

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Merced County Association of Governments
Conference Room
369 W. 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340
(209) 723-3153

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2011– 8:30 A.M.

1. INTRODUCTION

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY ADDRESS ANY ITEM ON THE AGENDA DURING CONSIDERATION OF THAT ITEM.

2. ORAL COMMUNICATION

PERSONS WISHING TO ADDRESS AGENDA ITEMS OR COMMENT ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA MAY DO SO AT THIS TIME. COMMENTS ARE LIMITED TO THREE MINUTES PER PERSON. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD.

FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA, NO ACTION WILL BE TAKEN AT THIS TIME. IF IT REQUIRES ACTION, IT WILL BE REFERRED TO STAFF AND/OR PLACED ON THE NEXT AGENDA.

COPIES OF STAFF REPORTS OR OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION RELATING TO ITEMS OF BUSINESS REFERRED TO ON THE AGENDA ARE ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS. PERSONS WITH QUESTIONS CONCERNING AGENDA ITEMS MAY CALL MCAG TO MAKE INQUIRY REGARDING THE NATURE OF THE ITEM DESCRIBED ON THE AGENDA.

ITEM

STAFF

- 3. City of Merced Presentation – Downtown Development** Joshua Ewen
- * **4. Consent Agenda**
- a. Minutes of the November 4, 2011 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting
- # b. Draft Formal Amendment No. 13 to the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program
- # c. Revised State Transit Assistance FY 2011/12 Apportionment Estimate and Revised Claim Form
- * # **5. Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Project Evaluation** Matt Fell
- Recommend CMAQ projects for programming.
- # **6. Status of California High-Speed Rail Project** Ty Phimmasone
- For information only.
- 7. Status on the San Joaquin Valley Interregional Goods Movement Plan** Ty Phimmasone
- For information only.
- 8. Atwater-Merced Expressway Status Report** Jesse Brown
- For information only.
- # **9. Regional Transportation Impact Fee Report Fiscal Year 2011/12 – 1st Quarter** Marjie Kirn
- For information only.
- 10. One Voice Revised Schedule** Lori Flanders
- For information only.
- # **11. Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule for 2012** Marjie Kirn
- For information only.
- * **12. Oral Report – Air District – CAC Report** Richard Jantz
- Nominate and appoint an Air District Representative.

13. Information/Discussion Only

- # a. CAC Highlights – November 4, 2011
- b. Sign-up sheet for CAC representative to the MCAG
Governing Board meetings – 2011
- c. MCAG Governing Board minutes – November 17, 2011

14. Announcements

** Action*

Attachment

+ Enclosure

*The next Citizens Advisory Committee meeting will be held on Friday, January 6, 2012 at 8:30 a.m.
at MCAG, 369 W. 18th Street, Merced, California*

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 4, 2011

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the **CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE** held Friday, November 4, 2011 at the Merced County Association of Governments conference room located at 369 W. 18th Street, Merced, California, was called to order by Tom Grave at 8:34 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mary Ford-Azevedo, Small Business
Tom Grave, Education
Larrae Iencarelli, Real Estate
Ron Price, Water
Erin Stacy, Student
Diana Westmoreland Pedrozo, Agriculture

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dennis Coté, Engineering
Jeff Freitas, Citizen-at-Large
Richard Jantz, Economic Development
Stuart Rawling, Construction
Vacant, Citizen-at-Large
Vacant, Citizen at Large
Vacant, Citizen at Large
Vacant, Citizen at Large
Vacant, Commerce/Finance
Vacant, Goods Movement
Vacant, Healthcare

OTHERS PRESENT

Matt Fell, MCAG
Rich Green, MCAG
Marjie Kirn, MCAG
Ty Phimmasone, MCAG

1. Introductions

So noted.

2. Oral Communication

Rich Green discussed the activities planned for GIS day on November 15, 2011.

Rich Green handed out printed Blueprint Roadmap packets to the committee. MCAG will make a decision on how to distribute the packets to local member agencies.

3. Consent Agenda

- a. Minutes of the October 7, 2011 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting
- b. Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
- c. Draft Formal Amendment No. 12 to the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program
- d. Regional Pedestrian Plan Final Draft
- e. MCAG Policies and Procedures

Diana Westmoreland Pedrozo made a motion to approve the items on the Consent Agenda.

Seconded by Larrae Iencarelli.

Abstained – Mary Ford-Azevedo.

MOTION CARRIED.

4. Unmet Transit Needs – Fiscal Year 2011/12

Marjie Kirn reported that the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) held four public hearings (in Los Banos, Atwater, Livingston, and Merced) to hear testimony about transit needs. The SSTAC evaluated the testimony and found that there are three unmet needs which they believe are reasonable to meet:

1. Bus Schedule to run on Saturday schedule for “minor” holidays that fall on Monday-Saturday (Columbus Day, Veterans Day, day after Thanksgiving, and Lincoln’s Birthday);
2. Evening Service to 10:30 (approximately); and
3. Sunday Service (limited).

However, since there are no known revenue sources to pay for these three (3) unmet transit needs unless there are improved efficiencies in the Merced County Transit system operation (a way to get more services for less costs) that are determined through the Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) consultant recommendations anticipated in the DRAFT SRTP document in Jan/Feb 2012, staff is recommending that there are no unmet needs reasonable to meet, and that the needs be revisited after the SRTP is completed.

Diana Westmoreland Pedrozo made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board find that there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet at this time, and that the unmet needs which were identified by the SSTAC should be addressed after the Short Range Transit Plan is completed.

Seconded by Erin Stacy.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Consolidating Dispatch

Marjie Kirn reported that the City Council and Board of Supervisors are in the process of expressing their interest in pursuing consolidation and appointing a staff person from each interested jurisdiction to serve on a consolidation committee. The committee will be charged with drafting a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Agreement for the City Councils

and Board of Supervisors consideration. So far, the cities of Dos Palos, Gustine, Merced and Los Banos approved participation in this effort. Livingston has decided not to participate.

At the last MCAG Governing Board Retreat, the Governing Board requested staff to prepare a Request for Proposals (RFP).

Diana Westmoreland Pedrozo made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve releasing the RFP for consultant services to assist in the Consolidation of Dispatch in Merced County with funding to pay for this service coming from Merced Data Special Services.

Seconded by Mary Ford-Azevedo.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Outreach – Committee Vacancies

The Committee continued its discussion about how to fill existing vacancies and discussed the suggestions in the staff report. Some additional suggestions were made, including:

- Compiling a variety of short statements (“blurbs”) from committee members for use in informational and promotional literature.
- Radio interviews of CAC members to promote the committee to the public.

8. CAC Bylaws

Erin Stacy made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the amendments to the Bylaws.

Seconded by Ron Price.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. Oral Report – Air District – CAC Report

This report will be continued at a future meeting.

10. Information/Discussion Only

So noted.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS OF THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:30 A.M.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: NOVEMBER 23, 2011

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: TY PHIMMASONE, PLANNER

RE: DRAFT FORMAL AMENDMENT NO. 13 TO THE 2011 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

BACKGROUND

The MCAG Governing Board adopted the Final 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) on July 15, 2010. The 2011 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP), which incorporated MCAG's 2011 FTIP, was officially approved by the Federal government agencies on December 14, 2010.

Projects and programs, which are federally funded, must be programmed in the FTIP in order to have access to these funds. Any updates or changes to these federally-funded projects/programs must be "amended" into the FTIP.

MCAG staff has prepared **Formal Amendment No. 13** (Type No. 3 – Exempt Projects) to address a programming change to MCAG's 2011 FTIP. This programming change addresses the updates to the Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation/Reconstruction (Highway Bridge Program, HBP):

- **Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation/Reconstruction (Highway Bridge Program, HBP)**: Updates the programming of the Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation / Reconstruction to reflect the changes addressed in the current 10/20/2011 HBP Listing for Merced County. Changes, made to the program within the period of the current 2011 FTIP, are summarized:
 - Delaying the Construction of the McCabe Road bridge by one fiscal year (moved to the first outer year of the current 2011 FTIP);
 - Delaying the Right of Way and Construction of the Burchell Avenue Bridge by one fiscal year. "Toll Credits" to be used in place of local matches for the Right of Way and Construction phases;
 - Advancing the funding for Construction of the Canal School Road Bridge to the current fiscal year. "Toll Credits" used to be used in place of local matches for Construction;

- Adding four Merced County bridges (Jorgensen Road, Santa Fe Avenue, Los Cerritos Road, Baxter Road) to the program, with “Toll Credits” to be used in place of local matches for Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way (and Construction in outer years).

To comply with the federally-approved guidelines for a Formal Amendment, as stated in MCAG’s Board-approved Public Participation Plan, an interagency consultation / public review period was required. The interagency consultation / public review period commenced November 21, 2011 and will close on December 15, 2011. The Governing Board is scheduled to adopt **Formal Amendment No. 13** on December 15, 2011.

The Caltrans database (CTIPs) has been modified. The FTIP financial plan has been updated as well. The **Formal Amendment No. 13** documents are available on the MCAG website (www.mcagov.org). Both state and federal approval are needed on this amendment.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt **Formal Amendment No. 13** to the 2011 FTIP programming updates to the Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation/Reconstruction Program by Resolution No. 2011/12-15-02.

Attachment: 2011 FTIP Draft Formal Amendment No. 13 Package

DATE: November 21, 2011

TO: Interagency Consultation Partners and Public

FR: Ty Phimmasone, Staff

RE: **Availability of Draft Amendment #13 (Type 3) to the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)**

Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) is proposing a formal amendment (Type # 3- Exempt Projects) to the federally approved 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2011 FTIP). The 2011 FTIP is the programming document that identifies four years (FFY 10/11, FFY 11/12, FFY 12/13, and FFY 13/14) of federal, state and local funding sources for projects in Merced County.

Formal Amendment #13 to the 2011 FTIP updates the Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation/Reconstruction (Highway Bridge Program, HBP):

- **Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation/Reconstruction (Highway Bridge Program, HBP):** Updates the programming of the Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehab./Recon. to reflect the changes addressed in the current 10/20/2011 HBP Listing for Merced County. Changes, made to the program within the period of the current 2011 FTIP, are summarized:
 - Delaying the Construction of the McCabe Road bridge by one fiscal year (moved to the first outer year of the current 2011 FTIP);
 - Delaying the Right of Way and Construction of the Burchell Avenue bridge by one fiscal year. “Toll Credits” to be used in place of local matches for the Right of Way and Construction phases;
 - Advancing the funding for Construction of the Canal School Road bridge to the current fiscal year. “Toll Credits” used to be used in place of local matches for Construction;
 - Adding four Merced County bridges (Jorgensen Road, Santa Fe Avenue, Los Cerritos Road, Baxter Road) to the program, with “Toll Credits” to be used in place of local matches for Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way (and Construction in outer years).

Per the State HBP Coordinators: “The projects in the lists have been prioritized based on structural and geometric deficiencies and their readiness to deliver consistent with federal and state code and policies recommended by the Highway Bridge Advisory Committee.”

Documentation associated with this amendment is provided as indicated below.

- **Project List:** Attachment 1 includes a summary of programming changes that result from **Amendment #13** to the 2011 FTIP. The SJV MPOs have modified the “Caltrans Summary of Changes” table to include additional information. This modified table has been used to summarize all changes resulting from **Amendment #13** to the 2011 FTIP. The attachment also includes the CTIPs printout for the project change to the federally approved 2011 FTIP via **Amendment #13**.
- **Updated Financial Plan:** Attachment 2. The Financial Plan from the 2011 FTIP has been updated to include the project list as provided in Attachment 1.
- **Conformity Requirements:** A new conformity determination and new regional emissions analysis is NOT required for **Amendment #13** to the 2011 FTIP, as these projects are exempt from air quality conformity analysis. In addition, the projects and/or project phases contained in **Amendment #13** to the 2011 FTIP do not interfere with the timely implementation of any approved TCMs.
- **Public Involvement:** A public review and comment period of 14-days (minimum) is required by MCAG’s Public Participation Plan. The public review/comment period commences on November 21, 2011 and will end on December 15, 2011 at 3 PM. The documents for **Amendment #13** are posted on the Merced County Association of Governments website (www.mcagov.org) for public access and viewing. The MCAG Governing Board will adopt **Amendment #13** by resolution on December 15, 2011. Attachment 3 is the Draft Adoption Resolution.

The MCAG Board of Directors will consider the adoption of **Amendment #13** to the 2011 FTIP on December 15, 2011. The meeting will be held at 3 pm in the City of Merced Council Chamber at 678 West 18th Street, Merced, California.

Formal Amendment #13 to the 2011 FTIP does not contain projects “in common” with projects identified in other currently in-processing FTIP amendments.

In conclusion, the 2011 FTIP as amended meets all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450, 40 CFR Part 93, and conforms to the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality.

If you have any questions or would like to submit comments, please contact: Ty Phimmasone at ty.phimmasone@mcagov.org or 209-723-3153 ext. 309.

