E. Ms. Dabbs stated that such a policy regarding what fell into Option E had not been set. Mr. Fell added that doing so could be a leveraging strategy. Director McDaniel commented that the Atwater-Merced Expressway could be partially under Option E as it paired with the Castle Industrial Park goods movement project to allow for cargo by rail instead of road, thus promoting cleaner air.

Ms. Dabbs stated that the committee could choose to set a small percentage aside of regional money to help develop projects that are not ready.

Director McDaniel proposed Staff could include in the language of project applications methods of getting clean energy funding or possibly realigning existing projects more in line with the State of California’s requirements.

Ms. Dabbs gave a brief description of leveraging. She explained that traditional leveraging was meant for state or federal funds and was limited for specific projects. Another type was to utilize different forms of local funding or MCAG controlled funding. Leveraging traditionally would have stricter qualifications.

Director Pareira reported that the Westside Regional Projects Committee had two conclusions. The first, was that none of the projects necessarily fit as a major regional project as compared to the Eastside. He expressed a desire to see a stricter evaluation process to trim down the project list. Second, he was hoping to see a gradual rise in the percentages over time to where in four years the funding is set for a 75-25 split or a 70-30 split. Director Pareira hoped to do so due to the
time necessary to deliver major projects. He believed that the public would not be pleased with a lack of project delivery.

Director McDaniel appreciated Director Pareira’s idea but expressed concern that Governor Newsom could make a major change in transportation funding, meaning that a large amount of money might be necessary in the short term.

Director Pareira countered that the gradual rise would allow smaller projects to move. He stressed that Measure V was never meant to fund a project completely but rather to leverage.

Director McDaniel asked if Staff required direction or action.

Ms. Dabbs clarified the committees desire for a hybrid option and asked whether the smaller share would be for completing commitments or for smaller projects. Staff would look into a step percentage.

Director Pareira asked the committee to give Staff a better percentage target for projections.

Mrs. Dietz stated that transitioning over time could limit opportunities now. She appreciated Director Pareira’s idea but proposed that the committee consider compromise.

Director Silveira liked Director Pareira’s idea but believed that small projects should use local rather than regional money. He expressed that the Measure’s intent was for leveraging large projects. Local jurisdiction projects could return at a later time rather than asking for full funding. He pushed for an immediate 75-25 split. He also stated that the committee needs a better regional definition and argued that the City of Gustine’s projects were not regional.

Director Pareira commented that a set aside would be for leveraging small projects not for funding full projects.

Director Silveira expressed that he would like to see many projects done in a few years.

Ms. Dabbs stated that changing the regional definition would require an action of the MCAG Governing Board. She commented that there may be interest on both sides and that a workshop with the Governing Board could be done in the future.

Director McDaniel approved of the idea.

Ms. Dabbs further added that part of the workshop could include developing better criteria for ranking projects from a Staff perspective. In respect to Director Lor’s point, Ms. Dabbs asked if there should be a comparison of projects to the State of California’s commitments. There was no verbal comment, but all directors nodded in affirmation.

Director McDaniel inquired if it was necessary to set specific split percentages at the moment. Ms. Dabbs replied that it was not and that hypothetical scenarios would be presented at the next meeting. Ms. Dabbs then asked if the committee would like to see additional options. Director Silveira responded that the options present were satisfactory. Director Pareira expressed a preference for Staff to present specific options with a specific policy for the committee to vote on.

There was no further discussion on this topic. Direction was given to Staff.
7. **Revenue Outlook**

Mr. Fell presented a brief outlook on revenue for Measure V and other MCAG controlled sources. He explained that there was approximately $10 million for five years and $20 million for ten years available on the Westside from Measure V. He also reminded the committee that the MCAG Governing Board determines Local Partnership Program (LPP) funding and STIP funding, and that additional large funding sources at the federal and state level were available. Mr. Fell added that there will be $26 million available in STIP funding this year.

There was no further discussion on this topic.

8. **Regional Project Candidates**

Item 8 was presented as informational. Director McDaniel commented that there was a recent traffic study conducted by the County on Fox Road and Franklin Road. Fox Road had a high traffic load, which Director McDaniel said demonstrated a need for the Atwater-Merced Expressway. The traffic bottleneck on Fox Road mirrored the planned AME corridor.

There was no further discussion on this item.

