

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

THURSDAY, June 4, 2009– 10:00 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.

- * **3. Minutes of the May 7, 2009 Technical Planning Committee Meeting**

- * **4. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for 2009/2010**

- * # **5. Draft Formal Amendment No. 10 (Type 2 – Funding Changes) to the 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)** Terri Lewis

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve Formal Amendment No. 10 with funding program modifications to three existing 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program regionally significant projects (Campus Parkway, Los Banos Bypass, PSR Hwy 99 & SR 165) with reliance on the previous air quality conformity analysis adopted with Amendment No. 2 to the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan by adoption of Resolution No. 2009/06-18-01.

- * # **6. Re-determination of Air Quality Conformity** Matt Fell

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt a resolution re-determining conformity for the 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #3 and 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Amendment #2.

- # **7. Traffic Counts report** Matt Fell

For information only.

- 8. Oral Report – Traffic Modeling** Matt Fell

- * # **9. San Joaquin Valley Express Transit Study** Jesse Brown

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the San Joaquin Valley Express Transit Study.

- * # **10. SR 99/165 Project Study Report (PSR) Milestone Approval** Ty Phimmasone

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the Purpose and Need for the SR 99/165 Project Study Report.

- 11. Status of Regional Road Projects for Merced County** Ty Phimmasone

For information only.

* # **12. MDSS GIS Data Agreement** Rich Green

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the MDSS GIS Data Agreement and give direction to MCAG staff to secure agreements with each member jurisdiction to provide data as stipulated.

13. ArcGIS Explorer Demonstration Rich Green

* *Action*

Attachment

+ *Enclosure*

*The next Technical Planning Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, July 2, 2009 at 10:00 a.m.
at MCAG, 369 W. 18th Street, Merced, California*

TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

May 7, 2009

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the **TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE** held Thursday, May 7, 2009, at the Merced County Association of Governments conference room located at 369 W. 18th Street, Merced, California, was called to order by Chairman Richard Schwarz at 10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mark Fachin, City of Los Banos
Ernie Garza, City of Gustine
John Gedney, Caltrans District 10
Dave Gonzalves, City of Merced
Len Guillette, City of Atwater
Justin Hendrix, City of Atwater
Larnold Jones, Merced County Transit
Richard Schwarz, Merced County Public Works

MEMBERS ABSENT

City of Dos Palos
City of Livingston
San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

OTHERS PRESENT

Matt Fell, MCAG
Rich Green, MCAG
Marjie Kirn, MCAG
Terri Lewis, MCAG

1. Introductions

So noted.

2. Oral Communication

Ernie Garza asked for correction of the April 2, 2009 TPC meeting minutes to reflect that he was present and not absent.

Larnold Jones noted his error during the April 2, 2009 TPC meeting when he stated incorrectly that the Merced County Transit bus wash project is not funded with ARRA-5311 funds. This project is funded with 5311 funds.

3. Minutes of the April 2, 2009 Technical Planning Committee Meeting

Larnold Jones made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 2, 2009 Technical Planning Committee meeting minutes as amended.

Seconded by Justin Hendrix.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Transit Joint Powers Agreement - Review

Marjie Kirn discussed the creation of Merced County Transit (MCT) as a consolidated transit service (1996) that was being provided by each of the local agencies. The administration of MCT service in the original Transit Joint Powers Agreement has been under Merced County Public Works. As the MCT system has evolved there have been possible jurisdictional conflict issues raised. It is staff's current belief that a different TJPA structure might benefit the management of the system. Also, at this time, almost 100% of the Local Transportation Funds (LTF) get allocated to transit. Staff believes that this is a good time to update the Transit Joint Powers Agreement and address a MCT new management structure.

Richard Schwarz stated that Merced County Public Works has no issues with possible TJPA changes. The question of whether the MCT employees stay under Merced County Public Works will have to be addressed in the TJPA.

Larnold Jones added that a similar change took place two years ago with the Solid Waste JPA.

Dave Gonzalves made a motion to recommend the Transit Joint Powers Authority direct staff to prepare a draft update of the Transit Joint Powers Agreement and return for review in 90 days.

Seconded by Justin Hendrix.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. San Joaquin Valley Blueprint – Next Steps

Rich Green explained that the San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council adopted Scenario B+ and the Smart Growth Principles included in the agenda packet. Rich commented that the difference between the original Scenario B and B+ is the inclusion of the High Speed Rail and other minor transportation enhancements.

Dave Gonzalves inquired if the 8.6 dwelling unit per acre figure is an average of all the cities and Merced County.

Rich Green answered yes.

Rich Green added that the 8.6 figure is doable as long as Merced County, all jurisdictions, stick with the higher density figures as proposed in their updated general plans and don't convert that future development to a lower density.

Rich Green reminded members of the San Joaquin Valley Planners meeting on May 13, 2009 in Fresno from 10:30 to 2:00. Video attendance is an option in MCAG's conference room.

Dave Gonzalves moved to recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the Smart Growth Principles and Scenario B+ adopted by the San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council.

Seconded by Justin Hendrix.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. 2008/2009 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Exchange Funds

Marjie Kirn discussed the federal RSTP funds that come to Merced County jurisdictions every year. Because Merced County's population was below 200,000 in 1990, California's constitution allows MCAG to exchange these federal funds for state only dollars (1:1) annually. This state exchange removes the federal funding requirements and makes it easier for local jurisdictions to spend this revenue.

Exchanged RSTP funds can be distributed based on population, a competitive call for projects, or some other methodology. Spending these funds are at the discretion of the MCAG Governing Board.

Dave Gonzalves stated that Merced County jurisdictions need to equally share in fee collection responsibilities and if they don't enact the Regional Transportation Impact Fee ordinance then they shouldn't have an opportunity to share in other available revenue sources.

Dave Gonzalves made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board:

- a. Direct staff to rework the RSTP distribution figures and not include any jurisdiction(s) that does not have an adopted Regional Transportation Improvement Fee (RTIF) ordinance to collect fees;
- b. Direct staff to enter into an agreement with Caltrans regarding the exchange of Regional Surface Transportation Program Funds;
- c. Approve the Draft Regional Surface Transportation Program Apportionment Schedule for Fiscal Year 2008/09 with the modification of recalculated funds for any jurisdiction that does not have an adopted RTIF ordinance;
- d. Adopt Resolution 2009/05-21-01 authorizing the disbursement of the modified FY08/09 RSTP funds upon receipt of claim forms from jurisdictions.

Seconded by Justin Hendrix.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Interstate Designation for SR99

Marjie Kirn explained that there would be extensive costs in designating SR 99 to interstate status. Caltrans completed a rather vague economic analysis that shows an interstate change would be of no economic benefit to Merced County, yet it would come with an estimated price tag of \$150 million for Merced County alone. No additional transportation funding sources would be available with the interstate change. Caltrans will be releasing an economic study within the next few weeks.

Mark Fachin made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board reaffirm their opposition to designating Highway 99 as a Federal Interstate Highway.

Seconded by Dave Gonzalves.

Ayes – Mark Fachin, Dave Gonzalves, Justine Hendrix, Larnold Jones, Richard Schwarz, Ernie Garza.

Noes - John Gedney.

MOTION CARRIED.

8. Obligation Goals for America Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funds

Marjie Kirn discussed the status of local jurisdictions obligating ARRA funds within the required deadlines. Last Friday, Will Kempton informed MPO's that the state has already obligated 50% of California's ARRA funding. With the first percentage deadline having been met, it takes a little pressure off of local jurisdictions. Marjie wants to make sure that everyone understands how critical it is to stay on schedule with obligating ARRA funds, even though the state has met the first percentage requirement. Marjie emphasized member jurisdictions need to forge ahead with MCAG's 50% obligation goal and stay on schedule.

Marjie inquired if there is a need to brainstorm alternatives for meeting the ARRA obligation deadlines.

Marjie's understanding of ARRA obligation status by jurisdiction:

Atwater – On schedule for obligation; 1511 certification submitted to Caltrans.

Dos Palos-Will not obligate ARRA funds within 120 days.

Gustine- TE application has been approved. On schedule for ARRA/TE obligation

Livingston- Assuming they will obligate within 120 days.

Los Banos-Experienced delay with going out to bid, won't obligate within 120 days.

Merced – Experienced delay with cultural analysis issue. Submitting authorization package tomorrow, May 8, 2009. Believe they can still obligate a portion of their funds within 120 days.

Merced County- On schedule to obligate a share of their allocation within 120 days.

Dave Gonzalves stated that he would confirm the ARRA authorization package will be submitted by tomorrow and if this is not going to happen he will let Marjie know this afternoon.

