

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, OCTOBER 2, 2008– 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 September 4, 2008 Technical Planning Committee Meeting**
- 4. Information/Discussion Only**
 - # a. RHNA Approval Letter
 - # b. Valley Land Use Conference Notice – October 11, 2008
 - # c. Regional Transportation Impact Fee Report
 - # d. Technical Overview of SB 375
 - # e. Atwater/Merced Expressway Update
- * # **5. Draft Amendment No. 1 to the 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program** Terri Lewis

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve Amendment No. 1 to the 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program by Resolution No. 2008/10-16-01.
- # **6. San Joaquin Valley Blueprint – Valleywide Scenario Update** Rich Green

For information and discussion.
- * # **7. 4th Year (FY 08/09) California Regional Blueprint Grant Application** Terri Lewis

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board support the submittal of a 4th Year San Joaquin Valley Region Blueprint Grant Application to Caltrans by October 10, 2008 by Resolution No. 2008/10-16-02.
- # + **8. San Joaquin Valley Express Transit Study** Matt Fell

For information and discussion only.

* *Action*

Attachment

+ *Enclosure*

The next Technical Planning Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, November 6, 2008 at 10:00 a.m. at MCAG, 369 W. 18th Street, Merced, California

TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 4, 2008

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the **TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE** held Thursday, September 4, 2008, 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 Hamilton, City of Merced
Dwayne Chisam, City of Los Banos
John Gedney, Caltrans District 10
Justin Hendrix, City of Atwater
Richard Schwarz, Merced County Public Works
Larry Shankland, Merced County Transit

MEMBERS ABSENT

Paul Creighton, City of Livingston
Michael Rhodes, Merced County
Jake Raper, City of Gustine
City of Dos Palos
San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

OTHERS PRESENT

Annette Clark, Caltrans District 10
Matt Fell, MCAG
Rich Green, MCAG
Marjie Kirn, MCAG
Terri Lewis, MCAG
Scott Malta, Castle Airport
Sally Rodeman, Caltrans District 10
Candice Steelman, MCAG

1. Introductions

So noted.

2. Oral Communication

Larry Shankland stated that the state budget impasse is creating a fiscal nightmare for transit providers. The state has not released the last two quarters of STA funds. If there is not resolution of the budget situation with STAF by the end of September, Merced

County Transit (MCT) management will be recommending that transit service is cut or stopped altogether as it is not fiscally prudent to keep incurring the cost of providing transit service without a funding source to pay for it.

Scott Malta distributed a green technologies brochure of the Fresno Airport solar panel project to Marjie Kirn.

Scott Malta added that Castle Airport would like to purchase an aircraft wash rack and he is looking for help in identifying any possible grant programs where this type of equipment/project would be eligible. Participants suggested that Scott look for a grant program with the Water Resources Board or California Energy Commission (CEC), yet no one has specific knowledge of a grant program for an aircraft wash rack.

3. Minutes of the August 7, 2008 Technical Planning Committee Meeting

Larry Shankland made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 7, 2008 Technical Planning Committee meeting.

Seconded by Dwayne Chisam.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Information / Discussion Only

- a. 2008 CCRA Conference Overview
- b. San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies' Fall Policy Conference
- c. Disposal Ban – Home-Generated “Sharps”

5. SB375 (Steinberg) – Transportation Planning: Travel Demand Models

Candice Steelman stated that SB375 is a controversial bill with recent changes; therefore, an up-to-date handout is being distributed. Today's handout includes letters from Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) and Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) that are now stating opposition to SB375 in spite of recent changes that have been agreed to by Senator Darrel Steinberg, including:

- Removal of language that would have seriously diminished local control over land use planning; and
- Supportive of Blueprint (anticipate carrots and incentives with compliance).

SB375 does not address the additional cost that will be required of MPO's to fund the required analysis. It is hoped that SB 732 will address the funding gap. SB375 is viewed as D. Steinberg legacy legislation that will be enacted regardless of those that are currently opposed.

In February 2008, the MCAG Governing Board sent a letter of opposition on SB375. Since that date, the bill has been amended numerous times, making the majority of original arguments no longer valid. Additionally, with the reversed positions of OCTA

and CCTA, the bill has gained legislative support, and is sitting on the Governors desk for his action.

Larry Shankland inquired as to why OCTA and CCTA are in the opposed position although the bill has been amended.

John Gedney stated that OCTA and CCTA base their current opposition on the issue of a compliance date of 2008 (in bill) versus the 2012 that was requested. These entities believe that the 2008 bill year will be cause for lawsuits on existing Prop 1B projects. Also, there are self-help tax measures that will be coming up for renewal in the next few years, and there is concern over the list of projects and what projects will be eligible for measure funding.

Dwayne Chisam asked what does SB375 do?

Candice Steelman responded that SB375 would require MPO's to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that is focused primarily on the following reductions:

- Green House Gas emissions (GHGE); and
- Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) Trips and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

It is unclear at this time just exactly what will be the depth of the SCS as there is more defining and refining of SB375 language in trailer bills. SB375 will tighten up local planning. It is not known what the future financial impact of SB375 will be.

Larry Shankland made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board issue a current letter of support for SB375 based on recent modifications that have been incorporated into the current legislative bill version.

Seconded by Mark Hamilton.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. San Joaquin Valley COG Directors Policy Council – Valley Voice

Candice Steelman highlighted the role of the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) COG Directors Policy Council. The COG Directors have requested that the San Joaquin Valley Legislative Affairs Committee organize legislative trips for the SJV Policy Council to Sacramento and Washington, D.C. MCAG is able to fund two Policy Council delegates and one staff member for hotel and meal expenses for a Sacramento legislative visit, however, there is no budget for a D.C. Policy Council trip.

Staff is asking the MCAG Governing Board if their local jurisdictions would agree to sponsor one of the scenarios options (A through E).

Marjie Kirn added that the purpose of the legislative trip to D.C. is to garner national support for the San Joaquin Valley National Agricultural Goods Movement and Trade

Corridor Program in the next Federal Reauthorization (Federal Surface Transportation Bill due in 2009).

Dwayne Chisam stated he supports Option A (Two Policy Council delegates with 1 staff, cost \$5,000) with Option B for the cost distribution (based on population).

Mark Hamilton added that other local representatives would be in D.C. at the same time as the Policy Council visit and he believes that one Policy Council delegate is sufficient, therefore, he supports Option B (one Policy Council delegate with one staff, cost \$3,400) with Option B for the cost distribution (based on population).

Richard Schwarz inquired what would be the responsibilities of the staff person?

Larry Shankland added that he believes two Policy Council delegates are needed along with staff, as this is the best method of getting the transfer of information back to local boards.

Candice Steelman added that staff is responsible for itinerary planning along with written reports.

Mark Hamilton stated that he would like to rescind his prior motion on Option B.

Dwayne Chisam made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board direct staff to send two Policy Council delegates and one staff member (Option A) to the San Joaquin Valley COGs Valley Voice Washington, D.C. trip with the expenses invoiced to jurisdictions based on population (Option B).

