Regular Meeting of the
Measure V West Side Regional Projects Committee

LOCATION
City of Dos Palos
Council Chambers
1554 Golden Gate Avenue
Dos Palos, CA 93620

DATE
Wednesday, April 17, 2019

TIME
10:00 am

West Side Regional Projects Committee Members

City of Dos Palos  Michael McGlynn, Councilman
City of Gustine   Pat Nagy, Mayor – Vice Chair
City of Los Banos Mike Villalta, Mayor
County of Merced, District 4 Lloyd Pareira, Supervisor – Chair
County of Merced, District 5 Scott Silveira, Supervisor
Welcome to the Measure V West Side Regional Projects Committee Meeting

AGENDA

At least 72 hours prior to each regular Measure V West 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 negoción en anticipación. Para solicitas 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 West Side Regional Projects Committee

**Wednesday, April 17, 2019 – 10:00 am**
City of Dos Palos, Council Chambers
1554 Golden Gate Avenue, Dos Palos, CA 93620

## AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roll Call</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approval of Agenda</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Approval of Minutes from January 23, 2019 West Side Regional Projects Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Implementation Plan 2019 Process and Schedule</td>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Stacie Dabbs</td>
<td>p. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Revenue Projections</td>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Matt Fell</td>
<td>p. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leverage Potential</td>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Matt Fell</td>
<td>p. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regional Project Candidates</td>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Matt Fell</td>
<td>p. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Implementation Plan Options</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Stacie Dabbs</td>
<td>p. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Stacie Dabbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting of the West Side Regional Projects Committee held on Wednesday, January 23, 2019 at the City of Gustine, Council Chambers, 352 Fifth Street, Gustine, CA was called to order by Chair Pareira at 2:00 p.m.

**DIRECTORS PRESENT**
- Director Michael McGlynn
- Director Pat Nagy, Vice-Chair
- Director Mike Villalta
- Director Lloyd Pareira, Chair
- Director Scott Silveira

**DIRECTORS ABSENT**
- None

**MCAG STAFF PRESENT**
- Nav Bagri, Finance Director
- Stacie Dabbs, Executive Director
- Blake Dunford, Assistant Planner
- Matt Fell, Transportation Planning Manager
- Emily Haden, Legal Counsel
- Ty Phimmasone, Associate Planner
- Mary-Michal Rawling, Public Affairs Manager
- Mauricio Torres, Assistant Planner

**GUESTS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**
- David Dees, Chair of Measure V Citizens Oversight Committee
- Doug Dunford, City Manager, City of Gustine
- Mark Fachin, Public Works Director, City of Los Banos
- Darrell Fonseca, City Manager, City of Dos Palos
- Joe Giulian, Deputy Director of Public Works Roads Division, Merced County
- Dana Hertfelder, Director of Public Works, Merced County
- Dr. Brenda Latham, Dean of Los Banos Campus, Merced College
- Alex Terrazas, City Manager, City of Los Banos
- Chris Vitelli, Superintendent/President, Merced College
1. Roll Call

2. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

3. Approval of the Agenda

Director Silveira moved to approve the agenda.
Seconded by Director Nagy.
Ayes – Directors McGlynn, Nagy, Villalta, Pareira, Silveira
Noes – None
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Approval of Minutes from May 15, 2018 West Side Regional Projects Committee

Director Villalta moved to approve the minutes of the May 15, 2018 West Side Regional Projects Committee.
Seconded by Director Nagy.
Ayes – Directors McGlynn, Nagy, Villalta, Pareira, Silveira
Noes – None
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Implementation Plan 2019 Process and Schedule

Stacie Dabbs presented an overview of the 2019 Update to the Implementation Plan including its purpose and process. A major goal of this meeting is to get direction on a preferred approach. She noted that the 2018 Implementation Plan programmed two years and that the updated plan is required for future funding and to align with the STIP cycle. All candidate project forms included were created by jurisdiction staff and not MCAG. Stacie reiterated that today’s meeting would focus on choosing an approach, reviewing the revenue outlook, and an initial review of candidate projects. She 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.