ATTACHMENT 1

PROJECT LIST / SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Summary of Changes

MCAG 2011 Formal Amendment No. 13

Existing / New	CTIPS ID	PROJECT TITLE	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE	Phase	Fund Type	PRIOR CTIPS Amt.	CURRENT CTIPS Amt.	FFY	Fund Source Category	Net Change	%	Comments				
Existing	205-0000-0037	Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehab./Recon.	Update grouped projects programming per 10/20/2011 updated HBP listing.	CON	HBP	765,000	765,000	10/11	HBP	\$0			No changes in FY 10/11 HBP programming.			
					County Funds	37,000	37,000		Local Funds	\$0						
					State LSSRP Bond	0	0		Proposition 1B	\$0						
				CON	HBP	50,000	2,547,000	11/12	HBP	\$2,497,000		HBP	\$2,497,000		51%	* Delay \$50,000 for Burchell Ave bridge R/W from 11/12 to 12/13; * Advance \$1.432 million construction of Canal School Road bridge to 11/12; * Program fundings for PE in 11/12 for each of the four new Merced County bridge projects.
					County Funds	0	0		Local Funds	\$0						
					State LSSRP Bond	0	0		Proposition 1B	\$0						
				CON	HBP	4,230,000	1,595,000	12/13	HBP	(\$2,635,000)		HBP	(\$2,635,000)		51%	* Delay \$50,000 for Burchell Ave bridge R/W from 11/12 to 12/13; * Delay \$2.685 million construction of Burchell Ave. bridge from 12/13 to 13/14.
					County Funds	200,000	200,000		Local Funds	\$0						
					State LSSRP Bond	0	0		Proposition 1B	\$0						
				CON	HBP	133,000	3,085,000	13/14	HBP	\$2,952,000		HBP	\$2,952,000		51%	* Delay \$150,000 construction of McCabe Road bridge from 13/14 to outer yr. 14/15; * Delay \$2.685 million construction of Burchell Ave. bridge from 12/13 to 13/14; * Program \$100,000 for R/W in 13/14 for each of the four new Merced County bridge projects.
					County Funds	0	0		Local Funds	\$0						
					State LSSRP Bond	17,000	0		Proposition 1B	(\$17,000)						
				% Change	HBP Program	5,432,000	8,229,000			\$2,797,000	51%	> 51% change triggers Formal Amendment				

Sum of Net Increases/Decreases by Fiscal Year

	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14
--	-------	-------	-------	-------

Totals

Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	\$0	\$2,497,000	(\$2,635,000)	\$2,952,000
Local Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Proposition 1B	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$17,000)
Total	\$0	\$2,497,000	(\$2,635,000)	\$2,935,000

\$2,814,000
\$0
(\$17,000)
\$2,797,000

**Merced County Association of Governments - Federal Transportation Improvement Program
(Dollars in Whole)
Local Highway System**

DIST: PPNO: EA: CTIPS ID: 10 CT PROJECT ID:	205-0000-0037 MPO ID: CT004	TITLE (DESCRIPTION): Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehab/Recon (HBP) (Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehab/Recon (HBP)) Projects are consistent w- 40CFR Part 93.126 Exempt Table 2- Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes)	MPO Aprv: 04/07/2011 State Aprv: 04/11/2011 Federal Aprv:
COUNTY: Merced County	ROUTE: VAR	PRIOR	EPA TABLE II or III EXEMPT CATEGORY: Non capacity widening or bridge reconstruction.

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Various Agencies

PROJECT MANAGER: JESUS SERRANO

PHONE: (209) 948-7398

EMAIL:

PROJECT VERSION HISTORY (Printed Version is Shaded)

Version	Status	Official Date	Updated By	Change Reason	Amend No.	Prog Con	(Dollars in whole) Prog RW	PE
15	Official	04/07/2011	TPHIMMAS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	6	12,960,000		
14	Official	12/16/2010	TPHIMMAS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	2	12,960,000		
13	Official	07/15/2010	TPHIMMAS	Adoption - Carry Over		9,186,000		
12	Official	04/29/2010	TPHIMMAS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	18	9,186,000		
11	Official	11/25/2009	TPHIMMAS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	13	9,187,000		
10	Official	02/26/2009	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	3	8,297,000		101,000
9	Official	11/17/2008	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over		2,192,000		3,580,000
8	Official	06/29/2007	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	2	2,192,000		3,557,000
7	Official	07/20/2006	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over		4,549,000		

		PRIOR	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	BEYOND	TOTAL
• Local HBRR - Local FHWA - HBRR	PE									
• Fund Source 1 of 3	RW									
• Fund Type: Highway Bridge Program	CON		765,000	50,000	4,230,000	133,000			6,828,000	12,006,000
• Funding Agency: Merced County	TOTAL		765,000	50,000	4,230,000	133,000			6,828,000	12,006,000
• Local Funds -	PE									
• Fund Source 2 of 3	RW									
• Fund Type: County Funds	CON		37,000		200,000				648,000	885,000
• Funding Agency: Merced County	TOTAL		37,000		200,000				648,000	885,000
• Local HBRR -	PE									
• Fund Source 3 of 3	RW									
• Fund Type: Bridge-Local Seismic	CON					17,000			52,000	69,000
• Funding Agency: Merced County	TOTAL					17,000			52,000	69,000
Project Total	PE									
	RW									
	CON		802,000	50,000	4,430,000	150,000			7,528,000	12,960,000
	TOTAL		802,000	50,000	4,430,000	150,000			7,528,000	12,960,000

Comments:

- ***** Version 15 - 04/06/2011 *****Amend 6 to make programming changes to reflect 03/28/2011 CT HQ HBP listing. Moving out construction of DWR's Butts Road Bridge project from FFY 13/14 to Beyond Year.
- ***** Version 14 - 11/22/2010 *****Amend 2 to make programming changes to reflect 11/10/2010 CT HQ HBP listing.
- ***** Version 13 - 04/29/2010 *****
- ***** Version 12 - 04/23/2010 *****Admin Amend 18 to make programming changes to reflect 04/06/2010 CT HQ HBP listing.
- ***** Version 11 - 04/06/2010 *****Programming changes to reflect 10/30/09 Caltrans HQ HBP listing. Original CTIPS Amend 13 inadvertently deleted while trying to make official. This CTIPS entry inputted based on original CTIPS page of Amend 13 (State approved 11/25/09).
- ***** Version 10 - 01/16/2009 ***** Programming figures consistent with 12/27/07 Caltrans HQ HBP listing
- ***** Version 9 - 01/14/2009 ***** Carrying over 2006 into 2008 for 2009 Interim FTIP.
- ***** Version 8 - 02/28/2007 ***** Prop 1B (LSSRP Bond monies) changes per Statewide Coordinator.
- 5/16/06 - carryover project into 2006 ***** Version 7 - 03/08/2006 *****The Statewide HBP Coordinator has directed MCAG to add HBP Lump Sum funding of \$799,000 in FY05/06 and \$6 in FY06/07for the Merced County - Livingston Canal/Almond Ave. bridge replacement project.
- ***** Version 6 - 04/27/2005 *****
- April 05 HBRRP amendment requested by Caltrans
- ***** Version 5 - 03/28/2005 *****Caltrans requested technical correction to Lump Sum vs. Line item
- ***** Version 4 - 12/21/2004 *****Caltrans requesting HBRR modification as required by FHWA conditional approval to the 2004 FTIP
- ***** Version 3 - 08/26/2004 *****
- ***** Version 2 - 02/11/2002 *****

2008/9 - 2013/14 Highway Bridge Program (HBP)

(http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hbrr99/HBP_MPO.html#Merced)

03/28/2011, 10:18 AM

District 10: Merced County

Bridge #	Project #	Location/Description	Source	Prior	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	Beyond	Total	
39C0250 DWR Proj.ID: 2284	5939(025)	McCabe Road, Over CA Aqueduct, 2.6 mi. West of I-5. LSSRP Seismic Retrofit.	Federal			\$ 159,354				\$ 132,795		\$ 292,149	
			Local			\$ 20,646						\$ 20,646	
			State								\$ 17,205		\$ 17,205
			Total			\$ 180,000					\$ 150,000		\$ 330,000
39C0252 DWR Proj.ID: 2285	5939(025) 6248(013)	Butts Road, Over CA Aqueduct, 0.4 mi. West of I-5. LSSRP Seismic Retrofit.	Federal			\$ 132,795					\$ 221,325	\$ 354,120	
			Local			\$ 17,205						\$ 17,205	
			State								\$ 28,675		\$ 28,675
			Total			\$ 150,000					\$ 250,000		\$ 400,000
39C0314 DWR Proj.ID: 2286	5939(025) 6248(030)	Mervel Ave, Over CA Aqueduct, 0.1 mi. West of Ortigalita Rd. LSSRP Seismic Retrofit.	Federal			\$ 194,766					\$ 177,060	\$ 371,826	
			Local			\$ 25,234						\$ 25,234	
			State								\$ 22,940		\$ 22,940
			Total			\$ 220,000					\$ 200,000		\$ 420,000
39C0023 Merced Co Proj.ID: 3358	5939(070)	La Grange Rd, Over Dry Creek, 4 mi. North of Merced Falls Rd. Replace 2-Lane Bridge with New 2-Lane Bridge.	Federal			\$ 442,650			\$ 929,565		\$ 2,655,900	\$ 4,028,115	
			Local			\$ 57,350			\$ 120,435		\$ 344,100	\$ 521,885	
			State										\$ -
			Total			\$ 500,000			\$ 1,050,000		\$ 3,000,000		\$ 4,550,000
39C0095 Merced Co Proj.ID: 469	5939(019)	Dickenson Ferry Rd, Over Bear Creek, Quinley Ave North. Replace (HBRR).	Federal	\$ 132,795			\$ 285,509		\$ 615,284		\$ 2,342,504	\$ 3,376,092	
			Local	\$ 17,205			\$ 36,991		\$ 79,717		\$ 303,496	\$ 437,408	
			State										\$ -
			Total	\$ 150,000			\$ 322,500		\$ 695,000		\$ 2,646,000		\$ 3,813,500
39C0290 Merced Co Proj.ID: 3659	NEW	Burchell Ave, Over Duck Slough, 0.6 mi. N/O Mariposa Way. Replace 2-Lane Bridge with New 2-Lane Bridge. Toll Credits Prgmmd. For PE, RW, & CON.	Federal			\$ 479,500	\$ 50,000	\$ 2,685,200				\$ 3,214,700	
			Local									\$ -	
			State										\$ -
			Total			\$ 479,500	\$ 50,000	\$ 2,685,200					\$ 3,214,700
39C0339 Merced Co Proj.ID: 1541	5939(048)	Canal School Rd, Over Newman Wasteway, 0.3 mi. North of Preston Rd. Replace 2-Lane Bridge with New 2-Lane Bridge. Toll Credits Prgmmd. For CON.	Federal	\$ 97,383		\$ 140,800					\$ 1,431,530	\$ 1,669,713	
			Local	\$ 12,617		\$ 35,200						\$ 47,817	
			State										\$ -
			Total	\$ 110,000		\$ 176,000						\$ 1,431,530	\$ 1,717,530

	PE
	RW
	PE & RW
	CON

Federal	\$ 230,178	\$ -	\$ 1,070,365	\$ 765,009	\$ 50,000	\$ 4,230,049	\$ 132,795	\$ 6,828,319	\$ 13,306,715
Local	\$ 29,822	\$ -	\$ 155,635	\$ 36,991	\$ -	\$ 200,152	\$ -	\$ 647,596	\$ 1,070,195
State	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,205	\$ 51,615	\$ 68,820
Total	\$ 260,000	\$ -	\$ 1,226,000	\$ 802,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 4,430,201	\$ 150,000	\$ 7,527,530	\$ 14,445,730

PRIOR 03/28/2011 HBP BACKUP LISTING
(from 2011 FTIP Formal Amend. #6)

**Merced County Association of Governments - Federal Transportation Improvement Program
(Dollars in Whole)
Local Highway System**

DIST: PPNO: EA: CTIPS ID: 10 CT PROJECT ID:	205-0000-0037 MPO ID: CT004	TITLE (DESCRIPTION): Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehab/Recon (HBP) (Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehab/Recon (HBP)) Projects are consistent w- 40CFR Part 93.126 Exempt Table 2- Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes)	MPO Aprv: State Aprv: Federal Aprv:
COUNTY: ROUTE: PM: Merced County VAR		CURRENT	EPA TABLE II or III EXEMPT CATEGORY: Non capacity widening or bridge reconstruction.

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Various Agencies

PROJECT MANAGER: JESUS SERRANO

PHONE: (209) 948-7398

EMAIL:

PROJECT VERSION HISTORY (Printed Version is Shaded)

Version	Status	Official Date	Updated By	Change Reason	Amend No.	Prog Con	(Dollars in whole) Prog RW	PE
16	Active	11/02/2011	TPHIMMAS	Amendment - Other (Explain ==>)	13	20,725,000		
15	Official	04/07/2011	TPHIMMAS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	6	12,960,000		
14	Official	12/16/2010	TPHIMMAS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	2	12,960,000		
13	Official	07/15/2010	TPHIMMAS	Adoption - Carry Over		9,186,000		
12	Official	04/29/2010	TPHIMMAS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	18	9,186,000		
11	Official	11/25/2009	TPHIMMAS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	13	9,187,000		
10	Official	02/26/2009	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	3	8,297,000		101,000
9	Official	11/17/2008	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over		2,192,000		3,580,000
8	Official	06/29/2007	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	2	2,192,000		3,557,000

	PRIOR	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	BEYOND	TOTAL
• Local HBRR - Local FHWA - HBRR	PE								
• Fund Source 1 of 3	RW								
• Fund Type: Highway Bridge Program	CON	765,000	2,547,000	1,595,000	3,085,000	6,675,000	5,104,000		19,771,000
• Funding Agency: Merced County	TOTAL	765,000	2,547,000	1,595,000	3,085,000	6,675,000	5,104,000		19,771,000
• Local Funds -	PE								
• Fund Source 2 of 3	RW								
• Fund Type: County Funds	CON	37,000		200,000		304,000	344,000		885,000
• Funding Agency: Merced County	TOTAL	37,000		200,000		304,000	344,000		885,000
• Local HBRR -	PE								
• Fund Source 3 of 3	RW								
• Fund Type: Bridge-Local Seismic	CON					69,000			69,000
• Funding Agency: Merced County	TOTAL					69,000			69,000
Project Total	PRIOR								
	PE								
	RW								
	CON	802,000	2,547,000	1,795,000	3,085,000	7,048,000	5,448,000		20,725,000
	TOTAL	802,000	2,547,000	1,795,000	3,085,000	7,048,000	5,448,000		20,725,000

Comments:

***** Version 16 - 11/02/2011 ***** Amend 13 to make programming changes to reflect 11/10/2010 CT HQ HBP listing. These changes include adding 4 Merced County bridges to the HBP. Toll Credits are used for some listed

HBP projects.