Seconded by Larry Shankland.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Transportation Development Act- Fare Box Ratio Requirements

Marjie Kirn reviewed the transit fare box requirements of the Transportation Development Act (TDA), including:

- 20% fare box ratio required for urban fixed route service;
- 10% fare box ratio required for rural service; and
- 10% fare box ratio required for dial-a-ride (DAR) service.

Annual financial audits of the Countywide Transit Enterprise Fund (CTEF) indicate that the Merced County Transit (MCT) system did not meet the 10% fare box ratio requirement for DAR service in fiscal years 2004/05, 2005/06 and 2006/07.

During the fiscal year 2004/05, MV Transit was the contracted transit operator and they did not keep adequate documentation for the auditor to make a fare box ratio determination for any of the transit services. MV has since been terminated and a new transit service contractor is in place. Staff recommends that since the fare box ratios

cannot be conclusively determined for 2004/05 as MV trashed MCT records that the Governing Board presumes that the fare box ratios were met for the 2004/05 fiscal year.

Unfortunately, the DAR fare box ratio for the subsequent fiscal years of 2005/06 and 2006/07 was also below the required 10%.

Per TDA statues and regulations, there is a four-year cycle to implement penalties for not meeting the fare box ratio requirements, including:

- 1st year – is a one time grace year;
- 2nd year – is the non-compliance year;
- 3rd year – is the determination year; and
- 4th year – a penalty is implemented for the noncompliance year.

If the MCAG Governing Board concurs with the staff recommendation regarding the 2004/05 fiscal year, the four-year cycle would begin in 2005/06 with the following calendar determination for the assessment of (if any) future penalties:

- 2005/06 – is the one time grace year;
- 2006/07 – is the non-compliance year;
- 2007/08 – is the determination year; and
- 2008/09 – a penalty is implemented for the noncompliance year.

The Dial-a-Ride transit services would need to meet a minimum of 14% fare box ratio in the current fiscal year.

An alternative option would be to combine all the non-urbanized service that is required to meet the 10% minimum fare box ratio. The non-urbanized service met the fare box ratio requirements for all of the years up until 2006/07 (fare box ratio – 8%). This would be considered the grace year and no penalties would be assessed.

Larry Shankland added that MCT has always held DAR fares low for seniors and disabled and we now need to consider changing to a single, one-price, 31-day fare ticket.

Dwayne Chisam made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board:

- Combine all of the non-urbanized transit service required to meet a minimum 10% fare box ratio; and
- Determine that the fare box ratio was not met in 2006/07 which is considered the grace year under TDA statute and regulations; and
- If non-urbanized transit service does not meet the 10% fare box ratio requirement in this fiscal year, then penalties will be applied per TDA statute.

Seconded by Larry Shankland.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Draft Amendment No. 1 to the 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program

Terri Lewis discussed the current situation with lack of EPA emissions budgets for PM2.5 that have been promised to the SJV COGS for the last year and a half.

100% of the SJV COGs adopted a 2009 Interim FTIP recently (July 08) as they had no other choice to leave out projects that required a new Air Quality Conformity Analysis.

Now, as a method of adding in as many existing transportation projects back into the 09 Interim FTIP as possible, this can be done for projects that relied on the previous AQ Conformity Analysis in 2007 and are consistent with the 2007 RTP where the design concept, scope, and year open to traffic is unchanged. Although, this does not add in 100% of SJV COG transportation projects that would make up a complete FTIP, it is an alternative to expand the 09 Interim FTIP project lists that relied on a previous AQ analysis and/or projects that are exempt from air quality conformity analysis altogether.

Draft Amendment 1 to the 09 Interim FTIP makes the following project programming changes:

- Adds four regionally significant projects (Bradley Overhead, Hwy 99 Widening – Plainsburg Interchange, Hwy 99 Widening – Arboleda Interchange, and Atwater/Merced Expressway) that are included in the 2007 RTP, where the design concept, scope and year open to traffic is unchanged and rely on the previous air quality conformity analysis;
- Adds a new Prop 1B Exempt Rail project (G Street Under crossing); and
- Modifies the 2008 Exempt SHOPP program to include:
 - Adds two new Collision Reduction projects; and
 - Corrects the Bridge Preservation programming figures.

9. Unmet Transit Needs Concept Report

Marjie Kirn highlighted the annual Unmet Transit Needs Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) and public hearings as required by Transportation Development Act (TDA) statute and regulations.

MCAG has three unmet transit needs hearing scheduled in October:

- October 6, 2008, City of Los Banos, Council Chambers – 6:00 PM;
- October 8, 2008, City of Merced, Civic Center – Sam Pipes Room 6:00 PM; and
- October 9, 2008, City of Atwater, Council Chambers – 6:00 PM.

Larry Shankland encouraged TPC members to attend at least one of the unmet transit needs public hearings to get a feel for transit concerns of local residents.

10. Atwater-Merced Expressway CEQA Certification and Preferred Alternative Selection

Marjie Kirn reviewed the status of the Atwater-Merced Expressway project and the current efforts with the CEQA certification and the preferred alignment selection. MCAG Governing Board action on August 21, 2008 was continued to permit further discussions with stakeholders in the project area on an eleventh hour issue that has arisen with the Atwater School District and the future site of a new school.

The Atwater School District is asking MCAG to move the Atwater-Merced Expressway alignment away from the parcel that they already own.

MCAG is asking the Atwater School District to consider moving the school site to alternative locations as proposed by Brookfield Development and the Ferrari family.

Involved partners have been meeting in an attempt to resolve the school location and alignment of the Atwater/Merced project route. The next meeting is scheduled for September 9, 2008.

If the location of the school can be resolved in the next few weeks, then the CEQA certification process can occur.

Scott Malta added that Castle Airport would like to get the alignment moved off of Castle property and it is unclear how alignment 1B (that crosses over a greater number of water canals) can be less expensive than 1A.

Marjie Kirn added that the consultants had studied all parcels around the alignment; therefore, there should be a solution to the current school parcel issue.

11. Corridor System Management Plan

Annette Clark and Sally Rodeman (Caltrans – District 10) briefed TPC members on the background of the SR99 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) as required for Prop 1B CMIA and SR99 bond funding.

The purpose of the CSMP is to reduce congestion, improve safety, and to preserve the mobility gains of the CMIA investments. Proposition 1B SR99 Bond funds have been programmed for two improvement projects in Merced County:

- Hwy 99 Widening, Arboleda Interchange - \$151,900,000 project cost. Construction to begin in 2010; and
- Hwy 99 Widening, Plainsburg Interchange - \$101,177,000 project cost. Construction to begin in 2011.

By requiring the development of a CSMP, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) expects Caltrans and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA's) to

demonstrate how mobility gains from the corridor improvements will be preserved. The CSMP completion and approval due date is October 1, 2008.

