



Revised FINAL
DECEMBER 11, 2013

MADERA COUNTY 2014 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM



Madera County Transportation Commission

2014
Regional Transportation
Improvement Program

Fiscal Years 2014/15 through 2018/19

REVISED FINAL
December 11, 2013

2014

**Madera County
Regional Transportation Improvement Program
(RTIP)**

**Madera County Transportation Commission
2001 Howard Road, Suite 201
Madera, California 93637
(559) 675-0721
(559) 675-9328 - FAX**

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
BACKGROUND.....	1
STIP FUND ESTIMATE.....	6
PROPOSED 2014 RTIP PROGRAMMING	7
2014 RTIP PRIORITIES AND PROJECT NEED STATEMENTS	7
2014 RTIP PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	8
APPENDIX A - 2014 STIP FUND ESTIMATE	16
APPENDIX B - PERFORMANCE INDICATORS, MEASURES, AND DEFINITIONS ...	23
APPENDIX C - 2014 MADERA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	29
APPENDIX D - 2014 RTIP PROJECT NOMINATION SHEETS	31
APPENDIX E - RESOLUTION APPROVING 2014 REGIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	45

Executive Summary

The 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for Madera County is prepared by the Madera County Transportation Commission (MCTC) and proposes how \$15 million in regional discretionary transportation dollars should be programmed from Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-2019. The deadline for regions to submit programming requests for the 2014 STIP is December 15, 2013. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) will adopt the 2014 STIP in March of 2014. For purposes of this 2014 RTIP, the 2014 STIP Guidelines and Fund Estimate of August 6, 2013, and amended on October 8, 2013, are the basis of current funding assumptions.

The RTIP is updated every two years and submitted to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). This RTIP covers a five-year period from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2019 (State fiscal years 2014/15 – 2017/18).

Background

Overview of STIP Process

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a biennial document adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) no later than April 1 of each even numbered year. The STIP Fund Estimate (FE) is an estimate of all resources available at the state level for the State's transportation infrastructure over a specific period of time. The FE provides an estimate, in annual increments, for all Federal and State funds reasonably expected to be available for programming in the subsequent STIP. Each STIP will cover a five-year period and add two new years of programming capacity. Each STIP will include projects carried forward from previous STIP plus new projects and reserves from among those proposed by regional transportation planning agencies in their Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and by Caltrans in its Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

The STIP consists of two broad programs, the Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funded from 75% of new STIP funding and the Interregional Improvement Program (IIP) funded from 25% of the new STIP funding. The 75% RIP funds are further divided by formula into county shares, which are also referred to as "Regional Shares" or "RIP" funds. Regional shares are available solely for projects nominated by regions in their RTIPs. The 25% IIP funds are commonly referred to "Interregional Shares" or "IIP" funds. Caltrans nominates only projects for the Interregional Share funding in its ITIP. Under strict circumstances, an RTIP may also recommend a project for funding from the interregional share. Appendix A identifies the current 2014 STIP Fund Estimate – County and Interregional shares for FY 2014/15 – 2018/19.

Overview of RTIP Process

Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) use the STIP fund estimate to create a programming document identifying specific transportation projects that need to be constructed. RTPAs are required to submit their adopted biennial Regional Transportation Improvement Programs to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Caltrans no later than December 15 of odd numbered years. Statutes allow the CTC to delay a Fund Estimate (FE) if there is legislation before the Legislature or Congress that may have a significant effect on the FE. The RTIP includes and separately identifies

programming proposals from its Regional share for the five-year STIP period. These proposals may include new projects, changes to prior STIP projects, and program reserves and advances.

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) provides for a significant number of transportation projects around the State. As the RTPA for Madera County, MCTC is responsible for developing regional projects in Madera County for the STIP.

The RTIP is the region's proposal to the State for STIP funding. The 2014 RTIP is due to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) by December 15, 2013. The 2014 STIP will include programming for five fiscal years from 2014-15 through 2018-19.

Caltrans and the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies are required to consult with each other in the development of the RTIP and ITIP. Under strict circumstances, an RTIP may also recommend a project for funding from Interregional Share. If Caltrans and a regional agency agree, they may recommend that a new project or a project cost increase be jointly funded from Regional and Interregional shares. In that case, the region will nominate the project in its RITP and Caltrans will nominate the project in its ITIP.

A region with a population of less than one million may, in its RTIP, ask the Commission to advance an amount beyond its Regional Share for a larger project. The amount of the requested advance, or "RIP Advance" may not exceed 200% of the Regional Share identified in the STIP Fund Estimate. If the CTC approves a region's request for a "RIP Advance" to program a larger project, the RIP Advance will be deducted from the Regional Share for the following STIP period. Any region may in its RTIP ask to leave all or part of its Regional Share unprogrammed, thus reserving that amount to build up a larger share for a higher cost project or otherwise to program projects in the county at a later time. The CTC may use funds freed up by these reserves to advance Regional Shares in other counties.

The CTC will include all RTIP projects nominated by the County Share unless the Commission finds that (a) the RTIP is not consistent with the STIP guidelines; (b) there are insufficient funds to implement the RTIP; (c) there are conflicts with other RTIPs or ITIP; (d) a project is not in an approved Congestion Management Program or is not included in a separate listing in the approved RTIP; or (e) that the RTIP is not a cost-effective expenditure of State funds.

If the CTC proposes to reject an RTIP, it will provide notice to the regional agency no later than 60 days after the date it receives the RTIP. Whenever the Commission rejects an RTIP, the regional agency may submit a new RTIP. Unless the new RTIP is rejected in the same manner, it will be incorporated into the STIP as a STIP amendment.

MCTC's Role in the RTIP Process

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, MCTC is responsible for developing the Madera County Transportation Improvement Program. The RTIP serves two functions:

1. proposes projects and funding reserves for programming in the STIP
2. conveys the transportation needs of Madera County

The RTIP is one part of the planning, programming and monitoring process that occurs in cooperation with local, state and federal agencies to achieve the ultimate goal of implementing or constructing transportation projects that reflect a well-based and long-term plan.

The cycle begins with the preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP is the long-term twenty-year plan for Madera County transportation. Based on the findings of the RTP, MCTC prepares the RTIP, which proposes transportation projects to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and covers a period of five years. Simultaneously, Caltrans prepares the ITIP (Interregional Transportation Improvement Program), which nominates highway, rail and other projects that are important to the state. The CTC combines all the regional RTIPs and the ITIP, creating a single programming document, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Funds are allocated only to projects that are included in the STIP. After the STIP is adopted, MCTC will prepare the three-year Federal Transportation Improvement Plan (FTIP), which contains only funded projects.

In the RTIP, Madera County nominates projects under the Regional Improvement Program (RIP). In the ITIP, Caltrans nominates highway construction projects under the Interregional Improvement Program (IIP). In the past, projects from the regional and interregional programs in a county competed for the same pool of funding, then known as the county minimum. Now this pool is called the county share, and it is allocated only to the region. The interregional program is now separate, with funds allocated on a statewide basis, and no requirement that any minimum amount be spent in each county.

RTIP Requirements

State law requires the RTIP to be prepared, adopted and submitted to the CTC and the Department of Transportation by December 15 of each odd-numbered year. State law also permits the CTC, in consultation with Caltrans and regional agencies, to amend the STIP FE to account for unexpected revenues. The CTC adopted the 2014 STIP Fund Estimate and Guidelines on August 6, 2013, and amended on October 8, 2013. The deadline for submitting the RTIP to CTC is December 15, 2013. The RTIP must be prepared in consultation with the Department of Transportation and the air quality management district. The RTIP must be consistent with fund estimates provided by the CTC for projects to be funded in whole or in part by the State Highway and Aeronautics accounts. Finally, the RTIP must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

STIP Guidelines

The 2014 RTIP reflects policy and procedural changes as outlined in the 2014 STIP Fund Estimate and 2014 STIP Guidelines adopted on August 6, 2013, and amended on October 8, 2013, by the CTC. The 2014 STIP Guidelines address the particular circumstances of the 2014 fund estimate and include the following changes:

The following specific policies and procedures address the particular circumstances of the 2014 STIP:

- Schedule. The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the 2014 STIP:

Caltrans presents draft Fund Estimate	June 11, 2013
STIP Guidelines & Fund Estimate Workshop	July 18, 2013
CTC adopts Fund Estimate & Guidelines	August 6, 2013
Caltrans identifies State highway needs	September 13, 2013
Regions submit RTIPs	December 15, 2013
Caltrans submits ITIP	December 15, 2013
CTC STIP hearing, North	January 30, 2014
CTC STIP hearing, South	February 4, 2014
CTC publishes staff recommendations	February 28, 2014
CTC adopts STIP	March 20, 2014

- Statewide fund estimate. The statewide capacity for the 2014 STIP fund estimate identifies net new capacity only in the two years added to the STIP, 2017-18 and 2018-19, with decreases in capacity in earlier years. The decreases in capacity are due mainly to the elimination of the Transportation Enhancement program. The estimate incorporates the 2013-14 Budget Act and other 2013 legislation enacted prior to the fund estimate adoption. Programming in the 2014 STIP will be constrained by fiscal year, with most new programming in the two years added to the STIP, 2017-18 and 2018-19.
- County shares and targets. The 2014 Fund Estimate indicates that the STIP is overprogrammed (or more accurately under-funded) by approximately 8% in the early years of the 2014 STIP due primarily to the loss of TE funding. Some of this over-programming will likely be resolved through the schedule updates which occur each STIP cycle, and through the deletion of TE projects by regions or Caltrans (see discussion of TE projects below). However, some projects currently programmed in the STIP may need to be delayed (reprogrammed into a later year).