***** Version 15 - 04/06/2011 ***** Amend 6 to make programming changes to reflect 03/28/2011 CT HQ HBP listing. Moving out construction of DWR's Butts Road Bridge project from FFY 13/14 to Beyond Year.

***** Version 14 - 11/22/2010 ***** Amend 2 to make programming changes to reflect 11/10/2010 CT HQ HBP listing.

***** Version 13 - 04/29/2010 *****

***** Version 12 - 04/23/2010 ***** Admin Amend 18 to make programming changes to reflect 04/06/2010 CT HQ HBP listing.

***** Version 11 - 04/06/2010 ***** Programming changes to reflect 10/30/09 Caltrans HQ HBP listing. Original CTIPS Amend 13 inadvertently deleted while trying to make official. This CTIPS entry inputted based on original CTIPS page of Amend 13 (State approved 11/25/09).

***** Version 10 - 01/16/2009 ***** Programming figures consistent with 12/27/07 Caltrans HQ HBP listing

***** Version 9 - 01/14/2009 ***** Carrying over 2006 into 2008 for 2009 Interim FTIP.

***** Version 8 - 02/28/2007 ***** Prop 1B (LSSRP Bond monies) changes per Statewide Coordinator.

5/16/06 - carryover project into 2006

***** Version 7 - 03/08/2006 ***** The Statewide HBP Coordinator has directed MCAG to add HBP Lump Sum funding of \$799,000 in FY05/06 and \$6 in FY06/07 for the Merced County - Livingston Canal/Almond Ave. bridge replacement project.

***** Version 6 - 04/27/2005 *****

April 05 HBRRP amendment requested by Caltrans

***** Version 5 - 03/28/2005 ***** Caltrans requested technical correction to Lump Sum vs. Line item

***** Version 4 - 12/21/2004 ***** Caltrans requesting HBRR modification as required by FHWA conditional approval to the 2004 FTIP

***** Version 3 - 08/26/2004 *****

***** Version 2 - 02/11/2002 *****

2010/11 - 2013/16 Highway Bridge Program (HBP)

(http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hbrr99/HBP_MPO.html#Merced)

10/20/2011, 4:14 PM

District 10: Merced County

Bridge #	Project #	Location/Description	Source	Prior	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	Beyond	Total	
39C0250 DWR Proj.ID: 2284	5939(025)	McCabe Road, Over CA Aqueduct, 2.6 mi. West of I-5. LSSRP Seismic Retrofit.	Federal	\$ 159,354					\$ 132,795			\$ 292,149	
			Local	\$ 20,646								\$ 20,646	
			State							\$ 17,205			\$ 17,205
			Total	\$ 180,000						\$ 150,000			\$ 330,000
39C0252 DWR Proj.ID: 2285	5939(025) 6248(013)	Butts Road, Over CA Aqueduct, 0.4 mi. West of I-5. LSSRP Seismic Retrofit.	Federal	\$ 132,795					\$ 221,325			\$ 354,120	
			Local	\$ 17,205								\$ 17,205	
			State							\$ 28,675			\$ 28,675
			Total	\$ 150,000						\$ 250,000			\$ 400,000
39C0314 DWR Proj.ID: 2286	5939(025) 6248(030)	Mervel Ave, Over CA Aqueduct, 0.1 mi. West of Ortigalita Rd. LSSRP Seismic Retrofit.	Federal	\$ 194,766					\$ 177,060			\$ 371,826	
			Local	\$ 25,234								\$ 25,234	
			State							\$ 22,940			\$ 22,940
			Total	\$ 220,000						\$ 200,000			\$ 420,000
39C0023 Merced Co Proj.ID: 3358	5939(070)	La Grange Rd, Over Dry Creek, 4 mi. North of Merced Falls Rd. Replace 2-Lane Bridge with New 2-Lane Bridge.	Federal	\$ 442,650			\$ 929,565			\$ 2,655,900		\$ 4,028,115	
			Local	\$ 57,350			\$ 120,435			\$ 344,100		\$ 521,885	
			State										\$ -
			Total	\$ 500,000			\$ 1,050,000			\$ 3,000,000			\$ 4,550,000
39C0095 Merced Co Proj.ID: 469	5939(019)	Dickenson Ferry Rd, Over Bear Creek, Quinley Ave North. Replace (HBRR).	Federal	\$ 132,795	\$ 285,509		\$ 615,284		\$ 2,342,504			\$ 3,376,092	
			Local	\$ 17,205	\$ 36,991		\$ 79,717		\$ 303,496			\$ 437,408	
			State										\$ -
			Total	\$ 150,000	\$ 322,500		\$ 695,000		\$ 2,646,000				\$ 3,813,500
39C0290 Merced Co Proj.ID: 3659	5939(077)	Burchell Ave, Over Duck Slough, 0.6 mi. N/O Mariposa Way. Replace 2-Lane Bridge with New 2-Lane Bridge. Toll Credits Prgmmd. For PE, RW, & CON.	Federal		\$ 479,500		\$ 50,000	\$ 2,685,200				\$ 3,214,700	
			Local									\$ -	
			State									\$ -	
			Total		\$ 479,500		\$ 50,000	\$ 2,685,200					\$ 3,214,700
39C0339 Merced Co Proj.ID: 1541	5939(048)	Canal School Rd, Over Newman Wasteway, 0.3 mi. North of Preston Rd. Replace 2-Lane Bridge with New 2-Lane Bridge. Toll Credits Prgmmd. For CON.	Federal	\$ 220,800		\$ 1,431,530						\$ 1,652,330	
			Local	\$ 55,200								\$ 55,200	
			State										\$ -
			Total	\$ 276,000		\$ 1,431,530							\$ 1,707,530
39C0217 Merced Co Proj.ID: 3847	5939(0##) NEW	Jorgensen Rd, Over Outside Canal. Replace 2-Lane Bridge with New 2-Lane Bridge. Toll Credits Prgmmed. For PE, RW, & CON.	Federal			\$ 216,650		\$ 100,000		\$ 1,213,250		\$ 1,529,900	
			Local									\$ -	
			State										\$ -
			Total			\$ 216,650		\$ 100,000		\$ 1,213,250			\$ 1,529,900
39C0110 Merced Co Proj.ID: 3845	5939(0##) NEW	Santa Fe Ave, Over Deadman Creek. Replace 2-Lane Bridge with New 2-Lane Bridge. Toll Credits Prgmmed. For PE, RW, & CON.	Federal			\$ 271,750		\$ 100,000	\$ 1,521,800			\$ 1,893,550	
			Local									\$ -	
			State										\$ -
			Total			\$ 271,750		\$ 100,000	\$ 1,521,800				\$ 1,893,550
39C0225 Merced Co Proj.ID: 3848	5939(0##) NEW	Los Cerritos Rd, Over Dry Creek. Replace 2-Lane Bridge with New 2-Lane Bridge. Toll Credits Prgmmed. For PE, RW, & CON.	Federal			\$ 407,000		\$ 100,000	\$ 2,279,200			\$ 2,786,200	
			Local									\$ -	
			State										\$ -
			Total			\$ 407,000		\$ 100,000	\$ 2,279,200				\$ 2,786,200
39C0230 Merced Co Proj.ID: 3849	5939(0##) NEW	Baxter Rd, Over Deadman Creek. Replace 2-Lane Bridge with New 2-Lane Bridge. Toll Credits Prgmmed. For PE, RW, & CON.	Federal			\$ 220,500		\$ 100,000		\$ 1,234,800		\$ 1,555,300	
			Local									\$ -	
			State										\$ -
			Total			\$ 220,500		\$ 100,000		\$ 1,234,800			\$ 1,555,300

PE
RW
PE & RW
CON

Federal	\$ 1,283,160	\$ 765,009	\$ 2,547,430	\$ 1,594,849	\$ 3,085,200	\$ 6,674,684	\$ 5,103,950	\$ -	\$ 21,054,282
Local	\$ 192,840	\$ 36,991	\$ -	\$ 200,152	\$ -	\$ 303,496	\$ 344,100	\$ -	\$ 1,077,578
State	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 68,820	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 68,820
Total	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 802,000	\$ 2,547,430	\$ 1,795,001	\$ 3,085,200	\$ 7,047,000	\$ 5,448,050	\$ -	\$ 22,200,680

CURRENT 10/20/2011 HBP BACKUP LISTING

ATTACHMENT 2
UPDATED FINANCIAL PLAN

TABLE 1: REVENUE

MPO's Name
2010/11-2013/14 Federal Transportation Improvement Program
 (\$'s in 1,000)

Funding Source	NOTES	4 YEARS (FSTIP Cycle)								CURRENT TOTAL
		2010/11		2011/12		2012/13		2013/14		
		Amendment		Amendment		Amendment		Amendment		
		Prior 12	Current 13	Prior 12	Current 13	Prior 12	Current 13	Prior 12	Current 13	
LOCAL	Sales Tax									
	- City									
	- County									
	Gas Tax	\$6,800	\$6,800	\$6,800	\$6,800	\$6,800	\$6,800	\$6,800	\$6,800	\$27,200
	- Gas Tax (Subventions to Cities)	\$2,600	\$2,600	\$2,600	\$2,600	\$2,600	\$2,600	\$2,600	\$2,600	\$10,400
	- Gas Tax (Subventions to Counties)	\$4,200	\$4,200	\$4,200	\$4,200	\$4,200	\$4,200	\$4,200	\$4,200	\$16,800
	Other Local Funds	\$2,405	\$2,405	\$2,783	\$2,783	\$2,538	\$2,538	\$2,538	\$2,538	\$10,264
	- County General Funds									
	- City General Funds									
	- Street Taxes and Developer Fees									
	- RSTP Exchange funds	\$2,405	\$2,405	\$2,783	\$2,783	\$2,538	\$2,538	\$2,538	\$2,538	\$10,264
	Transit	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$5,380
- Transit Fares	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$1,345	\$5,380	
Tolls (e.g. non-state owned bridges)										
Other (See Appendix 1)	\$7,959	\$7,959	\$8,392	\$8,392	\$8,494	\$8,494	\$8,494	\$8,494	\$33,339	
Local Total	\$18,509	\$18,509	\$19,320	\$19,320	\$19,177	\$19,177	\$19,177	\$19,177	\$76,183	
REGIONAL	Tolls									
	- Bridge									
	- Corridor									
	Regional Transit Fares/Measures									
	Regional Sales Tax									
	Regional Bond Revenue									
	Regional Gas Tax									
Vehicle Registration Fees (CARB Fees, SAFE)										
Other (See Appendix 2)	\$5,884	\$5,884	\$500	\$500					\$6,384	
Regional Total	\$5,884	\$5,884	\$500	\$500					\$6,384	
STATE	State Highway Operations and Protection Program	\$86,345	\$86,345	\$6,478	\$6,478			\$12,285	\$12,285	\$105,108
	SHOPP (Including Augmentation)	\$86,345	\$86,345	\$6,478	\$6,478			\$12,285	\$12,285	\$105,108
	SHOPP Prior									
	State Minor Program									
	State Transportation Improvement Program	\$1,617	\$1,617	\$11,984	\$11,984	\$1,424	\$1,424			\$15,025
	STIP (Including Augmentation)	\$1,617	\$1,617	\$11,984	\$11,984	\$1,424	\$1,424			\$15,025
	- Transportation Enhancement									
	STIP Prior									
	- Transportation Enhancement									
	Proposition 1 A									
	Proposition 1 B	\$103,827	\$103,827					\$17		\$103,827
	GARVEE Bonds (Includes Debt Service Payments)									
	Highway Maintenance (HM)	\$2,522	\$2,522							\$2,522
Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)										
State Transit Assistance (STA)(e.g. population/revenue based, Prop 42)	\$1,400	\$1,400	\$1,225	\$1,225	\$1,225	\$1,225	\$1,225	\$1,225	\$5,075	
Safe Routes to School (SR2S)										
State Emergency Repair Program										
Other (See Appendix 3)										
State Total	\$195,711	\$195,711	\$19,687	\$19,687	\$2,649	\$2,649	\$13,527	\$13,510	\$231,557	
FEDERAL TRANSIT	5307 - Urbanized Area Formula Program	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$8,272
	5308 - Clean Fuel Formula Program									
	5309a - Fixed Guideway Modernization									
	5309b - New and Small Starts (Capital Investment Grants)									
	5309c - Bus and Bus Related Grants									
	5310 - Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program									
	5311 - Nonurbanized Area Formula Program	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$1,660
	5311c - Public Transportation on Indian Reservation									
	5311 - Intercity Bus	\$573	\$573	\$300	\$300	\$225	\$225			\$1,098
	5316 - Job Access and Reverse Commute Program									
	5317 - New Freedom									
	5320 - Transit in the Parks									
FTA Transfer from Prior FTIP										
Other (See Appendix 4)										
Federal Transit Total	\$3,056	\$3,056	\$2,783	\$2,783	\$2,708	\$2,708	\$2,483	\$2,483	\$11,030	
FEDERAL HIGHWAY	Bridge Discretionary Program									
	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$2,585	\$2,585	\$2,632	\$2,632	\$2,679	\$2,679	\$2,727	\$2,727	\$10,623
	Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1303)									
	Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302)									
	Federal Lands Highway									
	Ferry Boat Discretionary									
	High Priority Projects (HPP) and Demo	\$490	\$490							\$490
	High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)	\$73	\$73					\$517	\$517	\$589
	Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	\$765	\$765	\$50	\$2,547	\$4,230	\$1,595	\$133	\$1,085	\$7,992
	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)									
	National Scenic Byways Program									
	Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301)									
	Public Lands Highway									
	Railway (Section 130)									
	Recreational Trails									
Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)	\$29	\$29	\$233	\$233	\$981	\$981			\$1,243	
Surface Transportation Program (Regional)										
Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program										
Transportation Improvements (TI)										
Other (see Appendix 5)										
Federal Highway Total	\$3,941	\$3,941	\$2,915	\$5,412	\$7,890	\$5,255	\$3,377	\$6,329	\$20,937	
FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009									
	Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (PRIIA)									
	Other (see Appendix 6)									
Federal Railroad Administration Total										
Federal Total	\$6,997	\$6,997	\$5,695	\$8,195	\$10,598	\$7,963	\$5,860	\$8,812	\$31,967	
INNOVATIVE FINANCE	TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)									
	State Infrastructure Bank									
	Section 129 Loans									
	Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing									
	Railroad Innovative Finance									
	Private Activity Bonds									
	Private Concession Fees									
	Private Donations									
Program Income (from a federal project)										
Other (See Appendix 7)										
Innovative Financing Total										
REVENUE TOTAL		\$227,101	\$227,101	\$45,205	\$47,702	\$32,424	\$29,789	\$38,564	\$41,499	\$346,091