The SR99 CSMP includes the following categories of improvements identified:

- Expansion of ITS, incident management, traveler information, traffic surveillance and detection and advanced synchronization of traffic signals;
- Operational, rehabilitation and maintenance improvements to include auxiliary lanes, increase acceleration lanes, reconstruct and modify interchanges and bridges, asphalt concrete overlays, median barriers, landscaping, and interchange upgrades to freeway standards;
- Expansion of transportation demand management practices including construction of new park-and-ride facilities with transit connectivity, continued work force vanpool and rideshare services through Commute Connection;
- Connectivity of bicycle and pedestrian facilities crossing or parallel to SR99;
- Access and truck parking issues along SR99 and throughout the San Joaquin Valley;
- Connectivity of existing and construction of new frontage roads in future transportation projects and commercial and residential development along SR99.

Scott Malta added that section 2.5.2 has woefully out-of-date information on Castle airport. Scott will forward more current information to Annette Clark directly for incorporation into the SR99 CSMP.

Richard Schwarz made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt the State Route 99 Corridor System Management Plan as amended with more current airport data in section 2.5.2.

Seconded by Larry Shankland.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

12. Aerial Photography

Rich Green initiated an item about updating aerial photography data that was brought up at the August Planners Roundtable meeting – Would local jurisdictions be interested in collaborating on updating aerial photos if this could be done at a reduced cost and data could be shared among jurisdictions?

John Gedney (Caltrans) stated that this type of collaborative process would be eligible for a State Planning & Research (SP&R) Grant. This year's SPR grant application will be released in October.

Rich Green will be contacting local jurisdictions to determine what aerial photography contracts and/or consultants are in place.

13. TPC Meeting Locations

Rich Green stated that the Planners Roundtable is recommending that the TPC monthly meeting be rotated amongst the local jurisdictions based on the TRB location rotation (every other month the meeting location is at MCAG). Member agencies would host lunch for the Planners Roundtable when the meeting is in their local jurisdiction.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS OF THE TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY CHAIRMAN RICHARD SCHWARZ AT 11:15 A.M.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 25, 2008

TO: TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

FROM: CHRISTINA SMITH, GRANT ANALYST III

RE: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE REPORT

BACKGROUND

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

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

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

DISCUSSION

Attached please find:

1. Table one (1) showing fees collected for the current fiscal year by jurisdiction.
2. Table two (2) showing fees collected to-date by jurisdiction.
3. Table three (3) showing fees collected by project.
4. Table four (4) showing project expenditures paid to date.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

Attachments: Table 1 – RTIF Fees Collected by Jurisdiction FY 2007-2008
Table 2 – RTIF Fees Collected by Jurisdiction To Date – June 30, 2008
Table 3 – Fees Collected by Project
Table 4 – Atwater Merced Expressway Project Expenditures

TABLE 1

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES (RTIF) COLLECTED BY JURISDICTION FOR FY 2007-2008					
JURISDICTION	1ST QTR	2ND QTR	3RD QTR	4TH QTR	TOTAL
Atwater	17,715	0	0	29,472	47,187
Dos Palos	0	0	16,280	1,427	17,707
Gustine	7,135	0	1,375	0	8,510
Livingston	0	0	0	0	0
Los Banos	0	292,520	101,639	38,994	433,153
Merced City	0	516,331	78,316	144,012	738,658
Merced County	112,181	87,615	74,504	45,404	319,704
Interest Earnings	32,258	45,366	46,284	31,678	155,912
Total	169,289	941,832	318,398	290,987	1,720,832

TABLE 2

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES (RTIF) COLLECTED BY JURISDICTION TO-DATE JUNE 30, 2008					
JURISDICTION	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08		TOTAL
Atwater	16,748	24,338	47,187		88,273
Dos Palos	31,625	57,080	17,707		106,412
Gustine	18,711	45,068	2,802		66,581
Livingston	0	0	0		0
Los Banos	69,534	601,679	433,153		1,104,366
Merced City	1,355,575	1,125,032	738,658		3,219,265
Merced County	973,251	435,576	288,520		1,697,347
Interest Earnings	32,060	141,768	155,912		329,740
Total	2,497,504	2,430,541	1,683,940		6,611,985

Above amounts shown net of refunds.

Please note that all information provide for the Fiscal Year 2007-2008 are pre-audit.

TABLE 3**FEES COLLECTED BY PROJECT**

Project Name	Total to Date	FY 2005-2006 Total	FY 2006-2007 Total (Net) *	FY 2007-2008 Total (Net)
Deposit Amount:	\$ 6,280,765.80	\$ 2,465,444.65	\$ 2,288,772.38	\$ 1,528,027.77
Allocations:				
Bellevue - connect 99	\$ 60,850.03	\$ 24,164.96	\$ 17,236.10	\$ 19,448.97
Mission - 59 to 99	\$ 29,032.13	\$ 12,696.36	\$ 9,820.89	\$ 6,514.88
59 North Realignment	\$ 2,049,653.38	\$ 904,904.17	\$ 678,939.54	\$ 465,809.67
59 - Mission to Childs	\$ 365,799.53	\$ 149,738.12	\$ 130,158.97	\$ 85,902.44
59 - 152 to Mission	\$ 217,329.94	\$ 82,735.92	\$ 81,836.09	\$ 52,757.93
140 Bradley OH	\$ 721,395.53	\$ 314,179.15	\$ 244,969.54	\$ 162,246.84
140 - to Campus Pkwy	\$ 399,291.08	\$ 173,811.99	\$ 135,646.98	\$ 89,832.11
140/33 Truck Route	\$ 179,973.28	\$ 84,238.43	\$ 69,503.24	\$ 26,231.61
152 Los Banos Bypass	\$ 1,759,202.51	\$ 580,630.01	\$ 707,065.37	\$ 471,507.13
165 - north of Hilmar	\$ 435,949.42	\$ 113,691.09	\$ 189,982.85	\$ 132,275.48
Administration	\$ 63,767.97	\$ 24,654.45	\$ 23,612.81	\$ 15,500.71
TOTAL of all allocations	\$ 6,282,244.80	\$ 2,465,444.65	\$ 2,288,772.38	\$ 1,528,027.77
1st Qtr Interest Income	\$ 57,592.13	\$ 230.18	\$ 25,103.49	\$ 32,258.46
2nd Qtr Interest Income	\$ 83,567.63	\$ 3,453.78	\$ 34,422.33	\$ 45,691.52
3rd Qtr Interest Income	\$ 101,930.28	\$ 10,430.96	\$ 45,215.18	\$ 46,284.14
4th Qtr Interest Income	\$ 86,650.55	\$ 17,945.02	\$ 37,027.17	\$ 31,678.36
TOTAL	\$ 6,611,985.39	\$ 2,497,504.59	\$ 2,430,540.55	\$ 1,683,940.25

* Net is total allocations received less any refunds made during that fiscal year.