6. Select an Implementation Plan Approach for the Westside

Stacie Dabbs presented the committee five options as starting points for the committee to discuss an approach for selecting projects:

- 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
She explained potential pros and cons of different approaches and asked for feedback on the options or any other approaches or considerations that committee members wished to consider.

Director Pareira stated that the public wanted to see projects completed and that he believed the approach in the 2018 Implementation Plan accomplished that. He suggested that the committee pursue Option B for the first five years, with a 20% set-aside for leveraging, before shifting to large projects.

Director Silveira suggested a hybrid approach with a 75-25 split for Options A and B respectively. He liked Option B for the first Implementation Plan, but felt it was time for a larger regional portion. He noted that part of the Measure V pie is already dedicated for local projects. He stated that state and federal dollars needed to be leveraged or all these projects can’t be done, and that the committee should follow a tiered approach for immediate needs but shift the focus to larger projects.

Director Nagy agreed with a hybrid option, but questioned whether changing the approach was necessary at this time. Stacie Dabbs explained that the prior approach was meant to only be for the 2018 plan. Director Nagy said the intention of Measure V was not to fully fund projects, yet all of the candidates were asking for full funding. He stated jurisdictions should get grant or other funding to pay projects and use Measure V as the match. He also commented that Measure V was intended primarily for fixing roads and sidewalks, not to bring a train.

Director McGlynn commented that local attitudes in Dos Palos range from mild frustration to anger. He said that the public demand is for project delivery.

Director Villalta stated that he was split between pursuing the Pacheco Boulevard Regional Path and the options for a larger Highway 152 related project. He added that a study from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District found that Merced and Los Banos had the same air quality. He expressed concern about the potential effects of pollution on students at schools located near Highway 152. He believed that large projects would be good for community health and safety. He agreed with a hybrid option, but expressed a desire to move to larger projects.

Director Pareira opened the item to public comment.

Darrell Fonseca commented that Dos Palos’ projects were not intended to be fully funded by Regional Measure V funding, but that the City would seek as much as possible. He reiterated local concerns regarding project completion, explaining that this is why the City limited their candidate projects to two for this round. He liked all of the potential policy options, but wants to see projects delivered. The people of Dos Palos want to see something done, but the City does not have the money to do so on its own yet.

Chris Vitelli expressed interest in a hybrid approach. He stressed that alternative transportation is critical for the Los Banos Campus. He cited Governor Newsom’s plan for expanded free college in
California, saying that it would drive attendance at the campus. He also stated that voters chose Measure V for alternative modes and safety improvements.

Dr. Brenda Latham shared that a survey of students at the Los Banos Campus showed a preference for alternative modes and a safer route to the campus. Regardless of what option the committee chose, she expressed hope for a consideration of the Pacheco Boulevard Regional Path.

Chris Vitelli further commented that Merced College was preparing a Facilities Master Plan with a ten year outlook. There was significant planned investment for the Los Banos Campus to grow with new comprehensive programs. He also stated that there was a potential for attendance to double.

Dana Hertfelder stated the County’s interest in creating an alternative corridor for freight movement outside of Highways 140 and 152. He further stated that some projects submitted did not seem to be significant on a regional level.

David Dees stressed that the promises to the voters should come first. He stated that leveraging makes sense when possible and such a practice would be necessary for any large projects. However, he continued, it does not make sense to add projects when the previous list has not been completed. He said that the Clean Future approach is not appropriate at this time. He hoped to see more roadwork completed. He encouraged the committee to add no new projects and pursue Option C.

Mark Fachin expressed that the larger projects do not have a Project Study Reports (PSR) completed. If that step is completed, the project becomes eligible for leveraging and outside funding. He stated that Los Banos has not stopped and will not stop seeking additional funding, but that they require the PSR at a minimum to move forward with their projects and grant applications.

Stacie Dabbs continued this point, stating that many projects across the county are not ready because of the long-term conditions in the region preceding Measure V. Measure V is not able to do everything, but it should be considered a step in the right direction.

Director Pareira stated that the public was promised that Measure V would be used to leverage more money, thus money should be able to be easily secured for all projects big and small. He expressed a need to minimize the jurisdictional need for the Measure alone and to increase money from additional sources.