MPO Financial Summary Notes:

TABLE 2: PROGRAMMED

MPO's Name
2010/11-2013/14 Federal Transportation Improvement Program
 (\$'s in 1,000)

Funding Source		NOTES	4 YEARS (FSTIP Cycle)								CURRENT TOTAL
			2010/11		2011/12		2012/13		2013/14		
			Amendment		Amendment		Amendment		Amendment		
			Prior 12	Current 13	Prior 12	Current 13	Prior 12	Current 13	Prior 12	Current 13	
LOCAL	Local Total		\$3,429	\$3,429	\$2,916	\$2,916	\$2,811	\$2,811	\$2,668	\$2,668	\$11,824
	Tolls										
REGIONAL	-- Bridge										
	-- Corridor										
	Regional Transit Fares/Measures										
	Regional Sales Tax										
	Regional Bond Revenue										
	Regional Gas Tax										
	Vehicle Registration Fees (CARB Fees, SAFE)										
Other (See Appendix A)		\$5,884	\$5,884	\$500	\$500					\$6,384	
	Regional Total		\$5,884	\$5,884	\$500	\$500					\$6,384
STATE	Slate Highway Operations and Protection Program		\$86,345	\$86,345	\$6,478	\$6,478			\$12,285	\$12,285	\$105,108
	SHOPP (Including Augmentation)		\$86,345	\$86,345	\$6,478	\$6,478			\$12,285	\$12,285	\$105,108
	SHOPP Prior										
	State Minor Program										
	Slate Transportation Improvement Program		\$1,617	\$1,617	\$11,984	\$11,984	\$1,424	\$1,424			\$15,025
	STIP (Including Augmentation)		\$1,617	\$1,617	\$11,984	\$11,984	\$1,424	\$1,424			\$15,025
	Transportation Enhancement										
	STIP Prior										
	Transportation Enhancement										
	Proposition 1 A										
	Proposition 1 B		\$103,827	\$103,827					\$17		\$103,827
	GARVEE Bonds (Includes Debt Service Payments)										
	Highway Maintenance (HM)		\$2,522	\$2,522							\$2,522
Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)											
State Transit Assistance (STA)(e.g., population/revenue based, Prop 42)		\$1,400	\$1,400	\$1,225	\$1,225	\$1,225	\$1,225	\$1,225	\$1,225	\$5,075	
Safe Routes to School (SR2S)											
State Emergency Repair Program											
Other (See Appendix B)											
	State Total		\$195,711	\$195,711	\$19,687	\$19,687	\$2,649	\$2,649	\$13,527	\$13,510	\$231,557
FEDERAL TRANSIT	5307 - Urbanized Area Formula Program		\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$2,068	\$8,272
	5308 - Clean Fuel Formula Program										
	5309a - Fixed Guideway Modernization										
	5309b - New and Small Starts (Capital Investment Grants)										
	5309c - Bus and Bus Related Grants										
	5310 - Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program										
	5311 - Nonurbanized Area Formula Program		\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$1,660
	5311c - Public Transportation on Indian Reservation										
	5311f - Intercity Bus		\$573	\$573	\$300	\$300	\$225	\$225			\$1,098
	5316 - Job Access and Reverse Commute Program										
	5317 - New Freedom										
	5320 - Transit in the Parks										
	FTA Transfer from Prior FTIP										
	Other (See Appendix C)										
	Federal Transit Total		\$3,056	\$3,056	\$2,783	\$2,783	\$2,708	\$2,708	\$2,483	\$2,483	\$11,030
FEDERAL HIGHWAY	Bridge Discretionary Program										
	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)		\$2,583	\$2,583	\$2,419	\$2,419	\$75	\$75	\$75	\$75	\$5,152
	Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec.1303)										
	Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302)										
	Federal Lands Highway										
	Ferry Boat Discretionary										
	High Priority Projects (HPP) and Demo		\$490	\$490							\$490
	High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)		\$72	\$72					\$517	\$517	\$589
	Highway Bridge Program (HBP)		\$765	\$765	\$50	\$2,547	\$4,230	\$1,595	\$133	\$3,085	\$7,992
	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)										
	National Scenic Byways Program										
	Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301)										
	Public Lands Highway										
	Railway (Section 130)										
	Recreational Trails										
Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)		\$29	\$29	\$233	\$233	\$981	\$981			\$1,243	
Surface Transportation Program (Regional)											
Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program											
Transportation Improvements (TI)											
Other (see Appendix D)											
	Federal Highway Total		\$3,939	\$3,939	\$2,702	\$5,199	\$5,286	\$2,651	\$725	\$3,677	\$15,466
FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)										
	Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (PRIIA)										
	Other (see Appendix E)										
	Federal Railroad Administration Total										
	Federal Total		\$6,995	\$6,995	\$5,485	\$7,982	\$7,994	\$5,359	\$3,208	\$6,160	\$26,496
INNOVATIVE FINANCE	TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)										
	State Infrastructure Bank										
	Section 129 Loans										
	Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing										
	Railroad Innovative Finance										
	Private Activity Bonds										
	Private Concession Fees										
	Private Donations										
	Program Income (from a federal project)										
Other (See Appendix F)											
	Innovative Financing Total										
PROGRAMMED TOTAL			\$212,019	\$212,019	\$28,588	\$31,085	\$13,454	\$10,819	\$19,403	\$22,338	\$276,261

MPO Financial Summary Notes:

TABLE 3: REVENUE-PROGRAMMED

MPO's Name
 2010/11-2013/14 Federal Transportation Improvement Program

(\$'s in 1,000)

Funding Source		4 YEARS (FSTIP Cycle)								CURRENT TOTAL
		2010/11		2011/12		2012/13		2013/14		
		Amendment		Amendment		Amendment		Amendment		
		Prior 12	Current 13	Prior 12	Current 13	Prior 12	Current 13	Prior 12	Current 13	
LOCAL	Local Total	\$15,080	\$15,080	\$16,404	\$16,404	\$16,366	\$16,366	\$16,509	\$16,509	\$64,359
REGIONAL	Tolls									
	-- Bridge									
	-- Corridor									
	Regional Transit Fares/Measures									
	Regional Sales Tax									
	Regional Bond Revenue									
	Regional Gas Tax									
	Vehicle Registration Fees (CARB Fees, SAFE)									
	Other									
	Regional Total									
STATE	State Highway Operations and Protection Program									
	SHOPP (Including Augmentation)									
	SHOPP Prior									
	State Minor Program									
	State Transportation Improvement Program									
	STIP (Including Augmentation)									
	Transportation Enhancement									
	STIP Prior									
	Transportation Enhancement									
	Proposition 1 A									
	Proposition 1 B									
	GARVEE Bonds (Includes Debt Service Payments)									
	Highway Maintenance (HM)									
	Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)									
	State Transit Assistance (STA)(e.g., population/revenue based, Prop 42)									
	Safe Routes to School (SR2S)									
	State Emergency Repair Program									
	Other									
	State Total									
FEDERAL TRANSIT	5307 - Urbanized Area Formula Program									
	5308 - Clean Fuel Formula Program									
	5309a - Fixed Guideway Modernization									
	5309b - New and Small Starts (Capital Investment Grants)									
	5309c - Bus and Bus Related Grants									
	5310 - Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program									
	5311 - Nonurbanized Area Formula Program									
	5311c - Public Transportation on Indian Reservation									
	5311f - Intercity Bus									
	5316 - Job Access and Reverse Commute Program									
	5317 - New Freedom									
	5320 - Transit in the Parks									
	FTA Transfer from Prior FTIP									
	Other									
	Federal Transit Total									
FEDERAL HIGHWAY	Bridge Discretionary Program									
	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$2	\$2	\$213	\$213	\$2,604	\$2,604	\$2,652	\$2,652	\$5,471
	Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec.1303)									
	Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302)									
	Federal Lands Highway									
	Ferry Boat Discretionary									
	High Priority Projects (HPP) and Demo									
	High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)									
	Highway Bridge Program (HBP)									
	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)									
	National Scenic Byways Program									
	Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301)									
	Public Lands Highway									
	Railway (Section 130)									
	Recreational Trails									
	Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)									
	Surface Transportation Program (Regional)									
	Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program									
	Transportation Improvements (TI)									
	Other									
	Federal Highway Total	\$2	\$2	\$213	\$213	\$2,604	\$2,604	\$2,652	\$2,652	\$5,471
FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009									
	Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (PRIIA)									
	Other									
	Federal Railroad Administration Total									
	Federal Total	\$2	\$2	\$213	\$213	\$2,604	\$2,604	\$2,652	\$2,652	\$5,471
INNOVATIVE FINANCE	TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)									
	State Infrastructure Bank									
	Section 129 Loans									
	Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing									
	Railroad Innovative Finance									
	Private Activity Bonds									
	Private Concession Fees									
	Private Donations									
	Program Income (from a federal project)									
	Other									
	Innovative Financing Total									
REVENUE - PROGRAM TOTAL		\$15,082	\$15,082	\$16,617	\$16,617	\$18,970	\$18,970	\$19,161	\$19,161	\$69,830

ATTACHMENT 3

DRAFT ADOPTION RESOLUTION

**BEFORE THE
MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 2011/12-15-02**

In the Matter of:

RESOLUTION ADOPTING the Formal Amendment #13 to the Merced County Association of Governments 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP),

WHEREAS, the Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) is a Regional Transportation Planning Agency and a Metropolitan Planning Organization, pursuant to State and Federal designation; and

WHEREAS, federal planning regulations require Metropolitan Planning Organizations to prepare and adopt a long range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for their region; and

WHEREAS, federal planning regulations require that Metropolitan Planning Organizations prepare and adopt a Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) for their region; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #13 to the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) has been prepared to comply with Federal and State requirements for local projects and through a cooperative process between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), principal elected officials of general purpose local governments and their staffs, and public owner operators of mass transportation services acting through the Merced County Association of Governments forum and general public involvement; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #13 to the FTIP program listing is consistent with: 1) the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan; 2) the 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program; and 3) the Corresponding Conformity Analysis; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #13 to the 2011 FTIP contains the MPO's certification of the transportation planning process assuring that all federal requirements have been fulfilled; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #13 to the 2011 FTIP meets all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450; and

WHEREAS, projects submitted in Amendment #13 to the 2011 FTIP must be financially constrained and the financial plan affirms that funding is available; and

WHEREAS, projects submitted in Amendment #13 to the 2011 FTIP includes a new Conformity Analysis; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #13 to the 2011 FTIP does not interfere with the timely implementation of the Transportation Control Measures; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #13 to the 2011 FTIP and 2011 RTP conforms to the applicable SIPs; and

WHEREAS, the documents have been widely circulated and reviewed by MCAG advisory committees representing the technical and management staffs of the member agencies; representatives of

other governmental agencies, including State and Federal; representatives of special interest groups; representatives of the private business sector; and residents of Merced County consistent with public participation process adopted by MCAG; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that MCAG adopts Amendment #13 to the 2011 FTIP with the programming updates to the Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation/Reconstruction (Highway Bridge Program, HBP) to reflect the changes addressed in the current 10/20/2011 HBP Listing for Merced County.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was passed and adopted by MCAG this 15th day of December, 2011.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution of the Merced County Association of Governments duly adopted at a regular meeting thereof held on the 15th day of December, 2011.