TABLE 4

ATWATER MERCED EXPRESSWAY PROJECT EXPENDITURES

		FY 2006-2007			
	Invoice #	Vendor	Date	Amount	
		TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES FY 06-07		\$ 2,453,365.90	
		FY 2007-2008			
#1	8110	MCAG/Bender/Thomas	08/29/2007	\$ 903.00	
	8158	MCAG/Bender/Thomas	09/21/2007	\$ 1,053.50	
	8163	MCAG/Mark Thomas & Co	9/21/007	\$ 31,876.63	
	8188	MCAG/Mark Thomas & Co	10/05/2007	\$ 54,837.52	
	8205	Robert Haden-Legal	10/12/2007	\$ 150.00	
	8266	MCAG/Mark Thomas & Co	11/14/2007	\$ 47,513.58	
	8311	MCAG/Bender/Thomas	12/06/2007	\$ 2,558.50	
	8352	MCAG/Mark Thomas & Co	12/19/2007	\$ 62,275.15	
	8120	Ty/Travel	09/10/2007	\$ 4.00	
	8136	County Fleet	09/12/2007	\$ 72.36	
	Element 1986	MCAG Oversight	12/31/2007	\$ 13,356.48	
		TOTAL #1	\$ 214,600.72		
#2	8397	MCAG/Mark Thomas & Co	01/15/2008	\$ 90,447.86	
	8401	MCAG/Bender/Thomas	01/15/2008	\$ 3,474.72	
	Element 1986	MCAG Oversight	01/31/2008	\$ 5,200.65	
		TOTAL #2	\$ 99,123.23		
#3	8370	Reserve Acct-Office expense	01/08/2008	\$ 6.52	
	8454	MCAG/Bender/Thomas	02/05/2008	\$ 1,204.00	
	8469	MCAG/Mark Thomas & Co	02/15/2008	\$ 34,974.86	
	8516	MCAG/Bender/Thomas	03/04/2008	\$ 451.50	
	8536	MCAG/Mark Thomas & Co	03/11/2001	\$ 41,535.05	
	8556	MCAG/Bender/Thomas	03/13/2008	\$ 4,214.00	
	8581	MCAG/Bender/Thomas	03/24/2008	\$ 2,408.00	
	8632	MCAG/Mark Thomas & Co	04/08/2008	\$ 41,086.16	
	8670	MCAG/Bender/Thomas	04/25/2008	\$ 1,300.25	
	8742	MCAG/Mark Thomas & Co	05/23/2008	\$ 85,736.02	
	8767	MCAG/Bender/Thomas	05/23/2008	\$ 1,505.00	
	8767	MCAG/Bender/Thomas	05/23/2008	\$ 451.50	
	8801	MCAG/Mark Thomas & Co	06/10/2008	\$ 59,479.89	
	8472	Jesse Brown Travel	02/15/2008	\$ 169.65	
	Element 1986	MCAG Oversight 2/08-5/08	06/11/2008	\$ 11,706.85	
		Amount Paid by MCAG-Loan Proceeds		\$ (19,094.14)	
		TOTAL #2	\$ 267,135.11		

	TOTAL FY 2007-08	\$ 580,859.06
	TOTAL TO-DATE	\$ 3,034,224.96

MEMORANDUM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 25, 2008

TO: TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

FROM: JESSE B. BROWN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RE: ATWATER/MERCED EXPRESSWAY UPDATE

BACKGROUND

At the August meeting of the MCAG Governing Board, action to certify the EIR and select a project alignment was continued to allow MCAG staff and consultants time to work out an issue with the Atwater Elementary School District (AESD) regarding their school site that would be impacted by Atwater/Merced Expressway (AME) Alignment 1B. In this regard, I believe we have achieved successful resolution to this issue. Alignment 1B has been redesigned to completely avoid the AESD school site and buffer the site by 250 feet. The route will also be constructed below grade to further attenuate noise and provide safe routes to school access by way of Avenue One.

On Wednesday, September 17, 2008 MCAG consultants and I, along with AESD Superintendent Hennes, met with State Education Department staff. At the conclusion of our meeting the district was told that their current site would retain approval by the State with the Alignment 1B as now designed. AESD Assistant Superintendent attended the MCAG Governing Board meeting on September 18, 2008 and so stated the District's support for the new 1B alignment.

MCAG consultants (Mark-Thomas and CirclePoint) will be revising the draft EIR to incorporate the new data/verbiage resulting from the new alignment. Once completed, the DEIR will be re-circulated for a 45-day period beginning November 17, 2008. The schedule includes a public hearing on December 16, 2008 and EIR certification and project alignment selection at the February 19, 2009 MCAG Governing Board meeting.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

Attachments: Atwater/Merced Expressway Schedule for EIR Certification and Project Selection
Revised Alignment 1B Project Map

ITEM 5

MEMORANDUM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 25, 2008

TO: TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

FROM: TERRI LEWIS, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

**RE: DRAFT AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE 2009 INTERIM FEDERAL
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

BACKGROUND

Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) is proposing a formal amendment (Type No. 4 – Projects that Rely on Previous Emissions Analysis and Type No. 3 – Air Quality Conformity Exempt projects) to the pending 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program (Interim FTIP).

The eight San Joaquin Valley (SJV) Council of Governments (COGs) Directors have directed staff to pursue Amendment No. 1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP as a measure to make the 2009 Interim FTIP as complete a program as possible in case the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) does not publish PM2.5 Emissions Budgets. The SJV COGs cannot adopt a complete FTIP without a current Air Quality Conformity Analysis. To process a new Air Quality Conformity Analysis, the SJV COGs need the PM2.5 Emissions Budgets from EPA. EPA has been promising the PM2.5 Emissions Budgets for the last year and a half. The SJV high wind occurrences in spring and summer of this year, further added to the delay of the PM2.5 Emissions Budgets release. If the EPA releases PM2.5 Emissions Budgets, then Amendment No. 1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP will be rescinded.

The 2009 Interim FTIP 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 projects in Merced County that are eligible to proceed without a conformity determination.

The Draft Amendment No. 1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP contains the following changes:

1. Adds four regionally significant projects that are included in the 2007 RTP, where the design concept and scope and year open to traffic is unchanged. Eligible to rely on a previous emissions analysis;
2. Adds a new Prop 1B Rail project (exempt from Air Quality Conformity Analysis); and

3. Modifies the 2008 SHOPP program (exempt from Air Quality Conformity Analysis):
 - a. Adds two new Collision Reduction projects; and
 - b. Corrects the Bridge Preservation programming figures.

In accordance with the FHWA checklist for this type of amendment, an MPO may submit the documentation from the original conformity determination (i.e., the Federally Approved 2007 Air Quality Conformity Analysis) with a cover sheet attached that details the changes to the TIP and/or Plan through the submitted Amendment and stating that those changes do not affect the MPOs ability to rely on the previous regional emissions analysis.

These projects and/or project phases are consistent with the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan, which was adopted by Merced County Association of Governments on May 17, 2007 and approved by FHWA/FTA on June 29, 2007.

Both the 2007 Air Quality Conformity Analysis as well as the 2007 RTP documents 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.1 do not interfere with the timely implementation of any approved Transportation Control Measures (TCMs).

