

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, January 9, 2009– 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. Minutes of the December 5, 2008 Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting**

- 4. Information/Discussion Only**
 - a. CAC Highlights – December 5, 2008
 - # b. Sign up sheet for CAC representative to the MCAG Governing Board meeting – 2009
 - c. MCAG Governing Board Minutes December 18, 2008
 - d. Continuum of Care

- 5. CAC Goal Setting Session** Dean Wilson

- 6. Oral Report – Air District – CAC Report** Dean Wilson

- 7. Oral Report – Local Fee Discussion** Richard Jantz

- * # **8. Regional Transportation Plan Amendment** Matt Fell

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Amendment #2.

- * **9. Final Draft Formal Amendment No. 3 to the 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)** Terri Lewis

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt Formal Amendment No. 3 to the 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) adding both Type 5 (Air Quality Conformity Analysis required) and Type 3 (Exempt from Air Quality Conformity Analysis) projects making the FTIP as whole a programming document as possible.

- * # **10. FY 2008-2009 Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Claims** Lori Flanders

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the revised Local Transportation Fund claims received by adoption of Resolution 2009/1-15-02.

* # **11. One Voice State and Federal Policy Platforms**

Candice Steelman

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve:

- a. The One Voice 2009 state and federal policy platforms;
and
- b. The One Voice 2009 state and federal priorities, with
staff's recommendation.

* *Action*

Attachment

+ *Enclosure*

*The next Citizens Advisory Committee meeting will be held on Friday, February 6, 2009 at 8:30 a.m.
at MCAG, 369 W. 18th Street, Merced, California*

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December 5, 2008

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE, held Friday, December 5, 2008 at the Merced County Association of Governments conference room, 369 W. 18th Street, Merced, California, was called to order by Chairman Dean Wilson at 8:35 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dennis Coté, Engineering
Tom Crawley, Finance
Kyle Ford, Citizen-at-Large
Mary Ford, Small Business
Tom Grave, Education
Matt Hoffman, Citizen-at-Large
Dan Hultgren, Real Estate
Richard Jantz, Economic Development
Melissa Kelly-Ortega, Citizen at Large
Brandon Williams for Scott Neal, Goods Movement
John Price, Citizen-at-Large
Ron Price, Water/Irrigation
Diana Westmoreland-Pedrozo, Agriculture
Dean Wilson, Citizen-at-Large

MEMBERS ABSENT

Adam Cox, Student
Vacant, Construction

OTHERS PRESENT

Matt Fell, MCAG
Lori Flanders, MCAG
Rich Green, MCAG
Ty Phimmasone, MCAG

1. Introductions

So noted.

2. Oral Communications

None.

3. Minutes of the October 3, 2008 Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting

Kyle Ford made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 3, 2008 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting as amended.

Seconded by Matt Hoffman.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Information / Discussion Only

- a. CAC Highlights – October 3, 2008
- b. Sign up sheet for CAC representative to the MCAG Governing Board meeting – 2008

Kyle Ford-alternate for the December 18, 2008 meeting.

Richard Jantz-January 15, 2009 meeting.

Dennis Cote will be the alternate for the January 15, 2009 meeting.

- c. MCAG Governing Board Minutes of October 16, 2008
- d. MCAG Governing Board Minutes of November 20, 2008
- e. CAC meeting schedule for 2009
- f. Status of Regional Road Projects for Merced County

Melissa Kelly-Ortega inquired to why BNSF needs a clearance for the Bradley Overhead Project. Matt Fell explained that the railroad needs to ensure there is sufficient clearance both vertically and horizontally (for potential railroad expansions).

- g. Neighborhood Stabilization Program Assistance
- h. Public Notice- Atwater Merced Expressway Flyer
- i. Save the Date: San Joaquin Valley Blueprint Summit – January 26, 2009

Chair Wilson highly recommends CAC members attend. Matt Fell stated that MCAG is offering to pay the registration fee for CAC members and elected officials to attend the San Joaquin Valley final Blueprint Summit on January 26, 2009 at the Fresno Convention Center. If anyone is interested, notify Matt Fell. MCAG will process registration for anyone interested in attending.

- j. Status of the Transit System Update

Larry Shankland provided the CAC an overview of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding. He provided a review of the State Transit Assistance Fund and stated that the Governor is going to eliminate the remaining State Transit Assistance Funds for the remainder of the 2008-2009 fiscal year. This cut would represent an additional \$750,000 in lost revenue for the Merced County Transit budget for the 2008-2009 fiscal year. Larry explained that the Governing Board approved suspension of Saturday service effective January 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009 with consideration of re-implementation of the service as revenues stabilize. He further explained that fare box ratios have increased during this past year for fixed route services but are dismal for Dial-a-Ride (DAR). Increasing fares to

help meet the shortfall are scheduled for public hearing consideration in January.

Dennis Cote recommended pursuing funding from Social Service agencies (outside of their typical pass purchases). Dennis also recommended improving bike lanes in the Livingston/Delhi area, which would provide other transportation alternatives. He asked that this item be discussed at the next CAC meeting.

Due to several members needing to leave by 10:00 a.m., action items were taken prior to informational items.

10. Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program

Ty Phimmason highlighted the proposed AVA program and MCAG chosen for designation as the service authority. The funding for this program is generated by an additional \$1 dollar added to the vehicle fee that is collected by the state and then distributed quarterly by the state controllers office.

Dennis Cote expressed his concerns with the definitions used in the staff report. He believes this program may create an encroachment on property rights.

Chair Wilson commented that this program currently exists in other jurisdictions throughout the state without encroachment concerns.

Ron Price informed the committee that he previously enforced this program through previous employment. He explained that it includes a 120-day process with investigation.

Dennis requested a discussion occur regarding an Abandoned Tires Program at a future meeting.

Ron Price made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the Final Abandoned Vehicle Abatement Plan and instruct staff to submit the Plan to the State Controller's Office.

Seconded by Tom Grave.

Dennis Cote provided his recommendation, but has reservations with the language provided.

MOTION CARRIED.

5. CAC Goal Setting Session

Chair Wilson asked the CAC to prioritize, and if necessary, edit the existing CAC Goal's document.

Richard Jantz stated that prioritizing the document during the meeting would be too time consuming, and asked the group to consider treating all items with equal importance.

Chair Wilson informed the committee that the CAC Goals list would be used to ensure agenda items are meeting the CAC's visions.

Tom Crawley expressed that topics should appear monthly on the agenda from the CAC's Goals list.

Richard Jantz stated that the Governing Board should be updated consistently on what the goals are of the CAC, not just once a year.

Melissa recommended assigning each member of the CAC a "workgroup" based on each topic listed on the goals list.

John Price requested the addition of "protecting legitimate jobs" to the list.

Dennis requested the addition of "getting Highway 99 interstate status".

Kyle recommended associating monthly agenda items to the topics they impact on the CAC Goals list.

Rich Green offered to create a large printout of the CAC Goal list that could be posted monthly during the meeting for reference.

Dennis Cote made a motion to approve the CAC Goals list with the above stated additions.

Seconded by Melissa Kelly-Ortega

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Oral Report – Air District – CAC Report

No report.

7. San Joaquin Valley Blueprint – Valleywide Scenario Recommendation (BRAC)

Rich Green reviewed the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint Scenario Presentation given to the BRAC on November 7th. The BRAC recommended the adoption of SJV-wide scenario C with two dissenting votes.

8. Regional Transportation Plan Amendment

So noted.

9. Draft Amendment No. 3 to the 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program

So noted.

11. Oral Report – Local Fee Discussion

Due to time constraints, this item has been postponed until the next CAC meeting.

12. Oral Report – San Joaquin Valley Express Transit Study

No report.

Chair Wilson asked the Committee to bring their December agenda with them to the January meeting so that they may discuss items that were skipped this month.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE WAS ADJOURNED BY DEAN WILSON AT 10:25 A.M.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Highlights December 5, 2008

CAC representative to Governing Board items:

4. Information / Discussion Only

j. Status of the Transit System Update

Larry Shankland provided the CAC an overview of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding. He provided a review of the State Transit Assistance Fund and stated that the Governor is going to eliminate the remaining State Transit Assistance Funds for the remainder of the 2008-2009 fiscal year. This cut would represent an additional \$750,000 in lost revenues for the Merced County Transit budget for the 2008-2009 fiscal year. Larry explained that the Governing Board approved suspension of Saturday service effective January 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009 with consideration of re-implementation of the service as revenues stabilize. He further explained that fare box ratios have increased during this past year for fixed route services but is dismal for Dial-a-Ride (DAR). Increasing fares to help meet the shortfall are scheduled for public hearing consideration in January.

Dennis Cote recommended pursuing funding from Social Service agencies (outside of their typical pass purchases). Dennis also recommended improving bike lanes in the Livingston/Delhi area, which would provide other transportation alternatives. He asked that this item be discussed at the next CAC meeting.

10. Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program

Ty Phimmason highlighted the proposed AVA program and that MCAG was chosen for designations as the service authority. The funding for this program is generated from an additional \$1 dollar added to the vehicle fee that is collected by the state and then distributed quarterly by the state controllers office.

Dennis Cote expressed his concerns with the definitions used in the staff report. He believes this program may create an encroachment on property rights.

Chair Wilson commented that this program currently exists in other jurisdictions throughout the state without encroachment concerns.

Ron Price informed the committee that he previously enforced this program through previous employment. He explained that it includes a 120-day process with investigation.

Dennis Cote requested a discussion occur regarding an Abandoned Tires Program at a future meeting.

Ron Price made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the Final Abandoned Vehicle Abatement Plan and instruct staff to submit the Plan to the State Controller's Office.

Seconded by Tom Grave.

Dennis Cote provided his recommendation, but has reservations with the language provided.

MOTION CARRIED.

5. CAC Goal Setting Session

Chair Wilson asked the CAC to prioritize, and if necessary, edit the existing CAC Goal's document.

Richard Jantz stated that prioritizing the document during the meeting would be too time consuming, and asked the group to considered treating all items with equal importance.

Chair Wilson informed the committee that the CAC Goals list would be used to ensure agenda items are meeting the CAC's visions.

Tom Crawley expressed that topics should appear monthly on the agenda from the CAC's Goals list.

Richard Jantz stated that the Governing Board should be updated consistently on what the goals are of the CAC, not just once a year.

Melissa Kelly Ortega recommended assigning each member of the CAC a "workgroup" based on each topic listed on the goals list.

John Price requested the addition of "protecting legitimate jobs" to the list.

Dennis Cote requested the addition of "getting Highway 99 interstate status.

Kyle Ford recommended associating monthly agenda items to the topics they impact on the CAC Goals list.

Rich Green offered to create a large printout of the CAC's Goal list that could be posted monthly during the meeting for reference.

Dennis Cote made a motion to approve the CAC Goals list with the above stated additions.

Seconded by Melissa Kelly-Ortega

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

| <u>MCAG staff follow-up item</u> | <u>Action</u> | <u>Date</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Local Development Fees discussion. | Agenda | January |
| 2. Abandoned Tires Program. | Agenda | January |
| 3. Create "banner" of CAC Goals to be posted at each CAC meeting. | | January |

**SIGN UP SHEET FOR CAC REPRESENTATIVE AT MCAG GOVERNING BOARD MEETINGS
2009**

| DATE | LOCATION | CAC REP | ALTERNATE |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| January 15 3pm | City of Dos Palos, Council Chambers | | |
| February 19 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | | |
| March 19 3pm | City of Atwater, Council Chambers | | |
| April 16 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | | |
| May 21 3pm | City of Gustine, City Hall | | |
| June 18 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | | |
| July 16 3pm | City of Livingston, City Hall | | |
| August 20 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | | |
| September 17 3pm | City of Los Banos, Council Chambers | | |
| October 15 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | | |
| November 19 3pm | City of Merced, Council Chambers | | |
| December 17 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | | |

MCAG GOVERNING BOARD

December 18, 2008

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the **MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS GOVERNING BOARD** held on Thursday, December 18, 2008, at the City of Merced, Council Chambers, 678 W. 18th Street, Merced, California, was called to order by Chair Oliveira at 3:20 P.M.

DIRECTORS PRESENT

Joan Faul
Tommy Jones
Johnny Mays
Jerald O'Banion
Joe Oliveira
Bill Spriggs
Daniel Varela

MEMBERS ABSENT

Kathleen Crookham
Deidre Kelsey
Mike Nelson
John Pedrozo

OTHERS PRESENT

Ken Baxter, Caltrans District 10
Jesse Brown, MCAG staff
Matt Fell, MCAG staff
Paul Fillebrown, Merced County Public Works
Kyle Ford, CAC Representative
Robert Haden, Legal Counsel
Marjie Kim, MCAG staff
Robin Lamas, MCAG staff
Larry Shankland, Merced County Transit – “The Bus”

7. Oral Report – Citizens Advisory Committee

There was not a Citizens Advisory Committee report available for this month. Kyle Ford from the Citizens Advisory Committee did wish to express his thanks to MCAG for their professionalism and for having a committee like the Citizens Advisory Committee.

8. Consent Agenda

- a. Minutes of the November 20, 2008 Governing Board meeting
- b. Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program
- c. Closing the office on December 26, 2008 and January 2, 2009

Director Spriggs moved to approve the Consent Agenda.

Seconded by Director Jones.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. Information Only

- a. Minutes of the December 10, 2008 Technical Review Board meeting
- b. Status of Regional Road Projects for Merced County
- c. Neighborhood Stabilization Program Assistance
- d. Public Notice – Atwater-Merced Expressway Flyer
- e. Save the Date: San Joaquin Valley Blueprint Summit – January 26, 2009
- f. Letter of September 30, 2008 from the Department of Transportation
- g. One Voice State and Federal Policy Platforms
- h. Merced County’s Proposed Economic Stimulus Projects
- i. San Joaquin Valley Express Transit Study (enclosure only)

So noted.

10. Oral Report – San Joaquin Valley Housing Trust

There was no San Joaquin Valley Housing Trust report available this month.

11. Oral Report - Caltrans

Ken Baxter gave a brief report from Caltrans.

12. Public Hearing – Regional Transportation Plan Amendment

Matt Fell gave a review of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendment. Matt stated that due to new federal requirements regarding financial documentation, it had become necessary to amend the RTP with a minor amendment. This amendment provides more recent and more specific information, which includes revised revenue and expenditure estimates to comply with the new “Year of Expenditure” requirement; more details including expected year of construction and escalated cost estimates; and details on segmenting/phasing approach for construction of the Los Banos Bypass project.

A public hearing is required to receive comments on the RTP Amendment.

Public Hearing Opened: 3:29

Public Hearing Closed: 3:30

No comments were received during the public comment period.

13. Public Hearing – Draft Amendment No. 3 to the 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program

Matt Fell gave a review of the Draft Amendment No. 3 to the 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program.

A public hearing is required to receive comments on the Draft Amendment No. 3 document.

Public Hearing Opened: 3:31
Public Hearing Closed: 3:32

No comments were received during the public comment period.

14. San Joaquin Valley Blueprint – Valleywide Scenario Recommendation (BRAC)

Rich Green gave an in-depth presentation on the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint Valleywide Scenario recommendation.

So noted.

15. San Joaquin Valley Policy Council Appointments and San Joaquin Valley Partnership

Director O'Banion moved to appoint Director Oliveira as alternate to the San Joaquin Valley Policy Council and to authorize Directors Mays and Oliveira to submit applications to the San Joaquin Valley Partnership.

Seconded by Director Spriggs.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

16. Executive Directors Report

So noted.

17. Directors Report

So noted.

After the Directors Report Paul Fillebrown, Merced County Public Works, announced that the County had held a bid opening for Phase 1 of the Campus Parkway Project. Due to the current economic status, the low bid came in well under the engineering estimate.

**THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS OF THE MCAG GOVERNING BOARD
THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:58 P.M.**

_____/s/
Robin Lamas
Administrative Assistant II

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JANUARY 2, 2009

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: LORI FLANDERS, ASSISTANT PLANNER

RE: CONTINUUM OF CARE

BACKGROUND

“Continuum of Care” is a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) term referring to a “continuum” of services that allow individuals to move from homelessness to eventual permanent housing.

The City of Merced, along with Merced County, have contracted with the Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) to facilitate the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program. MCAG’s contracted scope of work includes:

- Facilitating monthly meetings with stakeholders to discuss gaps in services and seek solutions;
- Researching potential grant opportunities that may assist stakeholders in addressing gaps in services;
- Submitting the annual Continuum of Care Plan, which describes the Merced County region’s comprehensive response to homelessness; and
- Assisting potential applicants of Continuum of Care Funds.

HUD offers Continuum of Care grant funds to communities that have undertaken an extensive planning process to identify the extent of homelessness, potential solutions, and leverage available resources. Continuum of Care grant funds are highly competitive at a national level and are not guaranteed.

The 2005 Merced County Continuum of Care Plan and Grant Application was awarded \$565,953 from HUD to fund a data collection project known as a Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) and a supportive housing project known as Project Home Start. The 2006 Continuum of Care Plan and Grant Application requested \$570,338 for an expansion of Project Home Start, which would have provided permanent supportive housing to six additional individuals. MCAG was notified in February of 2007 that the project had not been awarded funding. In 2007 HMIS was renewed for another year. The 2008 Continuum of Care Plan requested the renewal of HMIS for another year. Awards are expected to be announced in January 2009.