Matt Fell gave the committee examples of leveraging money for projects.

Director Villalta stated that the Westside hasn’t gotten money from STIP. He then discussed how there was potential that Governor Newsom may withhold gas tax (SB-1) funding if the region fails
Director Silveira reiterated the need for leverage and hopes for a hybrid option. He said that large projects cannot be funded by Measure V alone. He pushed for the committee to set percentages for each subset of the hybrid option, including a new set-aside percentage. Stacie Dabbs asked for clarification whether the Director was considering a leverage pool or programming large projects. Director Silveira said the leverage pool approach.

Director Villalta asked if the percentages would determine whether the committee would consider a five or ten year outlook. Stacie Dabbs replied that the duration could be set after the approach is chosen. She explained the difference between traditional leveraging of state and federal funding with a local match and looking at leverage as a combination of funding sources with other local and MCAG controlled funding.

Director Silveira asked for a focus on how jurisdictions could work together to prepare projects to the “shovel ready” stage and thus leverageable. He then expressed hope that President Trump’s infrastructure bill would provide opportunities for the region.

Director Pareira stated that the project list will expand over time. He also stated that 75% for a leveraging pool was too much at this time when the public was not satisfied with the amount of projects delivered. He suggested that the high percentage be deferred until after the first five years. He also expressed that projects like the Highway 165 widening in Los Banos should have significant state funding as it is a state highway. He believed the committee must leverage but for the most important projects. He asked for clarification on the Gustine Downtown project’s regional nature and whether the Gustine Airport project could be done using alternative modes. Matt Fell said that the Expenditure Plan does not specifically mention airports in the alternative modes subcategory of local projects but it is a broadly defined as providing alternatives to single-occupant vehicle travel.

Director Nagy stated that the committee should consider completing commitments. Rather than percentages, the committee should consider what is important to the jurisdictions and the regions.

Director Villalta suggested that the February meeting should present different approaches with leverage options. He requested more information with “hard numbers” to help the committee better choose an approach.

Stacie Dabbs summarized the options that the committee was interested as: Option C, a hybrid of A and B, or a hybrid of A, B, and C.

Directors Villalta, McGlynn, and Pareira expressed support for a hybrid of Options A, B, and C.
Director Silveira questioned Option C and the length of time to which commitments should continue to receive support. He stated that the committee cannot always fund every project to the end. He reiterated his support for a hybrid option, stating again that no large projects can be done without a large reserve set aside now.

Director Pareira added that the last Plan had been a hybrid approach.

Director Villalta reiterated that large projects need to get to the planning stage first to be able to apply for funding opportunities.

Doug Dunford stated that if the committee chose to pursue a 75% set-aside for leverage, the remaining 25% would only leave an approximate $1.5 million per year for smaller projects, which would not be enough to accomplish much.

Director Silveira said that the little money left should be used for leveraging. He expressed that he understood the need to deliver projects, but believed that the commitment to leveraging was more important.

Director McGlynn said he would like to have KNN present at the meeting as he was interested in discussing bonding for local shares of Measure V. Stacie Dabbs replied that bonding may need to be discussed by the Governing Board first.

Dana Hertfelder commented that it may help to have each jurisdiction explain why their project is regional. Stacie Dabbs replied that the Expenditure Plan is broad and flexible, but the Governing Board could choose to provide guidance or narrow the definition.

Director Silveira commented that individual project phase costs were already provided and funding requests should reflect that.

Stacie Dabbs stated that moving projects forward can be a gamble as if the project doesn’t reach completion then that money is lost.

Mark Fachin commented that Los Banos’ projects 2, 3, and 4 (Pioneer Widening, Badger Flat/H/Overland Widening, Mercey Springs/SR-165 Widening) cannot be funded through construction, but require a small investment to get the projects moving. He added that all jurisdictions would ask for all of the project cost to get as much as possible, but it was neither expected nor likely to receive the entire funding request.

Director Nagy commented that Gustine was under the impression that this was the only opportunity to ask for projects for the next ten years. Stacie Dabbs clarified that the Governing Board requested projects for the next five to ten years and to consider the priority of those projects.
Director Nagy asked whether there was a priority set for “shovel ready” projects. Stacie Dabbs said that the project form asks for a description of its readiness for construction. Neither committee formally used that information as a form of evaluation for the last Plan but informally they did express a desire for the first Plan to emphasize it. While no ranking platform was formally created, one could be made.