The Fund Estimate tables of county shares and targets take into account all county and interregional share balances on June 30, 2013. For each county and the interregional share, the table identifies the following amounts:

- Total Target. This target is determined by calculating the STIP formula share of all new capacity through 2018-19. The Total Target is not a minimum, guarantee, or limit on project nominations or on project selection in any county or region for the 2014 STIP.
- Maximum. This target is determined by estimating the STIP formula share of all available new capacity through the end of the county share period in 2019-20. This represents the maximum amount that the Commission may program in a county, other than advancing future shares, pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 188.8(j), to a county with a population of under 1 million.
- Transit and Rail Projects. While PTA program capacity has been eliminated, a region may still nominate transit and rail projects in its RTIP within State Highway Account and Federal funding constraints.
- Transportation Enhancement projects. With the passage of MAP-21 (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act; P.L. 112-141), Congress eliminated the Transportation Enhancement program, and in its place established the Transportation Alternatives Program. The Transportation Alternatives Program is a competitive program and is not included in the STIP. Existing Transportation Enhancement projects may remain in the STIP so long as they are eligible for State Highway Account or Federal funds.

MAP-21 eliminated the definition of transportation enhancement activities and inserted in its place a definition of transportation alternatives, which does not include eligibility for certain activities that were previously eligible as transportation enhancements:

- A. Safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicycles.
 - Some of these activities may be eligible under HSIP.
 - Nonconstruction projects for bicycle safety remain broadly eligible for STP funds.
 - Activities targeting children in Kindergarten through 8th grade are eligible under Safe Routes to Schools.
- B. Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites.

- C. Scenic or historic highway programs (including visitor and welcome centers).
 - o A few specific activities under this category (construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas) remain eligible.
- D. Historic preservation as an independent activity unrelated to historic transportation facilities.
 - o Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities are permitted as one type of community improvement activity.
- E. Operation of historic transportation facilities.
- F. Archaeological planning and research undertaken for proactive planning. This category now must be used only as mitigation for highway projects.
- G. Transportation museums.

Transportation Enhancement projects that are not eligible for State Highway Account or Federal funds should be deleted from the STIP.

- Transportation Enhancement reserves. **TE reserves will no longer be programmed in the STIP. Existing TE reserves should be deleted.** The amount deleted may be used to reduce a region’s over-programming or increase its programming target.
- Limitations on planning, programming, and monitoring (PPM). The fund estimate includes a table of PPM limitations that identifies the 5% limit for county shares for 2016-17 through 2018-19, based upon the 2012, and 2014 Fund Estimates. These are the amounts against which the 5% is applied. The PPM Limitation is a limit to the amount that can be programmed in any region and is not in addition to amounts already programmed.
- Advance Project Development Element (APDE). There is no APDE identified for the 2014 STIP.
- GARVEE bonding and AB 3090 commitments. The Commission will not consider proposals for either GARVEE bonding or new AB 3090 commitments as part of the 2014 STIP. The Commission will consider AB 3090 or GARVEE bonding proposals as amendments to the STIP after the initial adoption. Commission staff will maintain an “AB 3090 Plan” which will include projects for which regions intend to request an AB 3090 reimbursement in order to advance the project into 2013-14, 2014-15, or 2015-16. The inclusion of a project on the list is not a commitment by the regional agency to request an AB 3090 reimbursement, an endorsement or recommendation by Commission staff, or an approval by the Commission.
- Caltrans Benefit/Cost Model. The 2014 STIP guidelines expand the requirement project-level evaluations including use of Caltrans’ Benefit/Cost Model. The Commission requests that Caltrans expand the model to include bicycle and pedestrian projects in order to improve information available to decision makers at the regional and state level.
- Commission expectations and priorities. The 2014 Fund Estimate indicates that the 2012 STIP is over-programmed in the early years (including the two years of the share period ending in 2015-16). Some of this over-programming will likely be resolved through the schedule updates which occur each STIP cycle, and through the deletion of TE projects by regions or Caltrans (see discussion of TE projects above). However, some projects currently programmed in the STIP may need to be delayed (reprogrammed into a later year).

For the 2014 STIP, the Commission expects to give first priority to the reprogramming of projects from the 2012 STIP, as amended, and to new projects for counties that did not program up to their Base Target (Minimum) in the 2012 STIP.

The selection of projects for additional programming will be consistent with the standards and criteria in section 61 of the STIP guidelines. In particular, the Commission intends to focus on RTIP proposals that meet State highway improvement and intercity rail needs as described in section 20 of the guidelines. The Department should provide a list of the identified state highway and intercity rail needs to regional agencies and to the Commission by September 13, 2013.

Should the Department fail to provide a region and the Commission with this information, the Commission intends to assume there are no unmet state highway or intercity rail needs in that region.

Relationship to the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality

Madera County is part of the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB) District. The SJVAB, as designated by the Air Resources Board (ARB), is comprised of eight counties: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Kern.

The SJVAB is under the regulatory authority of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The District was officially formed in March 1991, under a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) between the eight counties. Under the JPA, the District assumed all control for air quality planning and regulatory powers that were once controlled by the individual air pollution control districts. The formation of the District was deemed necessary to confront the worsening air quality problems facing the San Joaquin Valley.

The District adopted the Ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the Valley in November 1994 and appropriate Transportation Control Measures and funding have been identified in the RTP and FTIP.

Madera County is both a recipient and a generator of air pollution in the SJVAB. Projects proposed in the 2014 RTIP would improve the air quality in Madera County by eliminating traffic congestion by improving traffic flow. Therefore, efforts promoted in this RTIP will aid in reducing congestion and help to prevent further degradation of Madera County's air quality. This conclusion is supported by a quantitative air quality analysis prepared by MCTC for the 2011 RTP.

Relationship to the Regional Transportation Plan

The RTIP documents the transition from the long-range planning phase, as defined by the Regional Transportation Plan, to the implementation phase of the transportation planning process. When plans and policies are adopted which call for active construction or initiation of service, the RTIP describes, schedules and allocates financial resources to these projects.

Projects included in the RTIP are included in the Federally approved Madera County 2011 Regional Transportation Plan.

STIP Fund Estimate

The 2014 RTIP is consistent with the 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program Fund Estimate, adopted by the California Transportation Commission on August 6, 2013, and amended on October 8, 2013. Madera County's total programming target is \$15,033,000. Appendix A contains a page from that document – a table displaying the adopted county share as well as the share for all counties in the state and the interregional share.

The 2014 STIP Fund Estimate (FE) projects that there will be almost \$1.3 billion available in the STIP program over the FE period in highway capacity.

Proposed 2014 RTIP Programming

2014 RTIP – PROPOSED PROGRAM

2014 RTIP (RIP) Funded Projects	prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	total	
Total County Share, June 12, 2012 (From 2012 Report)	\$ 28,906,000							
Less 2011-12 Allocations and closed projects	\$ (28,171,000)							
Total County Share, June 30, 2013	\$ 735,000							
Prior 2014 STIP Program								
MCTC PPM	\$ 176,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 87,000				\$ 350,000	
Rt 145 Interchange Improvements (supplement)	\$ 230,000						\$ 230,000	
Proposed 2014 STIP Program								
Madera Region Priorities								
MCTC PPM				\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 121,000	\$ 361,000	PPM Target
1. SR 41 Passing Lanes (CON)		\$ 11,047,000					\$ 11,047,000	
2. SR 99 - Ave 12 to Ave 17 - Widen to 6 Lanes (E&P)				\$ 1,500,000			\$ 1,500,000	
3. SR 99 - Ave 7 to Ave 12 - Widen to 6 Lanes (E&P)				\$ 1,545,000			\$ 1,545,000	
NEW								
None							\$ -	
							\$ -	
							\$ -	
Balance	\$ 406,000	\$ 11,134,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 3,165,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 121,000	\$ 15,033,000	
Total County Share	\$ 735,000							
Total Now Programmed	\$ 15,033,000							
Share Balance Advanced or Overdrawn	\$ (14,298,000)							
2014 STIP Formula Distribution	\$ 4,405,000							
Share Balance Advanced or Overdrawn	\$ (9,893,000)							
2014 STIP Advance PPM	\$ 220,000							
	\$ (9,673,000)							

2014 RTIP Priorities and Project Need Statements

There are no new projects being proposed as part of the 2014 RTIP. Appendix D contains three amended PPRs.

1. SR 41 Passing Lanes

The SR 41 Passing Lanes are located between SR 145 and Road 200 in Madera County at the location of the initial climb from the San Joaquin Valley floor to the Sierra Nevada mountain range. The addition of passing lanes will improve safety and overall traffic operations by breaking up traffic platoons and reducing traffic delays caused by inadequate passing opportunities. Passing lanes are needed to help achieve the desired Level of Service 'D' from the current LOS 'E'. Passing lanes will improve LOS considerably by providing passing opportunities and smoother traffic operations.

2. SR 99 – Ave 12 to Ave 17 – Widen to 6 Lanes

Widening of this section of SR 99 within the city limits of the City of Madera is needed to improve safety, reduce congestion, increase connectivity of the highway system, and preserve acceptable facility operation. The purpose of this project would be to increase capacity to reduce congestion, increase connectivity of the highway system, and preserve acceptable facility operation of Route 99. The proposed 6-lane freeway would accommodate the traffic demand at or above LOS D by 2025.

3. SR 99 – Ave 7 to Ave 12 – Widen to 6 Lanes

Widening of this section of SR 99 is needed to improve safety, reduce congestion, increase connectivity of the highway system, and preserve acceptable facility operation. The purpose of this project would be to increase capacity to reduce congestion, increase connectivity of the highway system, and preserve acceptable facility operation of Route 99. The proposed 6-lane freeway would accommodate the traffic demand at or above LOS D by 2025.

2014 RTIP Performance Measures

In order to maximize the State's investments in transportation infrastructure, it is CTC's policy that each RTIP will be evaluated as they are developed for performance and cost-effectiveness at the system and project level, where appropriate. As required by the STIP guidelines (Since 2006 RTIP and continued for the 2014 RTIP) performance measures are included. This report is intended to meet the 2014 STIP Guidelines regarding Performance Measures and demonstrates the effectiveness of achieving the goals, objectives and policies of the adopted 2011 Madera County Regional Transportation Plan. (See attached CTC 2014 RTIP Guidelines for performance indications, measures and definitions).