A public review and comment period is open for 30-days commencing on September 2, 2008 and ending on October 2, 2008. A public hearing was held on September 18, 2008 at 3:00 pm and no comments were received. The public still has until 5:00 PM on October 2, 2008 to submit any comments to MCAG.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve Amendment No. 1 to the 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program by Resolution No. 2008/10-16-01.

Attachments: CTIPS report – 4 projects
SHOPP Program Summary
Financial Summary
Resolution 2008/10/16/01

Merced County Association of Governments

Projects to be Included in Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP

Route Postmile PIN Dist-EA Fund AQ Lead	Project Description	2009 FTIP Programming Schedule Quadrennial Element						Beyond 4-year Quadrennial Element	
		Phase	PRIOR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14
140	Near Merced on Route 140 east of the city at Bradley Overhead. Widen structure to 4-lane with median for left turn channelization.	PE	\$2,421,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0
36.5/37.6		RW	\$4,388,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
10-0G1300 ST-CASH		Const	\$0	\$17,894,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
0.00	\$ 24,703,000								
Caltrans	FTIP Amend 0.00 0.00 10500000053	Total	\$6,809,000	\$17,894,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
99	Near Merced on Route 99 from north of the Madera County Line to Buchanan Hollow Road. Convert to 6-lane freeway and construct interchange at Plainsburg Road.	PE	\$8,543,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
0.0/4.6		RW	\$7,177,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
10-415800 ST-CASH/TCRF/BOND99		Const	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$103,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
0.00	\$ 118,720,000								
Caltrans	FTIP Amend 0.00 0.00 10500000036	Total	\$15,720,000	\$0	\$0	\$103,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
99	Near Merced on Route 99 from Buchanan Hollow Road to Miles Creek Overflow. Convert to 6-lane freeway and construct interchange at Arboleda Road. (TCRP #104)	PE	\$11,317,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4.6/10.5		RW	\$26,470,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
10-415700 ST-CASH/TCRF/BOND99		Const	\$0	\$0	\$139,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
0.00	\$ 176,787,000								
Caltrans	FTIP Amend 0.00 0.00 10500000037	Total	\$37,787,000	\$0	\$139,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
59	Atwater / Merced Expressway (AKA Castle Highway) Near Merced on Route 59 from Route 140 to the intersection of Route 59 and Bellevue Road. Construct 4-lane expressway (Project included in the FTIP for environmental approval)	PE	\$3,643,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
R14.8/R19.0		RW	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
10-0G4400 ST-CASH/DEV		Const	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
0.00	\$ 3,643,000								
Merced County	FTIP Amend 0.00 0.00 10500000072	Total	\$3,643,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local	G Street Railroad Undercrossing	PE	\$0	\$1,200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
		RW	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
		Const	\$0		\$16,650,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
0.00	\$3,200,000								
City of Merced	FTIP Amend 0.00 0.00 205-0000-0138	Total	\$0	\$3,200,000	\$16,650,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Programming Total by FY				\$ 21,094,000	\$ 155,650,000	\$ 103,000,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0

State of California FSTIP Template

AMENDMENT 1- 2009 INTERIM Federal Transportation Improvement Program

Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG)

REVENUE SOURCES		4 YEARS (See FSTIP Cycle)				
		2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	Total
LOCAL	Sales Tax	\$5,800,000	\$5,800,000	\$5,800,000	\$5,800,000	\$23,200,000
	-- City	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- County	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Other (e.g., Transportation Development Act) - LTF	\$5,800,000	\$5,800,000	\$5,800,000	\$5,800,000	\$23,200,000
	Gas Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Gas Tax (Subventions to Cities)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Gas Tax (Subventions to Counties)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other Local Funds	\$9,220,264	\$12,561,342	\$5,276,623	\$5,276,623	\$32,334,852
	* -- City General Funds	\$3,200,000	\$5,580,000	\$0	\$0	\$8,780,000
	-- Street Taxes and Developer Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	* -- Other (registration fees (AB434) and private)	6,020,264	6,981,342	5,276,623	5,276,623	\$23,554,852
	Transit	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
-- Transit Fares	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
-- Other Transit (e.g., parcel/property taxes, parking revenue, etc)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Tolls (e.g., non-state owned bridges)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Local Total	\$15,020,264	\$18,361,342	\$11,076,623	\$11,076,623	\$55,534,852	
REGIONAL ¹	Tolls	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Bridge	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Corridor	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Transit Fares/Measures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Sales Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Bond Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Gas Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Vehicle Registration Fees (CARB Fees, SAFE) Prop 42	\$5,120,264	\$5,181,342	\$5,276,623	\$5,276,623	\$20,854,852
	Other (Regional Transportation Impact Fee - RTIF)	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$16,000,000
Regional Total	\$9,120,264	\$9,181,342	\$9,276,623	\$9,276,623	\$36,854,852	
STATE	State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)	\$79,029,000	\$44,776,000	\$55,960,000	\$0	\$179,765,000
	SHOPP (Including Augmentation)	\$79,029,000	\$44,761,000	\$55,960,000	\$0	\$179,750,000
	SHOPP Prior	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	\$18,534,000	\$139,640,000	\$103,639,000	\$3,000,000	\$264,813,000
	* STIP (Including Augmentation)	\$18,534,000	\$139,640,000	\$103,639,000	\$3,000,000	\$264,813,000
	STIP Prior	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	* Proposition 1 B (HRCSA)	\$0	\$9,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$9,000,000
	GARVEE Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Traffic Congestion Relief Program	\$1,642,000	\$0	\$5,200,000	\$0	\$6,842,000
	State Transit Assistance (STA) <small>(e.g., population/revenue based, Prop 42)</small>	\$2,593,000	\$2,593,000	\$2,593,000	\$2,593,000	\$10,372,000
Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
State Total	\$101,798,000	\$196,009,000	\$167,392,000	\$5,593,000	\$470,792,000	
FEDERAL TRANSIT	Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)	\$1,527,000	\$565,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,092,000
	Clean Fuel Formula Program (5308)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Fixed Guideway Modernization (5309a)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Intercity Bus (5311f)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (5316)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Metropolitan Planning (5303)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	New and Small Starts (Capital Investment Grants) (5309b)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	New Freedom (SAFETEA-LU)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (5311)	\$393,000	\$393,000	\$393,000	\$393,000	\$1,572,000
	Public Transportation on Indian Reservation (5311c)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Transit in the Parks (5320)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)	\$2,558,000	\$2,485,000	\$2,200,000	\$2,200,000	\$9,443,000
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Transit Total	\$4,478,000	\$3,443,000	\$2,593,000	\$2,593,000	\$13,107,000	