During the current contract period, MCAG staff has facilitated a number of Continuum of Care community meetings and Executive Council meetings, as outlined below:

| First Quarter (June 08 – Sept 08) | |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 06/11/08 | <i>Executive Council Meeting</i> 7 attendees. Reviewed goals to include with the 2008/2009 Continuum of Care Plan. Reviewed quarterly progress reports for HMIS and Project Home Start. |
| 06/18/08 | <i>General Collaborative Meeting</i> 18 attendees. Presentation by Impact House. Discussion regarding the purpose of the Continuum of Care. Reviewed 2007/2008 Plan score. Established goals for the 2008/2009 CoC Plan. |
| 08/13/08 | <i>Executive Council Meeting</i> 5 attendees. Appointed members to the Prioritization Panel (ranks project applications submitted for CoC funding). Reviewed goals to include with the 2008/2009 CoC Plan. |
| 08/20/08 | <i>General Collaborative Meeting</i> 22 attendees. Distributed applications for Executive Council vacancies. Presentation by Herb Opalek of the Merced County Rescue Mission. |
| 09/09/08 | <i>Prioritization Panel Meeting</i> 4 attendees. Evaluated capacity of project applications submitted for CoC funding. Ranked accordingly for priority in CoC Plan. |
| 09/17/08 | <i>General Collaborative Meeting</i> 12 attendees. Discussion to implement a One Stop Shop at the D Street Homeless Shelter. Appointment of Executive Council. Homeless guest provided her view of what services are missing within Merced County. |

| Second Quarter (Oct 08 – Dec 08) | |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10/08/08 | <i>Executive Council</i> 6 attendees. Appointed Chair and Vice Chair. Reviewed priorities for following three months. Reviewed annual progress report for HMIS. |
| 10/15/08 | <i>General Collaborative</i> 14 attendees. Presentation by the Merced City School District, re: Donation of leftover food for homeless. Informational presentation from Lifeline Phone Services. |
| 11/12/08 | <i>Executive Council</i> 5 attendees. Discussion of attendance portion of CoC Bylaws. Neighborhood Stabilization Program overview. Discussions are conducting a consumer survey for Project Home Start. |
| 11/19/08 | <i>General Collaborative</i> 20 attendees. Discussion of encampment clean up. Recruitment for members to join the Street Count subcommittee. Grant opportunities flyer provided to attendees. |

| Second Quarter continued (Oct 08 – Dec 08) | |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 12/10/08 | <i>Executive Council</i> 7 attendees. Discussion of Project Homeless Connect in San Francisco, Neighborhood Stabilization Program, impact of homeless encampment clean up, and One Stop Shop at Homeless Shelter. |
| 12/17/08 | <i>General Collaborative</i> 40 attendees. Announcement of the first One Stop Shop taking place on December 19, 2008 at the D Street Shelter. Discussed possible solutions to house the homeless individuals that are living at several encampment sites; discussed available mail sources for homeless individuals; announced date of Street Count, January 22, 2009. |

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JANUARY 2, 2009

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: MATT FELL, SENIOR PLANNER

RE: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AMENDMENT

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is the long-term transportation-planning document for Merced County. Major updates are made every 3-4 years, and minor updates are made as needed. The last update was adopted in May 2007.

Due to new federal requirements regarding financial documentation, it has become necessary to amend the RTP. This is a minor amendment, which provides more recent and more specific information, as follows:

1. Revised revenue and expenditure estimates in the Financial Element, specifically to comply with the new Year of Expenditure requirement;
2. More details in “Table 14: Regionally Funded Projects” on page 42, including expected year of construction and escalated cost estimates; and
3. Details on a segmenting/phasing approach for construction of the Los Banos Bypass project.

The proposed amendment to the RTP includes updated funding tables, minor project description corrections and project year of construction edits.

No environmental supplement is necessary. Amendment #2 provides clarifying details on project segmenting and financial year of expenditure information. The proposed changes are consistent with the adopted Environmental Impact Report for the Merced County’s Regional Transportation Plan.

A Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis has been undertaken on the proposed amendment. The Analysis contains the documentation to support a finding that the 2007 RTP Amendment #2 meets the air quality conformity requirements for ozone and particulate matter.

A 30-day public review and comment period occurred from November 26, 2008 through December 26, 2008. A public hearing on these documents was held on December 18, 2008. No comments were received.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Amendment #2.

Attachments: Revised pages (cover, 42, 89-98) of the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan

2007 Regional Transportation Plan for Merced County

Adopted on May 17, 2007

Amended January 15, 2009

Prepared by:

Merced County Association of Governments
369 West 18th St.
Merced, CA 95340
209-723-3153
<http://mcagov.org>

Table 14: Regionally Funded Projects – all amounts in millions (x \$1,000,000) in YOY*

| | | Year | Total Cost | Cost by Funding Programs/Source (deciding agency in parentheses) | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Projects | | (CON / Open to traffic) | (in YOY dollars) | IIP, TCRP, SHOPP (State) | 99 Bond (State) | RIP (MCAG) | RTIF (MCAG) | Dev., Local (Other) | |
| map | Route - Project – Scope/Type - Limits and/or (Post-miles) | | | | | | | | |
| Funded | A | 99 - Mission Ave. Freeway - 4E to 6F - (10.2 / 12.8) | '06 / '07 | | | | | | |
| | B | 99 - Livingston Stage 2 - 4E to 6F - (26.5 / 28.8) | '06 / '08 | | | | | | |
| | C | 99 - Atwater Freeway - 4E to 6F - (23.8 / 26.5) | '08 / '10 | | | | | | |
| | D | 99 - Arboleda Freeway - 4E to 6F - (4.6 - 10.5) | '10 / '13 | 177 | 37 | 140 | | | |
| | E | 99 - Plainsburg Freeway - 4E to 6F - (0.0 / 4.6) | '11 / '14 | 119 | 11 | 108 | | | |
| Tier 1 | F | 99 - Livingston-Delhi Widen - 4F to 6F - (28.8 / 37.3) | '12 / '14 | 80 | 80 | | | | |
| | G | n/a - Campus Parkway - new 4E - Hwy. 99 to Yosemite Ave. | '12 / '14 | 71 | 23 | | | 48 | |
| | H | 152 - Los Banos Bypass, phase 1 - new 4E - Hwy. 165 to Santa Fe Grade (x / 24.8) | '12 / '15 | 72 | 30 | | 17 | 25 | |
| | H | 152 - Los Banos Bypass, phase 2 - new 4E - w. of Los Banos to Hwy. 165 (16.0 / x) | '16 / '19 | 154 | 35 | | 84 | 35 | |
| | I | 59 - Widening - 2C to 4C - 16 th to Olive (15.4 / 16.6) | '12 / '14 | 35 | | | 35 | | |
| | J | 140 - Bradley Overhead - 2 to 4 - (36.5 / 37.6) | '09 / '12 | 43 | 28 | | 5 | 9.5 | |
| | K | 59 - Atwater-Merced Expressway - new 4E - (14.8 / 19.0) | '17 / '20 | 214 | 50 | | 100 | 30 | 34 |
| Tier 1 Subtotal | | | | 651 | 235 | 0 | 241 | 148 | 34 |
| Tier 2 - Unconstrained | | Winton Parkway north extension | | 10 | | | | | |
| | | Bellevue Rd connection to 99 Westside | | 10 | | | | | |
| | | Mission Ave. Improvement | | 16 | | | | | |
| | | SR 99 Merced Fwy 6 lane | | 260 | | | | | |
| | | SR 99 Merced-Atwater Freeway 6 lane | | 160 | | | | | |
| | | SR 99 Atwater Fwy 6 lane | | 200 | | | | | |
| | | SR 59 widen to 4/5 lanes – 99 to 152 | | 55 | | | | | |
| | | SR 140 widen to 4 lanes – to Campus Pkwy | | 14 | | | | | |
| | | SR 165 widening n. of Hilmar | | 46 | | | | | |
| | | 140/33 Truck Route | | 15 | | | | | |
| | | SR 165 Hilmar project | | 43 | | | | | |
| | H | SR 152 Los Banos Bypass – phase 3 – interchanges, full freeway | | 167 | | | | | |
| | | SR 165 widening/bypass Los Banos | | 25 | | | | | |
| | | Bellevue Rd. widening | | 13 | | | | | |
| | | RR Grade Separation at G St. | | 15 | | | | | |
| | Santa Fe Ave. widening from 59 to Winton | | 50 | | | | | | |
| | SR 59 Southern re-alignment | | 150 | | | | | | |
| Tier 2 subtotal | | | | 1,249 | | | | | |
| Total Need = | | | | 1,900 | | | | | |

*: YOY is "Year of Expenditure".

Note that all amounts are estimates based on the information available and are subject to change.

FINANCIAL ELEMENT

The Financial Element identifies the current and anticipated revenue sources and financing techniques available to fund the planned transportation investments described in the Action Element. The intent of the Financial Element is to define realistic financing constraints and opportunities. The Financial Element is consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the RTP.