Dave Gonzalves made a motion to vacate the Plan B Alternatives discussion.
Seconded by Mark Fachin.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. ARRA 1511 Certification

Marjie Kirn stated for local jurisdictions to receive an authorization approval, MCAG must certify the ARRA projects to Caltrans. Caltrans has provided a 1511 certification template that local jurisdictions must complete with project information. Merced County local projects are considered "I = Individual" for the spreadsheet. This spreadsheet is submitted to MCAG and a separate certification letter is attached. Both documents are then sent to a Caltrans web address. It is unclear how long a turn around time Caltrans will need for their portion. Will Kempton stated that this is a new process, yet Caltrans intends to expedite the certification requirements and it could occur within weeks.

Marjie added that MCAG has already submitted the 1511 certification for the City of Atwater ARRA projects.

10. Information/Discussion Only

- a. New federal Transportation Act Request for High Priority Project Proposals
- b. Bike Grant Funding and History
- c. San Joaquin Valley Express Transit Study
- d. Proposition 42 Funding History

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS OF THE TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY CHAIRMAN RICHARD SCHWARZ AT 10:48 A.M.

ITEM 5

MEMORANDUM

DATE: MAY 28, 2009

TO: TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

FROM: TERRI LEWIS, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

RE: DRAFT FORMAL AMENDMENT NO. 10 (TYPE 2 – FUNDING CHANGES) TO THE 2009 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (FTIP)

BACKGROUND

Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) is proposing Formal Amendment No. 10 (Type No. 2 – funding changes) to the 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). Type No. 2 FTIP Formal Amendments do not require a new air quality conformity analysis, yet rely on the previous conformity analysis adopted with Amendment No. 2 to the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Modification of the FTIP is allowed in 23 CFR (Part 450.326) as needed to keep the document up-to-date.

The 2009 FTIP, and any subsequent amendment, is the programming document that identifies the four-year period (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.

Formal Amendment No. 10 to the 2009 FTIP includes programming changes to three regionally significant road projects (Campus Parkway, Los Banos Bypass, and Project Study Report (PSR) Hwy 99 & SR 165) funded with federal SAFETEA-LU High Priority Project (HPP) and Transportation Improvement (TI) Congressional Earmarks, state (Transportation Congestion Relief Program - TCRP, Transportation Corridor Systems Preservation – TCSP, Regional Improvement Program – RIP, and Interregional Improvement Program – IIP) funds, as well as local funds (Regional Transportation Improvement Fees – RTIF, etc).

Metropolitan Planning Organization areas designated to be in nonattainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are required to be fiscally constrained in the first four programming years of the FTIP (the quadrennial element). Any funds programmed in future fiscal years (FY 12/13, FY 13/14 or BEYOND year) are included for information purposes only and are not required to be fiscally constrained.

Formal Amendment No. 10 to the 2009 FTIP modifies programming figures on three projects:

1. Campus Parkway

- Adds the FY 2009 annual apportionment of \$74,921 (20% of the original earmark) of the SAFETEA-LU High Priority Project (HPP), Project No. 1780, to \$79,079 of unobligated HPP carryover funding from prior years for a total in FY 08/09 of \$154,000;
- Adds the FY 2009 annual apportionment of \$187,304 (20% of the original earmark) of the SAFETEA-LU High Priority Project (HPP), Project No.3806, to \$672,696 of unobligated HPP carryover funding from prior years for a total in FY 08/09 of \$860,000;
- Moves Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) funding of \$5,473,000 from FY 08/09 to FY 14/15 as is consistent with Merced County's Project Programming Request (PPR) document sent to Caltrans in May;
- Pushes out the City of Merced local funds of \$6,225,0000 for Phase 2 construction into the BEYOND year; and
- Adds Local UC Proportionate 2030 Share funds of \$751,000 in FY 08/09 for construction of phase 1, \$4,311,000 for construction of Phase 2 in BEYOND year, and \$5,461,600 for construction of phase 3 in BEYOND year.

2. Los Banos Bypass

- Adds the 2008 Surface Transportation Project Consolidated Appropriations act earmark (Section 129 – No. CA 812) of \$500,000 (obligation authority is \$490,000 with a 2% congressional rescission) for Right of Way (RW) in FY 08/09; and
- Adds the Caltrans' Transportation, Community, and System Preservation (TCSP) grant award of \$950,000 for preliminary engineering (PE) in FY 09/10 as instructed by TCSP statewide coordinator Teresa McWilliams;
- Modifies the Regional Improvement Program (RIP) and Interregional Improvement Program (IIP) funding sources to fiscal years consistent with the project managers Project Change Request (PCR) – See the CTIPS page with funding detail; and
- Reduces the City of Los Banos RW funds from \$9,600,000 to \$8,000,000 due to cost savings.

3. PSR Hwy 99 and SR 165

- Adds the 2009 Annual SAFETEA-LU HPP earmark (project No. Ca 716) apportionment of \$74,921 to a carryover of unobligated prior funds for a total of \$223,000 in FY 08/09;
- Pushes out the 2009 SAFETEA-LU TI earmark funds of \$702,000 into FY 12/13.

Formal Amendment No. 10 programming changes are consistent with Amendment No. 2 to the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as well as the associated Air Quality Conformity Analysis.

In addition, Formal Amendment No. 10 FTIP programming modifications do not interfere with the timely implementation of any approved Transportation Control Measures (TCMs).

Formal Amendment No. 10 has been distributed for Interagency Consultation (IAC) and a 14-day public review period (June 4 – June 18, 2009).

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve Formal Amendment No. 10 with funding program modifications to three existing 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program regionally significant projects (Campus Parkway, Los Banos Bypass, PSR Hwy 99 & SR 165) with reliance on the previous air quality conformity analysis adopted with Amendment No. 2 to the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan by adoption of Resolution No. 2009/06-18-01.

Attachments: CTIPS report by project
FTIP Updated Financial Summary
Resolution No. 2009/06-18-01

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

DIST: 10	COUNTY: Merced County	TITLE (DESCRIPTION): Campus Parkway - near Merced new arteria (Campus Parkway - near Merced construct new arterial : Phase 1 Hwy 99 to Childs Ave.; Phase 2 from Childs to Hwy 140 ; Phase 3 from Hwy 140 to Yosemite Ave.)	MPO Aprv: / / State Aprv: / / Federal Aprv: / /
ROUTE:	PM:		
PPNO: 5951	KP:		
EA: 4A0700	MPO ID:		
CTIPS ID: 105-0000-0016			
IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Merced County		PRJ MGR: STEVE ROUGH	EPA TABLE II or III EXEMPT CATEGORY:
		PHONE: (209) 385-7601	

PROJECT VERSION HISTORY (Printed Version is Shaded) (Dollars in whole)

Version	Status	Official Date	Updated By	Change Reason	Amend No.	Prog Con	Prog RW	PE					
10	Active	05/13/2009	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	10	77,735,000	14,884,000	8,499,000					
9	Official	02/26/2009	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	3	72,225,000	11,834,000	6,658,000					
8	Official	11/17/2008	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over		80,351,000	12,073,000	8,202,000					
7	Official	06/02/2008	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	12	75,151,000	12,073,000	6,560,000					
6	Official	06/29/2007	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change		75,451,000	12,073,000	6,260,000					
5	Official	02/05/2007	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	1	23,725,000	11,584,000	6,260,000					
4	Official	07/20/2006	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over		23,774,000	12,035,000	6,260,000					
3	Active	08/19/2004	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change		23,600,000	8,845,000	5,500,000					
2	Official	05/23/2002	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over		23,600,000	8,200,000	5,500,000					
* Demo - Fed Demo					PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 1 of 9					PE	5,326,000							5,326,000
* Fund Type: Demonstration - TEA21					RW	4,994,000							4,994,000
* Funding Agency: Merced County Association of Governments					CON								
					TOTAL	10,320,000							10,320,000
* TCRP (Committed) - Local Roads Improvements (Local Assistance)					PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 2 of 9					PE	2,295,000							2,295,000
* Fund Type: Traffic Congestion Relief Fund					RW	7,730,000							7,730,000
* Funding Agency: Merced County Association of Governments					CON		7,501,000					5,474,000	12,975,000
					TOTAL	10,025,000	7,501,000					5,474,000	23,000,000
* Demo -					PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 3 of 9					PE								
* Fund Type: High Priority Projects Program					RW	206,000	154,000						360,000
* Funding Agency: Merced County					CON								
					TOTAL	206,000	154,000						360,000
* Demo -					PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 4 of 9					PE								
* Fund Type: High Priority Projects Program					RW	940,000	860,000						1,800,000
* Funding Agency: Merced County					CON								
					TOTAL	940,000	860,000						1,800,000
* RIP -					PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 5 of 9					PE	453,000							453,000
* Fund Type: State Cash					RW								
* Funding Agency: Merced County					CON								
					TOTAL	453,000							453,000
* Loc Funds -					PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 6 of 9					PE	425,000							425,000
* Fund Type: City Funds					RW								
* Funding Agency: Merced, City of					CON							6,225,000	6,225,000
					TOTAL	425,000						6,225,000	6,650,000
* Loc Funds -					PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 7 of 9					PE								
* Fund Type: Developer Fees					RW								
* Funding Agency: Various Agencies					CON							48,000,000	48,000,000
					TOTAL							48,000,000	48,000,000
* Loc Funds -					PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 8 of 9					PE								
* Fund Type: Private Funds					RW								
* Funding Agency: Various Agencies					CON		751,000					9,772,000	10,523,000
					TOTAL		751,000					9,772,000	10,523,000