Revenue Projections – page 2

FEDERAL HIGHWAY	Federal Highway Non-Discretionary					
	* Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$2,485,000	\$2,530,000	\$2,576,000	\$2,622,000	\$10,213,000
	Surface Transportation Program (Regional) - RSTP EXCHANGE	\$2,363,000	\$2,405,000	\$2,449,000	\$2,493,000	\$9,710,000
	Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	\$0	\$200,000	\$3,428,000	\$0	\$3,628,000
	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Railway (Section 130)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU) - FEDERAL	\$445,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$445,000
	Safe Routes to School (SRTS) - STATE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Transportation Improvements (TI)	\$342,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$342,000
	Federal Lands Highway	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Please specify)- Highway Bridge Local Seismic	\$0	\$0	\$174,000	\$0	\$174,000
	Subtotal	\$5,635,000	\$5,135,000	\$8,627,000	\$5,115,000	\$24,512,000
	Federal Highway Discretionary Programs					
	Bridge Discretionary Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec.1303)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Ferry Boat Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	High Priority Projects (HPP)	\$137,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$137,400
	High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	National Scenic Byways Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Public Lands Highway Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Recreational Trails	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (Please Specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Subtotal	\$137,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$137,400	
Federal Highway Total	\$5,772,400	\$5,135,000	\$8,627,000	\$5,115,000	\$24,649,400	
FEDERAL TOTAL²	\$10,250,400	\$8,578,000	\$11,220,000	\$7,708,000	\$37,756,400	
INNOVATIVE FINANCE³	TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	State Infrastructure Bank	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Section 129 Loans	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Activity Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Concession Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Donations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Program Income (from a federal project)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Innovative Financing Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
REVENUE TOTAL	\$136,188,928	\$232,129,684	\$198,965,246	\$33,654,246	\$600,938,104	

²Amendment No. 1

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 FSTIP Template

AMENDMENT 1 - 2009 INTERIM Federal Transportation Improvement Program

Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG)

PROGRAMMED		4 YEARS (See FSTIP Cycle)				
		2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	Total
LOCAL	Local Total	\$15,020,264	\$18,361,342	\$11,076,623	\$11,076,623	\$55,534,852
REGIONAL ¹	<i>Tolls</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Bridge	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Corridor	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Regional Transit Fares/Measures</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Regional Sales Tax</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Regional Bond Revenue</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Regional Gas Tax</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Vehicle Registration Fees (CARB Fees, SAFE) Prop 42</i>	\$5,120,264	\$5,181,342	\$5,276,623	\$5,276,623	\$20,854,852
	<i>Other (Regional Transportation Impact Fee -RTIF)</i>	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$16,000,000
Regional Total	\$9,120,264	\$9,181,342	\$9,276,623	\$9,276,623	\$36,854,852	
STATE	<i>State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)</i>	\$79,029,000	\$44,761,000	\$55,960,000	\$0	\$179,750,000
	SHOPP (Including Augmentation)	\$79,029,000	\$44,761,000	\$55,960,000	\$0	\$179,750,000
	SHOPP Prior	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</i>	\$18,534,000	\$139,640,000	\$103,639,000	\$3,000,000	\$264,813,000
	* STIP (Including Augmentation)	\$18,534,000	\$139,640,000	\$103,639,000	\$3,000,000	\$264,813,000
	STIP Prior	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Proposition 1 B (HRCSA)</i>		\$9,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$9,000,000
	<i>GARVEE Bonds</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Traffic Congestion Relief Program</i>	\$1,642,000	\$0	\$5,200,000	\$0	\$6,842,000
	<i>State Transit Assistance (STA)</i> <small>(e.g., population/revenue based, Prop 42)</small>	\$2,593,000	\$2,593,000	\$2,593,000	\$2,593,000	\$10,372,000
	<i>Other (Please specify)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	State Total	\$101,798,000	\$195,994,000	\$167,392,000	\$5,593,000	\$470,777,000
FEDERAL TRANSIT	<i>Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)</i>	\$1,527,000	\$565,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,092,000
	<i>Clean Fuel Formula Program (5308)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Fixed Guideway Modernization (5309a)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Intercity Bus (5311f)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (5316)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Metropolitan Planning (5303)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>New and Small Starts (Capital Investment Grants) (5309b)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>New Freedom (SAFETEA-LU)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (5311)</i>	\$393,000	\$393,000	\$393,000	\$393,000	\$1,572,000
	<i>Public Transportation on Indian Reservation (5311c)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Transit in the Parks (5320)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)</i>	\$2,558,000	\$2,485,000	\$2,200,000	\$2,200,000	\$9,443,000
<i>Other (Please specify)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Federal Transit Total	\$4,478,000	\$3,443,000	\$2,593,000	\$2,593,000	\$13,107,000	

Programmed Revenue – page 2

FEDERAL HIGHWAY	Federal Highway Non-Discretionary					
	* Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$2,485,000	\$2,530,000	\$2,576,000	\$2,622,000	\$10,213,000
	Surface Transportation Program (Regional Exchange)	\$2,363,000	\$2,405,000	\$2,449,000	\$2,493,000	\$9,710,000
	Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	\$0	\$200,000	\$3,428,000	\$0	\$3,628,000
	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Railway (Section 130)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)	\$445,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$445,000
	Safe Routes to School (SR2S)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Transportation Improvements (TI)	\$342,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$342,000
	Federal Lands Highway	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Please specify) - Highway Bridge Local Seismic	\$0	\$0	\$174,000	\$0	\$174,000
	Subtotal	\$5,635,000	\$5,135,000	\$8,627,000	\$5,115,000	\$24,512,000
	Federal Highway Discretionary Programs					
	Bridge Discretionary Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec.1303)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Ferry Boat Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	High Priority Projects (HPP)	\$137,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$137,400
	High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	National Scenic Byways Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Public Lands Highway Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Recreational Trails	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Subtotal	\$137,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$137,400	
Federal Highway Total	\$5,772,400	\$5,135,000	\$8,627,000	\$5,115,000	\$24,649,400	
FEDERAL TOTAL²	\$10,250,400	\$8,578,000	\$11,220,000	\$7,708,000	\$37,756,400	
INNOVATIVE FINANCE	TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	State Infrastructure Bank	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Section 129 Loans	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Activity Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Concession Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Donations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Program Income (from a federal project)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Innovative Financing Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
PROGRAMMED TOTAL	\$136,188,928	\$232,114,684	\$198,965,246	\$33,654,246	\$600,923,104	

* Amendment No. 1

NOTES:

¹**Regional:** Not all MPOs may 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 FSTIP Template

AMENDMENT 1 - 2009 INTERIM Federal Transportation Improvement Program

Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG)

REVENUE Vs. PROGRAMMED		4 YEARS (See FSTIP Cycle)				
		2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	Total
LOCAL	Local Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	REGIONAL¹					
	<i>Tolls</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Bridge	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-- Corridor	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Regional Transit Fare/Measures</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Regional Sales Tax</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Regional Bond Revenue</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Regional Gas Tax</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Vehicle Registration Fees (CARB Fees, SAFE)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Other (Please specify)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Regional Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
STATE	<i>State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	SHOPP (Including Augmentation)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	SHOPP Prior	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	* STIP (Including Augmentation)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	STIP Prior	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>*Proposition 1 B (HRCSA)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>GARVEE Bonds</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Traffic Congestion Relief Program</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>State Transit Assistance (STA)</i> <small>(e.g., population/revenue based, Prop 42)</small>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Other (Please specify)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	State Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FEDERAL TRANSIT	<i>Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Clean Fuel Formula Program (5308)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Fixed Guideway Modernization (5309a)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Intercity Bus (5311f)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (5316)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Metropolitan Planning (5303)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>New and Small Starts (Capital Investment Grants) (5309b)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>New Freedom (SAFETEA-LU)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (5311)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Public Transportation on Indian Reservation (5311c)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Transit in the Parks (5320)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Other (Please specify)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Transit Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Revenue vs. Programmed - page 2