The purpose of the financial element is to:

- Estimate costs and revenues to implement the projects identified in the Action Element,
- Identify potential funding shortfalls,
- Identify alternative policy directions that affect the funding of projects.

FINANCIAL ASSUMPTIONS

This section describes anticipated revenues to 2030. Also discussed is the potential for other revenue sources.

To determine the level of available funding for each project mode and type, several assumptions were made. In all cases, assumptions regarding available funds are moderate and clearly identified. There are three primary funding levels for regional transportation projects: federal, state, and local. The tables in this section summarize estimated revenues for the RTP period. The most pertinent information provided in each of these tables is described in more detail afterwards.

The following projects are recently constructed and open to traffic, or under construction, or programmed in the State Transportation Improvement Program. Full funding is assumed.

Table 18: Projects Under Construction or Fully Funded

| Project | Funding | Amount (YOE dollars) |
|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Mission Ave. Freeway | IIP+RIP | Open to traffic |
| North Atwater Freeway | IIP | Under construction as of 2008 |
| Livingston Stage 2 Freeway | IIP | Open to traffic |
| Plainsburg IC and Freeway | IIP & 99 Bond | \$177 million |
| Arboleda IC and Freeway | IIP & 99 Bond | \$119 million |

Funding Sources

Federal Funding Sources

Federal funds are used for all modes, including highways and transit projects. These funds normally require a non-federal match of between 11.47-20% for road projects, and a 11.47%-50% match for transit projects. Nine federal funding programs are identified in Tables 19 and 20 below.

Table 19: Federal Funding Sources

| Fund Source | Abbreviation | Primary Mode |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| Surface Transportation Program | STP | Streets (local) |
| Congestion Mitigation / Air Quality | CMAQ | Air quality attainment |
| Transportation Enhancement Activities | TEA | Bicycle, Pedestrian, Landscaping |
| Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 | FTA 5307 | Urban transit |
| Federal Transit Administration Section 5311 | FTA 5311 | Rural transit operations |
| Federal Transit Administration Section 5309 | FTA 5309 | Discretionary transit |
| Highway Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation | HBRR | Bridges (local) |
| Hazard Elimination/Safety | HES | Streets (local) |
| Federal Airport Improvement Program | FAIP | Aviation |

Table 20: Federal Funding Sources, Projected Revenue (in escalated dollars)

| Fund Source | Decision Maker | Guarantee? | Annual Funding | Funding thru 2030 |
|--------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| STP | MCAG | Yes (TEA-21) | \$ 1,900,000 | \$ 58,000,000 |
| CMAQ | MCAG | Yes (TEA-21) | \$ 2,750,000 | \$ 84,000,000 |
| TEA | MCAG | Yes(TEA-21) | \$ 400,000 | \$ 12,000,000 |
| FTA 5307 | MCAG | Yes (TEA-21) | \$ 1,700,000 | \$ 52,000,000 |
| FTA 5311 | MCAG | Yes (TEA-21) | \$ 200,000 | \$ 6,000,000 |
| FTA 5309 | Federal | No | \$ 125,000 | \$ 3,800,000 |
| HBRR | Caltrans | No | \$ 415,000 | \$ 12,700,000 |
| HES | Caltrans | No | \$ 270,000 | \$ 8,200,000 |
| FAIP | Caltrans | No | \$ 90,000 | \$ 2,700,000 |
| TOTAL | | | \$ 7,850,000 | \$ 239,400,000 |

Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Funds

As a non-attainment area, Merced County receives federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. These funds are to be used for projects that contribute to improving air quality in the region. MCAG oversees the distribution of these funds. Examples of eligible CMAQ projects include the following:

- Public transit improvements.
- High occupancy vehicles (HOV) lanes.
- Intelligent Transportation Infrastructure (ITI).
- Traffic management, traveler information systems, and electric toll collection systems.
- Employer-based transportation management plans and incentives.
- Traffic flow improvement programs such as signal coordination.
- Fringe parking facilities serving multiple occupancy vehicles.
- Shared ride services.
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Flexible work-hour programs.
- Outreach activities establishing Transportation Management Associations.
- Fare/fee subsidy programs.
- and under certain conditions PM-10 projects.

Approximately \$55 million in CMAQ funds are estimated to be available for programming over the next 25 years. CMAQ projects are evaluated and selected on a countywide competitive basis. All of the estimated funding for CMAQ under SAFETEA-LU has been programmed to specific projects.

State Funding Sources

State funds are generated by license fees, truck fees, sales and fuel taxes, and other state apportioned funds. Eleven state funding programs are identified in Tables 13 and 14 below.

Table 21: State Funding Sources

| Fund Source | Abbreviation | Primary Mode |
|----------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| Interregional Improvement Program | IIP | Significant State Highways |
| Regional Improvement Program | RIP | Flexible: Regional Needs |
| TDA: Local Transportation Fund | LTF | Transit needs first, Streets (Local) |
| TDA: State Transit Assistance Fund | STAF | Transit |
| Gas Tax - Proposition 111 | Prop 111 | Streets (Local) |
| State Highway Operation and Protection | SHOPP | Safety & Rehab on State Highways |
| Caltrans' Minor Program | Minor | Safety & Rehab on State Highways |
| Environmental Enhancement Mitigation | EEM | Additional TCMs |
| REMOVE | REMOVE | Air Quality Projects |
| Bicycle Transportation Account Funds | BTA | Bicycle Projects |
| California Aid to Airports Program | CAAP | Aviation |

Table 22: State Funding Sources, Projected Revenue (in escalated dollars)

| Fund Source | Decision Maker | Guarantee? | Annual Funding | Funding through 2030 |
|--------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| IIP | Caltrans | No | n/a | \$ 207,000,000 |
| RIP | MCAG | Yes (State law) | \$ 11,000,000 | \$ 288,000,000 |
| LTF | MCAG | Yes (State law) | \$ 5,100,000 | \$ 157,000,000 |
| STAF | MCAG | Yes (State law) | \$ 350,000 | \$ 11,500,000 |
| Prop 111 | Local | Yes (State law) | \$ 6,700,000 | \$ 198,000,000 |
| SHOPP | Caltrans | No | \$ 5,843,000 | \$ 165,000,000 |
| Minor | Caltrans | No | \$ 750,000 | \$ 20,000,000 |
| EEM | Caltrans | No | \$ - | \$ - |
| REMOVE | Air District | No | \$ - | \$ - |
| BTA | Caltrans | No | \$ 50,000 | \$ 1,500,000 |
| CAAP | Caltrans | Yes (formula) | \$ 380,292 | \$ 125,000,000 |
| TOTAL | | | \$ 30,173,292 | \$ 1,173,000,000 |

Local Funding Sources

Local funds for transportation could be derived from taxes, development fees, impact mitigation fees, and transit revenues. There are six possible local funding sources identified in Table 15.

Table 23: Potential Local Funding Sources (in escalated dollars)

| Fund Source | Primary Mode | Decision Maker | Annual Funding | Funding through 2030 |
|-----------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Developer Impact Fees | Streets | Local/MCAG | \$ 4,550,000 | \$ 248,000,000 |
| Developer Mitigations/Local | Streets | Local | \$ 3,450,000 | \$ 112,000,000 |
| Transportation Measure | Streets | MCAG | \$ 13,350,000 | \$ 267,000,000 |
| Local Assessment Districts | Streets | Local | \$ - | \$ - |
| Advertising on Buses | Transit | Local | \$ 20,000 | \$ 400,000 |
| Farebox Recovery | Transit | Local | \$ 900,000 | \$ 18,000,000 |
| TOTAL | | | \$ 22,270,000 | \$ 645,400,000 |

Local Transportation Measure

Based on a recommendation in the 1990 RTP, MCAG prepared and approved a Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) in November of 1991, for the purpose of obtaining voter approval of a Transportation Measure. However, action to implement the plan was delayed due to the nationwide recession and announcement that Castle Air Force Base would be closed by 1995.

In April 2006, MCAG adopted a revised TEP. Projects included in the TEP were identified through an evaluation of the county's transportation system and interviews with key staff and elected officials

representing the county and all of the cities. Projects were evaluated in a public opinion poll conducted as a part of the study. Projects were prioritized using an objective set of criteria.

Key elements of the TEP include:

- Funds for transportation projects of countywide significance.
- Funds for maintenance, repair, safety and operational improvements to city streets and county roads
- Funds to improve transit.
- A requirement that the county and cities adopt local traffic impact fees to insure that new development pays its own way.

A Transportation Measure for a period of 30 years would generate about \$450 million in additional revenue. The Measure would automatically sunset after 30 years. Measure funds would be allocated as follows:

- 45 percent to Local Street and Road Maintenance with funds allocated to the county and cities on a formula basis.
- 50 percent to fund projects of countywide significance
- 4 percent to fund transit improvements.
- 1 percent for administrative oversight.

A Transportation Measure (Measure M) was placed on the November 2002 ballot. 61% of the voters supported the measure. As a 2/3 support was needed, it did not pass. The Measure was placed on the ballot in June 2006 and November 2006. It again failed to pass.