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

DIST: 10	COUNTY: Merced County	TITLE (DESCRIPTION):	MPO Aprv: //
ROUTE:	PM:	Campus Parkway - near Merced new arteria (Campus Parkway - near Merced construct new arterial : Phase 1 Hwy 99 to Childs Ave.; Phase 2 from Childs to Hwy 140 ; Phase 3 from Hwy 140 to Yosemite Ave.)	State Aprv: //
PPNO: 5951	KP:		Federal Aprv: //
EA: 4A0700	MPO ID:		
CTIPS ID: 105-0000-0016			
IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Merced County		PRJ MGR: STEVE ROUGH	EPA TABLE II or III EXEMPT CATEGORY:
		PHONE: (209) 385-7601	

		<u>PRIOR</u>	<u>08/09</u>	<u>09/10</u>	<u>10/11</u>	<u>11/12</u>	<u>12/13</u>	<u>13/14</u>	<u>BEYOND</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
• Loc Funds -										
• Fund Source 9 of 9	PE									
• Fund Type: Private Funds	RW									
	CON								12,000	12,000
• Funding Agency: Various Agencies	TOTAL								12,000	12,000

Project Total		<u>PRIOR</u>	<u>08/09</u>	<u>09/10</u>	<u>10/11</u>	<u>11/12</u>	<u>12/13</u>	<u>13/14</u>	<u>BEYOND</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	PE	8,499,000								8,499,000
	RW	13,870,000	1,014,000							14,884,000
	CON		8,252,000						69,483,000	77,735,000
	TOTAL	22,369,000	9,266,000						69,483,000	101,118,000

Comments:

***** Version 10 - 05/06/2009 *****SAFETEA_LU FY09 HPP allocation notification on May 5, 2009. HPP project no. 3806, Section 1702 of SAFETEA-LU FY09 allocation of \$400,000. OA authority is \$374,608 based on Obligation limitation of 93.65% per April Nitsos.

***** Version 9 - 01/16/2009 *****Adding existing project to 2009 Interim FTIP with new AQ conformity analysis now that EPA has provided emissions budgets.

***** Version 8 - 01/14/2009 ***** Carrying forward 2006 project into 2008 for 2009 Interim FTIP. Project can proceed in current phase, yet cannot move forward to another phase without a new AQ conformity analysis that cannot be processed with 09 Interim FTIP due to lack of EPA emissions budgets.

***** Version 7 - 06/05/2008 *****

Adding amendment 12 to 2006. No sure why but amendment 12 shows up in 2008, yet it should be carried over into 2008, not shown as a new project.

***** Version 6 - 03/02/2007 ***** 4/30.0

Local Measure funds = RTIF program funds.

FY06/07 SAFETEA-LU allocation information received from Caltrans Headquarters. FY06/07 HPP funding added to existing project (HPP No. 1780 \$82,000 added to \$206,000 = \$288,000 AND HPP No.3806 \$407,000 added to \$940,000 = \$1,347,000). Additional FY06/07 allocation amounts within administrative amendment guidelines.

Phase 2 Construction , deficit of \$26,226,000 therefore remaining \$12,274,000 of TCRP has been pushed out into FY10/11 beyond the four year fiscal constraint period as "information only" programming. Phase 3 Construction, deficit of \$25,000,000 and no funding currently identified for this phase, again pushed out to FY10/11 for "information only" programming at this time.

***** Version 5 - 02/05/2007 *****

Merced County shifting TEA-21 funds in FY06/07 from RW to PS&E and Development fees in FY06/07 from PS&E to Construction.

***** Version 4 - 05/16/2006 *****carryover project onto 2006

***** Version 3 - 08/30/04 *****

Project data transfered from 2004 STIP.

Funds moved to match 2004 RTIP

***** Version 2 - 05/21/02 *****

Project data transfered from 2002 STIP.

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

DIST: 10	COUNTY: Merced County	TITLE (DESCRIPTION):	MPO Aprv: / /
ROUTE: 152	PM: 16.0 / 24.8	Los Banos Bypass - Const 4-lane Expway i (Segment 1: Construct the east portion of bypass as four-lane expressway with signalized at-grade intersections at SR165 & existing SR152. Description continued in comments section)	State Aprv: / /
PPNO: 5707	KP: 25.7 / 39.9		Federal Aprv: / /
EA: 41910	MPO ID:		
CTIPS ID: 105-0000-0029			EPA TABLE II or III EXEMPT CATEGORY:
IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Caltrans		PRJ MGR: RAM NARAYAN GUPTA	
		PHONE: (209) 948-7972	

PROJECT VERSION HISTORY (Printed Version is Shaded) (Dollars in whole)

Version	Status	Official Date	Updated By	Change Reason	Amend No.	Prog Con	Prog RW	PE				
8	Active	05/26/2009	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	10	226,000,000	53,580,000	19,910,000				
7	Official	02/26/2009	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	3		11,900,000	14,400,000				
6	Official	11/17/2008	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over				14,318,000				
5	Official	06/29/2007	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	2			14,318,000				
4	Official	07/20/2006	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over				4,500,000				
3	Official	08/19/2004	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over				4,000,000				
2	Official	05/23/2002	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over				2,600,000				
1	Official	07/20/2000	BSPEARS	Adoption				800,000				
* RIP - Regional Improvement Program				PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 1 of 6				PE	5,180,000						4,300,000	9,480,000
* Fund Type: State Cash				RW	2,020,000						19,375,000	21,395,000
* Funding Agency: Merced County Association of Governments				CON					33,800,000		58,400,000	92,200,000
TOTAL					7,200,000				33,800,000		82,075,000	123,075,000
* IIP - Interregional Improvement Program				PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 2 of 6				PE	5,180,000						4,300,000	9,480,000
* Fund Type: State Cash				RW	2,020,000						19,375,000	21,395,000
* Funding Agency: Caltrans				CON					33,800,000		35,000,000	68,800,000
TOTAL					7,200,000				33,800,000		58,675,000	99,675,000
* Loc Funds -				PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 3 of 6				PE								
* Fund Type: City Funds				RW	8,000,000							8,000,000
* Funding Agency: Los Banos, City of				CON								
TOTAL					8,000,000							8,000,000
* Loc Funds -				PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 4 of 6				PE								
* Fund Type: Local Measure				RW	2,300,000							2,300,000
* Funding Agency: Merced County Association of Governments				CON							65,000,000	65,000,000
TOTAL					2,300,000						65,000,000	67,300,000
* Demo -				PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 5 of 6				PE								
* Fund Type: High Priority Projects Program				RW	490,000							490,000
* Funding Agency: Merced County Association of Governments				CON								
TOTAL					490,000							490,000
* Federal Disc. -				PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
* Fund Source 6 of 6				PE		950,000						950,000
* Fund Type: Trans. & Comm & Sys. Presrv. Pilot Prog				RW								
* Funding Agency: Merced County Association of Governments				CON								
TOTAL						950,000						950,000
Project Total				PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	BEYOND	TOTAL
				PE	10,360,000		950,000				8,600,000	19,910,000
				RW	4,040,000	10,790,000					38,750,000	53,580,000
				CON					67,600,000	158,400,000	226,000,000	
TOTAL					14,400,000	10,790,000	950,000		67,600,000	205,750,000	299,490,000	

Comments:

***** Version 8 - 05/15/2009 *****

Project Description continued:

Segment 2: Construct the west portion of the bypass as a four-lane expressway with signalized at-grade intersections at route 165 and at the west interchange location.

Segment 3: Construct the three interchanges located at West Pacheco Blvd, Route 165 and East Pacheco Blvd. Segment 3 is not in the 20-year RTP

Project title change and funding modifications as requested by Caltrans PM Ram Gupta. Adding 2008 Appropriations HPP earmark (No. 812) from August 22, 2008 of \$500,000 for RW in FY08/09. Only \$490,000 available of the \$500,000 due to the 2% recession per April Nitsos. Adding 2009 TCSP funds of \$950,000 for PE in FY09/10 per Teresa McWilliam email that funds are committed, yet the allocation is not anticipated until July 2009.