Signed:

Signed:

Jesse Brown, Merced County Association
of Governments, Executive Director

Hubert Hub Walsh, Merced County Association
of Governments, Governing Board Chairman

ITEM 4c

MEMORANDUM

DATE: NOVEMBER 23, 2011

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: TERRI LEWIS, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

**RE: REVISED STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FY 2011/12
APPORTIONMENT ESTIMATE AND REVISED CLAIM FORM**

DISCUSSION

On March 17, 2011, the Transit Joint Powers Authority for Merced County's (TJPA) Board approved the State Transit Assistance (STA) claim form of \$1,161,825 for FY 11/12 STA estimate allocation.

On March 17, 2011, the Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) Governing Board approved the TJPA STA claim form and distribution of 100 percent of the FY 11/12 funds estimated at \$1,161,825 to TJPA for operation of public transit services as Merced County Transit – *The Bus*.

On August 1, 2011, the State Controllers Office issued a Revised FY 11/12 estimate allocation of STA funds at \$1,517,025.

TJPA's Board must submit a Revised STA FY 11/12 claim form to MCAG for 100% distribution of the STA funds at the higher figure of \$1,517,025.

MCAG's Governing Board must approve the TJPA Revised FY 11/12 STA claim form and approve 100% distribution of the Revised FY 11/12 STA estimated allocation of \$1,517,025 by formal resolution to the TJPA which operates public transit service as Merced County Transit – *The Bus*.

BACKGROUND

STA funds were created as a result of Assembly Bill 2251 / Senate Bill 1335, and are designated for mass transportation purposes only.

As the sole provider of public transit services for Merced County, Merced County Transit – *The Bus*, under the Transit Joint Powers Authority for Merced County, will receive 100% of the STA funds allocated by the State Controller's Office in FY 11/12.

RESOLUTION NO. 2011/12-15-01

**RESOLUTION OF THE MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
APPROVAL OF THE TRANSIT JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY FOR MERCED COUNTY
REVISED STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE (STA) CLAIM FORM FOR FY 11-12**

WHEREAS, the State Transit Assistance (STA) Fund program was created under Chapter 161 of the Statutes of 1979 (Senate Bill 620) and Chapters 321 and 322 of the Statutes of 1982 (Senate Bill 1335) and (Assembly Bill 2551); and

WHEREAS, said program, as a result of Assembly Bill 2551/Senate Bill 1335, allows for funds to be allocated from the State Transportation Planning and Development Account to Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) for transportation planning and mass transportation purposes, as specified by the Legislature; and

WHEREAS, the Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) is the RTPA for Merced County; and

WHEREAS, Transit Joint Powers Authority of Merced County is the only public transit services in Merced County operated by Merced County Transit – *The Bus* , therefore, the TIPA is claiming 100% of the **REVISED** FY2011-12 STA fund apportionment estimate of \$1,517,025 funds per California Administrative Code, Title 21, Subchapter 2.5, Article 4, Section 6730(a) or 6731(b); and

WHEREAS, On January 19, 2011, The State Controller’s Office (SCO) had issued an initial STA FY11-12 estimate allocation of \$1,161,825.

WHEREAS, On August 1, 2011, SCO issued a REVISED STA FY11-12 estimate allocation of \$1,517,025.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Transit Joint Powers Authority of Merced County, after consideration of information including, but not limited to, what is presented within said document, adopts the following findings:

1. The proposed expenditure plan of Merced County Transit - *The Bus* is in conformity with the current Regional Transportation Plan.
2. The level of passenger fares and charges is sufficient to enable each entity's transit system, funded with State Transit Assistance funds, to meet the fare revenue requirements of Public Utilities Code Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 4-Sections 99268.2, 99268.3, 99268.4, 99268.5 and 99268.9, as applicable to each entity.
3. The Transit Joint Powers Authority for Merced County which operates public transit service as Merced County Transit - *The Bus*, as a recipient of State Transit Assistance (STA) operating funding, is making full use of federal funds available under the Federal Transit Administration (formerly UTMA, 1964).
4. The service provided by each entity's transit system funded with State Transit Assistance Funds, meets the high priority public transportation needs of the region.

5. The Transit Joint Powers of Authority for Merced County will make a responsible effort to continue productivity improvements recommended pursuant to Public Utilities Code (PUC), Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 3, Section 99244.
6. The Transit Powers Authority for Merced County as the sole provider of public transit services for each jurisdiction is not precluded in any contract entered into on or after June 28, 1979, from employing part-time drivers from contracting with common carriers of persons operating under a franchise or license.

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Merced County Governing Board does hereby approve the Transit Joint Powers Authority for Merced County REVISED claim form for State Transit Assistance (STA) fund monies in the amount of \$1,517,025, pursuant to the California Administrative Code, Title 21, Chapter 3, Subchapter 2.5, Article 4, Section 6730(a) or 6731(b) for the Fiscal Year 2011-12.

BE IT THEREFORE FURTHER RESOLVED: that 100% of the State Controller's Office FY11-12 REVISED STA estimate allocation of \$1,517,025 be distributed to the Transit Joint Powers Authority for Merced County for the operation of public transit service provided by Merced County Transit – *The Bus* and shall be made in quarterly payments from the State Controller's Office (SCO) in FY11-12.

The above resolution was approved by the Merced County Association of Governments Governing Board on December 15, 2011 by _____, who moved its adoption, which motion was duly seconded by _____ and which was adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

 Jesse Brown, Executive Director
 Merced County Association of Governments

 Hub Walsh, Chairman
 Merced County Association of Governments
 Governing Board

Claimant: Transit Joint Powers Authority for Merced County

The above named claimant, qualified pursuant to PUC Section 99314.5, hereby requests in accordance with Chapter 1400, Statutes of 1971 as amended, and applicable rules and regulations, that an allocation be made in the amount of **\$1,517,025** (PUC 99313 and 99314) for Fiscal Year 2011-12, to be drawn from the State Transit Assistance trust fund established pursuant to PUC Section 99313.6.

It is understood by this claimant that payment of the claim is subject to approval by MCAAG, to such monies being on hand and available for distribution, and to the provision that such monies (and the interest earned on such monies subsequent to allocation) will be used only for those purposes for which the claim is approved and in accordance with the terms of the allocation instructions.

Type of Claim (check appropriate category)

1. Claims of Operators – Section 6730

Claims may be filed for allocations from the State Transit Assistance Fund by an operator for the following purposes:

The operating costs of the operator's public transportation system

The capital requirements of the operator's public transportation system

Subsidy of passenger rail services, either by bulk purchases of passenger tickets or by direct payment to a railroad corporation, pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99260.2(b) and 99260.5.

2. Claims of cities, counties or transit districts – Section 6731

Claims may be filed for allocations from the State Transit Assistance Fund by a city, county or transit district for the following purposes, if it is eligible for allocations from the Local Transportation Funds for such purposes:

Payments to Amtrak pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99400(b)

Payment to any entity which is under contract with the city, county or transit district, for transportation services or payment for the claimant's related administrative and planning cost, pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99260.7

Provide or contract for transportation services to elderly and handicapped, if the city, county or transit district is a member of a joint powers entity operating a public transportation system, pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99260.7

Community transit service purposes pursuant to Public Utilities Code 99275

Page 2 - STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND CLAIM FOR FY 2011-12

Reports Required of ALL claimants

1. Has claimant submitted its certified fiscal audit to MCAG and to the State Controller?
 Yes No
2. Has claimant submitted its annual report of operations to MCAG and the State Controller?
 Yes No
3. Has claimant submitted its performance audit to MCAG?
 Yes No

Findings Required of ALL claimants

1. Are the proposed expenditures in conformance with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)?
 Yes No Cite page or amendment number to RTP _____
2. Is the level of passenger fares and charges sufficient to meet the fare revenue requirements of the Public Utilities Code as they may be applicable to claimant?
 Yes No
3. Is the claimant making full use of federal funds available under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 as amended?
 Yes No
4. Does the sum of the allocations from the State Assistance Fund and from the Local Transportation Fund exceed the amount claimant is eligible to receive during the fiscal year?
 Yes No
5. Has priority consideration been given to claims to offset reductions in federal operating assistance and the unanticipated increase in the cost of fuel, to enhance existing public transportation services, and to meet high priority regional, countywide or areawide public transportation needs?
 Yes No

Findings Required Section 6730 (Operators) Only

1. Has claimant made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvements recommended pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99244? Make specific reference to improvements recommended, and efforts made to implement them.

Yes

2. For an allocation made for operating costs:
Operator is not precluded by any contract entered into on or after June 28, 1979, from employing part-time drivers or from contracting with common carriers of persons operating under a franchise or license.

Yes No

The Transit Joint Powers Authority of Merced County hereby certifies that the State Transit Assistance Claim for Fiscal Year 2011-12 in the amount of \$1,161,825 is reasonable and accurate to the best of my knowledge, and that the aforementioned information indicates the maximum eligibility of this claimant for funds for the fiscal year of application pursuant to the California Code of Regulations Sections 6634 and 6734.

Authorized Representative: 
Signature

Jesse Brown
Type Name

Executive Director -TJPA
Title


Signature

Christina Smith
Type Name

Administrative Services Manager – MCAG
Title

November 4, 2011
Date



JOHN CHIANG
California State Controller
Division of Accounting and Reporting



August 1, 2011

COUNTY AUDITORS RESPONSIBLE FOR STATE TRANSIT
ASSISTANCE FUNDS
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES
COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONS
SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM

Re: 2011-2012 State Transit Assistance Allocation Revised Estimate

Pursuant to section 99312.7 of the Public Utilities Code (PUC), the State Controller is required to provide a revised estimate of the amount of the State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to be allocated to each transportation planning entity for the purposes of sections 99313 and 99314 of the PUC.

The estimated amount of STA funds budgeted, according to the Department of Finance, for the 2011-12 fiscal year is \$416,254,131. We anticipate that the first quarter's allocation will be paid in October.

PUC section 99313 allocations are based on the latest available annual population estimates from the Department of Finance. PUC section 99314 allocations are based primarily on qualifying revenues from the Annual Report of Financial Transactions of Transit Operators and Non-Transit Claimants under the Transportation Development Act.

Enclosed are schedules indicating the estimated fund allocation for the fiscal year 2011-12 to each transportation planning entity. We are providing a detailed schedule of STA funds allocated under the PUC section 99314. Since the detail for PUC section 99313 allocations is not reported to the Controller's Office, the SCO is only able to provide eligible amounts for each county for PUC section 99313.

Any questions you have regarding the STA program should be directed to Mike Silvera of the Division of Accounting and Reporting at (916) 323-0704.

Sincerely,

KELLY MARTELL, Manager
Local Apportionments Section

Enclosure

MAILING ADDRESS P.O. Box 942850, Sacramento, CA 94250
STREET ADDRESS 3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816

STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION ESTIMATE
FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012 SUMMARY

<u>Regional Entity</u>	<u>PUC 99313 Allocations</u>	<u>PUC 99314 Allocations</u>	<u>2011-2012 Allocations</u>
TRPA	\$ 534,195	\$ 22,775	\$ 556,970
MTC	39,982,679	110,301,493	150,284,172
SACOG	9,978,316	4,806,777	14,785,093
Alpine	6,525	91	6,616
Amador	210,348	12,196	222,544
Butte	1,228,363	69,612	1,297,975
Calaveras	253,526	0	253,526
Colusa	119,808	7,316	127,124
Del Norte	158,653	9,364	168,017
El Dorado	860,650	80,494	941,144
Fresno	5,216,775	1,060,140	6,276,915
Glenn	156,872	0	156,872
Humboldt	750,502	88,196	838,698
Imperial	977,961	0	977,961
Inyo	103,390	0	103,390
Kern	4,698,898	378,788	5,077,686
Kings	850,940	36,145	887,085
Lake	359,452	16,090	375,542
Lassen	191,849	10,667	202,516
Los Angeles	54,702,224	67,771,385	122,473,609
Madera	843,083	0	843,083
Mariposa	101,320	895	102,215
Mendocino	489,358	47,266	536,624
Merced	1,431,414	85,611	1,517,025
Modoc	53,848	0	53,848
Mono	79,387	91,529	170,916
Monterey	2,325,016	404,509	2,729,525
Nevada	549,914	27,138	577,052
Orange	16,811,058	5,625,025	22,436,083
Placer	1,572,906	269,840	1,842,746
Plumas	111,108	0	111,108
Riverside	12,305,257	1,768,332	14,073,589
San Benito	308,600	0	308,600
San Bernardino	11,387,647	2,576,459	13,964,106
SANDAG	4,302,017	2,030,546	6,332,563
San Diego MTS	13,002,949	6,476,827	19,479,776
San Joaquin	3,833,427	782,378	4,615,805
San Luis Obispo	1,503,445	120,380	1,623,825
Santa Barbara	2,364,694	799,769	3,164,463
Santa Cruz	1,467,180	1,383,851	2,851,031
Shasta	987,205	61,337	1,048,542
Sierra	18,021	0	18,021
Siskiyou	250,147	12,345	262,492
Stanislaus	2,872,356	195,890	3,068,246
Tehama	354,824	0	354,824
Trinity	76,863	1,578	78,441
Tulare	2,479,258	217,159	2,696,417
Tuolumne	306,586	0	306,586
Ventura	4,596,252	476,872	5,073,124
State Totals	<u>\$ 208,127,066</u>	<u>\$ 208,127,065</u>	<u>\$ 416,254,131</u>

ITEM 5

MEMORANDUM

DATE: NOVEMBER 23, 2011

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: MATT FELL, SENIOR PLANNER

RE: CONGESTION MITIGATION AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION

BACKGROUND

As a non-attainment area, Merced County receives federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. The purpose of these funds is twofold – to relieve congestion and to improve air quality in the Merced region.