Regional Transportation Impact Fee

The Regional Transportation Impact Fee program represents a major step forward in preparing for the anticipated growth in Merced County. The following key points place the program in context:

- The RTIF contributes to the funding of 10 projects across the county.
- Without the RTIF contribution these projects will face delay or termination.
- The total cost of these projects is \$530 million.
- The RTIF contributes about 17%, or \$91 million towards these projects.
- The fee is uniform throughout the county.
- The RTIF will receive an annual review to monitor administration and project progress.

Funding by Mode

Table 24 shows the breakdown of funding by Transportation Mode. Funding sources for all modes are discussed in the text below.

Table 24: Funding by Program and Mode (Amounts in Millions) (in escalated dollars)

| Funding Program | Regional Improvements | Local Roads | Transit | Control Measures | Bicycle Pedestrian | Totals by Fund |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|---------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Interregional Improvement Program | 207 | | | | | 207 |
| 99 Bond Program | 248 | | | | | 248 |
| Regional Improvement Program | 288 | | | | | 288 |
| Regional Transportation Impact Fee | 248 | | | | | 248 |
| Gas Tax Prop 111 | | 198 | | | | 198 |
| Local Transportation Funds | | 57 | 100 | | | 157 |
| Surface Transportation Funds | | 58 | | | | 58 |
| Congestion Mitigation Air Quality | | | 63 | 13 | 8 | 84 |
| Federal Transit Administration | | | 61 | | | 61 |
| State Transit Assistance | | | 11 | | | 11 |
| Transit Fares | | | 18 | | | 18 |
| Development Fees and other Local funds | 288 | 112 | | | | 400 |
| Bicycle Transportation Account Grants | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Totals by Mode | 1,279 | 425 | 253 | 13 | 9 | 1,979 |

Regional Road Projects

Several funding programs are expected to be primarily used for funding safety and maintenance projects on the regional road system. The State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) funds are used for safety and rehabilitation projects on the state highway system. On local regional roads, bridge and safety projects are expected to be funded from the following programs: Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (HBRR), Hazard Elimination/Safety (HES). HBRR and HES funds are programmed by Caltrans for local projects. SHOPP projects are programmed by Caltrans for State Highway projects. It is reasonable to expect that the Merced region will receive a share of statewide available revenues, in proportion to its share of statewide need, although the Merced County region is not guaranteed to receive funds under these programs. Historically, only about 20% of the candidate projects are approved for funding due to the program funding limitations. Caltrans has responsibility and authority to prioritize and program these types of projects.

Capacity-increasing or improvement projects on the regional road network are primarily funded through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program, Merced County proposes projects using Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds. Through the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program, Caltrans nominates highway construction projects using Interregional Improvement Program (IIP) funds. In the past, projects from the regional and interregional programs in a county competed for the same reservoir of funding, then known as the county minimum. Now, seventy-five percent of the STIP dollars available are allocated to the regions. Twenty-five percent of the STIP is allocated to the interregional program, with funds programmed on a statewide basis, and no requirement that any minimum amount be spent in each county.

Approximately \$242 million in Regional Improvement Program funds are estimated to be available for programming. These estimates are subject to change as more accurate information becomes available.

Local revenue for regional road improvements would include the Transportation Measure (\$133.5 million) and the Regional Transportation Impact Fee (\$91 million).

Local Road Projects

There are limited guaranteed funding sources available for funding local road projects. The following funding sources are allocated to each jurisdiction. These funds are primarily used to maintain the local system.

- State Transportation Program (STP) - Federal, exchanged for state dollars
- Local Transportation Funds (LTF) - derived from State sales tax
- State Gas Tax subventions - derived from State fuel tax

Under state law, the Merced County region and Merced County (the political subdivision of the State of California) are eligible to exchange STP funds for an equal amount of state-collected gasoline tax revenues. This opportunity provides more flexibility in the use of these funds, eliminates the required local match and eliminates the bureaucracy associated with using federal funds on a project. MCAG and Merced County have entered into agreements with the state for exchanging unobligated balances of STP funds. Exchanges are expected to be carried out on an annual basis. Exchange of funds will have no fiscal impact on available revenues.

New revenue for local road projects would come from a Transportation Measure (\$118.8 million).

Transit Projects

Transit funds are available through passenger fares, funding from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the Transportation Development Act.

The Federal Transit Administration provides funding for operating, capital and special earmark projects. Table 10 identifies the projected revenue from each Federal Transit Administration Section.

The Transportation Development Act established a State Transit Assistance Fund (STAF) and a Local Transportation Fund (LTF). The Merced region is expected to receive \$7,000,000 over the next 20 years in STAF funds. These funds are subject to approval by the Governor, and the annual amount fluctuates with each annual state budget.

By law, LTF funds are first and foremost to be used to fund transit projects. After all "unmet transit needs, which are reasonable to meet" have been met, unspent LTF funds may be used for street and road purposes.

Other potential transit revenues is available includes Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for air quality non-attainment areas, and STP funds which may be used for transit capital projects.

New revenue for transit would come from a Transportation Measure (\$12 million).

Non-Motorized/Bicycle Projects

Funds for non-motorized projects are available from several state and Federal programs, as well as local sources. However, only the Bicycle Transportation Account funds are designed with non-motorized projects as a primary use. Another potential funding source assumed to be used for non-motorized projects includes CMAQ funds.

Revenues for non-motorized projects from the BTA program during the RTP implementation period is anticipated to be \$1 million with an addition \$5 million dollars worth of projects being funded using CMAQ funds.

Aeronautics Projects

The primary sources of funds for aeronautic projects in the Merced region are the California Aid to Airports Program (CAAP) and the Federal Airport Improvement Program. Approximately \$9,339,000 are projected to be available for airport improvements over a 20-year period.

Rail Projects

Intercity rail projects are funded by State Highway Account funds (for projects programmed in the STIP), as well as funding for specific projects from the Public Transportation Account, the Traffic Congestion Relief Program and Proposition 116. There are no regional guarantees for such projects. As the intercity rail system operates on an interregional basis, improvements must be planned on a scale larger than any single county.

REVENUE VERSUS NEED

Regional Highways, Streets, and Roads

The Highways, Streets, and Roads section identified regional project priorities that are necessary within the RTP implementation.

Planned expenditures of Regional Improvement Program and other locally generated funds for regional road improvements total \$535 million. With the expenditure of these funds, it is assumed that approximately \$560 million in state discretionary funding will be leveraged for projects on the state highway system. Additional projects (Tier 2) that are projected to be of regional significance in

the RTP implementation period, but are excluded from the RTP due to a lack of available revenues, total \$53 million.

Transit

Local governments in the Merced County region have consolidated transit services, resulting in a reduced cost of providing public transit. Transit expenditures are projected to be \$143,000,000 for the RTP implementation period. There is no funding shortfall identified for transit over the RTP implementation period.

Local Streets and Roads

The County and each of the cities identified several local projects for maintenance and reconstruction for street and road systems in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) which is a three-year program. However, these projects do not reflect the actual transportation needs of Merced County since the FTIP is financially constrained. Over the RTP implementation period, local agencies expect to receive \$354 million in revenues. Based on the projects identified for the next seven years, the total necessary expenditures for local street and road projects over the RTP implementation period will be approximately \$347 million. The local project need represents a significant shortfall in revenues – approximately \$116 million.

Non-motorized (Bikeways & Pedestrian)

Expenditures for non-motorized projects, which include maintenance and construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities are estimated to be \$6 million during the 20-year implementation period. These projects will be implemented using discretionary grant funds through other sources and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Funds.

Aeronautics

Estimates of expenditures for aeronautics are projected to be approximately \$9,339,000 for the RTP implementation period. The estimated need for Merced County is approximately \$52 million with a shortfall of approximately \$42 million. Aviation projects are listed in the Appendix.

Summary of Revenue vs. Need

The region's priority transportation projects and strategies cannot all be implemented within the RTP implementation period given estimates of available revenues. Therefore, several projects and strategies are listed as "possible future additions to the RTP."

In Table 25, projected revenues for each mode of transportation are compared with estimated costs of transportation projects and strategies identified in the Action Element, and to the projected needs. Projected needs include all projects that will be necessary to achieve the transportation goals of the RTP, including projects excluded from the RTP because of financial constraint requirements. Shortfall of revenue for each mode is also identified.