9. **Next Steps**

Ms. Dabbs informed the committee that the next meeting will be held on February 28th at 10:00 a.m. at the City of Atwater Council Chambers. She added that KNN may not be necessary for the meeting, but will invite them if the committee is interested.

Mr. Hertfelder recommended that the committee and Governing Board do not bond local shares as a single group. Mrs. Dietz commented that bonding would place a lot of risk on the jurisdictions and did not recommend bonding. Mr. Hertfelder further added that bonding a significant amount of local money would be fiscally dangerous.

Ms. Dabbs explained that bonding locally was more for the specific needs of Dos Palos due to the slow arrival of money. Mr. Fell suggested that KNN could meet with the Governing Board as part of a workshop rather than at the Regional Projects Committee meetings. Staff will contact Dos Palos to possibly have an additional one-on-one meeting.

10. **Adjourn**

There being no further business of the Eastside Regional Projects Committee, Director McDaniel adjourned the meeting at 3:08 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2019

TO: Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee

FROM: Stacie Dabbs, Executive Director

RE: Implementation Plan 2019 Process and Schedule

The Expenditure Plan requires an Implementation Plan outlining project expenditures be prepared/updated at a minimum of every two years.

In September 2018, the MCAG Governing Board adopted the 2018 Implementation Plan which programmed two fiscal years with a pay-as-you-go approach and 20% set asides for future unidentified leveraging opportunities.

In October 2018, the Board directed staff to begin the development of the 2019 Implementation Plan with a call for projects with two lists including a 5-year horizon and a 10-year horizon. Candidate project forms were due January 9, 2019.

In January 2019, the Regional Projects Committees provided direction to staff by consensus as a basis for preparing materials for further discussion and deliberation.

SCHEDULE

Staff is following the attached schedule. Subsequent actions include reviewing candidate projects and recommending projects to the Governing Board for funding in the 2019 Implementation Plan.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

Attachment
# Measure V 2019 Implementation Plan

## Development Process and Schedule

*Updated April 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>Governing Board</td>
<td>Direct staff to issue call for projects</td>
<td>✔ DONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| October    | One-on-one meetings with jurisdictions | • Discuss and identify any new candidate projects;  
             |                                                                | ✔ DONE|  
|            |                                 | • Update on existing candidate and funded projects                  |        |
| **2019**   |                                 |                                                                      |        |
| January 9  | n/a                             | Deadline for jurisdictions to submit candidate projects and/or updated information to MCAG | ✔ DONE|
| January 23-24 | East and West Side Regional Projects Committees | • Select an approach for East and West sides;  
                                |                                                                | ✔ DONE|  
|            |                                 | • Review revenue outlook;  
                                |                                                                |        |  
|            |                                 | • Initial review of candidate projects.                             |        |
| April 17   | East and West Side Regional Projects Committees | • Discuss leveraging potential;  
                                |                                                                |        |  
|            |                                 | • Review candidate projects;  
                                |                                                                |        |  
|            |                                 | • Make project funding recommendations to the Board.                |        |
| May 16     | Governing Board                 | Approve Regional Project Committees’ recommendations               |        |
| March      | n/a                             | Staff circulates pre-draft Plan to jurisdictions for review and feedback |        |
| June 20    | Governing Board                 | Release Draft Plan for public review and comment                    |        |
| July       | Public Hearings                 | as required by Expenditure Plan                                    |        |
| July 18    | Governing Board                 | Action on 2019 Implementation Plan                                  |        |
MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2019
TO: Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee
FROM: Matt Fell, Transportation Planning Manager
RE: Revenue Projections

MEASURE V REVENUE PROJECTIONS

In order to recommend projects for funding, the Regional Projects Committees need an estimate of future revenue that will be available for projects.

The 2018 Implementation Plan used the same estimate as the voter-approved Expenditure Plan, which is $15,000,000 in total revenues per year. Since the Eastside share is 27% of the total and the Westside share is 17% of the total, that corresponds to:

- $4,050,000 per year for the Eastside share
- $2,550,000 per year for the Westside share

Actual revenues have been somewhat more than the estimate, however staff recommends using these same conservative estimates for the 2019 Implementation Plan. In the next Implementation Plan in two years there will be three years of revenue to look at and at that time if revenues continue to be higher, then the projection could be adjusted upward.