FEDERAL HIGHWAY	Federal Highway Non-Discretionary					
	* Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Surface Transportation Program (Regional)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Railway (Section 130)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Safe Routes to School (SR2S)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Transportation Improvements (TI)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Federal Lands Highway	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Federal Highway Discretionary Programs					
	Bridge Discretionary Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec.1303)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Ferry Boat Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	High Priority Projects (HPP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	National Scenic Byways Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Public Lands Highway Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Recreational Trails	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Federal Highway Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
FEDERAL TOTAL²	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
INNOVATIVE FINANCE³	TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	State Infrastructure Bank	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Section 129 Loans	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Activity Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Concession Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Donations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Program Income (from a federal project)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other (Please specify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Innovative Financing Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

¹ Amendment No. 1

NOTES:

¹**Regional:** Not all MPOs may 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

2008 SHOPP After July 2008 CTC

Excludes Federal ER Funds

(\$1,000)

Dist	County	Route	Post Miles	Location/Description	EA	PPNO	Prog Code	FY	RW	Sup RW	RW Total	Con	Sup Con	Con Total	Sup PA & ED	Sup PSE	PSE/PAED Total
Bridge Preservation (CTIPS ID 205-0000-0126)																	
10	Merced	99	15.8/17.3	In Merced County, from north of V Street to Black Rascal Bridge #39-0131R/L). Replace bridges.	0K020	5423	201.110	2008/09	\$ 395,000	\$ 468,000	\$ 863,000	\$ 44,274,000	\$ 2,430,000	\$ 46,704,000	\$ 1,261,000	\$ 2,425,000	\$ 3,686,000
10	Merced	140	36.5/37.6	In Merced, from Baker Drive to Santa Fe Avenue at Bradley overhead #39-44. Replace bridge.	3A660	5643	201.112	2008/09	\$3,038,000	\$ 643,000	\$ 3,681,000	\$ 17,696,000	\$ 1,961,000	\$ 19,657,000	\$ 1,639,000	\$ 1,142,000	\$ 2,781,000
								FY08/09 TOTAL			\$ 4,544,000			\$ 66,361,000			\$ 6,467,000
10	Merced	99	13.9/14.4	In the city of Merced, at Merced overhead and 15th Street undercrossing. Replace overhead and widen undercrossing.	4B100	5415	201.110	2010/11	\$ 286,000	\$ 249,000	\$ 535,000	\$ 40,066,000	\$ 4,252,000	\$ 44,318,000	\$ 173,000	\$ 3,171,000	\$ 3,344,000
								FY10/11 TOTAL			\$ 535,000			\$ 44,318,000			\$ 3,344,000
Collision Reduction (CTIPS ID 305-0000-0000)				ADDED NEW PROJECT June 08													
10	Merced	140	14.1/22.7	In the City of Merced, at Childs Avenue. Install traffic signals and left turn channelization	0N900	0143	201.010	2008/09	\$ 5,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 924,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 1,124,000	\$ 199,000	\$ 289,000	\$ 488,000
								FY 08/09 TOTAL			\$ 45,000			\$ 1,124,000			\$ 488,000
				ADDED NEW PROJECT May 08													
10	Merced		21.6/34.8	In Los Banos at Miller Lane. Install traffic signals and lighting	0H700	0088	201.010	2009/10	\$ 113,000	\$ 231,000	\$ 344,000	\$ 798,000	\$ 224,000	\$ 1,022,000	\$ 445,000	\$ 358,000	\$ 803,000
								FY09/10 TOTAL			\$ 344,000			\$ 1,022,000			\$ 803,000
Roadway Preservation (CTIPS ID 205-0000-0127)																	
10	Merced	165	11.7/26.9	Near Los Banos, from Henry Miller Road to Route 140. Rehabilitate roadway.	27980	5858	201.120	2009/10	\$ 417,000	\$ 286,000	\$ 703,000	\$ 19,774,000	\$ 1,816,000	\$ 21,590,000	\$ 1,929,000	\$ 1,551,000	\$ 3,480,000
10	Merced	165	26.9/30.0	Near Stevinson, from Route 140 to Westside Boulevard. Rehabilitate roadway.	3B150	5917	201.120	2009/10	\$3,683,000	\$ 1,851,000	\$ 5,534,000	\$ 4,064,000	\$ 886,000	\$ 4,950,000	\$ 793,000	\$ 1,113,000	\$ 1,906,000
								FY09/10 TOTAL			\$ 6,237,000			\$ 26,540,000			\$ 5,386,000
Mobility (CTIPS ID 205-0000-0128)																	
10	Merced	99	Various	In Merced and Stanislaus Counties, at various locations. Install CMS, CCTV, RWIS and TMS.	3A340	5356	201.315	2010/11	\$ 214,000	\$ 121,000	\$ 335,000	\$ 5,123,000	\$ 1,177,000	\$ 6,300,000	\$ 466,000	\$ 662,000	\$ 1,128,000
								FY10/11 TOTAL			\$ 335,000			\$ 6,300,000			\$ 1,128,000
10	Merced	99	Various	In Merced County, at all ramp areas; also on Routes, 5, 59, 140 and 152. Construct Traffic Monitoring Stations.	0E720	7610	201.315	2009/10	\$ 27,000	\$ 42,000	\$ 69,000	\$ 3,093,000	\$ 611,000	\$ 3,704,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 654,000	\$ 656,000
								FY09/10 TOTAL			\$ 69,000			\$ 3,704,000			\$ 656,000

**BEFORE THE
MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 2008/10-16-01**

In the Matter of:
**Amendment 1 to the 2009 Interim Federal
Transportation Improvement Program**

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE
Merced County Association
Governments **Amendment #1 to the
2009 Interim Federal Transportation
Improvement Program**

WHEREAS, the Merced County Association of Governments 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 #1 to the 2009 Interim 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 #1 to the Interim FTIP program listing is consistent with: 1) the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan; and 2) the 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP contains the MPO's certification of the transportation planning process assuring that all federal requirements have been fulfilled; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP meets all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450; and

WHEREAS, projects submitted in Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP must be financially constrained and the financial plan affirms that funding is available; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP has been developed consistent with 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 to: 1) Adds regionally significant projects that are included in the 2007 RTP, where the design concept and scope and year open to traffic is unchanged; 2) Adds a new exempt Prop 1B Rail project; and 3) Modifies the exempt 2008 SHOPP program- Adds two new Collision Reduction projects and corrects the Bridge Preservation programming figures by phase and fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP meets the transportation conformity provisions of 40 CFR 93.122(g). and

WHEREAS, Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP relies on the federally approved 2007 Air Quality Conformity Determination; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP does not interfere with the timely implementation of the Transportation Control Measures; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP conforms to the applicable SIPs; and

WHEREAS, the documents have 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 public hearing was conducted on September 18, 2008 to hear and consider comments on Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Merced County Association of Governments adopts Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim FTIP.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Merced County Association of Governments finds that the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan and Amendment #1 to the 2009 Interim 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 Merced County Association of Governments this 16th day of October 2008.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Signed: _____
Chairman of Directors

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 16th day of October, 2008.