MCAG currently receives about \$2.5 to \$3 million a year in CMAQ funding. Prior to 2006, the funding was used for a variety of purposes including traffic flow improvements and transit projects. From 2006 to 2010, most of the funds were used for transit-related projects. Over the past year, two rounds of a call for projects resulted in the programming of several highly cost-effective diesel-retrofit projects, some street sweeper replacements, some fleet vehicle replacements, some bike lanes, and a roundabout. These projects are being delivered in a timely manner and we are succeeding in our goal of obligating all CMAQ funds made available to us. However we still have an unprogrammed balance and need to program more projects.

CURRENT BALANCE

Based on new estimates received from Caltrans in October 2011, the CMAQ balance is \$4,269,892, broken down by federal fiscal year as follows:

FFY 11/12	\$579,706
FFY 12/13	\$2,812,688
FFY 13/14	\$877,498
Total	\$4,269,892

Per policy, at least \$1,229,409 of this overall amount needs to go to highly cost-effective projects.

NEW POLICY AND CALL FOR PROJECTS

In October 2011 the Governing Board adopted new goals and procedures for programming CMAQ funds. These are attached. The priorities for programming CMAQ funds are as follows:

1. Transportation Control Measures, if necessary to achieve air quality conformity (*not applicable at this time*);
2. Obligating all CMAQ funding allocated;
3. Transit projects, if needed and as appropriate;
4. “Cost-Effective Projects”: At least 20% of total 4-year program to projects which cost \$30/lb. or less;
5. “Quality of Life Projects”: usable by the general public.

A call for projects was released on October 21, 2011 and applications were due November 21, 2011. Seventeen (17) applications were received. Six qualify for Cost-Effective projects, eight for Quality of Life, and three for neither.

The projects are summarized in the second attachment. Staff has reviewed the applications and the emission reduction calculations and has made some changes or calculations which are highlighted in grey. The Cost-Effective projects are sorted by cost-effectiveness. The other projects are sorted by agency.

PROJECT EVALUATION

As noted in the Goals and Procedures:

- Highly Cost-Effective projects will compete on the basis of cost-effectiveness, with deliverability being a potential screening factor.
- Quality of Life projects and programs will compete on the basis of all factors except cost-effectiveness. Deliverability is a potential screening factor for these as well.

At your meeting we will review the applications.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend CMAQ projects for programming.

Attachment: Goals and Procedures for Programming CMAQ Funds (October 2011)
Summary of CMAQ applications

Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) Goals and Procedures for Programming Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funds

October 2011

In order to maximize the public benefit of CMAQ funds while complying with federal regulations and air quality rules, MCAG has adopted the following goals for the use of these funds, in priority order:

Goal #1: Achieve air quality conformity. This includes funding transportation control measures as needed.

Goal #2: Obligate all CMAQ funding allocated, losing none.

Goal #3: Supplement transit service as needed and as appropriate.

Goal #4: Implement the San Joaquin Valley Cost-Effectiveness Policy threshold.

Goal #5: Priority for remaining funds will be for quality of life projects usable by the general public.

The following procedures shall be used to monitor and adjust the implementation of programmed projects, primarily in order to meet Goal #2:

1. Staff will review and report project status at least once a year, or more frequently, as long as unobligated CMAQ balances exist in the current federal fiscal year.
2. Projects in jeopardy of failing to meet obligation deadlines may be postponed to the next fiscal year, and other projects that can be delivered quickly may be advanced, as necessary. These adjustments may be made at any time.
3. A CMAQ Subcommittee of the Technical Planning Committee (TPC) may be convened as necessary to review project implementation and make recommendations for programming adjustments. Since the Subcommittee consists of the entirety of the TPC, these discussions may also occur in due course of regular committee meetings, i.e. separate meetings may or may not be necessary.

The following guidelines shall be used to select and program CMAQ funding to projects, in order to meet Goals as noted:

4. Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) and/or other air quality projects may be funded as needed to demonstrate federally-required air quality conformity. (Goal #1)
5. Eligible transit projects may be funded as needed at the discretion of the Board. (Goal #3 and in some cases Goal #2)
6. At least 20% of each four-year CMAQ total shall be used for highly cost-effective projects and programs ("HCE projects"). This is currently defined as those which cost \$30 or less per pound of criteria pollutant reduced. (Goal #4)
7. The priority for any remaining CMAQ funds (after TCMs, transit, and HCE projects) will be CMAQ-eligible "quality of life" projects usable by the general public. Cost-effectiveness will **not** be a primary evaluation criteria for these projects.
8. Emission benefits and cost-effectiveness will be calculated using the methods of the California Air Resources Board (ARB). (Goals #4 and #1)

9. A Call for Projects shall be issued as needed. The Technical Planning Committee (CMAQ Subcommittee) shall review and evaluate project applications and recommend projects for programming.
10. Projects will be evaluated on a region-wide competitive basis with no geographic equity guarantees.
11. Projects will generally be evaluated as one of two types but may be considered for both if applicable. The evaluation categories are “highly cost-effective” projects (HCE), and “quality of life” projects.
12. All project applications must document all of the following information, regardless of which category they are competing for:
 - a. project total cost and CMAQ cost, by phase and by year
 - b. total emission reductions
 - c. cost-effectiveness of CMAQ dollars
 - d. project schedule
 - e. project deliverability statement – to be eligible for “quick delivery” status a project should have no or very minimal environmental and design needs and no right-of-way acquisition required
 - f. public use statement – i.e. is it usable by the general public?
 - g. “quality of life” subjective factors (applicant discretion as to what to provide)
13. HCE projects will compete on the basis of cost-effectiveness, with deliverability being a potential screening factor.
14. Quality of Life projects and programs will compete on the basis of all factors except cost-effectiveness. Deliverability is a potential screening factor for these as well.

Summary of CMAQ Applications Received

Nov. 22, 2011

#	Agency	Project	Cost effective-ness (\$/lb.) lower is better	Pollution reduced (kg/day) higher is better	Quick?	CMAQ cost max. 88.53%	Local match min. 11.47%	Total project cost
CE projects: highly cost effective, costing \$30/lb. or less								
1	Los Banos	Replace dump truck	\$8.46	2.29	YES	\$132,795	\$17,205	\$150,000
2	County	Replace hot-mix pothole patcher	\$11.74	2.19	YES	\$172,633	\$22,367	\$195,000
3	County	Replace spray pothole patcher	\$13.21	2.15	YES	\$190,339	\$24,661	\$215,000
4	Los Banos	Replace 2 backhoes	\$14.79	2.00	YES	\$198,307	\$25,693	\$224,000
5	Livingston	Replace backhoe	\$15.56	1.06	YES	\$110,662	\$14,338	\$125,000
6	Dos Palos	Replace front loader	\$18.93	0.49	YES	\$61,971	\$8,029	\$70,000
CE subtotal						\$866,707		
QoL projects: quality of life projects usable by the public								
7	Atwater	Install sidewalks	\$380.79	0.09	NO	\$410,169	\$53,142	\$463,311
8	County	Install sidewalks	\$281.61	0.19	NO	\$626,792	\$81,208	\$708,000
9	Gustine	Install bike lanes	\$634.65	0.05	NO	\$297,017	\$38,483	\$335,500
10	Livingston	Install sidewalks	\$93.85	0.53	NO	\$597,785	\$77,450	\$675,235
11	Los Banos	Install sidewalks	\$313.65	0.07	NO	\$277,098	\$35,902	\$313,000
12	Merced	Install bike lanes (10 miles)	\$306.22	0.09	NO	\$290,400	\$39,600	\$330,000
13	Merced	Install 50 bike racks	\$58.50	0.05	YES	\$32,525	\$4,435	\$37,100
14	Merced	Install 3 bike shelters	\$435.27	0.03	YES	\$145,200	\$19,800	\$165,000
QoL subtotal						\$2,676,986		
Other projects: neither highly cost-effective nor usable by public								
15	Los Banos	Replace tractor	\$5,806.11	0.0025	YES	\$84,988	\$11,012	\$96,000
16	Los Banos	Purchase 2 hybrid pickup trucks	\$645.97	0.02	YES	\$75,250	\$9,750	\$85,000
17	Merced	Purchase 43 hybrid vehicles	\$2,495.44	0.08	YES	\$1,361,280	\$176,369	\$1,537,649
"Other" subtotal						\$1,521,518		
Total of all applications received						\$5,065,211		\$5,724,795
CMAQ balance						\$4,269,892		
CE Target						\$1,229,409		
CE subtotal						\$866,707		
CE balance						\$362,702		
QoL subtotal						\$2,676,986		
Other/Neither subtotal						\$1,521,518		

MEMORANDUM

DATE: NOVEMBER 23, 2011

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: TY PHIMMASONE, PLANNER

RE: STATUS OF CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL PROJECT

On November 1, 2011, the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) released the 2012 Draft Business Plan for a 60-day review and comment period. The CHSRA also prepared the Funding Plan for the State Legislature to review and approve.

The attached CHSRA fact sheet summarizes the Draft Business Plan. The following are some highlights from the CHSRA webinar for that plan.

The new estimated cost for building the Full Phase 1, from Anaheim to San Francisco, of the high speed rail system is \$98.1 billion. This year-of-expenditure (YOE) figure (versus current year dollars used in prior Business Plan) includes a 9-year schedule cushion, \$16 billion in contingencies, and \$27.5 billion for inflation at 3% per year.



CONSERVATIVE ASSUMPTIONS

Construction

- 9-year schedule cushion
- \$16 billion in contingencies
- \$27.5 billion for inflation at 3% per year

Operations & Maintenance Costs

- Validated through comparisons to international systems

Ridership

- Gas at \$3.80/gal
- LA-SF airfares constant at \$95
- Reduced by 15% for planning

The high speed rail system will be implemented in phases, as addressed in the following.

- Initial Construction Section (ICS):** Central Valley 130-mile section from north of Bakersfield to south of Chowchilla with a construction cost of \$6.0 billion. “This straight stretch will allow for testing the high speed train and signals at 220 mph, and represents the cheapest per mile first phase for implementation.”



- Initial Operating Section (IOS) - South:** A 300-mile extension of the ICS north to Merced and south to Sylmar (San Fernando Valley) with a construction cost of \$27.2 billion. “This IOS-South has stronger projected ridership and net operating profits than the IOS-North.”



- **IOS – North: Bay to Basin:** A 290-mile stretch from the Central Valley to San Jose with a construction cost of \$21.1 billion.



- **Phase 1 Blended:** Electrify existing commuter rail system tracks to allow shared operations and a “one-seat ride” into San Francisco (north) and into Anaheim (south) at a construction cost of \$23.9 billion.



- **Phase 1 Full HSR:** Construction of the full Phase 1 high speed rail system on dedicated tracks at a construction cost of \$19.9 billion. Phase 2 for connections to Sacramento and San Diego have not been currently estimated.



The following table, taken from the Draft Business Plan, provides a summary of the phases.

Phase: Section	Capital Cost (YOE)	Section Completion
ICS	\$ 6.0	2017
IOS-South	\$ 27.2	2021
Bay to Basin	\$ 21.1	2026
Phase 1 Blended	\$ 23.9	2030
Phase 1 Full HSR	\$ 19.9	2033
Total Cost (in Billions)	\$ 98.1	

“The CHSRA estimates that constructing the Central Valley section would generate 100,000 direct and indirect jobs over five years.” With the State’s sluggish economy and high unemployment (11.7% in October), not constructing that first leg would mean the loss of job creation from the unexpended \$6.0 billion. Without going to construction in 2012, the \$3.3 billion in federal funding will be lost to California.

JOBS



- 100,000 jobs next five years for initial construction
- 1.2-1.4 million jobs over 20 years for Phase 1 construction
- 4,500 permanent operations jobs
- 100,000-450,000 new non-HSR permanent jobs by 2040


“With the State’s population expected to grow to 60 million by 2050, there will be increased infrastructure demand.” The economic and quality of life (greater time savings, promotion of transit-oriented development, safer way to travel, reduction of vehicular congestion, and better air quality) benefits of high speed rail will outweigh the estimated, future \$171 billion cost to construct additional highway lanes and add more airport runways.

ADVANTAGE HSR

	\$78 – 98 billion	\$171 billion
	HSR	Business as Usual
Cost	✓	
Job creation – construction, permanent O&M, indirect	✓	✓
Private investment	✓	
Reduced auto use	✓	
Air quality improvement	✓	
Transit-oriented development	✓	
Feasibility	✓	
Safety	✓	
Reduced oil consumption	✓	
Travel time savings	✓	
Operations & maintenance costs	✓	

NEXT STEPS

The CHSRA has requested the multi-million appropriation to begin construction of the \$6.0 billion Initial Construction Section (ICS) next year. The CHSRA seeks to access the \$2.7 billion in state bond monies and the \$3.3 billion in federal grants for this construction. This request, the Draft Business Plan and the Funding Plan, goes to Governor Brown's administration and to the State Legislature.