The Governing Board’s initial direction in October 2018 was to look at both a 5-year horizon and a 10-year horizon. The table below shows in millions of today’s dollars (unescalated) what the East and West shares and Measure V total would be for 5 years, 10 years, and the entire 30 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>5 Years</th>
<th>10 Years</th>
<th>30 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>121.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>76.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure V Total (including Local and Transit)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If a Regional Projects Committee were to continue to recommend a 20% set aside for future leveraging opportunities, then the amounts available for consideration in this 2019 Implementation Plan would be as highlighted in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>5 Years</th>
<th>10 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastside – Projects</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>32.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside – 20% set-aside</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside – Total</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>40.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside – Projects</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>20.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside – 20% set-aside</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside – Total</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>25.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Or taking the highlighted numbers from the table:

- Eastside Available Funding (with 20% set-aside), 5 years = $16.2 million
- Eastside Available Funding (with 20% set-aside), 10 years = $32.4 million
- Westside Available Funding (with 20% set-aside), 5 years = $10.2 million
- Westside Available Funding (with 20% set-aside), 10 years = $20.4 million

Attached are tables showing various percentages of the totals for various numbers of years. This will assist with comparing how much revenue may be available for varying terms if the total is broken down in a variety of ways.

At your meeting we will have poster-size boards of the attached tables for easy reference.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

For information only.

Attachments
**Measure V - East Side Revenue Projections (27% of total)**

Assumes $15,000,000 total Measure V revenue per year (unescalated)

With no off-the-top set asides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$405,000</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$2,025,000</td>
<td>$4,050,000</td>
<td>$12,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$1,620,000</td>
<td>$4,050,000</td>
<td>$8,100,000</td>
<td>$24,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$1,012,500</td>
<td>$2,025,000</td>
<td>$5,062,500</td>
<td>$10,125,000</td>
<td>$30,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$1,620,000</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
<td>$8,100,000</td>
<td>$16,200,000</td>
<td>$48,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$2,025,000</td>
<td>$4,050,000</td>
<td>$10,125,000</td>
<td>$20,250,000</td>
<td>$60,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$2,430,000</td>
<td>$4,860,000</td>
<td>$12,150,000</td>
<td>$24,300,000</td>
<td>$72,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$3,037,500</td>
<td>$6,075,000</td>
<td>$15,187,500</td>
<td>$30,375,000</td>
<td>$91,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
<td>$6,480,000</td>
<td>$16,200,000</td>
<td>$32,400,000</td>
<td>$97,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$4,050,000</td>
<td>$8,100,000</td>
<td>$20,250,000</td>
<td>$40,500,000</td>
<td>$121,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With a 20% off-the-top set aside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$324,000</td>
<td>$648,000</td>
<td>$1,620,000</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
<td>$9,720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$648,000</td>
<td>$1,296,000</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
<td>$6,480,000</td>
<td>$19,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$1,620,000</td>
<td>$4,050,000</td>
<td>$8,100,000</td>
<td>$24,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$1,296,000</td>
<td>$2,592,000</td>
<td>$6,480,000</td>
<td>$12,960,000</td>
<td>$38,880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$1,620,000</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
<td>$8,100,000</td>
<td>$16,200,000</td>
<td>$48,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$1,944,000</td>
<td>$3,888,000</td>
<td>$9,720,000</td>
<td>$19,440,000</td>
<td>$58,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$2,430,000</td>
<td>$4,860,000</td>
<td>$12,150,000</td>
<td>$24,300,000</td>
<td>$72,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$2,592,000</td>
<td>$5,184,000</td>
<td>$12,960,000</td>
<td>$25,920,000</td>
<td>$77,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
<td>$6,480,000</td>
<td>$16,200,000</td>
<td>$32,400,000</td>
<td>$97,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20% set-aside
MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2019

TO: Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee

FROM: Matt Fell, Transportation Planning Manager

RE: Leverage Potential

DISCUSSION

Acquiring leverage – match or especially outside funds – is a stated goal of the Expenditure Plan. Many self-help counties in California use their measure funds to try to leverage outside funds.

At both Regional Project Committee meetings in January, there were discussions about leverage in general and goals for achieving it.

On the candidate project forms under the “fundability” criteria, project sponsors provided information on committed funding, leverage funding, and competitiveness for grants.