***** Version 7 - 01/16/2009 ***** Consistent with RTP amendment 2 adding existing project into 2009 Interim FTIP with 3 project segments: Segment 1) Construct new 4-lane expressway on 6-lane right of way from Hwy 165 to Santa Fe Grade; Segment 2) Construct new 4-lane expressway on 6-lane right of way West of Los Banos to Hwy 165; Segment 3) Construct Interchanges and full freeway.

***** Version 6 - 01/14/2009 ***** Carrying forward 2006 into 2008 for 2009 Interim FTIP.

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

***** Version 5 - 03/02/2007 *****

Prop IB STIP/RIP Augmentation (state cash) funds added per Caltrans District 10

***** Version 4 - 06/19/06 *****

Project data transferred from 2006 STIP.

***** Version 3 - 08/30/04 *****

Project data transferred from 2004 STIP.

***** Version 2 - 05/21/02 *****

Project data transferred from 2002 STIP.

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

DIST: 10	COUNTY: Merced County	TITLE (DESCRIPTION): SR165 / SR 99 PE (PSR & PAED) (SR165 improvements and SR99 I/C between SR165 & Bradbury Road in Merced and Stanislaus Counties.)	MPO Aprv: / /
ROUTE: 165	PM:		State Aprv: / /
PPNO:	KP:		Federal Aprv: / /
EA:	MPO ID: MG006		
CTIPS ID: 205-0000-0111			
IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Merced County Association of Governments		PRJ MGR: MARJIE KIRN	EPA TABLE II or III EXEMPT CATEGORY: Non construction related activities.
		PHONE: (209) 723-3153	

PROJECT VERSION HISTORY (Printed Version is Shaded) (Dollars in whole)

Version	Status	Official Date	Updated By	Change Reason	Amend No.	Prog Con	Prog RW	PE					
6	Active	05/26/2009	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	10			1,407,000					
5	Official	02/26/2009	TLEWIS	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	3			1,337,000					
4	Official	11/17/2008	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over				1,915,000					
3	Official	06/29/2007	TLEWIS	Amendment - Other (Explain ==>)	2			797,000					
2	Official	07/20/2006	TLEWIS	Adoption - Carry Over				443,000					
1	Official	05/04/2006	TLEWIS	Amendment - New Project	9			443,000					
* Demo -					<u>PRIOR</u>	<u>08/09</u>	<u>09/10</u>	<u>10/11</u>	<u>11/12</u>	<u>12/13</u>	<u>13/14</u>	<u>BEYOND</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
* Fund Source 1 of 4					PE	137,000	223,000						360,000
* Fund Type: High Priority Projects Program					RW								
					CON								
* Funding Agency: Merced County Association of Governments					TOTAL	137,000	223,000						360,000
* Loc Funds -					<u>PRIOR</u>	<u>08/09</u>	<u>09/10</u>	<u>10/11</u>	<u>11/12</u>	<u>12/13</u>	<u>13/14</u>	<u>BEYOND</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
* Fund Source 2 of 4					PE	61,000	39,000						100,000
* Fund Type: Private Funds					RW								
					CON								
* Funding Agency: Merced County Association of Governments					TOTAL	61,000	39,000						100,000
* Other Fed -					<u>PRIOR</u>	<u>08/09</u>	<u>09/10</u>	<u>10/11</u>	<u>11/12</u>	<u>12/13</u>	<u>13/14</u>	<u>BEYOND</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
* Fund Source 3 of 4					PE	205,000				702,000			907,000
* Fund Type: TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS					RW								
					CON								
* Funding Agency: Merced County Association of Governments					TOTAL	205,000				702,000			907,000
* Loc Funds -					<u>PRIOR</u>	<u>08/09</u>	<u>09/10</u>	<u>10/11</u>	<u>11/12</u>	<u>12/13</u>	<u>13/14</u>	<u>BEYOND</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
* Fund Source 4 of 4					PE		17,000			23,000			40,000
* Fund Type: Agency					RW								
					CON								
* Funding Agency: Various Agencies					TOTAL		17,000			23,000			40,000
Project Total					<u>PRIOR</u>	<u>08/09</u>	<u>09/10</u>	<u>10/11</u>	<u>11/12</u>	<u>12/13</u>	<u>13/14</u>	<u>BEYOND</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
					PE	403,000	279,000			725,000			1,407,000
					RW								
					CON								
					TOTAL	403,000	279,000			725,000			1,407,000

Comments:

***** Version 6 - 05/20/2009 *****
There is an additional match of \$69,000 that is required, yet has not been identified for the \$702,000 TI earmark shown for information purposes only outside the 2009 FTIP 4-year quadrennial element in FY12/13.
SAFETEA-LU, last year (FY08/09) HPP and TI apportionments available as of May 4, 2009.
***** Version 5 - 01/16/2009 ***** Title of project corrected to include latest Congressional fix to include both the HPP and TI funds for the PE (PSR & PAED)
***** Version 4 - 01/14/2009 ***** Carrying forward 2006 project into 2008 for 2009 Interim FTIP. PSR is phase exempt from AQ Conformity.
***** Version 3 - 06/18/2007 *****
***** Version 2 - 05/16/2006 ***** carryover project into 2006
***** Version 1 - 10/06/2005 *****
HR3 (SAFETEA-LU) HPP project, Section 1702,
No. 716. 20% HPP/year max programming limit. FY04/05 (\$68,438) and FY05/06 (\$68,348) available now \$137,000. FY06/07 available Nov 2006. OK from David Thompson/April Nitsos (HPP Coordinator) to use program separate SAFETEA-LU (TI) earmark project No. 18 (\$1,000,000) with sliding scale programming limit per year (10/20/25/25/20) for PSR/PE per FHWA definitions/policy.TI Earmark OA availability - FY04/05 \$85,500 now ; FY05/06 \$177,000 available March 06 for a total of \$265,500. Only programming \$205,200 of the \$265,500 available for FY04-06.
When the HPP earmark OA becomes available in Nov of future years, Caltrans HQ will replace the TI earmark funds that were programmed in FY05/06.
Private donation of \$100,000 will be used to match the local non-federal requirement. HPP required match 20%. TI required match 11.47%.
Fund Type 5 - Private Funds (\$38,000) is ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION.

State of California
2008/09-2011/12 Federal Transportation Improvement Program
MPO: Merced County Association of Governments
DRAFT FORMAL AMENDMENT #10

REVENUE SOURCES		(Dollars X 1,000)								
		2008/09		2009/10		2010/11		2011/12		CURRENT TOTAL
		Previous	Current	Previous	Current	Previous	Current	Previous	Current	
LOCAL	Sales Tax	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$23,200
	-- City	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- County	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Other (Transportation Development Act)	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$23,200
	Gas Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Gas Tax (Subventions to Cities)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Gas Tax (Subventions to Counties)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other Local Funds	\$445	\$445	\$1,967	\$1,967	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,412
	-- City General Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Street Taxes and Developer Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Other (registration fees (AB434) - Private (Mariposa, Mono)	\$445	\$445	\$1,967	\$1,967	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,412
	Transit	\$3,303	\$3,303	\$3,011	\$3,011	\$2,101	\$2,101	\$2,101	\$2,101	\$10,516
	-- Transit Fares	\$2,346	\$2,346	\$2,346	\$2,346	\$2,101	\$2,101	\$2,101	\$2,101	\$8,894
	-- Other Transit (e.g., parcel/property taxes, parking revenue, AMTRAK, NPS)	\$957	\$957	\$665	\$665	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,622
Tolls (e.g., non-state owned bridges)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Other (Please Specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Local Total	\$9,548	\$9,548	\$10,778	\$10,778	\$7,901	\$7,901	\$7,901	\$7,901	\$36,128	
REGIONAL ¹	Tolls	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Bridge	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Corridor	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Transit Fares/Measures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Sales Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Bond Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Gas Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Vehicle Registration Fees (CARB Fees, SAFE)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Regional Transportation Impact Fee - RTIF)	\$1,700	\$2,300	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$2,300
	Regional Total	\$1,700	\$2,300	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$2,300
STATE	State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)	\$84,584	\$84,584	\$44,761	\$44,761	\$55,960	\$55,960	\$0	\$0	\$185,305
	SHOPP (Including Augmentation)	\$79,029	\$79,029	\$44,761	\$44,761	\$55,960	\$55,960	\$0	\$0	\$179,750
	SHOPP Prior	\$5,555	\$5,555	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,555
	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	\$47,694	\$47,694	\$6,457	\$6,457	\$19,190	\$19,190	\$12,800	\$12,800	\$86,141
	STIP (Including Augmentation) (included IIP nonbond funding)	\$47,694	\$47,694	\$6,457	\$6,457	\$19,190	\$19,190	\$12,800	\$12,800	\$86,141
	STIP Prior	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Proposition 1 B ⁴ (SR 99, HRCSA, PTMISEA)	\$0	\$0	\$148,000	\$148,000	\$103,000	\$103,000	\$0	\$0	\$251,000
	GARVEE Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Traffic Congestion Relief Program	\$12,000	\$7,501	\$0	\$0	\$5,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,501
	State Transit Assistance (STA) Prop 42	\$7,713	\$7,713	\$7,774	\$7,774	\$7,869	\$7,869	\$7,869	\$7,869	\$31,225
	Other (ER, Local HBRR, Local Seismic, SR2S, BLA)	\$1,133	\$1,133	\$1,461	\$1,461	\$461	\$461	\$0	\$0	\$3,055
	State Total	\$153,124	\$148,625	\$208,453	\$208,453	\$191,680	\$186,480	\$20,669	\$20,669	\$564,227
FEDERAL TRANSIT	Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)	\$1,527	\$1,527	\$565	\$565	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,092
	Clean Fuel Formula Program (5308)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Fixed Guideway Modernization (5309a)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Intercity Bus (5311f)	\$195	\$195	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$195
	Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (5316)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Metropolitan Planning (5303)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	New and Small Starts (Capital Investment Grants) (5309b)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	New Freedom (SAFETEA-LU)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (5311)	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$1,660
	Public Transportation on Indian Reservation (5311c)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Transit in the Parks (5320)	\$273	\$273	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$273
	Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)	\$2,648	\$2,648	\$2,485	\$2,485	\$2,370	\$2,370	\$2,370	\$2,370	\$9,873
	ARRA - FTA 5307	\$2,486	\$2,486	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,486
ARRA - FTA 5309	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
ARRA - FTA 5311	\$1,952	\$1,952	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,952	
Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Federal Transit Total	\$9,496	\$9,496	\$3,465	\$3,465	\$2,785	\$2,785	\$2,785	\$2,785	\$18,531	