The following section is taken from the Measure T Regional Program Strategic Plan and is intended for informational purposes relating to Performance Measures

Measure T Regional Program

Phase I Project Delivery

Measure T was approved by the voters in 2006 along with California State Proposition 1B which provided the Madera County Region with a rare opportunity to deliver major transportation capital improvement projects at a time when the State was dealing with chronic fiscal and budget crisis. Unfortunately, fiscal crisis continues to be the norm in the State of California, no doubt a significant contributor has been the recent Great Recession and its aftermath. Congress and President Obama approved the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) in 2009 which contained significant infrastructure funds for "shovel ready" transportation projects. It was also the intent of the MCTC Policy Board to accelerate the delivery of Phase I projects by pursuing bond financing early in the 20 year measure program.

The Measure T Regional Program as envisioned when drafted and approved by the voters was designed to leverage State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds and also required at least a 20% developer impact fee contribution. The Regional Program contained a list of major capital improvement projects and outlined a funding component of Measure T Regional Funds; STIP; and Developer Impact Fees to match the estimated cost of each project. This funding formula as envisioned in the Measure T Investment Plan consisted of the following: Developer Impact Fees (20%); Measure T Regional (26.4%) STIP (53.6%), which represents a STIP to Measure T funding ratio of approximately 2 to 1. In order to deliver Phase I projects, the Investment Plan required that Measure T Flexible Program funds be impounded to make up for the unavailability of Developer Impact Fees which have not materialized during the recent recession. Flexible funds provide funding for the Developer Fee gap but are not able to provide the necessary contribution for all of the projects on the list. And based upon the projected STIP gap for Phase II projects, funding is not projected to be available for several developer driven projects on the list.

Reliance on STIP funding has proved to be difficult based upon CTC Allocation priorities which haven't lined up perfectly with Measure T projects. The CTC Staff has favored projects on State Route 99 based upon the Prop. 1B 99 Bond Program and SJ Valley SR 99 Business Plan. The Measure T Regional projects are primarily on the local system and operational improvements to interchanges. The MCTC Policy Board has recognized the priority for widening SR 99 through the San Joaquin Valley and has approved a partnership with Caltrans District 06 to leverage state funds and to better position Madera SR 99 projects contained in the SR 99 Business plan by providing STIP funds for seed money to build two projects on SR 99 from Ave 7 to Ave 17 including the Interchange at Ave 17. This partnership has the potential to deliver approx. \$150 million dollars to the Madera Region allowing the City of Madera to interface with the new freight capacity that a 6 lane SR 99 will bring through the SJ Valley. This investment is required for the economic development of the Ave 17 area where a major business and industrial park and city airport are located.

Although the STIP program and State Prop 1B funds have been a major contributor to some Phase I projects, the Regional Program has not been delivered as envisioned due to lack of STIP funds available to certain projects, the lack of Developer Impact Fees, and lower revenues during the Great Recession. It was in this environment that Phase I Projects have been delivered. The MCTC Policy Board has been very aggressive in the delivery of Phase I projects and has provided \$44.7 million in Measure T funds (bonded \$22.5 million); leveraged \$51 million in Prop 1B funds and \$40 million in STIP funds for several major projects that total \$138 million from 2006 through 2015. Table 4-1 from the Measure T Investment Plan was updated to reflect the Phase I delivery and Phase II projects for prioritization. The remaining projects from the Measure T Regional Program are projected as future projects should revenues be available.

Phase I delivery has been a major success due to the policies outline in the 2006 Measure T Strategic Plan as enacted by the MCTC Policy Board utilizing innovative financing to obtain the necessary funds to build transportation projects when they are ready for construction regardless of the funding formula and/or fund source.

TABLE 4-1							
20-YEAR MEASURE 1/2 CENT TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX							
1. Regional Streets and Highways Program							
Candidate Capacity Increasing Projects and Recommended Priorities							
Approved by the Steering Committee on March 16, 2006 and approved by local agencies in June 2006							
Map #	Route	Limits	Description	Estimated Cost	Measure T	STIP/Other	
PHASE I PROJECTS (2006-2015)							
	Gateway	At SR 99	Reconstruct/widen interchange	\$6,650,000	\$0	\$6,650,000	COMPLETED
	SR 145	At SR 99	Reconstruct/widen interchange	\$6,800,000	\$0	\$6,800,000	COMPLETED
	Ellis/Avenue 16	Granada to Road 26 & new SR99	Reconstruct street & Construct overcrossing	\$16,400,000	\$10,470,000	\$5,930,000	COMPLETED
	Ave 12	At SR 99	Reconstruct/widen interchange	\$85,500,000	\$11,577,000	\$73,923,000	CON PHASE
	4th	SR 99 to Lake	Reconstruct/widen from 2 to 4 lanes w/RR Xing	\$3,580,000	\$3,580,000	\$0	CON PHASE
	4th Street	At SR 99	Reconstruct/widen interchange	\$6,950,000	\$1,802,000	\$5,148,000	CON PHASE
	SR 41	Between SR 145 and Road 200	Construct passing lanes	\$22,148,000	\$11,101,000	\$11,047,000	RW PHASE
	SR 99	Ave 12 to Ave 17	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes and Reconstruct Interchange	\$3,905,000	\$2,405,000	\$1,500,000	ENV STUDY ONLY
				\$151,933,000	\$40,935,000	\$110,998,000	
PHASE II PROJECTS (2017-2025) (STIP Funding GAP)							
	Oakhurst	Mid-Town Connector	New Road	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$0	PSR
	SR 233	At SR 99	Interchange operational improvements	\$12,500,000	\$12,500,000	\$0	PSR
	Road 200	Phase III	Fine Gold Creek Bridge	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$0	
	Ave 7	SR 99 to SR 145	Reconstruct/widen	\$9,788,000	\$9,788,000	\$0	
	Cleveland	Schnoor to SR 99	Widen to 6 Lanes	\$3,750,000	\$3,400,000	\$350,000	
	Gateway (SR 145)	Yosemite to SR 99	Reconstruct/widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$8,600,000	\$6,100,000	\$2,500,000	
				\$47,638,000	\$44,788,000	\$2,850,000	
FUTURE PROJECTS							
	SR 41	Ave 10 to Ave 12 w/interchange at Ave 12	Extend freeway/build interchange	\$46,400,000	\$0	\$0	PSR Expired
	Ave12	Road 38 to SR 41	2 to 4 lanes	\$21,239,169	\$0	\$0	
	Ave 12	SR 99 to Road 32	2 to 4 lanes	\$12,200,000	\$0	\$0	
	Rd 29	Olive to Ave 13	2 to 4 lanes	\$4,857,311	\$0	\$0	
	Rd 29	Ave 12 to Ave 13	2 to 4 lanes and realignment	\$9,567,994	\$0	\$0	
				\$94,264,474	\$0	\$0	
				\$293,835,474	\$85,723,000	\$113,848,000	

Phase II Project Planning and Delivery

Phase I Project delivery, however successful, showed that financing major capital improvement projects rarely goes according to plan. Considering the STIP Funding GAP on Phase II projects and the Partnership between the MCTC Policy Board and Caltrans District 06 on State Route 99 and the lack of debt service capacity, the planning for Phase II project delivery relies almost exclusively on pay-go financing with Measure T funds. Based upon an updated Measure T cash flow analysis that projects approximately \$44 million in revenues, six (6) projects were nominated by the local agencies for implementation. It is the intention of the MCTA to close out the Regional Program with the completion of the six projects slated for Phase II. At that point, the Regional program revenues will be set to **Zero** and any remaining Flexible Funds would be distributed to the local agencies for local transportation projects. The Measure T funding indicated for each Phase II project is considered the maximum Measure T contribution and any and all cost increases will be contributed from other local funds or the project scope will be revised and/or may be dropped from the program.

It is important to note that there have been a couple of revisions to the original Measure T Tier 1 project list for Phase II delivery as follows:

1. SR 233 Interchange Reconstruction – Revised from \$60 million reconstruction to \$15 million dollar bridge widening with roundabouts operational improvement project. A lack of available funding necessitated the project scope change. However, the roundabout project will provide for similar capacity enhancement for a fraction of the cost of the completed interchange reconstruction saving taxpayers tens of millions of dollars.

2. SR 41 – Road 420 to SR 49 - Deadwood Grade Widening – This project was deemed to be infeasible as the original cost estimate was ridiculously low considering the blasting required and the cost of a bypass route during construction. The project has been replaced by three (3) smaller projects nominated by the county.
 - a) Oakhurst Midtown Connector – Project connects Road 426 and SR 41 near Yosemite High School - \$7.5 million
 - b) Road 200 Phase III – Construct new bridge at Fine Gold Creek - \$5.5 million
 - c) Ave 7 – SR 99 to SR 145 – Reconstruct/widen- \$9.7 million
3. SR 99 – Ave 12 to Ave 17- Widen to 6 lanes – Reconstruct Ave 17 interchange* – This project was added to leverage State funds for SR 99. Environmental and Design funds only. Flexible funds - \$2.4 million. NOTE: The Avenue 17 interchange reconstruction has been separated from this project since the Measure T Strategic Plan was prepared.