Staff reviewed the information provided and applied our knowledge of various transportation funding programs that might be available for these projects. Based on that we have prepared an assessment of the leveraging potential for the candidate projects.

The attached table includes a “Match” column and a “Leverage Potential” column:

- Match – amount the project sponsor has identified that they are bringing as match from sources other than Measure V Regional.
- Leverage Potential – other, typically competitive, sources that staff believes the project has a possibility of acquiring. There are four levels:
  - Blank – unknown or low potential for leveraging
  - Unshaded text – potential exists but competitiveness is unknown
  - Light green – may be competitive for identified sources
  - Darker green – has demonstrated competitiveness for significant % of total cost

To summarize – few of the candidate projects have identified match or strong leverage chances – primarily the Atwater-Merced Expressway and possibly Highway 59 projects. Highway 99 widening (through Atwater and Merced) would have the strongest leverage chances by far, however also has the greatest total cost by far. The Applegate interchange project does not widen the mainline, so its leverage potential is therefore less.
The Transit Centers could potentially leverage transit funds, and if they end up being rail stations, rail funds; however staff feels it is “too soon to tell” as they largely depend on the plans of other entities, which have not been finalized.

FUNDING SOURCES

At previous meetings, staff has given an overview of transportation funding sources, including the key factor of who makes the decision:

- Local sources – such as gas tax funds, SB 1 local streets and roads, and Measure V local.
- MCAG – such as State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Local Partnership Program (LPP), and CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation Air Quality).
- State and Federal – competitive programs such as SB 1 Trade Corridor, Active Transportation Program, Federal BUILD and INFRA, and others.

Staff has also shared with the committee that most of the “outside” funding sources are highly competitive. They favor projects with strong benefits at the regional or state scale.

MCAG FUNDING SOURCES

Two funding sources which are decided by the MCAG Governing Board are commonly used in self-help counties to complement their measure programs. This practice has benefits including:

- Making larger projects more fundable and achievable;
- Delivering priority projects sooner rather than later;
- Making projects more competitive for outside leverage;

The Local Partnership Program Formula funding was established by SB 1 and goes to transportation self-help agencies throughout the state, including MCAG. It was established to reward agencies who have voter-approved measures. About a half-million dollars is available per year.

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP or RTIP) funds are recommended by MCAG every two years and subject to California Transportation Commission approval. The next STIP cycle will be coming up this Summer, with the RTIP due by December 2019. Currently MCAG has $26 million of unprogrammed STIP funding and may get more in the next cycle. This will be available in a future year to be programmed as MCAG decides, subject to state requirements. Historically this funding has gone to major projects with broad regional benefits.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

Attachment
### East Side Regional Project Candidates - Leverage Potential

*April, 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Agency Priority</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>CON Year</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>2018 Plan Funding</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Leverage Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atwater</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winton Way Phase 2</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$2,385,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$721,979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwater</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hwy. 99 Applegate Interchange</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$62,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>State (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwater</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atwater Transit Center</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$13,408,278</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>Transit/Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Livingston Transit Center (1)</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>Transit/Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Livingston Transit Center (2)</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>Transit/Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Main Street Corridor</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B Street Corridor</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hwy. 59 Black Rascal Bridge</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$4,090,000</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hwy. 59 Widen (16th to Olive)</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$5,944,300</td>
<td>$764,580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hwy. 59 Widen (Olive to Yosemite)</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$18,879,885</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>State tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parsons Bridge over Bear Creek</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$2,850,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parsons Ave (140 to Yosemite)</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$33,400,666</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mission Ave Widening</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$8,535,823</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,022,807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bellevue Widening (59 to Lake)</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$41,374,909</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hwy. 59 Widen (Olive to Bellevue)</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$38,537,923</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>State tbd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AME Phase 1B</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$75,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,724,681</td>
<td>State, Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bellevue Rd Connect to 99</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$3,350,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County</td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>Mission Ave project</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$5,300,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Childs Ave Project</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$18,372,382</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ATP,CMAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sandy Mush Phase 2</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$4,575,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hwy. 140 &amp; Plainsburg Roundabout</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$4,750,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ATP,State tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Washington Rd. Rehabilitation</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$2,025,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Atwater-Merced Rehabilitation</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$8,250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ATP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>McKee Rd. Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ATP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