State of California

2008/09-2011/12 Federal Transportation Improvement Program

MPO: Merced County Association of Governments

DRAFT FORMAL AMENDMENT #10

REVENUE SOURCES (page 2)		(Dollars X 1,000)								
		2008/09		2009/10		2010/11		2011/12		CURRENT TOTAL
		Previous	Current	Previous	Current	Previous	Current	Previous	Current	
FEDERAL HIGHWAY	Federal Highway Non-Discretionary									
	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Surface Transportation Program (Regional)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Railway (Section 130)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)	\$445	\$445	\$0	\$0	\$871	\$871	\$263	\$263	\$1,579
	Safe Routes to School (SR2S)	\$649	\$649	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$649
	Transportation Improvements (TI)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Federal Lands Highway	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - SHOPP	\$46,704	\$46,704	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$46,704
	ARRA - STIP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - Highway Maintenance (HM)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - TE	\$0	\$299	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$299
	ARRA - RSTP	\$5,054	\$9,892	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,892
	ARRA - Federal Lands Highway	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Subtotal	\$52,852	\$57,989	\$0	\$0	\$871	\$871	\$263	\$263	\$59,123
	Federal Highway Discretionary Programs									
	Bridge Discretionary Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec.1303)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Ferry Boat Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	High Priority Projects (HPP)	\$1,917	\$1,727	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,727
	High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)	\$0	\$0	\$70	\$70	\$670	\$670	\$0	\$0	\$740
	National Scenic Byways Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Public Lands Highway Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational Trails	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program (TCSP)	\$0	\$950	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$950	
Other (SPR-YARTS)	\$93	\$93	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$93	
Subtotal	\$2,010	\$2,770	\$70	\$70	\$670	\$670	\$0	\$0	\$3,510	
Federal Highway Total	\$54,862	\$60,759	\$70	\$70	\$1,541	\$1,541	\$263	\$263	\$62,633	
FEDERAL TOTAL²	\$64,358	\$70,255	\$3,535	\$3,535	\$4,326	\$4,326	\$3,048	\$3,048	\$81,164	
INNOVATIVE FINANCE³	TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	State Infrastructure Bank	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Section 129 Loans	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Private Activity Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Private Concession Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Private Donations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Program Income (from a federal project)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Innovative Financing Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
REVENUE TOTAL	\$228,730	\$230,728	\$226,766	\$222,766	\$207,907	\$198,707	\$35,618	\$31,618	\$683,819	

NOTES:

¹ **Regional:** Some MPOs may not have regional fund sources. In these cases, data would be shown as "zero" or not applicable.

² **Federal Total:** Is the sum of federal highway and federal transit programs.

³ **Innovative Finance:** Toll revenues have been included under local and regional while GARVEE bond revenues are included under state.

⁴ **Proposition 1B:** Subtotal is a sum of funding for various programs funded under proposition 1B except for STIP Augmentation and SHOPP Augmentation

State of California
2008/09-2011/12 Federal Transportation Improvement Program
MPO: Merced County Association of Governments
DRAFT FORMAL AMENDMENT # 10

PROGRAMMED		(Dollars X 1,000)								
		2008/09		2009/10		2010/11		2011/12		CURRENT TOTAL
		Previous	Current	Previous	Current	Previous	Current	Previous	Current	
LOCAL	Local Total	\$9,548	\$9,548	\$10,778	\$10,778	\$7,901	\$7,901	\$7,901	\$7,901	\$36,128
REGIONAL	Tolls	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Bridge	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Corridor	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Transit Fares/Measures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Sales Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Bond Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Gas Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Vehicle Registration Fees (CARB Fees, SAFE)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Regional Transportation Impact Fee - RTIF)	\$1,700	\$2,300	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$2,300
	Regional Total	\$1,700	\$2,300	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$2,300
STATE	State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)	\$84,584	\$84,584	\$44,761	\$44,761	\$55,960	\$55,960	\$0	\$0	\$185,305
	SHOPP (Including Augmentation)	\$79,029	\$79,029	\$44,761	\$44,761	\$55,960	\$55,960	\$0	\$0	\$179,750
	SHOPP Prior	\$5,555	\$5,555	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,555
	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	\$47,694	\$47,694	\$6,457	\$6,457	\$19,190	\$19,190	\$12,800	\$12,800	\$86,141
	STIP (Including Augmentation)(includes IIP nonbond funding)	\$47,694	\$47,694	\$6,457	\$6,457	\$19,190	\$19,190	\$12,800	\$12,800	\$86,141
	STIP Prior	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Proposition 1 B ¹ (SR99, HTCSA, PTMISEA)	\$0	\$0	\$148,000	\$148,000	\$103,000	\$103,000	\$0	\$0	\$251,000
	GARVEE Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Traffic Congestion Relief Program	\$12,000	\$7,501	\$0	\$0	\$5,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,501
	State Transit Assistance (STA) Prop 42	\$7,713	\$7,713	\$7,774	\$7,774	\$7,869	\$7,869	\$7,869	\$7,869	\$31,225
Other (ER, Local HBRR, Local Seismic, SR2S, BLA)	\$1,133	\$1,133	\$1,461	\$1,461	\$461	\$461	\$0	\$0	\$3,055	
State Total	\$153,124	\$148,625	\$208,453	\$208,453	\$191,680	\$186,480	\$20,669	\$20,669	\$564,227	
FEDERAL TRANSIT	Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)	\$1,527	\$1,527	\$565	\$565	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,092
	Clean Fuel Formula Program (5308)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Fixed Guideway Modernization (5309a)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Intercity Bus (5311f)	\$195	\$195	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$195
	Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (5316)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Metropolitan Planning (5303)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	New and Small Starts (Capital Investment Grants) (5309b)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	New Freedom (SAFETEA-LU)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (5311)	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$415	\$1,660
	Public Transportation on Indian Reservation (5311c)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Transit in the Parks (5320)	\$273	\$273	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$273
	Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)	\$2,648	\$2,648	\$2,485	\$2,485	\$2,370	\$2,370	\$2,370	\$2,370	\$9,873
	ARRA - FTA 5307	\$2,486	\$2,486	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,486
ARRA - FTA 5309	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
ARRA - FTA 5311	\$1,952	\$1,952	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,952	
Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Federal Transit Total	\$9,496	\$9,496	\$3,465	\$3,465	\$2,785	\$2,785	\$2,785	\$2,785	\$18,531	

State of California
2008/09-2011/12 Federal Transportation Improvement Program
MPO: Merced County Association of Governments
DRAFT FORMAL AMENDMENT # 10