Signed: _____
Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 25, 2008

TO: TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

FROM: RICHARD GREEN, GIS PROGRAM MANAGER

**RE: SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY BLUEPRINT - VALLEYWIDE SCENARIO
UPDATE**

BACKGROUND

Each individual county has submitted their “Status Quo” or “Current Trends” Scenario and a “Locally Selected Alternative” Scenario. These were compiled together by U.C. Davis to create Valley-wide Scenarios A and B respectively. Based on discussion and recommendation from the Blueprint Regional Advisory Committee, U.C. Davis created three more draft valley-wide scenarios. These scenarios took the “Locally Selected Alternative” scenario as the basis and applied more regional policies and projects. These are outlined in the attached spreadsheet.

After further discussion, an additional hybrid scenario was discussed. U.C. Davis is currently developing this and the results should be available by the time of the meeting.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information and discussion.

Attachment: San Joaquin Valley Blueprint Recent Trends

MEMORANDUM

DATE: **SEPTEMBER 25, 2008**

TO: **TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

FROM: **TERRI LEWIS, ASSOCIATE PLANNER**

RE: **4th Year (FY 08/09) CALIFORNIA REGIONAL BLUEPRINT GRANT APPLICATION**

BACKGROUND

The California Regional Blueprint Planning Grant Program is a competitive program to initiate efforts to conduct regional comprehensive growth scenario planning including: transportation, mobility, housing, jobs, economic development, and land use.

1st Year Grant Application, Award, and Local Match

The eight San Joaquin Valley (SJV) Councils of Government (COGs) submitted a joint grant application for \$10 million in Blueprint Grant Funding over a two-year fiscal year period (06/07, 07/08) with Merced County Association of Governments as the lead Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The San Joaquin Valley Regional Blueprint project was awarded \$2,000,000 in grant funding on February 1, 2006. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District) provided \$500,000 in local matching funds.

2nd Year Grant Application, Award, and Local Match

On October 31, 2006, MCAG submitted a 2nd Year Blueprint Grant application on behalf of the San Joaquin Valley Councils of Governments. On November 30, 2006, Caltrans awarded \$1,950,000 in grant funding to the San Joaquin Valley Regional Blueprint. On September 20, 2007, the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District) approved \$250,000 in match funding contingent upon the eight SJV COGs matching these dollars on a 1:1 ratio. The SJV COGs have committed (at minimum) \$250,000 of their matching funds.

3rd Year Grant Application, Award, and Local Match

On November 29, 2007, MCAG submitted a 2nd Year Blueprint Grant application on behalf of the San Joaquin Valley Councils of Governments. On May 4, 2008, Caltrans awarded \$1,375,000 in FY 07/08 grant funding to the San Joaquin Valley Regional Blueprint. The eight SJV COG's are providing the required 20% in local match funding.

DISCUSSION

It was known from the inception of the SJV Regional Blueprint concept that the Blueprint Planning process was to develop in the long-term, rather than the short-term. Also, the state (Caltrans) acknowledged that additional grant funding would be available in future years as long as it was approved in the state budget annually.

4th Year Blueprint Grant RFP release

Due to the state's ongoing budget deficit crisis, it was understood by the SJV COGs that there would not be a 4th year of Blueprint Grant funding available in FY 08/09. Contrary to this information, Caltrans did release a 4th year Blueprint Grant Request for Proposal (RFP) on September 5, 2008 with an application due date of **October 10, 2008**.

The eight SJV COG Blueprint Project Managers are recommending that a 4th Year Blueprint Grant Funding Application be submitted for the Blueprint Implementation Phase. Fresno COG will be submitting the 4th Year Blueprint Grant Application and will also become the lead agency for the Blueprint process. The 20% required local match is the responsibility of each of the eight SJV COGs.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board support the submittal of a 4th Year San Joaquin Valley Region Blueprint Grant Application to Caltrans by October 10, 2008 by Resolution No. 2008/10-16-02.

Attachment: San Joaquin Valley Regional Blueprint Planning Grant Resolution No. 2008/10-16-02.

MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

IN THE MATTER OF SUPPORTING THE) RESOLUTION NO. 2008/10-16-02
4th Year CALIFORNIA REGIONAL) RE: CALIFORNIA REGIONAL
PLANNING GRANT) BLUEPRINT PLANNING
APPLICATION) 4th YEAR RENEWAL GRANT

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

WHEREAS, the California Regional Blueprint Planning Program is a voluntary, competitive grant program which facilitates comprehensive scenario planning that results in consensus by regional leaders, local governments, and stakeholders on a preferred growth scenario that achieves the objectives for twenty-year planning horizon; and

WHEREAS, scenario planning enables public officials and other participants to evaluate future land use patterns and their potential impacts on the region’s transportation system, housing supply, jobs-housing proximity and balance, environment, and natural resources; and

WHEREAS, the California Regional Blueprint Planning Grant Program is designed to support related statutory requirements, programs, and guidelines that address the need for integrated planning, including the Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, the State’s planning priorities, and “alternative planning scenarios”.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Merced County Association of Governments Governing Board supports the submittal of a 4th Year San Joaquin Valley Regional Blueprint grant application to the California Regional Blueprint Planning Program.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted on a motion by _____, and seconded by _____, at a regular meeting held on the 16th day of October, 2008, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

WITNESS, my hand this _____ day of _____, 2008.

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

Jesse Brown, Executive Director, Merced County Association of Governments

MEMORANDUM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 25, 2008

TO: TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

FROM: JESSE B. BROWN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RE: SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY EXPRESS TRANSIT STUDY

BACKGROUND

On behalf of the San Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (SJVRTPA), the Merced County Association of Governments submitted a Partnership Planning Grant application last year to prepare a San Joaquin Valley Express Transit Study for \$200,000 of federal funds to be matched with \$50,000 of in-kind match shared among the eight SJVRTPA's. Recognizing the substantial growth that is currently taking place and the need for relieving traffic congestion, the study will inventory and assess current transit service, evaluate future need for transit services throughout the San Joaquin region, and identify institutional and financial arrangement tools that could be used for service implementation, if warranted.

The MCAG Governing Board awarded the planning contract to the firm of Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates. To date the attached draft products have been produced and are attached for review and discussion.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information and discussion only.

Attachments: SJV Express Transit: Initial Commute Travel Demand Analysis
 SJV Express Transit: Summary of Stakeholder Interviews with Transit Operators
 SJV Express Transit: Summary of Stakeholder Interviews with Employers and
 Business Organizations

Enclosure: SJV Express Transit Study - Existing Conditions and Case Studies