The priorities for Measure T Regional Program Phase II remain unchanged from the original Strategic Plan which center around fast cost effective project delivery, leveraging State and Federal funding, and geographic equity. Also, the reality of pay-go financing dictate that few projects may move forward at the same time. The MCTC TAC recommend and the MCTA Policy Board has directed that the program provide funds for the environmental and design phase of the first two (2) projects and that the project that advances to construction readiness first will receive priority for right of way and construction funding. It has also been the continuing policy of the MCTC Policy Board to obtain all funds, regardless of the source, to fund the construction of Regional Program projects when they are shovel ready. It is the intention of the Board to have at least two (2) projects under development to ensure a competitive atmosphere and to have a back-up plan should one project slip its delivery schedule and to be able to take advantage of any future funding programs that fall from the congressional or legislative sky. Measure T Regional Program Phase II initial priorities are indicated below as project 1a:

- 1a. Oakhurst Midtown Connector - \$7.5 million
- 1a. SR 233 Interchange Operational Improvements - \$12.5 million

The uncertainty of Regional Program funding and delivery make it somewhat unrealistic to program projects beyond the first two, except to show that revenues sufficient to fund the program are projected to materialize. We are confident, that is the case, however the last project on the list could be in jeopardy of only being partially funded by Measure T should sufficient revenues not materialize as projected. Indeed the capacity for the last four (4) projects is projected at the very end of the Measure T program out to 2025. The following pages are intended to describe the 20 year financial partnership between MCTC and Caltrans District 06 for Phase I and Phase II and SR 99 North and South widening and Ave 17 interchange reconstruction including possible scenarios for Phase II delivery and SR 99 investment. KNN Financial Services, Inc. has reviewed the updated Measure T cash flow analysis and recommends pay-go financing for Phase II implementation. The updated Measure T cash Flow analysis and Phase I and Phase II Regional Program are included in this document.

****NOTE: The Avenue 17 interchange reconstruction has been separated from this project since the Measure T Strategic Plan was prepared, but is still identified in the above text for informational purposes as taken from the 2013 Measure T Strategic Plan.***

**20 years
of Partnership**

District 6 Caltrans Madera CTC

MEASURE T REGIONAL PROGRAM

REVENUES 20 Year Estimate

Regional	\$	51,168,512
Flexible	\$	41,812,154
		\$92,980,666

Measure T Regional Program - Phase I (2006 - 2015)

Phase I - Total Project Expenditures			
Regional	\$	25,078,000	
Flexible	\$	15,857,000	\$ 40,935,000 (Bonded 22,572,200)
STIP	\$	40,518,000	
Bond	\$	51,100,000	
Other	\$	5,930,000	
	\$	138,483,000	

Phase I - Measure T Expenditures			
	Expenditures	Debt Service Int.	Total
Regional	\$ 25,078,000	\$ 5,459,445	\$ 30,537,445
Flexible	\$ 15,857,000	\$ 3,329,101	\$ 19,186,101
	\$ 40,935,000	\$ 8,788,546	\$49,723,546

PHASE I Projects	Est. YOC	Measure T	STIP/Other	TOTAL COST
1 SR 99/ Ave 12 Interchange Improvements	2012	\$11,577,000	\$73,923,000	85,500,000
2 Ellis Ave Widen Phase I	2011	\$1,500,000	\$3,100,000	4,600,000
3 Ellis Ave Bridge Phase II	2012	\$8,970,000	\$2,830,000	11,800,000
4 4th Street Bridge Phase I	2012	\$1,802,000	\$5,148,000	6,950,000
5 4th Street Widen Phase II	2012	\$3,580,000	\$0	3,580,000
6 SR 41 Passing Lanes	2015	\$11,101,000	\$11,047,000	22,148,000
7 SR 99 North Widen & Ave 17 Interchange (E & P)	2013	\$2,405,000	\$1,500,000	3,905,000
	Total	\$40,935,000	\$97,548,000	\$138,483,000



1

**20 years
of Partnership**

District 6 Caltrans Madera CTC

Measure T Regional Program - Phase II (DRAFT)

(2017 - 2025)

Phase II - Revenues		
Regional	\$ 20,631,067	48%
Flexible	\$ 22,626,053	52%
	\$ 43,257,120	

SCENARIO 1	Est. YOC	Est. Cost***
1 Oakhurst Midtown Connector	2018	\$7,500,000
2 SR 233 Interchange Operational Improvements*	2022	\$12,500,000
3 Road 200 - Phase III	2023	\$5,500,000
4 Ave 7 Reconstruction	2025	\$9,788,000
5 Cleveland Ave Widening	2026	\$3,400,000
6 Gateway Ave Widening	2027	\$6,100,000
	Total	\$44,788,000
	Balance**	-\$1,530,880

SCENARIO 2	Est. YOC	Est. Cost
1 SR 233 Interchange Operational Improvements	2020	\$12,500,000
2 Oakhurst Midtown Connector	2022	\$7,500,000
3 Road 200 - Phase III	2023	\$5,500,000
4 Ave 7 Reconstruction	2025	\$9,788,000
5 Cleveland Ave Widening	2026	\$3,400,000
6 Gateway Ave Widening	2027	\$6,100,000
	Total	\$44,788,000
	Balance	-\$1,530,880

* Est. \$3 million CMAQ Funds (FTIP Priority) would displace equivalent Measure T Funds on SR 233 project.

** Phase II Regional Fund Balance set to zero upon completion and remaining Flexible Fund Balance distributed to local agencies if any.

*** Phase II Est Cost is considered maximum Measure T contribution based upon Measure T Expenditure Plan approved by voters.



**20 years
of Partnership**

District 6 Caltrans Madera CTC

STIP Regional Program - Phase II (DRAFT)

(2012 STIP - 2026 STIP) \$4 million per STIP Cycle (7)

SR 99 Business Plan Cost Estimate		CON
Madera North 99 5-Mile Widening & Ave 17 Int	\$75,000,000	
Madera South 99 5-Mile Widening	\$40,000,000	
	<u>\$115,000,000</u>	

SCENARIO 1

Madera RTIP Revenues	
Balance	-\$14,000,000
Share Est.	\$28,000,000
	<u>\$14,000,000</u>
Advance	\$41,000,000
	<u>\$55,000,000</u>

	CON		
SR 99 Business Plan - Proposed Program			
	RIP	IP/Other	Total
1 Madera North 99 5-Mile Widening & Ave 17 Int	\$45,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$75,000,000
2 Madera South 99 5-Mile Widening	\$10,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$40,000,000
	<u>\$55,000,000</u>	<u>\$60,000,000</u>	<u>\$115,000,000</u>
	48%		

SCENARIO 2

Madera RTIP Revenues	
Balance	-\$14,000,000
Share Est.	\$28,000,000
	<u>\$14,000,000</u>
Advance	\$21,000,000
	<u>\$35,000,000</u>

	CON		
SR 99 Business Plan - Proposed Program			
	RIP	IP/Other	Total
1 Madera North 99 5-Mile Widening	\$0	\$40,000,000	\$40,000,000
2 Madera South 99 5-Mile Widening	\$0	\$40,000,000	\$40,000,000
3 Ave 17 Interchange	\$35,000,000	\$0	\$35,000,000
	<u>\$35,000,000</u>	<u>\$80,000,000</u>	<u>\$115,000,000</u>
	30%		





Date: March 21, 2013

To: Derek Winning, Deputy Director
Troy McNeil, Fiscal Supervisor
Madera County Transportation Commission

From: Mark Li, Vice President
KNN Public Finance

Re: Debt Capacity for Measure "T" ½ Cent Sales Tax

Per the request of the Madera County Transportation Commission ("MCTC"), KNN Public Finance ("KNN") has analyzed the current debt capacity for Measure "T". In summary, based on MCTC's current revenue and capital expenditure forecasts, there is no available debt capacity because there is not enough free cash flow in the Regional and Flexible Programs to pay interest on new debt.

KNN's debt capacity analysis started with updating the cash flow model that was used to evaluate the economics of the two prior bond offerings. The model had been vetted by rating agencies and would work well to evaluate debt capacity. We updated the model to reflect the audited sales tax revenues of \$7,775,292 for Fiscal Year 2011-2012 and the sales tax revenue forecast which ramps up to a growth of 4.5% per year. In addition, we also updated the forecasted "Phase I" capital expenditures and added a forecast for the "Phase II" capital expenditures. Moreover, we did a review of the entire model and updated various financing assumptions and parameters.

After updating the model it became apparent that based on the sales tax revenue and capital expenditure forecasts there was little to no free cash flow in the Regional and Flexible Programs to pay interest on new debt. Accordingly, there is no debt capacity and pay-as-you-go would be the best approach to provide for the projects.

As always, let me know if you have any questions (510-208-8213, mli@knninc.com). Best regards, - Mark.

Appendix A
2014 STIP Fund Estimate

2013 SUMMARY OF STIP COUNTY SHARES

Does Not Include ITIP Interregional Share Funding (See Separate Listing)
(\$1,000's)

Total County Share, June 30, 2012 (from 2012 Report)	28,906
Less 2011-12 Allocations and closed projects	(28,171)
Less Projects Lapsed, July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013	0
Total County Share, June 30, 2013	735

Madera

Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Ext	Del.	Voted	Total	Project Totals by Fiscal Year					Project Totals by Component					
								Prior	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Sup
Highway Projects:																		
Caltrans	99	5355A	Rt 145 interchange improvements (suppl)			Aug-12	230	0	230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Madera CTC		6L05	Planning, programming, and monitoring			May-13	88	0	88	0	0	0	0	0	88	0	0	
Caltrans	41	6606	Passing Lanes				11,047	0	0	0	0	11,047	0	0	11,047	0	0	
Caltrans	99	5335	Ave 12-Ave 17, widen to 6 lanes & Ave 17 I/C improv.				1,545	0	0	0	0	0	1,545	0	0	1,545	0	
Caltrans	99	6297	Ave 7-Ave 12, widen to 6 lanes (RIP)				1,500	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	1,500	0	
Madera CTC		6L05	Planning, programming, and monitoring				403	0	0	88	87	87	141	0	403	0	0	
Subtotal, Highway Projects							14,813	0	318	88	87	11,134	3,186	0	11,768	3,045	0	
Total Programmed or Voted since July 1, 2012							14,813											

Balance of STIP County Share, Madera	
Total County Share, June 30, 2013	735
Total Now Programmed or Voted Since July 1, 2012	14,813
Unprogrammed Share Balance	0
Share Balance Advanced or Overdrawn	14,078