PROGRAMMED (page 2)		(Dollars X 1,000)								
		2008/09		2009/10		2010/11		2011/12		CURRENT TOTAL
		Previous	Current	Previous	Current	Previous	Current	Previous	Current	
FEDERAL HIGHWAY	Federal Highway Non-Discretionary									
	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Surface Transportation Program (Regional)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Railway (Section 130)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)	\$445	\$445	\$0	\$0	\$871	\$871	\$263	\$263	\$1,579
	Safe Routes to School (SR2S)	\$649	\$649	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$649
	Transportation Improvements (TI)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Federal Lands Highway	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - SHOPP	\$46,704	\$46,704	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$46,704
	ARRA - STIP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - Highway Maintenance (HM)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - TE	\$0	\$299	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$299
	ARRA - RSTP	\$5,054	\$9,892	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,892
	ARRA - Federal Lands Highway	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Subtotal	\$52,852	\$57,989	\$0	\$0	\$871	\$871	\$263	\$263	\$59,123
	Federal Highway Discretionary Programs									
	Bridge Discretionary Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec.1303)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Ferry Boat Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	High Priority Projects (HPP)	\$1,917	\$1,727	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,727
	High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)	\$0	\$0	\$70	\$70	\$670	\$670	\$0	\$0	\$740
	National Scenic Byways Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Public Lands Highway Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Recreational Trails	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program (TCSP)	\$0	\$950	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$950
	Other (SPR-YARTS)	\$93	\$93	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$93
	Subtotal	\$2,010	\$2,770	\$70	\$70	\$670	\$670	\$0	\$0	\$3,510
	Federal Highway Total	\$54,862	\$60,759	\$70	\$70	\$1,541	\$1,541	\$263	\$263	\$62,633
FEDERAL TOTAL²	\$64,358	\$70,255	\$3,535	\$3,535	\$4,326	\$4,326	\$3,048	\$3,048	\$81,164	
INNOVATIVE FINANCE³	TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	State Infrastructure Bank	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Section 129 Loans	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Private Activity Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Private Concession Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Private Donations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Program Income (from a federal project)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Innovative Financing Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
PROGRAMMED TOTAL	\$228,730	\$230,728	\$226,766	\$222,766	\$207,907	\$198,707	\$35,618	\$31,618	\$683,819	

NOTES:

- ¹ **Regional:** Some MPOs may not have regional fund sources. In these cases, data would be shown as "zero" or not applicable.
- ² **Federal Total:** Is the sum of federal highway and federal transit programs.
- ³ **Innovative Finance:** Toll revenues have been included under local and regional while GARVEE bond revenues are included under state.
- ⁴ **Proposition 1B:** Subtotal is a sum of funding for various programs funded under proposition 1B except for STIP Augmentation and SHOPP Augmentation

State of California

2008/09-2011/12 Federal Transportation Improvement Program

MPO: Merced County Association of Governments

DRAFT FORMAL AMENDMENT # 10

REVENUE Vs. PROGRAMMED (page 2)		(Dollars X 1,000)								
		2008/09		2009/10		2010/11		2011/12		CURRENT TOTAL
		Previous	Current	Previous	Current	Previous	Current	Previous	Current	
FEDERAL HIGHWAY	Federal Highway Non-Discretionary									
	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Surface Transportation Program (Regional)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Railway (Section 130)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Safe Routes to School (SR2S)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Transportation Improvements (TI)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Federal Lands Highway	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - SHOPP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - STIP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - Highway Maintenance (HM)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - TE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - RSTP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ARRA - Federal Lands Highway	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Federal Highway Discretionary Programs									
	Bridge Discretionary Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec.1303)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Ferry Boat Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	High Priority Projects (HPP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	National Scenic Byways Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Public Lands Highway Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Recreational Trails	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program (TCSP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Other (SPR-YARTS)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Federal Highway Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
FEDERAL TOTAL²	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
INNOVATIVE FINANCE³	TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	State Infrastructure Bank	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Section 129 Loans	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Activity Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Concession Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Donations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Program Income (from a federal project)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Innovative Financing Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

NOTES:

¹**Regional:** Some MPOs may not have regional fund sources. In these cases, data would be shown as "zero" or not applicable.

²**Federal Total:** Is the sum of federal highway and federal transit programs.

³**Innovative Finance:** Toll revenues have been included under local and regional while GARVEE bond revenues are included under state.

⁴**Proposition 1B:** Subtotal is a sum of funding for various programs funded under proposition 1B except for STIP Augmentation and SHOPP Augmentation

**BEFORE THE
MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 2009/06-18-01**

In the Matter of:

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE Formal Amendment #10 to the Merced County Association of Governments 2009 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 #10 to the 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (Interim 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 #10 to the FTIP program listing is consistent with: 1) the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan, Amendment #2; 2) the 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program; and 3) the adopted corresponding Conformity Analysis; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #10 to the 2009 FTIP contains the MPO's certification of the transportation planning process assuring that all federal requirements have been fulfilled; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #10 to the 2009 FTIP meets all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #10 to the 2009 FTIP make programming changes to three existing projects (Campus Parkway, Los Banos Bypass, PSR Hwy 99 & SR165) and their federal, state, and local funding revenues.

WHEREAS, The FTIP programming changes in Amendment #10 to the 2009 FTIP quadrennial element (FY08/09 through FY11/12) are financially constrained and the financial plan affirms that funding is available; and

WHEREAS, The FTIP programming modifications in Amendment #10 to the 2009 FTIP in fiscal years 12/13 and beyond are included for informational purposes only; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #10 to the 2009 FTIP does not interfere with the timely implementation of the Transportation Control Measures (TCM); and

WHEREAS, Amendment #10 to the 2009 FTIP conforms to the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIPs) for air quality; and

WHEREAS, a 14-day public review process occurred from June 4, 2009 to June 17, 2009.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that MCAG adopts Formal Amendment #10 to the 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) as programming modifications on three projects (Campus Parkway, Los Banos Bypass, and Project Study Report (PSR) - Hwy 99 & SR165);

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the MCAG finds that the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan as amended and Formal Amendment #10 to the 2009 FTIP are in conformity with the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments and applicable State Implementation Plan for air quality.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was passed and adopted by MCAG this 18th day of June 2009.

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 18th day of June 2009.

Signed:

Signed:

Jesse Brown, Executive Director
Merced County Association of Governments

Joe Oliveira, Chair, Merced County
Association of Governments Governing Board

MEMORANDUM

DATE: MAY 28, 2009

TO: TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

FROM: MATT FELL, SENIOR PLANNER

RE: RE-DETERMINATION OF AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY

DISCUSSION

The San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) is proposing a “Type 5” Formal Amendment to its Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Type 5 means the amendment requires a conformity determination and new regional emissions analysis, due to significant changes to regionally significant projects.

Although this is a SJCOG Amendment, MCAG must take an action as well for it to be approved by the federal government. The San Joaquin Valley is a PM2.5 multi-jurisdiction area; there are eight Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) – including MCAG – within the nonattainment area and no PM2.5 conformity budgets are available for use at this time. PM2.5 conformity determinations must be based on a regional emissions analysis that covers the entire nonattainment area. In accordance with EPA guidance, the other seven MPOs must re-determine conformity. Since no other transportation planning changes are being made, the seven other MPOs individual conformity analyses remain unchanged. However, a new Appendix D “PM2.5 Conformity Results for Each MPO in the San Joaquin Valley Nonattainment Area” has been prepared and is attached.

A public review occurred from May 8, 2009 through June 8, 2009 (see attached public notice). No public hearing is required.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt a resolution re-determining conformity for the 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #3 and 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Amendment #2.

Attachments: Draft Resolution
Public Notice published in Merced Sun-Star on May 8, 2009
Revised Appendix D “PM2.5 Conformity Results for Each MPO in the San Joaquin Valley Nonattainment Area”

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON THE
REDETERMINATION OF CONFORMITY FOR THE 2009 FEDERAL
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT #3 AND
THE 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AMENDMENT #2**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) is conducting a 30-day public comment period on the redetermination of conformity for the federally-approved 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Amendment #3 and 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendment #2.

- The 2009 FTIP is a listing of capital improvement and operational expenditures utilizing federal and state monies for transportation projects in Merced County during the next four years.
- The San Joaquin Valley is a PM2.5 multi-jurisdictional area; there are 8 MPOs within the PM2.5 nonattainment area and no PM2.5 conformity budgets are available for use at this time. Consequently, the PM2.5 conformity determination must be based on a regional emissions analysis that covers the entire nonattainment area.
- The San Joaquin Council of Governments has revised their portion of the PM2.5 conformity analysis. Consequently, the other 7 MPOs must redetermine conformity. Since no other transportation planning changes are being made, the 7 other MPO individual conformity analyses remain unchanged. However, the new Appendix D “PM2.5 Conformity Results Summary for Each MPO in the San Joaquin Valley Nonattainment Area” is being made available for a 30-day public comment period prior to re-adoption of their conformity determination.

The 30-day public review and comment period will commence on May 8, 2009 and conclude June 8, 2009 at 5 p.m. The draft documents are available for review at the Merced County Association of Governments office, located at 369 West 18th St., Merced, CA, 95340, and on the MCAG website at www.mcagov.org.