**CON:** year construction begins, if funding is available when needed

**Match:** amount of local match identified

**Leverage:** Potential Sources

- blank = unknown or low potential for leveraging
- unshaded with text = potential exists but competitiveness is unknown
- light green shading = may be competitive for identified sources
- darker green shading = has demonstrated competitiveness for significant % of total cost

State (99) = Hwy. 99 is a high priority for the State

SHOPP = State Highway Operation and Protection Program (Safety and Maintenance on highways)

HSIP = Highway Safety Improvement Program

ATP = Active Transportation Program

Transit/Rail = various transit and rail funding sources

State tbd = various state sources that may be available for projects on highways

CMAQ = Congestion Mitigation Air Quality
DATE: April 10, 2019

TO: Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee

FROM: Matt Fell, Transportation Planning Manager

RE: Regional Project Candidates

In October 2018, the MCAG Governing Board directed staff to begin the development of the 2019 Implementation Plan with a call for projects with two lists including a 5-year horizon and a 10-year horizon. Staff issued the call for projects following that Board meeting with a due date in December, later extended to January 9, 2019.

The candidate project forms were the same as those created during the development of the 2018 Implementation Plan. They were based on discussions at the East and West Regional Projects Committees in 2017, in which committee members brainstormed regional projects for consideration and discussed potential evaluation criteria.

CANDIDATE PROJECTS

24 project candidates were submitted on the East side. The complete packet of information/evaluation forms is unchanged from last meeting and is available at https://www.measurev-mcag.com/uploads/1/2/3/5/123584958/east_rpc_1.24.2019_project_forms.pdf (15 MB, 66 pages).

“REGIONAL”

At both January Regional Project Committee meetings, there was discussion about the regional nature of projects and regional compared to local projects.

Attached is page 6 of the Expenditure Plan with a red box around the language defining a Regional Project for the purposes of Measure V Regional Project funding. Also attached is the Regional Road System/Network description, taken from the adopted Regional Transportation Plan.
Staff used the text in the Expenditure Plan to categorize candidate projects into a hierarchy based on their qualifying characteristic. From highest to lowest staff proposes the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>“on the State Highway system”, also example 4 “Passenger Rail”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“on the Regional Road System or the Regional Transportation System defined by MCAG” (but not on the state highway system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Examples: “Bus Rapid Transit”, “Regional bikeways and trails”, “Improvements to Regional Airports”, “Transportation Demand Management benefitting more than one jurisdiction, such as vanpools and ridesharing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“located in … more than one jurisdiction”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attached is a table showing staff application of this hierarchy to the candidate projects.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

For information only.

Attachments:  
Expenditure Plan, pages 6-7, “Regional Projects”  
Regional Road Network Description from Regional Transportation Plan Appendix T  
East Side Regional Project Candidates Hierarchy
1. **Regional Projects** – 44% of total

If $450 million is collected over 30 years, then $198 million will be available for Regional Projects - $121.5 million on the Eastside and $76.5 million on the Westside.

Forty-four percent (44%) of the funds will be allocated to this category.

- 27% of the total is for an Eastside share, to be spent on projects east of the San Joaquin River.
- 17% of the total is for a Westside share, to be spent on projects west of the San Joaquin River.

The dividing line between Eastside and Westside shares is the San Joaquin River. Two committees will be created to recommend projects:

- The Eastside Regional Projects Committee will consist of one council person from each City that includes area east of the San Joaquin River and each County Supervisor whose district includes area east of the River.
- The Westside Regional Projects Committee will consist of one council person from each City that includes area west of the San Joaquin River and each County Supervisor whose district includes area west of the River.

As the Local Transportation Authority overseeing the funds, the Governing Board of Merced County Association of Governments has the authority to approve recommendations made by the Regional Projects Committees. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the MCAG Governing Board shall not approve a project that has not been recommended by a Regional Projects Committee.

Regional Projects must be listed in the applicable Regional Transportation Plan, which is updated every four years and can be amended as needed. These projects provide for the movement of goods, services, and people throughout Merced County. Projects on the State Highway system or the Regional Road System or the Regional Transportation System defined by MCAG are Regional Projects. Projects located in or directly benefiting more than one jurisdiction are Regional Projects.