Table 25: Projected Revenues vs. Needs, by Mode (Amounts in Millions)

| Transportation Mode | Revenue | Needs | (Shortfall) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Regional Road & Highway Improvements | 1,279 | 1,900 | (621) |
| Local Road Improvement & Maintenance | 425 | 760 | (335) |
| Transit | 253 | 253 | 0 |
| Air Quality Control Measures | 13 | 13 | 0 |
| Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities | 9 | 17 | (8) |
| Total | 1,979 | 2,943 | (964) |

ITEM 9

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JANUARY 2, 2009

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: TERRI LEWIS, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

**RE: FINAL DRAFT FORMAL AMENDMENT NO. 3 TO THE 2009 INTERIM
FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (FTIP)**

BACKGROUND

Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) is proposing Formal Amendment No. 3 with the addition of Type 5 projects (relies on a new air quality emissions analysis) and adds Type 3 projects (Air Quality Conformity Exempt projects) to the approved 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program (Interim FTIP).

The eight San Joaquin Valley (SJV) Council of Governments (COGs) Directors have directed staff to process Amendment No. 3 to the 2009 Interim FTIP to make the 2009 Interim FTIP as complete of a whole programming document as possible.

In July 2008, when the 2009 Interim FTIP document was processed, the SJV COGs did not have an opportunity to include regionally significant projects that required a new air quality conformity analysis because the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) had not approved the PM-10 Maintenance Plan. Subsequent to the adoption of the 2009 Interim FTIP being approved, the EPA has approved the PM-10 Maintenance Plan, therefore, SJV COGs now have the necessary emissions budgets to process a new air quality conformity analysis and make the Interim FTIP programming document as whole as possible.

The 2009 Interim FTIP and any subsequent amendment is the programming document that identifies four years (FY 08/09, FY 09/10, FY 10/11, and FY 11/12) of federal, state and local funding sources for transportation projects in Merced County.

The Draft Amendment No. 3 to the 2009 Interim FTIP contains the following changes:

1. Adds regionally significant projects and/or project phases that could not be included in the 2009 Interim FTIP without an air quality conformity analysis:
 - Widening Existing Hwy 59;
 - Los Banos Bypass (project now segmented);

- SR99 Freeway Widening – Livingston to Stanislaus County line;
 - SR99 Widening Buchanan Hollow to Miles Creek with Arboleda Interchange;
 - SR99 Widening Buchanan Hollow to Madera County line with Plainsburg Interchange;
 - Atwater/Merced Expressway;
 - Campus Parkway (projected segmented);
 - Bradley Overhead;
 - SR165 & SR99 PA/ED includes the Project Study Report (PSR).
2. Adds the new G Street Railroad Undercrossing Prop 1B funded project (exempt from Air Quality Conformity Analysis).
 3. Modifies the 2008 SHOPP program Lump Sums (exempt from Air Quality Conformity Analysis):
 - a. Adds two new SHOPP Collision Reduction Lump Sum programs to coincide with the Caltrans October 08 listing;
 - b. Add 2006 SHOPP projects in FY08/09 that have received extensions from the California Transportation Commission (CTC);
 - c. Modifies the SHOPP Bridge Preservation Lump Sum program with the Caltrans October 08 listing;
 - d. Modifies the SHOPP Mobility Lump Sum program to coincide with the Caltrans October 08 listing;
 - e. Modifies the SHOPP Roadway Preservation Lump Sum program to coincide with the Caltrans October 08 listing.
 4. Modifies the Caltrans Highway Bridge Program (HBP) Local Lump Sum program (exempt from Air Quality Conformity Analysis) to coincide with the 12/27/07 Caltrans listing;
 5. Adds two Federal Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) (air quality exempt projects) for the City of Livingston in FY10/11 and the City of Los Banos in FY11/12;
 6. Adds two State Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) (air quality exempt projects) for the City of Merced Schools, and Merced County;
 7. Adds the Hilmar Bike/Pedestrian Bicycle Transportation Account (air quality exempt) project;
 8. Adds the YARTS FTA-5320 FY08/09 (air quality exempt) grant award;
 9. Adds the YARTS State Planning and Research grant (air quality exempt) funding for a Short Range Transit Plan;
 10. Reduces the Merced County Transit CNG bus purchase (air quality exempt) total by \$75,000; and
 11. Technical correction to the CMAQ FY11/12 apportionment to \$2,622,000.

These projects and/or project phases are consistent with the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or Amendment #2 to the 2007 RTP.

Both the 2007 RTP documents and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis can also be viewed on the Merced County Association of Governments website at www.mcagov.org.

In addition, the projects and/or project phases contained in Amendment No. 3 do not interfere with the timely implementation of any approved Transportation Control Measures (TCMs).

A 30-day public review and comment period closed on December 26, 2008 at 5:00 pm. A public hearing was held on December 18, 2008. MCAG staff has received two sets of written comments: 1) Caltrans District 10; and 2) Caltrans-Headquarters. MCAG staff is in the process of addressing the comments.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt Formal Amendment No. 3 to the 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) adding both Type 5 (Air Quality Conformity Analysis required) and Type 3 (Exempt from Air Quality Conformity Analysis) projects making the FTIP as whole a programming document as possible.

ITEM 10

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JANUARY 2, 2009

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: LORI FLANDERS, ASSISTANT PLANNER

RE: FY 2008-2009 LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUND (LTF) CLAIMS

BACKGROUND

At the October 16, 2008 Governing Board meeting, staff was directed to shift \$993,987 of Local Transportation Funds (LTF) back to transit to cover a budget shortfall. The shortfall is due to a \$423,572 shortfall in budgeted State Transit Assistance (STA) funding and a projected \$570,415 shortfall in fuel appropriations due to the increase in gasoline and diesel fuel prices.

DISCUSSION

MCAG has received revised LTF claims from the Cities of Atwater, Dos Palos, Gustine, Livingston, Los Banos, Merced, and the County of Merced.

A resolution from the MCAG Governing Board approving the revised LTF claims is required by the Merced County Auditor's office so that these funds can be dispersed. Resolution 2009/1-15-02 is attached for your review.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the revised Local Transportation Fund claims received by adoption of Resolution 2009/1-15-02.

Attachment: Resolution 2009/1-15-02
 LTF Apportionment Schedule FY 08-09

RESOLUTION NO. 2009/1-15-02

**RESOLUTION OF THE MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
GOVERNING BOARD APPROVING REVISED CLAIMS FOR
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUND (LTF)
MONIES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009**

WHEREAS, Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) is designated the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Merced County; and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Atwater, Dos Palos, Gustine, Livingston, Los Banos, Merced and County of Merced have filed individual revised claims with MCAG for Local Transportation Fund (LTF) (Transportation Development Act) monies in the amount of \$5,800,000 for Fiscal Year 2008/2009; and

WHEREAS, these claims include streets and roads projects and projects used for pedestrians and bicycles in the amount of **\$603,152** pursuant to Public Utilities Code (PUC), Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 8, Section 99400(a); public transportation services in the amount of **\$4,445,435**, pursuant to PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 4, Section 99260(a) and PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 8, Section 99400(c); and planning projects in the amount of **\$133,360** pursuant to PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 8, Section 99402 and PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 4, Section 99262 for Fiscal Year 2008/2009; and

WHEREAS, public transportation services are provided to the general public through operation of the consolidated transit service, "The Bus" - Merced County Transit.

WHEREAS, specific efforts undertaken by MCAG in the transportation planning process and approval of the unmet transit needs process were previously approved by the MCAG Governing Board in a Resolution dated November 29, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the cities submitting these claims have filed their claims pursuant to the following codes: for streets and roads PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 8, Section 99400(a); planning projects pursuant to PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 8, Section 99402 and PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 4, Section 99262 and public transportation pursuant to PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 4, Section 99260(a) and PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 8, Section 99400(c);

WHEREAS, the **City of Atwater** claim includes **streets and roads** projects in the amount of **\$72,164** and **planning projects** in the amount of **\$14,644** for Fiscal Year 2008/2009; and

WHEREAS, the **City of Dos Palos** claim includes **streets and roads** projects in the amount of **\$13,902** and **planning projects** in the amount of **\$2,598** for Fiscal Year 2008/2009; and

WHEREAS, the **City of Gustine** claim includes **streets and roads** projects in the amount of **\$15,842** and **planning projects** in the amount of **\$2,732** for Fiscal Year 2008/2009; and

WHEREAS, the **City of Livingston** claim includes **streets and roads** projects in the amount of **\$42,985** and **planning projects** in the amount of **\$7,045** for Fiscal Year 2008/2009; and

WHEREAS, the **City of Los Banos** claim includes **streets and roads** projects in the amount of **\$88,747** and **planning projects** in the amount of **\$18,670** for Fiscal Year 2008/2009; and

WHEREAS, the **City of Merced** claim includes **streets and roads** projects in the amount of **\$154,674** and planning projects in the amount of **\$42,268** for Fiscal Year 2008/2009; and

WHEREAS, the **County of Merced** claim includes **streets and roads** projects in the amount of **\$214,838**; **public transportation services** in the amount of **\$4,445,435**; **capital transit purchase** in the amount of **\$553,104** and **planning projects** in the amount of **\$45,403** for Fiscal Year 2008/2009; and

WHEREAS, MCAG has conducted meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee, the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) and a public hearing in conformance with the PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 3, Sections 99238(2) and 99238.5; and

WHEREAS, Merced County transit providers propose to serve, at a minimum, all claimant areas of Merced County within their jurisdictions at the level of public transportation services that are reasonable to meet as defined by the MCAG Governing Board; and

WHEREAS, the proposed expenditures on the claims are found to be in conformity with the Regional Transportation Plan; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, after said SSTAC meetings, public hearings, consideration of testimony presented therein, and consideration of all information identified in a MCAG Minute Order dated November 29, 2007, that the claims for Merced County claimants for Local Transportation Funds (Transportation Development Act) monies for the Fiscal Year 2008/2009 for the purposes specified in PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 8, Section 99400(a) in the amount of **\$603,152**; PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 4, Section 99260(a) and PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 8, Section 99400(c) in the amount of **\$4,445,435**; and PUC Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 8, Section 99402 and PUC, Division 10, Part 11, Chapter 4, Article 4, Section 99262 in the amount of **\$133,360** (as listed individually above) be, and are hereby approved.