Public comments may be submitted in writing by 5 p.m. on June 8, 2009 to Matthew Fell at the address below.

After considering the comments, the documents will be considered for adoption, by resolution, by the MCAG Board of Directors at a regularly scheduled meeting to be held on June 18, 2009. The documents will then be submitted to state and federal agencies for approval.

Contact Person: Matthew Fell, 209-723-3153 x320, matt.fell@mcagov.org

**BEFORE THE
MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. []**

In the Matter of:

**RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE
Redetermination of Conformity for the
Federally Approved 2009 Federal
Transportation Improvement Program
Amendment #3 and 2007 RTP
Amendment #2**

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, the Federally Approved 2009 FTIP Amendment #3 and 2007 RTP Amendment #2 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, the Federally Approved 2009 FTIP Amendment #3 and 2007 RTP Amendment #2 contains the MPO's certification of the transportation planning process assuring that all federal requirements have been fulfilled; and

WHEREAS, the Federally Approved 2009 FTIP Amendment X #3 and 2007 RTP Amendment #2 meets all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450.

WHEREAS, SJCOG Amendment #10 to the 2009 FTIP and 2007 RTP Amendment #4 includes a new Conformity Analysis; and

WHEREAS, Merced County Association of Governments is not making any other transportation planning changes, the federally approved individual conformity analysis remain unchanged.

WHEREAS, in accordance with EPA Companion Guidance for the Conformity Rule for multi-jurisdictional areas, SJCOG has developed their portion of the PM2.5 regional emissions analysis separately and provided the entire PM2.5 nonattainment area conformity demonstration; and

WHEREAS, the PM2.5 nonattainment area conformity demonstration is contingent upon adoption by all MPOs in the PM2.5 nonattainment area; and

WHEREAS, the new Appendix D "PM2.5 Conformity Results for Each MPO in the San Joaquin Valley Nonattainment Area" (PM2.5 Demonstration) has been widely circulated and reviewed by Merced County Association of Governments 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 Merced County Association of Governments; and

WHEREAS, a 30-day public review period conducted on the PM2.5 Demonstration; and the SJCOG conducted a public hearing on the revised conformity analysis, containing PM2.5 Demonstration; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Merced County Association of Governments redetermines conformity for the Federally Approved 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #3 and 2007 RTP Amendment #2.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Merced County Association of Governments finds that the for the Federally Approved 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #3 and 2007 RTP Amendment #2 are in conformity with the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments and applicable State Implementation Plan for air quality.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was passed and adopted by Merced County Association of Governments this 18th day of June, 2009.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Signed: _____
Chairman

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 18th day of June, 2009.

Signed: _____
Executive Director

PM2.5 Conformity Results Summary – Fresno

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 24-Hour Standard	2002 Base Year	2.2	63.4		
	2010	2.0	52.7	YES	YES
	2020	1.3	23.0	YES	YES
	2030	1.2	15.5	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/year)	Nox (tons/year)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 Annual Standard	2002 Base Year	803	23141		
	2010	730	19236	YES	YES
	2020	475	8395	YES	YES
	2030	438	5658	YES	YES

PM2.5 Conformity Results Summary – Kern

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 24-Hour Standard	2002 Base Year	3.7	94.1		
	2010	3.2	86.0	YES	YES
	2020	1.8	38.5	YES	YES
	2030	1.5	27.2	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/year)	Nox (tons/year)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 Annual Standard	2002 Base Year	1351	34347		
	2010	1168	31390	YES	YES
	2020	657	14053	YES	YES
	2030	548	9928	YES	YES

PM2.5 Conformity Results Summary – Kings

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?		
		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx	
PM2.5 24-Hour Standard	2002 Base Year	0.8	18.5			
	2010	0.6	16.1	YES	YES	
		2020	0.3	6.7	YES	YES
		2030	0.3	4.7	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?		
		PM2.5 (tons/year)	Nox (tons/year)	PM2.5	NOx	
PM2.5 Annual Standard	2002 Base Year	292	6753			
	2010	219	5877	YES	YES	
		2020	110	2446	YES	YES
		2030	110	1716	YES	YES

PM2.5 Conformity Results Summary – Madera

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?		
		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx	
PM2.5 24-Hour Standard	2002 Base Year	0.5	13.7			
	2010	0.5	13.6	YES	YES	
		2020	0.4	6.5	YES	YES
		2030	0.4	4.9	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?		
		PM2.5 (tons/year)	Nox (tons/year)	PM2.5	NOx	
PM2.5 Annual Standard	2002 Base Year	183	5001			
	2010	183	4964	YES	YES	
		2020	146	2373	YES	YES
		2030	146	1789	YES	YES

PM2.5 Conformity Results Summary – Merced

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 24-Hour Standard	2002 Base Year	1.5	37.1		
	2010	1.3	30.4	YES	YES
	2020	0.7	12.8	YES	YES
	2030	0.7	10.0	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/year)	Nox (tons/year)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 Annual Standard	2002 Base Year	548	13542		
	2010	475	11096	YES	YES
	2020	256	4672	YES	YES
	2030	256	3650	YES	YES

PM2.5 Conformity Results Summary – San Joaquin

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 24-Hour Standard	2002 Base Year	1.5	43.4		
	2010	1.4	37.5	YES	YES
	2020	1.0	16.7	YES	YES
	2030	1.1	12.3	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/year)	Nox (tons/year)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 Annual Standard	2002 Base Year	548	15841		
	2010	511	13688	YES	YES
	2020	365	6096	YES	YES
	2030	402	4490	YES	YES

PM2.5 Conformity Results Summary – Stanislaus

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 24-Hour Standard	2002 Base Year	1.0	30.2		
	2010	0.9	24.8	YES	YES
	2020	0.6	10.1	YES	YES
	2030	0.6	7.0	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/year)	Nox (tons/year)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 Annual Standard	2002 Base Year	365	11023		
	2010	329	9052	YES	YES
	2020	219	3687	YES	YES
	2030	219	2555	YES	YES

PM2.5 Conformity Results Summary – Tulare

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 24-Hour Standard	2002 Base Year	0.8	26.4		
	2010	0.8	22.9	YES	YES
	2020	0.6	10.5	YES	YES
	2030	0.6	7.4	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/year)	Nox (tons/year)	PM2.5	NOx
PM2.5 Annual Standard	2002 Base Year	292	9636		
	2010	292	8359	YES	YES
	2020	219	3833	YES	YES
	2030	219	2701	YES	YES

MEMORANDUM

DATE: MAY 28, 2009

TO: TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

FROM: MATT FELL, SENIOR PLANNER

RE: TRAFFIC COUNTS REPORT

DISCUSSION

MCAG collects and disseminates traffic count information as part of the Traffic Modeling element of its Overall Work Program. Attached is the Year 2009 Traffic Count Report, which summarizes traffic counts collected.

There are two sets of data in this report. First, are traffic counts collected by MCAG during traffic model updates. These were mostly collected in the Year 2000, however some were done in 2005.

Secondly is count data on state routes. Caltrans produces this information. The latest information can always be found on the web at <http://traffic-counts.dot.ca.gov>. This report collects Year 2007 counts, which are the latest counts they have published for State Routes in Merced County.

All of the counts shown here are “(Annual) Average Daily Traffic” (ADT or AADT), meaning it is the average number of vehicles that traverse the location in a 24-hour period, in both directions.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

Attachments: Traffic Counts in Merced County, June 2009

MEMORANDUM

DATE: MAY 28, 2009

TO: TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

FROM: JESSE BROWN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RE: SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY EXPRESS TRANSIT STUDY

BACKGROUND

The Executive Summary of the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) Express Transit Study is attached. (The complete report was included in your agenda package last month.) This study is valley wide and comprehensive in its documentation of existing inter- and intra-valley transit services. It further projects future transit demand both within the Valley and to Sacramento, Bay Area, and SoCal destinations. The attached report proposes service options throughout the San Joaquin Valley and by various modes ranging from rideshare/TDM, Vanpool, commuter express bus, and commuter rail. The study has been coordinated with local transit providers in each of our counties, vanpool programs, and the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (ACE).

This study, from a procedural and geographic perspective, serves as a model for modal studies for the San Joaquin Valley. This study was presented to your committee for review and comment last month and is on your agenda this month with a staff recommendation for approval and forwarding to the MCAG Governing Board.

In turn, the Governing Board action will be relayed to the San Joaquin Policy Council who will have it on their June 19, 2009 meeting agenda for their approval.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the San Joaquin Valley Express Transit Study.