Examples of Regional Projects include but are not limited to:

- Improving highway and freeways
- Adding lanes to projects on the Regional Road System
- Improvements on the Regional Transportation System
- Passenger Rail
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Regional bikeways and trails
- Improvements to Regional Airports
- Transportation Demand Management benefiting more than one jurisdiction, such as vanpools and ridesharing.

Funds can be used for all phases of project development and implementation. In some cases, other sources of funding will also be used for these projects, for example State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds.
Figure 2. Regional Roadway System, Merced County
**Regional Road Network**

The regional road system is the fundamental component of transportation in Merced County. It provides the basic network for the movement of people and goods. Regional roads are used by nearly all travel modes including automobiles, ridesharing (carpools and vanpools), transit buses, paratransit, trucks, bicycles, and pedestrians.

The regional road system consists of State and Interstate Highways as well as local routes which connect urban areas and other major activity centers. Facilities that are not included in the regional road system are considered to primarily serve local transportation needs.

The Regional Road Network consists of the following roadways:

- **All State Highways** and Interstates.
  - Interstate 5, Highways 33, 59, 99, 140, 152, and 165
  - including any future realignments and bypasses
    - Highway 152 Los Banos Bypass (Tier II Improvement)
    - Highway 59 realignment between Atwater and Merced (aka Atwater-Merced Expressway) (Tier I Improvement)
    - Highway 59 realignment extension southwest of Merced (Tier I Improvement)
    - Highway 140 Gustine Truck Route / Bypass (Tier II Improvement)
    - Highway 165 Hilmar Bypass (Tier II Improvement)

- **Santa Fe Drive** – from Stanislaus County to Highway 59 – is an arterial, which connects Stanislaus to Winton, Atwater, Castle, and Merced.

- **Olive Avenue** – in Merced and the County, from Highway 59 / Santa Fe Drive to the future Campus Parkway – is an arterial serving large amounts of traffic from other jurisdictions such as the County and Atwater.

- **Lincoln Boulevard** – in the County, from Hwy. 165 to Peach Ave. – is a major collector, which connects westside jurisdictions to Livingston via Hwys 165 and 140.

- **Main St.** – in Livingston, from Peach Ave. to Hwy. 99 – is an arterial serving through traffic connecting westside jurisdictions and the county to Hwy. 99 and Livingston.

- **Livingston-Cressey Road** – in Livingston and the County, from Hwy. 99 to Santa Fe Drive – is an arterial and major collector, which connects northern Merced County to Livingston and Hwy. 99.

- **Applegate Rd.** – in the County and Atwater, from Hwy 140 to Bellevue Rd. – is a major collector and arterial connecting the westside to Atwater and Winton.

- **Winton Way** – in Atwater and the County, from Bellevue Rd. to Santa Fe Drive – is a major collector connecting Atwater to Winton.

- **Buhach Rd.** – in the County and Atwater, from Hwy 140 to Santa Fe Drive – is a major collector and an arterial connecting the westside to Atwater and Castle.

- **Walnut Ave.** – in the County, from Livingston to Santa Fe Drive – is a major collector connecting Livingston to Winton, north Atwater, and Castle.

- **Westside Boulevard** – in the County, from Hwy 165 to Hwy 99 – is a major collector connecting the westside to the eastside and Atwater and Merced.

- **Bloss Avenue** – in the County, from Hwy 165 to Hwy 99 – is a major collector connecting Hilmar and the westside to Livingston and Delhi.
- **Bellevue Road** – from Hwy 99 west of Atwater to Lake Rd. or Campus Parkway, including “gaps” which may be connected in the future – is a major collector and an arterial, which connects Atwater, Winton, Castle, Merced, and UC Merced.

- **G Street** – in Merced and the County, from Hwy 99 to Hwy. 59 – is an arterial and major collector, which serves through traffic and connects to UC Merced and the north.

- **Mission Ave**. – south of Merced, from Hwy. 59 to Hwy. 99 – is a major collector and future arterial, which will serve heavy interregional movements connecting these highways.

- **Santa Fe Avenue** from Plainsburg Rd. in Planada to the Madera County line – connects Le Grand to the rest of the network.

- **Plainsburg Road** – in the County, from Hwy. 99 to Hwy. 140 – is a major collector, which connects Planada and points east to Hwy. 99

- **Le Grand Road** – in the County, from Hwy. 99 to Santa Fe Ave. – is a major collector, which connects Le Grand and eastern Merced County to Hwy. 99.