2014 STIP FUND ESTIMATE - CORRECTED
Table 1 - Reconciliation to County and Interregional Shares
(\$ millions)

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	5-Year Total	6-Year Total
Public Transportation Account (PTA)								
2014 FE PTA Target Capacity	\$25	\$65	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$65	\$90
Total 2014 STIP FE PTA Target Capacity	\$25	\$65	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$65	\$90
2012 STIP Program ¹	\$68	\$84	\$101	\$97	\$0	\$0	\$282	\$350
Extensions	\$11	\$43	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$43	\$54
Delivered But Not Allocated	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Advances	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Net PTA STIP Program	\$79	\$127	\$101	\$97	\$0	\$0	\$325	\$404
PTA Capacity for County Shares	(\$54)	(\$62)	(\$101)	(\$97)	\$0	\$0	(\$260)	(\$314)
Cumulative	(\$54)	(\$116)	(\$217)	(\$314)	(\$314)	(\$314)		
SHA								
2014 FE Non-PTA Target Capacity	\$798	\$774	\$691	\$686	\$686	\$681	\$3,518	\$4,316
2014 FE Non-PTA GARVEE Debt Service	(\$84)	(\$84)	(\$11)	(\$11)	(\$11)	(\$11)	(\$128)	(\$212)
TE State Match (Estimated program totals)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total 2014 STIP FE Non-PTA Capacity	\$714	\$690	\$680	\$675	\$675	\$670	\$3,390	\$4,104
2012 STIP Program ¹	\$462	\$516	\$569	\$531	\$0	\$0	\$1,616	\$2,078
Extensions	\$120	\$2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2	\$122
Delivered But Not Allocated	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Advances	\$0	(\$5)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$5)	(\$5)
Net Non-PTA STIP Program	\$581	\$512	\$569	\$531	\$0	\$0	\$1,613	\$2,194
Non-PTA Capacity for County Shares	\$133	\$178	\$111	\$144	\$675	\$670	\$1,777	\$1,910
Cumulative	\$133	\$310	\$421	\$565	\$1,240	\$1,910		
Transportation Enhancements (TE)								
2014 STIP FE TE Capacity (Federal)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TE State Match (Estimated program totals)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total 2014 STIP FE TE Capacity	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2012 STIP Program ¹	\$81	\$95	\$72	\$94	\$0	\$0	\$260	\$341
Extensions	\$4	\$1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1	\$5
Advances	(\$6)	(\$3)	(\$1)	(\$1)	\$0	\$0	(\$6)	(\$12)
Net TE	\$79	\$92	\$70	\$92	\$0	\$0	\$255	\$334
TE Capacity for County Shares	(\$79)	(\$92)	(\$70)	(\$92)	\$0	\$0	(\$255)	(\$334)
Cumulative	(\$79)	(\$171)	(\$241)	(\$334)	(\$334)	(\$334)		
Total Capacity	\$0	\$23	(\$61)	(\$45)	\$675	\$670	\$1,262	\$1,262

Notes:

General note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

¹ 2013 Orange Book

2014 STIP Fund Estimate - Corrected
County and Interregional Shares
Table 2. Summary of Targets and Shares
(,000)

County	2014 STIP Programming		
	Total Target	Maximum	TE Target
	Target through 2018-19	Estimated Share through 2019-20	Target through 2018-19
Alameda	33,785	51,301	0
Alpine	2,200	2,720	0
Amador	2,495	3,677	0
Butte	18,830	22,325	0
Calaveras	2,556	3,964	0
Colusa	2,501	3,436	0
Contra Costa	26,752	38,739	0
Del Norte	0	0	0
El Dorado LTC	0	0	0
Fresno	17,193	30,384	0
Glenn	3,581	4,561	0
Humboldt	776	4,297	0
Imperial	18,028	24,247	0
Inyo	18,946	23,787	0
Kern	30,131	47,913	0
Kings	0	0	0
Lake	7,673	9,203	0
Lassen	5,616	7,855	0
Los Angeles	177,779	283,706	0
Madera	0	0	0
Marin	0	0	0
Mariposa	3,203	4,118	0
Mendocino	7,049	10,338	0
Merced	19,514	23,845	0
Modoc	3,773	4,968	0
Mono	15,130	18,726	0
Monterey	14,726	20,961	0
Napa	6,822	8,979	0
Nevada	0	1,101	0
Orange	65,610	98,266	0
Placer TPA	0	0	0
Plumas	5,348	6,683	0
Riverside	69,696	98,571	0
Sacramento	48,239	64,831	0
San Benito	0	0	0
San Bernardino	54,392	87,590	0
San Diego	38,207	75,320	0
San Francisco	13,305	22,194	0
San Joaquin	24,614	33,606	0
San Luis Obispo	8,035	14,657	0
San Mateo	21,145	30,191	0
Santa Barbara	2,674	10,131	0
Santa Clara	19,158	39,966	0
Santa Cruz	5,893	9,476	0
Shasta	14,588	18,424	0
Sierra	2,315	2,949	0
Siskiyou	7,549	10,179	0
Solano	11,108	16,537	0
Sonoma	0	0	0
Stanislaus	15,364	22,016	0
Sutter	4,109	5,642	0
Tahoe RPA	3,062	3,877	0
Tehama	6,439	8,389	0
Trinity	3,154	4,537	0
Tulare	9,139	17,355	0
Tuolumne	11,399	12,926	0
Ventura	30,969	42,064	0
Yolo	13,469	16,673	0
Yuba	5,234	6,407	0
Statewide Regional	953,273	1,434,608	0
Interregional	309,124	477,789	0
TOTAL	1,262,397	1,912,397	0

	New Capacity
Statewide Flexible Capacity	1,909,730
Statewide PTA Capacity	(313,695)
Statewide TE Capacity	(333,638)
Total STIP Capacity	1,262,397

2014 Fund Estimate - Corrected

County and Interregional Shares

Table 3. Calculation of New Programming Targets and Shares - Total
(\$1,000's)

County	Net Carryover		2014 STIP Share through 2018-19			
	Unprogrammed Balance	Balance Advanced	Formula Distribution	Add Back Lapses 11-12/12/13	Net Share (Total Target)	Net Advance
Alameda	2,000	0	31,785	0	33,785	0
Alpine	1,255	0	945	0	2,200	0
Amador	350	0	2,145	0	2,495	0
Butte	12,488	0	6,342	0	18,830	0
Calaveras	0	0	2,556	0	2,556	0
Colusa	673	0	1,698	130	2,501	0
Contra Costa	5,000	0	21,752	0	26,752	0
Del Norte	0	(11,560)	1,585	0	0	(9,975)
El Dorado LTC	0	(9,478)	4,448	0	0	(5,030)
Fresno	0	(8,176)	23,939	1,430	17,193	0
Glenn	1,802	0	1,778	1	3,581	0
Humboldt	0	(5,655)	6,391	40	776	0
Imperial	6,741	0	11,287	0	18,028	0
Inyo	9,824	0	8,784	338	18,946	0
Kern	0	(2,711)	32,269	573	30,131	0
Kings	0	(17,941)	4,735	0	0	(13,206)
Lake	4,665	0	2,776	232	7,673	0
Lassen	652	0	4,064	900	5,616	0
Los Angeles	0	(17,809)	192,230	3,358	177,779	0
Madera	0	(14,078)	4,405	0	0	(9,673)
Marin	0	(39,820)	5,945	245	0	(33,630)
Mariposa	1,541	0	1,662	0	3,203	0
Mendocino	1,081	0	5,968	0	7,049	0
Merced	11,655	0	7,859	0	19,514	0
Modoc	1,373	0	2,168	232	3,773	0
Mono	8,439	0	6,526	165	15,130	0
Monterey	0	(6,844)	11,314	10,256	14,726	0
Napa	2,678	0	3,914	230	6,822	0
Nevada	0	(4,118)	3,365	0	0	(753)
Orange	0	(1,653)	59,263	8,000	65,610	0
Placer TPA	0	(45,878)	8,070	0	0	(37,808)
Plumas	2,925	0	2,423	0	5,348	0
Riverside	15,380	0	52,400	1,916	69,696	0
Sacramento	17,630	0	30,109	500	48,239	0
San Benito	0	(6,819)	2,084	0	0	(4,735)
San Bernardino	0	(5,969)	60,246	115	54,392	0
San Diego	0	(29,142)	67,349	0	38,207	0
San Francisco	0	(2,827)	16,132	0	13,305	0
San Joaquin	7,957	0	16,319	338	24,614	0
San Luis Obispo	0	(4,624)	12,017	642	8,035	0
San Mateo	3,728	0	16,417	1,000	21,145	0
Santa Barbara	0	(12,288)	13,532	1,430	2,674	0
Santa Clara	0	(19,262)	37,760	660	19,158	0
Santa Cruz	0	(611)	6,504	0	5,893	0
Shasta	7,628	0	6,960	0	14,588	0
Sierra	1,043	0	1,151	121	2,315	0
Siskiyou	2,470	0	4,772	307	7,549	0
Solano	1,256	0	9,852	0	11,108	0
Sonoma	0	(21,840)	12,113	1,204	0	(8,523)
Stanislaus	3,292	0	12,072	0	15,364	0
Sutter	1,327	0	2,782	0	4,109	0
Tahoe RPA	1,585	0	1,477	0	3,062	0
Tehama	2,422	0	3,538	479	6,439	0
Trinity	586	0	2,508	60	3,154	0
Tulare	0	(6,022)	14,911	250	9,139	0
Tuolumne	8,626	0	2,773	0	11,399	0
Ventura	9,335	0	20,134	1,500	30,969	0
Yolo	6,739	0	5,815	915	13,469	0
Yuba	3,004	0	2,130	100	5,234	0
Statewide Regional	169,150	(295,125)	918,248	37,667	953,273	(123,333)
Interregional	0	(13,246)	306,083	16,287	309,124	0
TOTAL	169,150	(308,371)	1,224,331	53,954	1,262,397	(123,333)
Statewide Flexible Capacity					1,909,730	
Statewide PTA Capacity					(313,695)	
Statewide TE Capacity					(333,638)	
Total					1,262,397	