Attachment: Executive Summary of the SJV Express Transit Study

Executive Summary

Study Goals

The primary goal of this study is to identify markets that can support inter-county commuter express transportation services within the San Joaquin Valley region, and between the San Joaquin Valley and its neighbors. Commuter express transit is designed primarily to serve workers traveling to their places of employment, generally over longer distances than typical intra-urban bus routes. These services provide workers with improved choice, relieve pressure on congested freeways during peak times, and decrease emissions that contribute to air pollution.

The study evaluates travel demand projections, existing services, and the characteristics of the San Joaquin Valley's diverse communities to determine the investments that will best serve the region's inter-county commuters. This report documents the outcomes of this study including recommendations.

Sections include:

1. An evaluation of existing commute conditions and available inter-county transportation service in the region.
2. Case studies of existing inter-county commuter transportation services from across the United States, with lessons learned for the San Joaquin Valley.
3. An analysis of the demand for inter-county transportation services. This analysis is based on stakeholder interviews, travel demand models, and current demographics and growth projections.
4. Recommendations for services to meet the projected transportation needs, including policy changes and the organizational and funding arrangements required to implement these policy changes.

The study considers the full range of possible strategies for providing higher-capacity transportation choices for Valley commuters. These represent a continuum from very basic incentives for carpooling to higher occupancy vanpools, subscription bus services, and finally higher-capacity public transit services including commuter rail.

Travel Demand Study Findings

The travel demand analysis carried out for this study confirms that the San Joaquin Valley is a challenging environment for inter-county commuter transit. Most of the region's land area is rural or very low-density residential in character, and is expected to remain so for the foreseeable future. Even in the region's urban areas, residential and employment densities are low and too dispersed to be served by a transit service that could be competitive with the auto. Long distance travel, with dispersed origins and destinations spread over a wide geographic area is very difficult to serve with traditional transit services. Given these constraints, for most of the region's communities, the most attractive alternative to single-occupancy vehicle travel will remain ridesharing.

However, there a number of corridors where investments in transportation services may help improve commuter choice in a cost-effective way. They are:

1. *The northern Highway 99 corridor, extending from Merced through Modesto, Manteca, Stockton, Lodi, and continuing to Sacramento.* This corridor includes a cluster of the region’s most transit competitive cities, and its strongest internal travel markets. There will be nearly 10,000 daily trips on Route 99 heading towards Sacramento by 2030.
2. *The northern Highway 99 corridor to the Bay Area.* The stretch of I-580 that crosses the Altamont Pass between Tracy and Livermore is expected to carry more than 50,000 commute trips per day by 2030, with commuters on the west side of the pass dividing between a diverse set of Bay Area destinations. Service planning will focus on ways to enhance connections to ACE and BART, as well as ways to enhance service to destinations very close to the west side of the Altamont pass.
3. *The Cities of Madera and Visalia to the City of Fresno.* Fresno attracts a large number of workers from the surrounding communities, and these commute markets are expected to grow substantially in the coming decades. The most feasible origin points for transit service into Fresno are Visalia in to the south and Madera to the north.
4. *Los Angeles County to Edwards Airforce Base in Eastern Kern County.* More than 20,000 people work at Edwards Air Force Base, and it is likely than many of these employees are included in the projected flow of workers from Los Angeles to Kern County by 2030. This study considers connecting transit service from Lancaster Metrolink station to the Air Force Base.

Service Recommendations

The study builds on the key corridors identified above to provide recommendations for investments to improve inter-county commute choices in the San Joaquin Valley. The San Joaquin Valley is a large region made up of a diverse group of communities. Regional policymakers should seek to tailor transportation investments based on the specific land use, population, and employment context in each community.

Figure ES-1 lists the Valley's key inter-county commute corridors, and the type of service enhancement proposed for each.

Figure ES-1 Summary of Proposed Services

Proposed Service	Key Travel Corridor			
	Northern SR 99 corridor, to Sacramento	Northern SR 99 corridor to the Bay Area.	Madera and Visalia to the City of Fresno.	Northern LA County to Eastern Kern County
Ridesharing	X	X	X	X
Vanpool	X	X	X	X
Commuter Express Bus	X	X		
Commuter Rail Improvements	X	X		

Ridesharing/Vanpool

Recognizing that lower-density land use patterns will continue to dominate most of the San Joaquin Valley for the foreseeable future, the expansion of the ridesharing and vanpool opportunities should be the primary investment to increase transportation choices for inter-county commuters in most of the region. Vanpools offer the opportunity for relatively high-capacity commute transportation service with operating costs far lower than traditional fixed-route transit. With new transit operating funds expected to be difficult to access, and with many transit operators considering reductions in service within their traditional service area, expanded vanpool access may be the most promising avenue to improve commuter choice in the near term.

While the whole of the Valley can benefit from enhanced ridesharing opportunities, this will be the primary alternative to single-occupancy vehicle travel for most inter-county commuters travelling to employment destinations other than those along northern SR 99 corridor, the San Francisco Bay Area, and Sacramento. *Recommendations for expanding access to ridesharing and vanpool services are as follows:*

1. Continue with plans to form a Joint Powers Authority in the Southern portion of the Valley to operate KART and AITS Vanpool.
2. Expand Commute Connection's service area to include Merced County, and enhance coordination between the participating MPO's.
3. Commute Connection should consider pilot testing lease-purchasing vanpool vehicles.
4. Prioritize vanpooling to Fresno.
5. Provide a single valley-wide ride-matching and vanpool website.
6. Invest in more marketing of vanpool to choice riders.
7. Expand park-and-ride opportunities.
8. Offer Guaranteed Ride Home throughout the Valley.
9. Seek to influence the development of the new Air District trip reduction rule, so that it can fund and promote ridesharing to large employers..

Inter-county express bus

While much of the Valley has employment trip densities far too low to support commuter transit service, three key corridors identified through this study (Northern SR 99 corridor to Sacramento; Northern SR 99 corridor to the Bay Area; Northern LA County to Edwards Air Force Base in Eastern Kern County) have potential for commuter express transit services.

Currently, seven San Joaquin Valley transit agencies provide at least some bus service across county lines. Four agencies provide service between the San Joaquin Valley and neighboring regions. These services operate with reasonable productivity, and align well with the key demand corridors identified by this study. In an extremely challenging funding environment, transit operators should attempt to maintain these services to the extent possible. *Recommendations for express bus services are as follows:*

1. Maintain existing inter-county commuter service
2. Enhance San Joaquin Regional Transit District subscription routes to Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area as funding becomes available.
3. Study express bus service between Lancaster Metrolink and Edwards Air Force Base.

Commuter Rail

Nearly half of the San Joaquin Valley's inter-county commuters travel not between Valley counties but between the Valley and the neighboring San Francisco Bay Area and Sacramento areas. High trip densities, congested roads, and the opportunity to connect to dense downtowns and high quality local rail service on the destination end make these corridors good candidates for commuter rail service. The Altamont Corridor is already served by the region's only existing commuter railroad, the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission's Altamont Commuter Express (ACE). While there is no commuter-oriented rail service between San Joaquin County and Sacramento County, Amtrak operates four daily San Joaquin trains from Sacramento to Stockton.

Expanding and improving passenger rail service in these corridors may be the best way to serve San Joaquin Valley commuters in the coming decades. The most practical way to enhance commute options for these commuters may be for the Valley to advocate for regional, state, and federal investments in rail service improvements. *Recommendations for commuter rail are as follows:*

1. Develop a coordinated regional advocacy plan for enhanced state and federal investments in commuter rail.
2. Work cohesively as Valley Counties to upgrade ACE.
3. Work cohesively as Valley Counties for a direct ACE/BART connection.
4. Work toward expansion of commuter rail service between Merced and Sacramento.
5. Invest in great station area planning.

Summary of Recommendations

For a majority of the region, investments in ridesharing are the most cost-effective strategy for increasing inter-county commuter services. The region's focus should be on expanding vanpool offerings in both the northern and southern parts of the Valley. The new Air District rule requiring trip reduction programs from large employers offers the opportunity both for a new funding stream, and an effective marketing strategy for expanded vanpool offerings.

The region's existing inter-regional bus offerings match the highest demand corridors. In an extremely difficult funding environment for transit, the region's first priority should be to maintain these services to the extent possible. As additional funding becomes available, it should consider expanding subscription bus service from Stockton to Sacramento and the Bay Area. The region should also consider implementing bus service between Lancaster Metrolink station and Edwards Air Force Base in Eastern Kern County in partnership with the base.

Finally, the region's long-term vision for its highest demand corridors should include significant upgrades to commuter rail service. The region should lobby for state and federal funds to upgrade the speed, capacity, and reliability of ACE, and to add a similar service between Sacramento and Stockton (and perhaps as far south as Merced). If demand warrants, the region

should also consider extending LA Metrolink into eastern Kern County. To the extent possible, all passenger rail investments should seek to capitalize on California High Speed Rail investments.