Director Pareira asked how Staff would like action on the approach to be formalized. Stacie Dabbs stated that, given the information and discussion, Staff had adequate direction to prepare figures and models for the requested options. No action is required if the committee is not ready.

7. Revenue Outlook

Matt 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, if a 20% set-aside is continued. He also reminded the committee that the MCAG Governing Board determines Local Partnership Program (LPP) funding and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding.

Director Pareira asked if Staff could discuss with the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Caltrans on their interest in partnerships on funding projects. Matt Fell replied that Staff would follow up with Caltrans on projects that involved state right-of-way.

Director Pareira also asked why the Pacheco Boulevard Regional Path did not receive funding from the CTC. Matt Fell responded that the Active Transportation Program is highly competitive, and the project narrowly missed the margin. Director Silveira questioned what kept the project from being funded. Mark Fachin commented that the project lost points for public outreach and a low pedestrian count.

8. Regional Project Candidates

Item 8 was presented as informational.

9. Next Steps

Stacie Dabbs informed the committee that since the approach was still being decided, KNN may be deferred to a later meeting. She stated that at the next meeting, Staff will prepare some hybrid options with different percentage splits. A third meeting could be planned if necessary.

Director McGlynn said that he would still like to speak with KNN.

Darrell Fonseca asked for clarification on the time and date. He stated that he was hosting a meeting in Selma and requested to move the date or location. Stacie Dabbs said staff would try to reschedule to 2:00 pm on Wednesday, February 27th in Dos Palos. Director Villalta offered to host
the meeting in Los Banos if rescheduling was not possible. There were no conflicts from the other Directors on a change in date.

Director Silveira asked for clarification on KNN's role in the Implementation Plan Process, which Stacie Dabbs provided.

10. **Adjourn**

   Director Pareira adjourned the meeting at 3:37 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2019
TO: Measure V West 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;  
|            |                                   | • Update on existing candidate and funded projects                  | ✓ DONE |
| **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;  
|            |                                   | • Review revenue outlook;                                           | ✓ DONE |
|            |                                   | • 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 West 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</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(including Local and Transit)
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 - West Side Revenue Projections (17% of total)

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

With no off-the-top set asides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
<td>$7,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
<td>$5,100,000</td>
<td>$15,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$637,500</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
<td>$3,187,500</td>
<td>$6,375,000</td>
<td>$19,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
<td>$2,040,000</td>
<td>$5,100,000</td>
<td>$10,200,000</td>
<td>$30,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
<td>$6,375,000</td>
<td>$12,750,000</td>
<td>$38,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$1,530,000</td>
<td>$3,060,000</td>
<td>$7,650,000</td>
<td>$15,300,000</td>
<td>$45,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$1,912,500</td>
<td>$3,825,000</td>
<td>$9,562,500</td>
<td>$19,125,000</td>
<td>$57,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$2,040,000</td>
<td>$4,080,000</td>
<td>$10,200,000</td>
<td>$20,400,000</td>
<td>$61,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
<td>$5,100,000</td>
<td>$12,750,000</td>
<td>$25,500,000</td>
<td>$76,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With a 20% off-the-top set aside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$204,000</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
<td>$2,040,000</td>
<td>$6,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
<td>$816,000</td>
<td>$2,040,000</td>
<td>$4,080,000</td>
<td>$12,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
<td>$5,100,000</td>
<td>$15,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$816,000</td>
<td>$1,632,000</td>
<td>$4,080,000</td>
<td>$8,160,000</td>
<td>$24,480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
<td>$2,040,000</td>
<td>$5,100,000</td>
<td>$10,200,000</td>
<td>$30,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$1,224,000</td>
<td>$2,448,000</td>
<td>$6,120,000</td>
<td>$12,240,000</td>
<td>$36,720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$1,530,000</td>
<td>$3,060,000</td>
<td>$7,650,000</td>
<td>$15,300,000</td>
<td>$45,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$1,632,000</td>
<td>$3,264,000</td>
<td>$8,160,000</td>
<td>$16,320,000</td>
<td>$48,960,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,040,000</td>
<td>$4,080,000</td>
<td>$10,200,000</td>
<td>$20,400,000</td>
<td>$61,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20% set-aside
MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2019