**2014 Fund Estimate - Corrected
County and Interregional Shares**

Table 4. Calculation of New Programming Targets and Shares - Maximum
(\$1,000's)

County	Net Carryover		2014 STIP Share through 2019-20			
	Unprogrammed Balance	Balance Advanced	Formula Distribution	Add Back Lapses 11-12/12-13	Net Share (Maximum)	Net Advance
Alameda	2,000	0	49,301	0	51,301	0
Alpine	1,255	0	1,465	0	2,720	0
Amador	350	0	3,327	0	3,677	0
Butte	12,488	0	9,837	0	22,325	0
Calaveras	0	0	3,964	0	3,964	0
Colusa	673	0	2,633	130	3,436	0
Contra Costa	5,000	0	33,739	0	38,739	0
Del Norte	0	(11,560)	2,458	0	0	(9,102)
El Dorado LTC	0	(9,478)	6,899	0	0	(2,579)
Fresno	0	(8,176)	37,130	1,430	30,384	0
Glenn	1,802	0	2,758	1	4,561	0
Humboldt	0	(5,655)	9,912	40	4,297	0
Imperial	6,741	0	17,506	0	24,247	0
Inyo	9,824	0	13,625	338	23,787	0
Kern	0	(2,711)	50,051	573	47,913	0
Kings	0	(17,941)	7,345	0	0	(10,596)
Lake	4,665	0	4,306	232	9,203	0
Lassen	652	0	6,303	900	7,855	0
Los Angeles	0	(17,809)	298,157	3,358	283,706	0
Madera	0	(14,078)	6,833	0	0	(7,245)
Marin	0	(39,820)	9,221	245	0	(30,354)
Mariposa	1,541	0	2,577	0	4,118	0
Mendocino	1,081	0	9,257	0	10,338	0
Merced	11,655	0	12,190	0	23,845	0
Modoc	1,373	0	3,363	232	4,968	0
Mono	8,439	0	10,122	165	18,726	0
Monterey	0	(6,844)	17,549	10,256	20,961	0
Napa	2,678	0	6,071	230	8,979	0
Nevada	0	(4,118)	5,219	0	1,101	0
Orange	0	(1,653)	91,919	8,000	98,266	0
Placer TPA	0	(45,878)	12,517	0	0	(33,361)
Plumas	2,925	0	3,758	0	6,683	0
Riverside	15,380	0	81,275	1,916	98,571	0
Sacramento	17,630	0	46,701	500	64,831	0
San Benito	0	(6,819)	3,232	0	0	(3,587)
San Bernardino	0	(5,969)	93,444	115	87,590	0
San Diego	0	(29,142)	104,462	0	75,320	0
San Francisco	0	(2,827)	25,021	0	22,194	0
San Joaquin	7,957	0	25,311	338	33,606	0
San Luis Obispo	0	(4,624)	18,639	642	14,657	0
San Mateo	3,728	0	25,463	1,000	30,191	0
Santa Barbara	0	(12,288)	20,989	1,430	10,131	0
Santa Clara	0	(19,262)	58,568	660	39,966	0
Santa Cruz	0	(611)	10,087	0	9,476	0
Shasta	7,628	0	10,796	0	18,424	0
Sierra	1,043	0	1,785	121	2,949	0
Siskiyou	2,470	0	7,402	307	10,179	0
Solano	1,256	0	15,281	0	16,537	0
Sonoma	0	(21,840)	18,787	1,204	0	(1,849)
Stanislaus	3,292	0	18,724	0	22,016	0
Sutter	1,327	0	4,315	0	5,642	0
Tahoe RPA	1,585	0	2,292	0	3,877	0
Tehama	2,422	0	5,488	479	8,389	0
Trinity	586	0	3,891	60	4,537	0
Tulare	0	(6,022)	23,127	250	17,355	0
Tuolumne	8,626	0	4,300	0	12,926	0
Ventura	9,335	0	31,229	1,500	42,064	0
Yolo	6,739	0	9,019	915	16,673	0
Yuba	3,004	0	3,303	100	6,407	0
Statewide Regional	169,150	(295,125)	1,424,243	37,667	1,434,608	(98,673)
Interregional	0	(13,246)	474,748	16,287	477,789	0
TOTAL	169,150	(308,371)	1,898,991	53,954	1,912,397	(98,673)
Statewide Flexible Capacity					2,559,730	
Statewide PTA Capacity					(313,695)	
Statewide TE Capacity					(333,638)	
Total					1,912,397	

2014 STIP FUND ESTIMATE - CORRECTED

County and Interregional Shares

Table 5 - Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) Limitations
(\$1,000's)

County	Total		5% PPM Limitation	
	2012 STIP FY 2016/17	2014 STIP 16/17-18/19	Total 16/17-18/19	FY 2016/17-2018-19
Alameda	20,348	31,785	52,133	2,607
Alpine	602	945	1,547	77
Amador	1,383	2,145	3,528	176
Butte	4,031	6,342	10,373	519
Calaveras	1,623	2,556	4,179	209
Colusa	1,081	1,698	2,779	139
Contra Costa	13,881	21,752	35,633	1,782
Del Norte	1,011	1,585	2,596	130
El Dorado LTC	2,806	4,448	7,254	363
Fresno	15,366	23,939	39,305	1,965
Glenn	1,132	1,778	2,910	146
Humboldt	4,066	6,391	10,457	523
Imperial	7,218	11,287	18,505	925
Inyo	5,617	8,784	14,401	720
Kern	20,698	32,269	52,967	2,648
Kings	3,035	4,735	7,770	389
Lake	1,769	2,776	4,545	227
Lassen	2,585	4,064	6,649	332
Los Angeles	122,728	192,230	314,958	15,748
Madera	2,810	4,405	7,215	361
Marin	3,792	5,945	9,737	487
Mariposa	1,058	1,662	2,720	136
Mendocino	3,799	5,968	9,767	488
Merced	5,004	7,859	12,863	643
Modoc	1,379	2,168	3,547	177
Mono	4,180	6,526	10,706	535
Monterey	7,227	11,314	18,541	927
Napa	2,497	3,914	6,411	321
Nevada	2,146	3,365	5,511	276
Orange	37,971	59,263	97,234	4,862
Placer TPA	5,140	8,070	13,210	661
Plumas	1,542	2,423	3,965	198
Riverside	33,370	52,400	85,770	4,289
Sacramento	19,227	30,109	49,336	2,467
San Benito	1,328	2,084	3,412	171
San Bernardino	38,336	60,246	98,582	4,929
San Diego	43,126	67,349	110,475	5,524
San Francisco	10,283	16,132	26,415	1,321
San Joaquin	10,407	16,319	26,726	1,336
San Luis Obispo	7,729	12,017	19,746	987
San Mateo	10,617	16,417	27,034	1,352
Santa Barbara	8,644	13,532	22,176	1,109
Santa Clara	24,115	37,760	61,875	3,094
Santa Cruz	4,164	6,504	10,668	533
Shasta	4,436	6,960	11,396	570
Sierra	732	1,151	1,883	94
Siskiyou	3,036	4,772	7,808	390
Solano	6,277	9,852	16,129	806
Sonoma	7,819	12,113	19,932	997
Stanislaus	7,718	12,072	19,790	990
Sutter	1,775	2,782	4,557	228
Tahoe RPA	942	1,477	2,419	121
Tehama	2,269	3,538	5,807	290
Trinity	1,595	2,508	4,103	205
Tulare	9,531	14,911	24,442	1,222
Tuolumne	1,780	2,773	4,553	228
Ventura	12,867	20,134	33,001	1,650
Yolo	3,691	5,815	9,506	475
Yuba	1,357	2,130	3,487	174
Statewide	586,696	918,248	1,504,944	75,247

Note: Limitation amounts include amounts already programmed.

Appendix B

Performance Indicators, Measures and Definitions

California Transportation Commission
STIP Guidelines

August 6, 2013

Appendix B:

Part A: Performance Indicators, Measures and Definitions

Complete Part A

Use the following to indicate quantitatively how the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) or the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) is consistent with the goals established in your Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP). If any of the performance measures in Part A do not reflect the goals contained in an RTP/ITSP or if an RTIP/ITIP does not contain goals that are measurable by the performance measures contained within, simply state “not applicable (na)” for each indicator or each performance measure (where appropriate).

Performance Indicators and Measures						
Indicator	Relation to STIP Sec 19 Performance Criteria	Performance Measures			Current System Performance (Baseline)	Projected Impact of Projects
		Mode	Level*	Measures		
Safety	2	Roadway	Region	Fatalities per Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and per capita		
	2			Fatal Collisions per VMT and per capita		
	2			Injury Collisions per VMT and per capita		
	2	Transit	Mode	Fatalities / Passenger Miles		
Mobility	1	Roadway	Region	Passenger Hours of Delay / Year		
	1			Average Peak Period Travel Time		
	1			Average Non-Peak Period Travel Time		
Accessibility	4 (also 1,3,6,7)	Transit	Region	Percentage of population within 1/2 mile of a rail station or bus route.		
		All	Region	Average travel time to jobs or school.		
Reliability	1	Roadway	Corridor	Travel Time Variability (buffer index)		
	1	Roadway	Corridor	Daily vehicle hours of delay per capita		
	1	Roadway	Corridor	Daily congested highway VMT per capita		
	5	Transit	Mode	Percentage of vehicles that arrive at their scheduled destination no more than 5 minutes late.		
Productivity (Throughput)	7	Roadway - Vehicles	Corridor	Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips		
	7			Average Daily Vehicle Trips (ADT)		
	6,7,8			Daily VMT per capita		
	7	Roadway - People	Corridor	Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate		
	7			Average Daily Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate		
	7	Trucks	Corridor	Percentage of ADT that are (5+ axle) Trucks		
	7			Average Daily Vehicle Trips that are (5+ axle) Trucks		
	7	Transit	Mode	Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Hour		
	7			Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Mile		
	7			Passenger Mile per Train Mile (Intercity Rail)		
7	Boardings per capita					
System Preservation	3	Roadway	Region	Total number of Distressed Lane Miles		
	3			Percentage of Distressed Lane Miles		
	3			Percentage of Roadway at Given IRI Levels		
	3			Percentage of highway bridges in need of repair (by number of bridges and by deck area)		
Environmental Impact	6	All	Region	Carbon dioxide emissions per capita		
				Criteria pollutant emissions per capita		
Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost	1-7	All	Corridor	Percentage rate of return		
*Level:						
Corridor - Routes or route segments that are identified by regions and Caltrans as being significant to the transportation system.						
Region - Region or county commission that is responsible for RTIP submittal.						
Mode - One of the following transit types (light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, trolley bus, and all forms of bus transit).						