The above resolution was approved by the Merced County Association of Governments on **January 15, 2009** by _____, who moved its adoption, which motion was duly seconded by _____, and which was adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

APPROVED:

Jesse Brown, Executive Director
Merced County Association of Governments

Joe Oliveira, Chair
MCAG Governing Board

DATED: _____

Local Transportation Fund Apportionments Schedule
Fiscal Year 2008 - 2009
Jan-09

Table 1: LTF Apportionment Less Expenditures

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Total FY 08-09 LTF Apportionment | \$ 5,800,000 |
| County Auditor | \$ 2,850 |
| MCAG Administration | \$ 62,100 |
| MCAG Planning | \$ 133,360 |
| Capital Transit Purchases | \$ 553,104 |
| Total Expenditures | \$ 751,414 |
| Remainder | \$ 5,048,586 |

Table 2: LTF Shares by Jurisdiction prior to Transit

| Jurisdiction | Pop - Depart of Fin Jan 2007 | % of Population | MCAG Planning Share | Remaining portion before Transit |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| Atwater | 27,618 | 10.98% | \$ 14,644 | \$ 554,379 |
| Dos Palos | 4,899 | 1.95% | \$ 2,598 | \$ 98,338 |
| Gustine | 5,152 | 2.05% | \$ 2,732 | \$ 103,417 |
| Livingston | 13,287 | 5.28% | \$ 7,045 | \$ 266,711 |
| Los Banos | 35,211 | 14.00% | \$ 18,670 | \$ 706,794 |
| Merced | 79,715 | 31.69% | \$ 42,268 | \$ 1,600,127 |
| Unincorporated | 85,628 | 34.05% | \$ 45,403 | \$ 1,718,820 |
| TOTAL | 251,510 | 100.00% | \$ 133,360 | \$ 5,048,586 |

Table 3: LTF Funds Needed for Transit

| Remaining LTF before Transit | |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| | \$ 5,048,586 |
| LTF Needed for Rural Service | \$ 1,550,649 |
| LTF Needed for Urban Service | \$ 1,900,799 |
| Total Needed for Transit Operations | \$ 3,451,448 |
| Balance left for Streets and Roads | \$ 1,597,138 |
| Budget Shortfall | \$ 993,987 |
| Balance left for Streets and Roads | \$ 603,151 |
| 1st Quarter Payments | \$ 399,285 |
| Balance to be distributed | \$ 203,867 |

Table 4: LTF Transit Costs by Jurisdiction

| Jurisdiction | Remaining portion before Transit | % of Rural Transit Service | Rural Transit Service Deduction | % of Urban Transit Service | Urban Transit Service Deduction | Population Split in UrbanArea** | 50% Population Share | Total Urban Share | Transit Share Deduction | Amount Available January 2008 Estimate | 1st Quarter Payment | Distribution after Transit Shortfall (based on population) | Amount Available to Claim FY08-09 |
|----------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Atwater | \$ 554,379 | | | 16.38% | \$ 155,685 | 21% | \$ 199,584 | \$ 355,269 | \$ 355,269 | \$ 199,110 | \$ 49,777 | \$ 22,386 | \$ 72,164 |
| Dos Palos | \$ 98,338 | 3.78% | \$ 58,615 | | | | | | \$ 58,615 | \$ 39,724 | \$ 9,931 | \$ 3,971 | \$ 13,902 |
| Gustine | \$ 103,417 | 3.66% | \$ 56,754 | | | | | | \$ 56,754 | \$ 46,663 | \$ 11,666 | \$ 4,176 | \$ 15,842 |
| Livingston | \$ 266,711 | 8.89% | \$ 137,853 | | | | | | \$ 137,853 | \$ 128,859 | \$ 32,215 | \$ 10,770 | \$ 42,985 |
| Los Banos | \$ 706,794 | 30.05% | \$ 465,970 | | | | | | \$ 465,970 | \$ 240,824 | \$ 60,206 | \$ 28,541 | \$ 88,747 |
| Merced | \$ 1,600,127 | | | 72.26% | \$ 686,759 | 58% | \$ 553,133 | \$ 1,239,891 | \$ 1,239,891 | \$ 360,236 | \$ 90,059 | \$ 64,615 | \$ 154,674 |
| Unincorporated | \$ 1,718,820 | 53.62% | \$ 831,458 | 11.36% | \$ 107,956 | 21% | \$ 197,683 | \$ 305,639 | \$ 1,137,097 | \$ 581,723 | \$ 145,431 | \$ 69,408 | \$ 214,838 |
| TOTAL | \$ 5,048,586 | 100.00% | \$ 1,550,649 | 100.00% | \$ 950,400 | 100% | \$ 950,400 | \$ 1,900,799 | \$ 3,451,448 | \$ 1,597,138 | \$ 399,284 | \$ 203,867 | \$ 603,151 |

** Based on 2000 Census

Table 5 Historic Use of LTF Funding

| | FY 06-07 | FY 07-08 | FY 08-09 |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Apportionment | \$ 7,775,000 | \$ 7,300,000 | \$ 5,800,000 |
| County Auditor | \$ 2,700 | \$ 2,850 | \$ 2,850 |
| MCAG Administration | \$ 62,100 | \$ 62,100 | \$ 62,100 |
| MCAG Planning | \$ 133,360 | \$ 183,360 | \$ 133,360 |
| Capital Transit Purchases | \$ 381,861 | \$ 689,196 | \$ 553,104 |
| Transit Budget Shortfall | \$ 384,490 | \$ - | \$ 993,987.00 |
| Balance | \$ 964,511 | \$ 937,506 | \$ 1,745,401 |
| LTF Needed for Rural Service | \$ 1,362,326 | \$ 1,907,460 | \$ 1,550,649 |
| LTF Needed for Urban Service | \$ 1,413,850 | \$ 2,269,796 | \$ 1,900,799 |
| More STAF = Less LTF | \$ (1,371,467) | \$ (464,480) | |
| Total Transit Service | \$ 1,404,709 | \$ 4,177,256 | \$ 4,445,435 |
| Remaining for Streets | \$ 5,405,780 | \$ 2,185,238 | \$ 603,151 |

Table 6: Historic Apportionments for Streets and Roads

| Apportionment Claimed by Jurisdiction | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Original FY 2007-08 | Aug Adjustment to Transit Budget | Additional STAF = More LTF | 07-08 Final | Draft 08-09 |
| Atwater | \$ 198,131 | \$ 233,160 | \$ 54,672 | \$ 287,832 | \$ 72,164 |
| Dos Palos | \$ 42,691 | \$ 50,411 | \$ 6,206 | \$ 56,617 | \$ 13,902 |
| Gustine | \$ 50,581 | \$ 52,909 | \$ 6,639 | \$ 59,548 | \$ 15,842 |
| Livingston | \$ 127,046 | \$ 190,868 | \$ 10,782 | \$ 201,650 | \$ 42,985 |
| Los Banos | \$ 201,626 | \$ 273,357 | \$ 48,865 | \$ 322,222 | \$ 88,747 |
| Merced | \$ 172,666 | \$ 261,025 | \$ 197,866 | \$ 458,891 | \$ 154,674 |
| Unincorporated | \$ 609,101 | \$ 659,028 | \$ 139,451 | \$ 798,479 | \$ 214,838 |
| TOTAL | \$ 1,401,842 | \$ 1,720,758 | \$ 464,481 | \$ 2,185,239 | \$ 603,151 |
| | | A | B | A+B | |

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JANUARY 2, 2009

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: CANDICE STEELMAN, PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER

RE: ONE VOICE STATE AND FEDERAL POLICY PLATFORMS

BACKGROUND

The One Voice delegates have traditionally carried earmark requests to legislators and agencies in Washington, D.C. and a mix of funding and policy requests to State agencies and legislators. During the course of this year's program, One Voice participants requested that State and Federal policy platforms be established. The lists of needs compiled during the first two One Voice meetings was then divided up into appropriate policy and earmarks requests.