- **Minturn Road** – in the County, from Le Grand Rd. to the Madera County line – is a major collector, which connects to Hwy. 99 and serves interregional movements.

- **Oakdale Road** – in the County, from Highway 59 to the Stanislaus County line – is a major collector, which connects to Stanislaus County and Oakdale.

- **La Grange Road** – in the County, from Highway 59's termination in Snelling to the Stanislaus County line – is a major collector, which connects to the foothills and eventually Sonora.

- **Merced Falls Road** – in the County, from Highway 59’s termination in Snelling to the Mariposa County line – is a major collector, which connects to Lake McClure and Mariposa County.

- the future **Campus Parkway** from Highway 99 to end of route at Yosemite Ave. or UC Merced

- **Henry Miller Avenue** - east from Interstate 5 in Santa Nella, across State Route 165 to Turner Island Road (an important farm-to-market route and informal bypass of Los Banos).

- Los Banos to Gustine Route - an important route that connects farms to several packing plants from State Route 152 north along **Volta Road, Ingomar Grade, Cottonwood Road** and **Hunt Road** to Gustine.

- **Sandy Mush Road/Turner Island Road** - west from State Route 99, across State Route 59 to Turner Island Road and south to State Route 152. This is an important farm-to-market road and alternate route from Highway 99 to Los Banos.

- **Bradbury Road** - from its interchange with State Route 99 west to Highway 165.

- **Gurr Road** - from State Route 140 near the McSwain area to Sandy Mush Road.

- **Washington Road** - from Indiana Avenue to Highway 59.

- **Hutchins Road** – from Carlucci Road to Indiana Avenue.

- **Indiana Ave.** - from Highway 152 to Washington Road.

  - **Merced Falls Road** – in the County, from Highway 59’s termination in Snelling to the Mariposa County line – is a major collector, which connects to Lake McClure and Mariposa County.

  - Future extension of **Pioneer Road** to Volta Road.
## East Side Candidates "Regional" Qualifying Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Qualifying Characteristic (based on candidate forms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atwater</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hwy. 99 <strong>Applegate</strong> Interchange</td>
<td>5 state highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwater</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atwater <strong>Transit Center</strong></td>
<td>5 passenger rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Livingston <strong>Transit Center (1)</strong></td>
<td>5 passenger rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Livingston <strong>Transit Center (2)</strong></td>
<td>5 passenger rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hwy. 59 <strong>Black Rascal</strong> Bridge</td>
<td>5 state highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hwy. 59 Widen <strong>(16th to Olive)</strong></td>
<td>5 state highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hwy. 59 Widen <strong>(Olive to Yosemite)</strong></td>
<td>5 state highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hwy. 59 Widen <strong>(Olive to Bellevue)</strong></td>
<td>5 state highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hwy. 140 &amp; Plainsburg Roundabout</td>
<td>5 state highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwater</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Winton Way</strong> Phase 2</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Main Street</strong> Corridor</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Mission</strong> Ave Widening</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Bellevue Widening</strong> (59 to Lake)</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>AME</strong> Phase 1B</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Bellevue Rd Connect</strong> to 99</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County</td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td><strong>Mission</strong> Ave project</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Sandy Mush</strong> Phase 2</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Washington</strong> Rd. Rehabilitation</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Atwater-Merced Bike Path</strong></td>
<td>3 example - regional trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td><strong>Childs Ave Project</strong></td>
<td>2 located in more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>8 Street</strong> Corridor</td>
<td>1 directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Parsons Bridge</strong> over Bear Creek</td>
<td>1 directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Parsons Ave</strong> (140 to Yosemite)</td>
<td>1 directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>McKee Rd. Pedestrian Bridge</strong></td>
<td>1 directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualifying Characteristics for Regional Projects are drawn from the Expenditure Plan

**Hierarchy:**

Highest 5 "on the State Highway System" or example "Passenger Rail"

4 "on the Regional Road System or the Regional Transportation System"

3 examples: Bus Rapid Transit, Regional bikeways and trails, Improvements to Regional Airports, Regional Transportation Demand Management (carpool, rideshare)

2 "located in more than one jurisdiction"

Lowest 1 "directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction"
DATE: April 10, 2019
TO: Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee
FROM: Stacie Dabbs, Executive Director
RE: Implementation Plan Options and Scenarios

BACKGROUND

At the January meeting, staff requested direction on an approach the Committee would like to pursue for the 2019 Implementation Plan. Staff presented five options as starting points for discussion:

- A: Major Projects and Leveraging
- B: Something-For-Everyone
- C: Complete Existing Commitments
- D: Hybrid
- E: Clean Future

Committee members proposed a variety of approaches that combined strategies. The most support was received for a combination of A and B with 75% for A and 25% for B. Other approaches that received support were a combination of A and C, and a combination of A and E.