Part B:

If Part A alone is insufficient in indicating how progress towards attaining goals and objectives contained in each RTP and the ITSP is assessed and measured, complete Part B.

Include the following information:

- List your performance measures.
- Provide a quantitative and/or qualitative analysis (include baseline measurement and projected program or project impact).
- State the reason(s) why selected performance measure or measures are accurate and useful in measuring performance. Please be specific.
- Identify any and all deficiencies encountered in as much detail as possible.

Provide a quantitative evaluation and/or qualitative explanation of how the goals and objectives contained in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) are linked to the program of projects contained in the RTIP and the ITIP.

For qualitative explanations, state how progress towards attaining goals and objectives contained in each RTP and the ITSP is assessed and measured. If performance indicators and/or performance measures used by an agency are different from those outlined in Table A of the Guidelines and as provided in Appendix B, describe the method(s) used.

If the quality or quantity of data required to demonstrate the linkage between an RTIP/ITIP and the associated RTP/ITSP quantitatively is in question, describe the quality and quantity of data that are available, being sure to highlight those instances where data are not available. Where data are unavailable, please describe data deficiencies in as much detail as possible.

Part C:

A project level evaluation shall be submitted for projects for which construction is proposed if:

- the proposed STIP programming exceeds 50% of a county's target for new programming (as identified in the fund estimate), or
- the total amount of existing and proposed STIP for the project is \$15 million or greater, or
- the total project cost is \$50 million or greater.

If a project-level evaluation is conducted, Table A should be used for reference. The project level evaluation shall include a Caltrans generated benefit/cost estimate and identify the estimated impact the project will have on the annual cost of operating and maintaining the state's transportation system.

A project level evaluation shall also be conducted for existing STIP projects with a total project cost of \$50 million or greater or a total STIP programmed amount of \$15 million or greater if construction is programmed in the STIP and CEQA was completed for the project after a region adopted its 2012 RTIP or, for Caltrans, after submittal of the 2012 ITIP.

**Table A: Performance Indicators, Measures and Definitions
(Page 1 of 3)**

Indicator	Relation to Section 19 Performance Criteria	Performance Measures			Definition/Indication
		Mode	Level*	Measures	
Safety	2	Roadway	Region	Fatalities per Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and per capita	Indicates the ratio of the number of fatalities to the number of vehicle miles traveled and per capita.
	2			Fatal Collisions per VMT and per capita	Indicates the ratio of the number of fatal collisions to the number of vehicle miles traveled and per capita.
	2			Injury Collisions per VMT and per capita	Indicates the ratio of the number of injury collisions to the number of vehicle miles traveled and per capita.
	2	Transit	Mode	Fatalities / Passenger Miles	Indicates the ratio of the number of fatalities to the number of passenger miles traveled.
Mobility	1	Roadway	Region	Passenger Hours of Delay / Year	Indicates the total amount of delay per traveler that exists on a designated area over a selected amount of time.
	1			Average Peak Period Travel Time	Indicates the average travel time for peak period trips taken on regionally significant corridors and between regionally significant origin and destination pairs.
	1			Average Non-Peak Period Travel Time	Indicates the average travel time for non-peak period trips taken on regionally significant corridors and between regionally significant origin and destination pairs.
Accessibility	4 (also 1,3,6,7)	Transit	Region	Percentage of population within 1/2 mile of a rail station or bus route.	Indicates the accessibility of transit service.
		All	Region	Average travel time to jobs or school.	Indicates the accessibility of jobs and schools.

*Level

Corridor – Routes or route segments that are identified by regions and Caltrans as being significant to the transportation system.

Region – Region or county commission that is responsible for RTIP submittal.

Mode – One of the following transit types: light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, trolley bus, and all forms of bus transit.

**Table A: Performance Indicators, Measures and Definitions
(Page 2 of 3)**

Indicator	Relation to Section 19 Performance Criteria	Performance Measures			Indicator
		Mode	Level*	Measures	
Reliability	1	Roadway	Corridor	Travel Time Variability	Indicates the difference between expected travel time and actual travel time. Buffer index represents the extra time cushion most travelers add to their average travel time to ensure on-time arrival when planning trips.
	1	Roadway	Corridor	Daily vehicle hours of delay per capita	Indicate travel time attributable to delay.
	1	Roadway	Corridor	Daily congested highway VMT per capita	
	5	Transit	Mode	Percentage of vehicles that arrive at their scheduled destination no more than 5 minutes late.	These measures indicate the ability of transit service operators to meet customers' reliability expectations.
Productivity (Throughput)	7	Roadway - Vehicles	Corridor	Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips	Indicates the utilization of the transportation system by all vehicles.
	7			Average Daily Vehicle Trips	
	7,8			Daily VMT per capita	
	7	Roadway - People	Corridor	Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate	Indicates the utilization of the transportation system by people.
	7			Average Daily Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate	
	7	Trucks	Corridor	Percentage of Average Daily Vehicle Trips that are (5+ axle) Trucks	Indicates the utilization of the transportation system by trucks.
	7			Average Daily Vehicle Trips that are (5+ axle) Trucks	
	7	Transit	Mode	Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Hour	Indicates the effectiveness of mass transportation system operations by measuring the number of passengers carried for every mile of revenue service provided.
	7			Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Mile	
	7			Passenger Mile per Train Mile (Intercity Rail)	
7			Boardings per capita.	Indicates transit usage on a per capita basis.	
System Preservation	3	Roadway	Region	Total number of Distressed Lane Miles	Indicates the number of lane miles in poor structural condition or with bad ride (pavement condition).
	3			Percentage of Distressed Lane Miles	
	3			Percentage of Roadway at Given IRI Levels	Indicates roadway smoothness.
	3			Percentage of highway bridges in need of repair (by number of bridges and by deck area)	Indicates the number of bridges and lane miles in need of rehabilitation or replacement.

*Level

Corridor – Routes or route segments that are identified by regions and Caltrans as being significant to the transportation system.

Region – Region or county commission that is responsible for RTIP submittal.

Mode – One of the following transit types: light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, trolley bus, and all forms of bus transit.

**Table A: Performance Indicators, Measures and Definitions
(Page 3 of 3)**

Indicator	Relation to Section 19 Performance Criteria	Performance Measures			Indicator
		Mode	Level*	Measures	
Environmental Impact	6	All	Region	Carbon dioxide emissions per capita	Indicates air quality impact.
				Criteria pollutant emissions per capita	
Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost	1-7	All	Corridor	Percentage rate of return	Return on Investment indicates the ratio of resources available to assets utilized. Lifecycle Cost Analysis is Benefit-Cost Analysis that incorporates the time value of money.

*Level

Corridor – Routes or route segments that are identified by regions and Caltrans as being significant to the transportation system.

Region – Region or county commission that is responsible for RTIP submittal.

Mode – One of the following transit types: light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, trolley bus, and all forms of bus transit.

Appendix C

2014 Madera County Regional Transportation Improvement Program

2014 RTIP (RIP) Funded Projects

	prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	total
Total County Share, June 12, 2012 (From 2012 Report)	\$ 28,906,000						
Less 2011-12 Allocations and closed projects	\$ (28,171,000)						
Total County Share, June 30, 2013	\$ 735,000						

Prior 2014 STIP Program

MCTC PPM	\$ 176,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 87,000			\$ 350,000
Rt 145 Interchange Improvements (supplement)	\$ 230,000					\$ 230,000

Proposed 2014 STIP Program

Madera Region Priorities

MCTC PPM				\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 121,000	\$ 361,000	PPM Target
1. SR 41 Passing Lanes (CON)	\$ 11,047,000						\$ 11,047,000	
2. SR 99 - Ave 12 to Ave 17 - Widen to 6 Lanes (E&P)				\$ 1,500,000			\$ 1,500,000	
3. SR 99 - Ave 7 to Ave 12 - Widen to 6 Lanes (E&P)				\$ 1,545,000			\$ 1,545,000	

NEW

None							\$ -
							\$ -
							\$ -

Balance	\$ 406,000	\$ 11,134,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 3,165,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 121,000	\$ 15,033,000
----------------	------------	---------------	-----------	--------------	------------	------------	---------------

Total County Share	\$ 735,000
Total Now Programmed	\$ 15,033,000
Share Balance Advanced or Overdrawn	\$ (14,298,000)

2014 STIP Formula Distribution	\$ 4,405,000
Share Balance Advanced or Overdrawn	\$ (9,893,000)

2014 STIP Advance PPM \$ 220,000

	\$ (9,673,000)
--	----------------

Appendix D

2014 RTIP Project Nomination Sheets

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (Revised September 2013)

General Instructions

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment (Existing Project)					Date:	9/16/13
District	EA	Project ID	PPNO	MPO ID	TCRP No.	
06	0G900	0600000112	6606			
County	Route/Corridor	PM Bk	PM Ahd	Project Sponsor/Lead Agency		
MAD	41	11.7	13.6	Madera County Transportation Commission		
				MPO	Element	
				Madera	CO	
Project Manager/Contact		Phone		E-mail Address		
Anand Kapoor		(559)243-3588		anand_kapoor@dot.ca.gov		
Project Title						
Madera 41 Passing Lane						
Location, Project Limits, Description, Scope of Work						
Near Friant, from 0.3 miles north of Road 208 to 2.2 miles north of Road 208. Construct passing lane.						
<input type="checkbox"/> Includes ADA Improvements <input type="checkbox"/> Includes Bike/Ped Improvements						
Component	Implementing Agency					
PA&ED	Caltrans					
PS&E	Caltrans					
Right of Way	Caltrans					
Construction	Caltrans					
Purpose and Need						
The addition of passing lanes will improve overall traffic operations by breaking up traffic platoons and reducing traffic delays caused by inadequate passing opportunities. Passing lanes are needed to help achieve the desired Level of Service (LOS) 'D' from the current LOS 'E'.						
Project Benefits						
<input type="checkbox"/> Supports Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Goals <input type="checkbox"/> Reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions						
Project Milestone					Existing	Proposed
Project Study Report Approved						
Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase					02/04/09	
Circulate Draft Environmental Document			Document Type	ND/FONSI	03/25/11	
Draft Project Report					05/02/11	
End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone)					09/01/11	
Begin Design (PS&E) Phase					09/01/11	
End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone)					09/01/13	07/02/14
Begin Right of Way Phase					09/01/11	
End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone)					07/01/13	08/19/13
Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone)					03/01/14	02/01/15
End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone)					01/01/16	07/01/16
Begin Closeout Phase					01/01/16	07/01/16
End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report)					07/01/17	07/01/18

ADA Notice

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in alternate formats. For information call (916) 654-6410 or TDD (916) 654-3880 or write Records and Forms Management, 1120 N Street, MS-89, Sacramento, CA 95814.