DISCUSSION

Attached are the drafts of the State and Federal policy platforms. On December 12, 2008, One Voice attendees ranked their priorities. The results were as follows:

State Priorities

1. Economic Development: Adopt a San Joaquin Valley prevailing wage.
2. Water: Pass a comprehensive water plan that addresses supply, quality, conveyance, and storage.
3. Transportation: Lower requirement for self-help measures to 55%.
4. Healthcare: Support a County Organized Health System (COHS).
5. Education: Pass legislation to put Career Technical Education on equal footing with other forms of education, thus receiving equal opportunities for funding.

Federal Priorities

1. Water: Support legislation to establish a comprehensive water plan for the San Joaquin Valley that addresses supply, quality, conveyance, and storage.
2. Transportation 1: Fund right-of-way purchase for Phase II of the Campus Parkway.
3. Transportation 2: Fund right-of-way purchase for Phase I of the Los Banos bypass.
4. Healthcare: Pass legislation to make Merced County a medical needs region for enhanced reimbursement.
5. Education: Fund the Engineering Academy model program.

After discussing the priorities with MCAG's state and federal lobbyists and with legislative staff, MCAG staff recommends some changes. At the federal level, there are only three earmarks and they should appear first. The Healthcare request, while not an earmark, is a defined program. Water is a top concern, but as the request stands, it is too ambiguous. Unfortunately, knowledgeable water advisors only attended the first One Voice meeting, which was not enough to help guide discussion towards a project. Therefore, staff concurs with the state priority list and recommends this arrangement of the federal priorities:

1. Transportation: Los Banos bypass. Continue to keep this project as the top priority. Consistency is important. Legislators question when priorities, which have not been fully funded, change.
2. Transportation: Campus Parkway.
3. Education: Engineering Academy.
4. Healthcare: Medical needs region.
5. Water: Comprehensive water plan for the San Joaquin Valley.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve:

- a. The One Voice 2009 state and federal policy platforms; and
- b. The One Voice 2009 state and federal priorities, with staff's recommendation.

Attachments: One Voice 2009 State Policy Platform
One Voice 2009 Federal Policy Platform

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT



Merced County Association of Governments One Voice: 2009 Federal Legislative Platform

Introduction

In 2003, due to concerns that Merced County was receiving considerably less funding per capita than other California counties, the Governing Board of the Merced County Association of Governments asked that a legislative program be developed. The result was the One Voice program, a coalition of elected officials, business owners, nonprofit agencies and other interested parties. This coalition meets to select priority issues for the year and, with the approval of the MCAG Governing Board, travels to Sacramento and Washington, D.C. to present to legislators issues of importance to the cities and county of Merced.

The MCAG Governing Board consists of one elected official from each of the six cities and one supervisor from each of the five county districts.

The One Voice group, in coordination with the MCAG Governing Board, has established a Legislative Platform that reflects the current priorities of One Voice in state and federal legislative matters. The goal of the Legislative Platform is to represent a unified voice when communicating legislative issues of regional importance to our state and federal legislative members as well as to relevant state and federal agencies.

In General

- Pursue a fair share of funding from all state and federal sources for Merced County, which has traditionally received 33-42% less per capita than other areas of the state and country

Transportation

- Support efforts to provide additional sources of funding for all modes of transportation, including road improvements, road maintenance, air and rail travel, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian paths
- Under the "Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century" (MAP 21) Federal Surface Transportation Authorization bill, support the San Joaquin Valley COG Directors Policy Council proposal to create a National Goods Movement Program, with emphasis on farm to market corridors. This would necessitate increased rail movement carrying San Joaquin Valley agricultural goods to reduce number of truck trips on SJV corridors and installation of grade separations that promote safety and faster rail and truck movement
- Support federal funding to develop a High Speed Rail system

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Economic Development

- Support the Seattle office of U.S. EDA in their request to create an earmark for the entire San Joaquin Valley to help fund activities within a regional economic development district
- Support legislation that provides incentives for renewable energy companies to locate in Merced County

Water

- Support legislation and bond proposals that adequately address the water supply, water storage, and water quality needs of the San Joaquin Valley, with special recognition of the importance of agriculture to the Valley's economy.
- Emphasize how the San Joaquin River restoration, lack of water storage, lack of a conveyance system around the Delta, and invasive species in the Delta impact not only Merced County, but the entire San Joaquin Valley
- Provide incentives to build regional wastewater treatment plants. Some communities can not afford to pay their fair share, which limits regional solutions.
- Fund countywide ground and surface water supply studies and model development. Fund old promises made by state and federal agencies.

Healthcare

- Oppose lowering Medicare reimbursements
- Support the San Joaquin Valley as a medical needs region for enhanced reimbursement. The Valley has the 2nd poorest health statistics in the nation, just ahead of Mississippi.

Housing Foreclosure Crisis

- Pursue additional funding from the Neighborhood Stabilization Program

Education

- Support funding for maintenance and expansion of local general and specialty programs that have proven successful
- Support funding for Career Technical Education programs that integrate best practices into their programs; support funding for state-of-the-art facilities for CTE 5
- Encourage language in legislation that recognizes Career Technical Education (CTE) as a viable and valuable path for continuing education; support funding for programs that combine core curriculum with CTE experiences

Air Quality

- Support legislation, such as S 3496 (Sen. Barbara Boxer), that provides funding to retrofit or replace engines in heavy duty trucks and buses to attain air quality standards and improve the health of Valley residents
- We join with the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley to ensure full funding of the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) under the Farm Bill, including a fair allocation to the San Joaquin Valley.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT



Merced County Association of Governments One Voice: 2009 State Legislative Platform

Introduction

In 2003, due to concerns that Merced County was receiving considerably less funding per capita than other California counties, the Governing Board of the Merced County Association of Governments asked that a legislative program be developed. The result was the One Voice program, a coalition of elected officials, business owners, nonprofit agencies and other interested parties. This coalition meets to select priority issues for the year and, with the approval of the MCAG Governing Board, travels to Sacramento and Washington, D.C. to present to legislators issues of importance to the cities and county of Merced.

The MCAG Governing Board consists of one elected official from each of the six cities and one supervisor from each of the five county districts.

The One Voice group, in coordination with the MCAG Governing Board, has established a Legislative Platform that reflects the current priorities of One Voice in state and federal legislative matters. The goal of the Legislative Platform is to represent a unified voice when communicating legislative issues of regional importance to our state and federal legislative members as well as to relevant state and federal agencies.

In General

- Pursue a fair share of funding from all state and federal sources for Merced County, which has traditionally received 33-42% less per capita than other areas of the state and country
- Seek a San Joaquin Valley presence on all state advisory committees when committee recommendations will affect the economic well-being and quality of life for Merced County residents

Transportation

- Support efforts to provide additional sources of funding for all modes of transportation, including road improvements, road maintenance, air and rail travel, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian paths
- Oppose the practice of placing spillover funds in the General Fund; allow Prop. 42 to receive all gas sales tax revenues
- In order to help counties help themselves, lower voting requirements to become a self-help county from 66.67% to 55%
- Support development of High Speed Rail

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Economic Development

- Support a San Joaquin Valley prevailing wage to replace the current Bay Area-based prevailing wage which discourages or limits projects in Merced County due to costs
- Support legislation that provides incentives for renewable or alternative energy companies to locate in Merced County
- Join the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) to oppose reduction in funding for Community Block Development Grants (CDBG)

Water

- Support legislation and bond proposals that adequately address the water supply, water storage, and water quality needs of the San Joaquin Valley, with special recognition of the importance of agriculture to the Valley's economy.
- Emphasize how the San Joaquin River restoration, lack of water storage, lack of a conveyance system around the Delta, and invasive species in the Delta impact not only Merced County, but the entire San Joaquin Valley
- Provide incentives for communities to build regional wastewater treatment plants. Some communities can not afford to pay their fair share, which limits regional solutions
- Fund countywide ground and surface water supply studies and model development. Fund old promise made by state and federal agencies.

Healthcare

- Oppose lowering Medi-Cal reimbursements
- Pursue Health Empowerment Zone legislation linking current Health Professional Shortage Area designations with economic development's Enterprise Zones to increase the number of health providers in an underserved area and, specifically, the supply of primary care in more isolated communities

Housing Foreclosure Crisis

- Pursue additional funding from the Neighborhood Stabilization Program as more funds become available

Education

- Support funding for maintenance and expansion of local general and specialty programs that have proven successful
- Support funding for Career Technical Education programs that integrate best practices into their programs; support funding for state-of-the-art facilities for CTE
- Encourage language in legislation that recognizes Career Technical Education (CTE) as a viable and valuable path for continuing education; support funding for programs that combine core curriculum with CTE experiences.

Air Quality

- Support legislation that provides funding to retrofit or replace engines in heavy duty trucks and buses to attain air quality standards and improve the health of Valley residents