TO: Measure V West 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. The Pacheco Blvd. Path project competed well in the last state Active Transportation Program cycle, narrowly missing funding. The other leverage potentials are speculative at this point.
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
West 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>Dos Palos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Center Avenue North Area</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$936,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dos Palos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blossom Street East Area</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$2,488,310</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Downtown Revitalization</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$3,440,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hwy. 33/140 Signalization</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SHOPP, HSIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carnation Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$2,460,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kniebes Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>East Avenue Sidewalk</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ATP, CMAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Airport Entrance</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gustine Transit Center</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pacheco Blvd Path (Scenario 1a)</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$2,221,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ATP, CMAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pioneer Road Widening</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$831,292</td>
<td>State tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H St, Badger Flat, Overland</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hwy. 165 Widening</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>State tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hwy. 152 Los Banos Bypass</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>State tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Henry Miller Ave., Phase 2</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$7,451,112</td>
<td>$2,426,112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ingomar Grade Reconstruction</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$2,025,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hutchins Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indiana Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$953,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Palm Avenue Reconstruction</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,025,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Whitworth Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$4,937,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ 127,061,422 $ 3,626,112

**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

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

**HSIP** = Highway Safety Improvement Program

**ATP** = Active Transportation Program

**Transit** = various transit funding sources

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

**CMAQ** = Congestion Mitigation Air Quality
MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2019

TO: Measure V West 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

20 project candidates were submitted on the West 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/west_rpc_1.23.2019_project_forms.pdf (17 MB, 60 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
West 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 benefitting 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 benefitting 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.
West Side Candidates "Regional" Qualifying Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Agency Priority</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Qualifying Characteristic (based on candidate forms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hwy. 33/140 Signalization</td>
<td>5 state highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gustine Transit Center</td>
<td>5 passenger rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pacheco Blvd Path (Scenario 1a)</td>
<td>5 state highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hwy. 165 Widening</td>
<td>5 state highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hwy. 152 Los Banos Bypass</td>
<td>5 state highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Henry Miller Ave., Phase 2</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ingomar Grade Reconstruction</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hutchins Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indiana Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Palm Avenue Reconstruction</td>
<td>4 regional road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carnation Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>2 located in more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pioneer Road Widening</td>
<td>2 located in more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H St, Badger Flat, Overland</td>
<td>2 located in more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dos Palos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Center Avenue North Area</td>
<td>1 directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dos Palos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blossom Street East Area</td>
<td>1 directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Downtown Revitalization</td>
<td>1 directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kniebes Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>1 directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>East Avenue Sidewalk</td>
<td>1 directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Airport Entrance</td>
<td>1 directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Whitworth Road Reconstruction</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"
MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2019

TO: Measure V West Side Regional Projects Committee

FROM: Stacie Dabbs, Executive Director

RE: Implementation Plan Options

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 hybrid approaches that combined strategies A, B, and C to various extents. The most support was received for some combination of all three A, B, and C. A hybrid of A and B and a focus on C also received support.

SAMPLE SCENARIO

For discussion, staff has prepared a set of projects that attempts to combine the approaches. This addresses goal C in that all four currently funded projects would receive enough funding to complete them per the estimates provided in the candidate project forms. It addresses goal B in that each jurisdiction’s priorities are reflected. For approach A, options are limited as there are few candidate projects with broad regional benefits and strong match or leverage chances.

This scenario assumes 10 years of funding, or $25,500,000. It includes the same 20% set-aside for unidentified future leveraging opportunities as the 2018 Plan did, which is a RPC decision. Without the set-aside, the seven projects listed total $16,964,018. Note that the Pioneer Road project is through Design only.

For reference, 5 years of funding would be $12,750,000, or $10,200,000 with a 20% set-aside.
## OTHER OPTIONS / SET-ASIDES

As noted, the above scenario includes 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.

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.

### 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.