WHAT'S NEXT?

- 60-day public review and comment
- Legislature considers request for appropriation of \$2.7 billion of Proposition 1A GO bonds for ICS as part of 2012-13 budget process
- Legislature appropriates Proposition 1A bonds for ICS in state budget
- Governor approves appropriation of Proposition 1A bonds for ICS in state budget

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

On November 17, 2011, Congress voted to eliminate federal funding for high-speed rail in 2012. These new, additional federal funds will not be needed to build the ICS of California's high-speed rail project. "The Draft Business Plan assumes no additional federal funding before 2014, and no subsidies for operations and maintenance."

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

Attachment: California High-Speed Rail Authority 2012 Draft Business Plan Fact Sheet

HIGH-SPEED RAIL

2012 DRAFT BUSINESS PLAN FACT SHEET



With the state's population expected to grow to 60 million by 2050, California faces three choices regarding its transportation system: try to build more freeways and expand airports to meet the increased demands; do nothing; or develop a high-speed train system connecting our population centers, as many other countries around the world have done. At a total cost about half of what it would take to provide the same capacity on new freeways and at expanded airports, high-speed rail delivers many other significant economic, social and environmental benefits.

JOBS

Construction of the initial Central Valley section is expected to generate 100,000 direct and indirect jobs over five years, an average of 20,000 jobs annually. Direct and indirect jobs to build all of Phase 1 are estimated at 1.2 million to 1.4 million over 20 years, an average of approximately 65,000 jobs annually. The Phase 1 system will generate 4,500 permanent operations and maintenance jobs.

An estimated 100,000 to 450,000 new statewide permanent jobs not related to HSR are expected by 2040.

IMPLEMENTATION

The new business plan introduces a "building block" implementation approach to connect the state's major Northern California and Southern California population centers with high-speed trains. The project will be built incrementally as additional funding becomes available. Each step represents a critical decision point about whether to continue moving the project forward and each completed segment can be used on its own before a full statewide system is in place.

Critical Decision Point One: Construction of a 130-mile stretch in the Central Valley for about \$6 billion (year of expenditure) with a combination of federal and state funding that has already been identified. **2012 – 2017**

Critical Decision Point Two: Extend the initial construction section to create an initial operating section (IOS) either from Merced to the San Fernando Valley or San Jose to Bakersfield. Once either of those sections is completed, true high-speed rail service will be provided to passengers for the first time in the U.S., projected ridership and revenue will be sufficient for the initial system to operate at break even or better, and private investment will initially materialize. Projected cost: IOS from Merced – San Fernando Valley: \$27.2 billion; or IOS from San Jose to Bakersfield: \$24.7 billion. **2015 – 2021**

Critical Decision Point Three, "Bay to Basin:" Build the remaining initial operation section either to the north or south to provide a high-speed rail "Bay to Basin" system connecting the Bay Area and Los Angeles basin population centers and integrating with MetroLink in Southern California and Caltrain in the Bay Area. Projected cost: IOS from San Jose to Bakersfield: \$21.1 billion; or IOS from Merced-San Fernando Valley: \$24 billion. **2021 – 2026**

Critical Decision Point Four: Additional rail-transit improvements in the Los Angeles basin and Bay Area, including electrification of existing rail systems, to create "blended" operations with high-speed rail to provide a "one-seat" ride from San Francisco to Los Angeles and Anaheim. Projected cost: \$23.9 billion. **2026 – 2030**

Critical Decision Point Five: Start to construct Phase 2 extensions toward Sacramento and San Diego, or continue to complete the full Phase 1 high-speed rail system between downtown San Francisco and Anaheim through Los Angeles. Projected cost for full Phase 1: \$19.9 billion: **2026 – 2033+**

REALISTIC COST ASSUMPTIONS

Cost estimates are based on a set of realistic assumptions to provide an honest and credible assessment of resources required to develop the HSR system. These include:

- Nine-year construction-schedule cushion to account for potential delays and funding availability
- Annual inflation of 3 percent
- \$16 billion in contingencies for material-cost increases, use of different components or parts, and minor quantities changes.

FUNDING

In addition to state bond revenues, funding required to build the high-speed rail system will primarily be provided from the federal government and private investors. Local support also remains an element of the overall funding plan.

Funds necessary to begin the Initial Construction Segment have been identified. This includes \$3.3 billion in federal funding and \$2.7 billion in state bond funding. New funding will be identified before additional construction begins, ensuring that the program will go forward in a fiscally responsible manner. The plan assumes no additional federal funding before 2014.

Once passenger service is provided on an initial operating section, ridership and revenue will facilitate private capital to supplement public investments for future construction.

The Authority also is partnering with cities and transportation agencies to find early investment opportunities in the south and north, such as grade separations or double tracking, which could potentially allow for early development of “higher speed” rail in existing rail corridors and prepare those corridors for eventual, true high-speed train service.

If resources become available earlier, construction timelines can be accelerated.

RIDERSHIP

Ridership estimates and models used to develop them were peer reviewed and approved by international expert peer-review group. Projections are based on average HSR fares that are 83 percent of current airfares and reflect conservative assumptions on fuel prices (\$3.80 per gallon), population growth and pace of travel growth. No operating subsidy will be required under any ridership scenarios.

Projected annual ridership in 2040:

IOS South:	9.5 million – 14.0 million
IOS North:	7.6 million – 11.2 million
Bay to Basin:	16.1 million – 23.7 million
Phase 1:	29.6 million – 43.9 million

ANNUAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL BENEFITS

- 8 billion fewer vehicle miles traveled
- 146 million hours saved
- CO₂ emissions reduced by 3 million tons



ITEM 7

MEMORANDUM

DATE: NOVEMBER 23, 2011

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: TY PHIMMASONE, PLANNER

RE: STATUS ON THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY INTERREGIONAL GOODS MOVEMENT PLAN

BACKGROUND

In June 2011, Cambridge Systematics, the hired consultants for the San Joaquin Valley Council of Governments, began working on the San Joaquin Valley Interregional Goods Movement Plan (SJVIGMP). The cost for the SJVIGMP is paid for by a Transportation Partnership Planning Grant and local cash and in-kind matches.

DISCUSSION

The SJVIGMP, involving the participation of regional stakeholders, will develop a consensus-based-preferred, future San Joaquin Valley goods movement system financeable strategy that will have identified, evaluated and ranked multimodal projects, which can maximize benefits while minimizing/mitigating impacts to the San Joaquin Valley region, and which will have the emphasis on east-west corridors.

The project will be prepared using a three-phase approach:

Phase 1 will look at existing conditions and will also project expected growth in freight demand to identify future goods movement system deficiencies. This phase will evaluate freight impacts on overall quality of life (community, environment, economic).

Phase 2 will identify specific parameters and performance measures for evaluating a long string of proposed regional projects and for prioritizing projects/strategies to address the future system deficiencies. Based on developed decision-making procedures, this phase will evaluate the benefits versus costs and impacts for the regional stakeholders' proposals.

Phase 3 will recommend the highest ranked goods movement system proposed projects and will identify possible means to finance them.

UPDATE

As part of Phase 1, Assessing Conditions, Cambridge Systematics has prepared the Draft Existing Conditions Assessment Technical Memorandum. The key findings, taken from the report, include the following.

- Demographic Findings:
 - Despite the economic slowdown, the San Joaquin Valley population is expected to double in population by 2040, which will increase activity in the construction, retail, and wholesale trade industries.
 - Population centers are generally located adjacent to highway facilities.
 - The median household incomes are projected to double by 2040, which will increase demand for goods.
- Economic and Employment Findings:
 - In 2010, there were about 1.2 million people employed in the San Joaquin Valley, with over 44 percent associated with goods movement-dependent industries.
 - By 2040, goods movement-dependent jobs are expected to increase 45 percent.
 - The San Joaquin Valley currently accounts for over eight percent of California's total Gross Domestic Product, by providing nearly 50 percent of the State's agricultural output and 25 percent of the State's mining and mineral extraction output.
 - The economic downturn of recent years has resulted in the region facing one of the highest unemployment levels in the Nation.
 - Current federal policy initiatives may boost the need for more goods from the San Joaquin Valley.
- Infrastructure Findings:
 - Trucking is the dominant freight mode. Goods are trucked to and from the seaports. Therefore, the highway and local road system is the primary freight infrastructure for the region.
 - New clusters of industries have been developing along regional roads not intended for freight truck traffic, which has resulted in faster pavement deterioration and increased safety concerns.
 - There currently is no intraregional rail freight service within the San Joaquin Valley. Also, railroad spur (side tracks for loading and unloading) abandonments limit the potential for additional rail freighting.

- The San Joaquin Valley airports are currently handling only a very small portion of California's airports total cargo tonnage.

This report includes a brief discussion of the State Route 152 and its significance as a major east-west goods movement corridor.

This first deliverable product will be available on the San Joaquin Valley Council of Governments' website at: <http://sjvcogs.com/goods.html>

The consultant will begin working on portions of the Goods Movement Data and Report and the Assessment of Growth in Freight Demand, Trends in Logistics Industry, and 2035 System Performance Report.

Staff will continue to provide status reports and deliverables as the project progresses.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: NOVEMBER 23, 2011
TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: JESSE B. BROWN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
RE: ATWATER-MERCED EXPRESSWAY STATUS REPORT

BACKGROUND

Work is moving forward on two fronts for Phase 1A (Buhach Interchange replacement and SR 99 widening to 6-lanes) of the Atwater/Merced Expressway Project. Project engineering and design has passed the 60% milestone and our consultants (Mark-Thomas) met with Caltrans in Stockton to review and receive comments. Engineering is on schedule to be completed in June 2012. Secondly, right-of-way acquisition hit a snag when the California Transportation Commission (CTC) staff failed to support the \$11.8 million in fund allocation that was approved by the Commission in June. Through our consultants, Gray-Bowen, we are seeking a trade of our STIP funds for local transportation measure funds. We have promising discussions currently with the Orange County Transportation Commission. If those bear fruit (no pun intended), the next step will be communicating with CTC staff and Caltrans for support and the RTIP amendment will be prepared for action by the Governing Board.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: NOVEMBER 23, 2011

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: JUDI PERRY, ACCOUNTANT

**RE: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE REPORT FISCAL YEAR
2011/12 - 1ST QUARTER**

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) program collects one-time fees from new development to mitigate their impact on the regional road network.

Effective August 1, 2005, the cities of Atwater, Dos Palos, Los Banos, Merced and the County of Merced began collecting RTIF fees through their permitting process. The City of Gustine began collecting the fee effective August 22, 2005. The City of Livingston has not adopted an ordinance or resolution to implement the RTIF program fee collection.

MCAG Governing Board and member jurisdictions are updated on the status of the fee collection and the proposed transportation projects through staff report updates.

DISCUSSION

Attached please find:

1. Table one (1) showing fees collected for the current fiscal year by jurisdiction.
2. Table two (2) showing fees collected to-date by jurisdiction.
3. Table three (3) showing fees collected by project and total expenditures to date.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

Attachments: Table1 and Table 2
Table 3

TABLE 1

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES (RTIF) COLLECTED BY JURISDICTION FOR FY 2011-2012					
JURISDICTION	1 ST QTR	2 ND QTR	3 RD QTR	4 TH QTR	TOTAL
Atwater	26,770.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	26,770.40
Dos Palos	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gustine	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Livingston	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Los Banos	25,055.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	25,055.32
Merced City	4,145.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,145.87
Merced County	73,647.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	73,647.09
Interest Earnings	300.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	300.03
Total	129,918.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	129,918.71

TABLE 2

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES (RTIF) COLLECTED BY JURISDICTION TO-DATE SEPTEMBER 30, 2011*								
JURISDICTION	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	TOTAL
Atwater	16,748.00	24,337.58	47,186.97	0.00	0.00	59,632.41	26,770.40	174,675.36
Dos Palos	31,625.00	57,080.00	17,707.00	3,115.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	109,527.00
Gustine	18,711.00	45,068.19	2,802.00	66,076.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	132,658.15
Livingston	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Los Banos	69,534.00	601,678.57	433,153.29	355,488.97	182,434.83	58,308.90	25,055.32	1,725,653.88
Merced City	1,355,575.39	1,125,031.96	738,658.15	276,673.85	145,025.94	100,137.23	4,145.87	3,745,248.39
Merced County	973,251.20	435,576.08	288,520.36	420,975.77	116,274.21	262,554.22	72,272.09	2,569,423.93
Interest Earnings	32,060.00	141,768.17	155,912.48	114,747.50	62,057.04	43,237.62	300.03	550,082.84
Total	2,497,504.59	2,430,540.55	1,683,940.25	1,237,078.05	505,792.02	523,870.38	128,543.71	9,007,269.55

* Actual deposit amounts without refund deductions

TABLE 3
FEES COLLECTED BY PROJECT (Thru 09/30/11)