MAJOR PROJECTS AND LEVERAGING

As noted in the prior items, there are few projects with strong match or leveraging chances and broad regional benefits. Essentially they are:

- Atwater-Merced Expressway (AME) 1B – $75 million total
- Highway 59 Widening (3 projects) – $6 / $19 / $39 million (pending refined cost estimates)

These projects have high costs and long time frames, although the first phase of 59 Widening (16th to Olive) may be somewhat less cost than the others. Only AME 1B has a completed Project Study Report with a detailed cost estimate and schedule. The 59 Widening first phase received funding in the 2018 Plan and project development will be underway soon.

10 years of Measure V East Side Regional Funding is not enough to construct these projects without additional funds.
Nonetheless the Committee could recommend funding for a project or projects earlier phases, with the financial strategy for construction to be worked out later. For example AME through right-of-way needs about $11 million, leaving about $61 million for construction to be determined.

The Committee could also recommend other options to the Governing Board for consideration, such as a longer (or shorter) time frame, bonding for regional projects, or providing direction on regional priorities for STIP funding.

SOMETHING FOR EVERYONE

Sample projects which would meet this goal (and also approach C, completing existing commitments) include:

- Atwater – Winton Way Phase 2 – $663,021 shortfall for construction
- Livingston – Main Street Corridor – up to $13 million, project could potentially be phased
- Merced – Highway 59 Black Rascal Bridge – $3.6 million for remaining phases

SAMPLE SCENARIO

This scenario assumes 10 years of funding, or $40,500,000. It includes $8,100,000 for a 20% set-aside for unidentified future leveraging opportunities as the 2018 Plan did, which is a RPC decision. That leaves $32,400,000 which divided 75% / 25% is $24.3 million and $8.1 million for A and B respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>CON Year</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>2018 Plan Funding</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>2019 Plan Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>AME Phase 1B (through Right-of-Way)</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$75 million</td>
<td>$2,724,681</td>
<td>$10,975,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>59 Widening Phase 1</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>$6 million (pending PSR)</td>
<td>$764,580</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Projects Subtotal = $10.975 million

B/C – Something For Everyone / Completing Projects (25% of $32.4 million is $8.1 million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>CON Year</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>2018 Plan Funding</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>2019 Plan Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atwater</td>
<td>Winton Way Phase 2</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$2,385,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$721,979</td>
<td>$663,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>Main Street Corridor</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,807,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>59 Black Rascal Bridge</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>$4,090,000 (pending PSR)</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,630,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Something For Everyone subtotal = $8.1 million

20% set-aside for leveraging opportunities

Unprogrammed = $8,100,000

10 years of East Side Regional = $27,175,000

Unprogrammed = $23,125,000

10 years of East Side Regional = $40,500,000
Of course there are other options as well which the Committee could recommend and at your meeting staff will be prepared to facilitate a discussion.

**OTHER OPTIONS / SET-ASIDES**

The 2018 Plan included a 20% set-aside for future leveraging opportunities. This set-aside could be maintained, decreased, or increased. Based on the discussion at the last meeting, the committee could also consider other set-asides, for example for specific project types or approaches, or for project development.

The committee could also leave amounts unprogrammed. Any amounts not recommended to a project are available for recommendation to projects at a future time.

**LEVERAGING INCENTIVE**

Recognizing that this scenario funds some projects with 100% measure money, should the committee be interested in incentivizing leveraging, staff could develop an “Incentive Policy” to reward jurisdictions who successfully bring competitive state or federal funds to the project. For example, if a jurisdiction receives a state or federal grant or award and that amount offsets Measure V funding for the project, then the amount of the off-set could remain earmarked for that jurisdiction to use on a future RPC approved regional project. Further details would have to be worked out.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

Discuss and potentially recommend projects for funding to the MCAG Governing Board.