Project Name	Total to Date	FY 2005-2006 Total	FY 2006-2007 Total (Net) **	FY 2007-2008 Total (Net) **	FY 2008-2009 Total (Net) **	FY 2009-2010 Total (Net) **	FY 2010-2011 Total (Net) **
Deposit Amount:	\$8,457,486.80	\$2,465,444.65	\$2,288,772.38	\$1,528,027.77	\$1,122,330.55	\$443,734.98	\$480,632.76
Allocations:	\$0.00						
Bellevue - Connect 99	\$79,881.35	\$24,164.96	\$17,236.10	\$19,448.97	\$3,577.94	\$1,044.16	\$10,210.93
Mission - 59 to 99	\$40,486.45	\$12,696.36	\$9,820.89	\$6,514.88	\$5,656.67	\$2,528.52	\$2,773.17
Atwater/Merced Expressway	\$2,520,798.54	\$904,904.17	\$678,939.54	\$465,809.67	\$210,662.53	\$84,581.18	\$139,304.50
59 - Mission to Childs	\$400,854.05	\$149,738.12	\$130,158.97	\$85,902.44	\$18,049.74	\$8,261.65	\$7,349.95
59 - 152 to Mission	\$243,748.02	\$82,735.92	\$81,836.09	\$52,757.93	\$14,009.55	\$6,185.40	\$5,045.20
140 Bradley Overhead	\$782,768.27	\$314,179.15	\$244,969.54	\$162,246.84	\$30,707.77	\$13,613.51	\$14,602.19
140 - To Campus Parkway	\$433,153.62	\$173,811.99	\$135,646.98	\$89,832.11	\$16,940.85	\$7,514.85	\$8,056.40
140/33 Truck Route	\$252,925.98	\$84,238.43	\$69,503.24	\$26,231.61	\$56,188.04	\$4,723.43	\$9,420.81
152 Los Banos Bypass	\$2,642,107.88	\$580,630.01	\$707,065.37	\$471,507.13	\$477,220.09	\$187,213.27	\$166,701.19
165 - North of Hilmar	\$611,938.88	\$113,691.09	\$189,982.85	\$132,275.48	\$97,100.30	\$41,234.28	\$28,310.33
DP Road Improv	\$13,897.30	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,447.52	\$2,100.49	\$3,392.61
Winton Parkway Interchange	\$35,645.62	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,576.78	\$5,788.27	\$11,847.10
Campus Parkway 99 - Yosemite	\$313,462.32	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$158,969.46	\$74,508.62	\$68,812.04
Administration	\$85,518.49	\$24,654.45	\$23,612.81	\$15,500.71	\$11,223.31	\$4,437.35	\$4,806.34
TOTAL all allocations	\$8,457,186.77	\$2,465,444.65	\$2,288,772.38	\$1,528,027.77	\$1,122,330.55	\$443,734.98	\$480,632.76
1st Qtr Interest Income	\$97,805.87	\$230.18	\$25,103.49	\$32,258.46	\$28,287.98	\$10,780.63	\$845.10
2nd Qtr Interest Income	\$158,494.79	\$3,453.78	\$34,422.33	\$45,691.52	\$39,159.61	\$17,662.80	\$18,104.75
3rd Qtr Interest Income	\$148,565.07	\$10,430.96	\$45,215.18	\$46,284.14	\$31,605.12	\$14,247.43	\$782.24
4th Qtr Interest Income	\$145,217.05	\$17,945.02	\$37,027.17	\$31,678.36	\$15,694.79	\$19,366.18	\$23,505.53
TOTAL Interest	\$550,082.78	\$32,059.94	\$141,768.17	\$155,912.48	\$114,747.50	\$62,057.04	\$43,237.62
TOTAL	\$9,007,269.55	\$2,497,504.59	\$2,430,540.55	\$1,683,940.25	\$1,237,078.05	\$505,792.02	\$523,870.38

** Net equals total deposits less refunds

Atwater Merced Expressway Project Expenditures though 09/30/2011 \$4,377,317.29

MEMORANDUM

DATE: NOVEMBER 23, 2011
TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: LORI FLANDERS, PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER
RE: ONE VOICE REVISED SCHEDULE

Legislative Plan 2011/12
Schedule is subject to change

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Start</u>	<u>Finish</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Call for Projects forms/guidelines sent to all participating agencies	Oct. 21	Nov. 30	Participating agencies send forms to departments. Jurisdictions will gather forms and prioritize.
Steering Committee meeting with MCAG federal lobbyist	Nov. 16		Guidance on project/policy/legislative requests.
Steering Committee meeting to choose priority project/policy requests	Jan. 11, 2012		Projects/policies must be prioritized by agencies prior to this meeting.
One Voice priorities presented to MCAG standing committees and boards for recommendation and approval	Feb., 2012		
MCAG conducts outreach to enlist private sector representation	Jan., 2012	Mar., 2012	
Completed fact sheets, using One Voice format, are due		Mar. 15, 2012	
Washington, D.C. trip briefing	Apr. 13, 2012		<u>Mandatory for all delegates</u>
Washington, D.C. One Voice visit		April 24-25 (travel days 23 & 26)	

Call Lori at 209-723-3153 x 308 for more information.
Lori.Flanders@mcagov.org

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

2012

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE

***The 1st Friday of each month
8:30 a.m.
MCAG Conference Room***

January 6

February 3

March 2

April 6

May 4

June 1

July 6

August 3

September 7

October 5

November 2

December 7

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Highlights

November 4, 2011

CAC Representative to Governing Board items:

4. Unmet Transit Needs

Marjie Kirn reported that the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) held four public hearings (in Los Banos, Atwater, Livingston, and Merced) to hear testimony about transit needs. The SSTAC evaluated the testimony and found that there are three unmet needs which they believe are reasonable to meet:

1. Bus Schedule to run on Saturday schedule for “minor” holidays that fall on Monday-Saturday (Columbus Day, Veterans Day, day after Thanksgiving, and Lincoln’s Birthday);
2. Evening Service to 10:30 (approximately); and
3. Sunday Service (limited).

However, since there are no known revenue sources to pay for these three (3) unmet transit needs unless there are improved efficiencies in the Merced County Transit system operation (a way to get more services for less costs) that are determined through the Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) consultant recommendations anticipated in the DRAFT SRTP document in Jan/Feb 2012, staff is recommending that there are no unmet needs reasonable to meet, and that the needs be revisited after the SRTP is completed.

Diana Westmoreland Pedrozo made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board find that there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet at this time, and that the unmet needs which were identified by the SSTAC should be addressed after the Short Range Transit Plan is completed next Spring.

Seconded by Erin Stacy.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Consolidating Dispatch

Marjie Kirn reported that the City Councils and Board of Supervisors are in the process of expressing their interest in pursuing consolidation and appointing a staff person from each interested jurisdiction to serve on a consolidation committee. The committee will be charged with drafting a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Agreement for the City Councils and Board of Supervisor consideration. So far, the cities of Dos Palos, Gustine, Merced

and Los Banos approved participation in this effort. Livingston has decided not to participate.

At the last MCAG Governing Board Retreat, the Governing Board requested staff to prepare a Request for Proposals (RFP) for consultant services.

Diana Westmoreland Pedrozo made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve releasing the RFP for consultant services to assist in the Consolidation of Dispatch in Merced County with funding to pay for this service coming from Merced Data Special Services.

Seconded by Mary Ford-Azevedo.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Outreach – Committee Vacancies

The Committee continued its discussion about how to fill existing vacancies and discussed the suggestions in the staff report. Some additional suggestions were made, including:

- Compiling a variety of short statements (“blurbs”) from committee members for use in informational and promotional literature.
- Radio interviews of CAC members to promote the committee to the public.

	Follow-up Items	Action	Date
1	CAC Goals	CAC goals discussion & prioritization	Future Meeting
2	Transportation Ballot Measure	Follow-up	Future Meeting
3	CAC Topic Reports	Standing item	As Needed

**SIGN UP SHEET FOR CAC REPRESENTATIVE AT MCAG GOVERNING BOARD MEETINGS
2011**

Last updated September 2, 2011

DATE	LOCATION	CAC REP	ALTERNATE
January 20 3pm	City of Atwater, Council Chambers	Richard Jantz	Stuart Rawling
February 17 3pm	Merced County Admin Bldg	Kyle K. Ford	Diana Westmoreland-Pedrozo
March 17 3pm	City of Dos Palos, City Hall	Larrae Iencarelli	
April 21 3pm	Merced County Admin Bldg	Diana Westmoreland-Pedrozo	Dennis Cote
May 19 3pm	City of Gustine, Council Chambers	Mary Ford-Azevedo	Diana Ingram
June 16 3pm	City of Livingston Council Chambers	Stuart Rawling	Erin Stacy
July 21 3pm	Merced County Admin Bldg	Dennis Cote	Diana Ingram
August 18 3pm	Merced County Admin Bldg	Richard Jantz	Larrae Iencarrelli
September 15 3pm	City of Los Banos, City Hall	Dennis Cote	Stuart Rawling
October 20 3pm	Merced County Admin Bldg	Jeff Freitas	Diana Westmoreland-Pedrozo
November 17 3pm	City of Merced, Council Chambers	Erin Statcy	Richard Jantz
December 15 3pm	Merced County Admin Bldg	Diana Westmoreland-Pedrozo	Erin Stacy

MCAG GOVERNING BOARD

November 17, 2011

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the **MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS GOVERNING BOARD** held on Thursday, November 17, 2011, at the County of Merced, Board of Supervisors Chambers, 2222 M Street, Merced, CA was called to order by Chair Walsh at 3:04 P.M.

DIRECTORS PRESENT

Linn Davis
Jerald O'Banion
Joe Oliveira
John Pedrozo
Bill Spriggs
Mike Villalta
Hub Walsh

DIRECTORS ABSENT

Rodrigo Espinoza
Joan Faul
Deidre Kelsey
Johnny Mays

GUESTS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Carrie Bowen, Caltrans District 10
Erin Stacy, Citizens Advisory Committee
Heidi Pedrozo, Congressman Cardoza's office
Chris Bobbitt, Human Services Agency – AAA

STAFF PRESENT

Rod Andrews, Merced County Regional Waste Management Authority Manager
Jesse Brown, Executive Director
Sam Chandler, Merced County Regional Waste Management Authority Director
Matt Fell, Senior Transportation Planner
Robert Haden, Legal Counsel
Marjie Kirn, Deputy Executive Director
Joy Gort, Administrative Assistant II

6. Oral Report – Legislative Update – Congressman Cardoza's Office

Heidi Pedrozo gave the legislative update from Congressman Cardoza's office.

7. Oral Report – Citizens Advisory Committee

Erin Stacy gave the report from the Citizens Advisory Committee.

8. Caltrans Report

Carrie Bowen gave a brief report from Caltrans and asked for questions from the Directors.

9. Consent Agenda

- a. Minutes of the October 20, 2011 MCAG Governing Board meeting

Director O’Banion moved to approve the minutes of the October 20, 2011 MCAG Governing Board meeting.

Seconded by Director Oliveira.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- b. Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

Director O’Banion moved to adopt the Regional Transportation Improvement Program with the preferred programming priorities, for submittal to the California Transportation Commission no later than December 15, 2011, by Resolution No. 2011/11-17-01.

Seconded by Director Pedrozo.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- c. Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

Director O’Banion moved to adopt Formal Amendment No. 12 to the 2011 FTIP, programming the recently awarded City of Merced Project to the Grouped Projects for the Federal Safe Routes to School Program, by Resolution No. 2011/11-17-02.

Seconded by Director Oliveira.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- d. MCAG Policies and Procedures

Director O’Banion moved to adopt:

- a. Title VI Program FFY 2011-2014 with the Limited English Proficiency Plan;
b. Federal Procurement Policy Manual; and
c. Drug Free Workplace Policy.

Seconded by Director Oliveira.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- e. CAC Bylaws

Director O’Banion moved to approve the amendments to the CAC Bylaws.

Seconded by Director Oliveira.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- f. Fiscal Year 2011/2012 1st Quarter Report July 2011 – September 2011 – 1st Quarter Warrant Register

Director O'Banion moved to approve the Fiscal Year 2011/2012 1st Quarter Report July 2011 – September 2011 – 1st Quarter Warrant Register.

Seconded by Director Oliveira.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. Information/Discussion Only

- a. Minutes of the November 9, 2011 Technical Review Board meeting
- b. Regional Transportation Impact Fee Report Fiscal Year 2011/12 – 1st Quarter
- c. Van Scoyoc Associates Legislative Update
- d. USDA Rural Development Community Facilities Grant Application for the City of Livingston

So noted.

11. Regional Pedestrian Plan Final Draft

Matt Fell gave a brief update on the Regional Pedestrian Plan Final Draft.

Director O'Banion move to accept the Regional Pedestrian Plan.

Seconded by Director Pedrozo.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

12. Unmet Transit Needs – Fiscal Year 2011/12

Director Pedrozo moved to adopt Resolution No. 2011/11-17-03 with a finding of fact for FY 2011/12 that there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet.

Seconded by Director O'Banion.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

13. Consolidating Dispatch

Director Pedrozo moved to approve releasing the RFP for consultant services to assist in the Consolidation Dispatch in Merced County with funding to pay for this service coming from Merced Data Special Services.

Seconded by Director O'Banion.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

14. Short Range Transit Plan Project Status and Summary of Finding Working Paper

Marjie Kirn reported on the Short Range Transit Plan Project Status and Summary of Finding Working Paper.

15. Executive Directors' Report

Jesse Brown thanked Bill Spriggs for his dedication and service and stated that he would be missed.

16. Directors' Report

The Directors thanked Bill Spriggs for his years of service and wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

**THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS OF THE MCAG GOVERNING BOARD
THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:34 P.M.**

_____/s/
Joy Gort
Administrative Assistant II