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (Revised September 2013)

Date: 9/16/13

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD, ,	41, ,	0G900	0600000112	6606	
Project Title: Madera 41 Passing Lane						

Existing Total Project Cost (\$1,000s)									Implementing Agency
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	
E&P (PA&ED)	2,033							2,033	Caltrans
PS&E	997							997	Caltrans
R/W SUP (CT)	400							400	Caltrans
CON SUP (CT)			2,271					2,271	Caltrans
R/W	3,147							3,147	Caltrans
CON			13,300					13,300	Caltrans
TOTAL	6,577		15,571					22,148	
Proposed Total Project Cost (\$1,000s)									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)	2,033							2,033	
PS&E	997							997	
R/W SUP (CT)	400							400	
CON SUP (CT)			2,271					2,271	
R/W	3,147							3,147	
CON			13,300					13,300	
TOTAL	6,577		15,571					22,148	

Fund No. 1:	RIP - National Hwy System (NH)								Program Code
Existing Funding (\$1,000s)									20.XX.075.600
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									Madera County Transportation Con
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON			11,047					11,047	
TOTAL			11,047					11,047	
Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)									
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON			11,047					11,047	
TOTAL			11,047					11,047	

Fund No. 2:	Local Funds - Local Measure (MEA)								Program Code
Existing Funding (\$1,000s)									20.10.400.100
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)	2,033							2,033	Madera County Transportation Con
PS&E	997							997	
R/W SUP (CT)	400							400	
CON SUP (CT)			2,271					2,271	
R/W	3,147							3,147	
CON			2,253					2,253	
TOTAL	6,577		4,524					11,101	
Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)									
E&P (PA&ED)	2,033							2,033	
PS&E	997							997	
R/W SUP (CT)	400							400	
CON SUP (CT)			2,271					2,271	
R/W	3,147							3,147	
CON			2,253					2,253	
TOTAL	6,577		4,524					11,101	

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (Revised September 2013)

Complete this page for amendments only

Date: 9/16/13

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD	41	0G900	0600000112	6606	

SECTION 1 - All Projects**Project Background**

--

Programming Change Requested

Funding year change from 2015/16 to 2014/15

--

Reason for Proposed Change

Project will achieve RTL by end of 2014 fiscal year. Early funding would allow the project to move earlier into the construction phase. This would result in improving overall traffic operations, reducing traffic delays and in achieving the desired Level of Service a year earlier.

--

If proposed change will delay one or more components, clearly explain 1) reason the delay, 2) cost increase related to the delay, and 3) how cost increase will be funded

--

Other Significant Information

--

SECTION 2 - For TCRP Projects Only

- Alternative Project Request (Please follow Instructions at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/tcrp/LETTERguidelines>)
- Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) (Please follow Guidelines at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/tcrp/docs/042706.pdf>)

SECTION 3 - All Projects**Approvals**

I hereby certify that the above information is complete and accurate and all approvals have been obtained for the processing of this amendment request.*

Name (Print or Type)	Signature	Title	Date

Attachments

- 1) Concurrence from Implementing Agency and/or Regional Transportation Planning Agency
- 2) Project Location Map

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

General Instructions

<input type="checkbox"/> New Project		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment (Existing Project)			Date:	08/20/13
District	EA	Project ID	PPNO	MPO ID	TCRP No.	
06	47090	0600000973	5335			
County	Route/Corridor	PM Bk	PM Ahd	Project Sponsor/Lead Agency		
MAD	99	R7.5	15.1	Caltrans		
				MPO	Element	
				Madera	Capital Outlay	
Project Mgr/Contact		Phone		E-mail Address		
Anand Kapoor		(559) 243-3588		anand_kapoor@dot.ca.gov		
Project Title						
Madera 6-Lane						
Location, Project Limits, Description, Scope of Work, Legislative Description						
In the city of Madera, from south of Avenue 12 to north of Avenue 17. Widen from 4 to 6 lanes.						
Component	Implementing Agency				Reimbursements	
PA&ED	Caltrans					
PS&E	Caltrans					
Right of Way	Caltrans					
Construction	Caltrans					
Legislative Districts						
Assembly:	29			Senate:	12	
Congressional:	19					
Purpose and Need						
<p>Currently this section of SR 99 is operating at a level of service (LOS) "D". This section of SR 99 has had an increase in development resulting in deteriorating the traffic operation. With further traffic growth due to this ongoing development along this corridor it is anticipated that the freeway will operate at capacity or LOS "E" between the years 2017 and 2022. The 4-lane freeway will continue to fail beyond the year 2022.</p> <p>The purpose of this project is to increase the capacity of the facility.</p>						
Project Benefits						
The improvement would reduce traffic congestions and improve traffic safety.						
Project Milestone				Existing	Proposed	
Project Study Report Approved					11/28/11	
Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase				07/01/15	01/07/13	
Circulate Draft Environmental Document			Document Type	ND/CE	01/03/18	07/01/14
Draft Project Report				07/01/18	06/01/14	
End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone)				10/01/18	12/01/14	
Begin Design (PS&E) Phase				07/01/19	12/01/14	
End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone)				07/01/21	09/01/16	
Begin Right of Way Phase				07/01/19	12/01/14	
End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone)				07/01/21	08/01/16	
Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone)				07/01/21	04/01/17	
End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone)				02/01/24	01/02/19	
Begin Closeout Phase				02/01/24	07/01/18	
End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report)				07/01/25	07/01/20	

ADA Notice

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in alternate formats. For information call (916) 654-6410 or TDD (916) 654-3880 or write Records and Forms Management, 1120 N Street, MS-89, Sacramento, CA 95814.

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

Date: 08/20/13

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD	99	47090	0600000973	5335	
Project Title: Madera 6-Lane						

Existing Total Project Cost									Implementing Agency
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	
E&P (PA&ED)				3,150				3,150	Caltrans
PS&E					6,000			6,000	Caltrans
R/W SUP (CT)					2,000			2,000	
CON SUP (CT)					10,000			10,000	
R/W					10,000			10,000	Caltrans
CON					100,000			100,000	Caltrans
TOTAL				3,150	128,000			131,150	
Proposed Total Project Cost									
E&P (PA&ED)				3,150				3,150	
PS&E					3,200			3,200	
R/W SUP (CT)					500			500	
CON SUP (CT)							5,200	5,200	
R/W					600			600	
CON							35,500	35,500	
TOTAL				3,150	4,300		40,700	48,150	

Fund No. 1:	RIP - State Cash (ST-CASH)								Program Code
Existing Funding									20.XX.075.600
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)				1,545				1,545	Madera CTC
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,545				1,545	
Proposed Funding									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)				1,545				1,545	
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,545				1,545	

Fund No. 2:	Local Funds - Local Measure (MEA)								Program Code
Existing Funding									20.10.400.100
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)				1,605				1,605	Madera CTC
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,605				1,605	
Proposed Funding									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)				1,605				1,605	
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,605				1,605	

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

Date: 08/20/13

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD	99	47090	0600000973	5335	
Project Title: Madera 6-Lane						

Fund No. 3:	Future Need - Future Funds (NO-FUND)								Program Code
Existing Funding									FUTURE
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E					6,000			6,000	
R/W SUP (CT)					2,000			2,000	
CON SUP (CT)					10,000			10,000	
R/W					10,000			10,000	
CON					100,000			100,000	
TOTAL					128,000			128,000	
Proposed Funding									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)							5,200	5,200	
R/W									
CON							35,500	35,500	
TOTAL							40,700	40,700	

Fund No. 4:	IIP								Program Code
Existing Funding									20.XX.025.700
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									Caltrans
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL									
Proposed Funding									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E					3,200			3,200	
R/W SUP (CT)					500			500	
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W					600			600	
CON									
TOTAL					4,300			4,300	

Fund No. 5:									Program Code
Existing Funding									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL									
Proposed Funding									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL									

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

Complete this page for amendments only

Date: 08/20/13

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD	99	47090	0600000973	5335	

SECTION 1 - All Projects**Project Background****Programming Change Requested**

Ave 17 Interchange Improvements is being split from this project and will be delivered under another project.

Reason for Proposed Change

Limited availability of funds

If proposed change will delay one or more components, clearly explain 1) reason the delay, 2) cost increase related to the delay, and 3) how cost increase will be funded

Other Significant Information**SECTION 2 - For TCRP Projects Only**

- Alternative Project Request (Please follow Instructions at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/tcrp/LETTERguidelines>)
- Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) (Please follow Guidelines at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/tcrp/docs/042706.pdf>)

SECTION 3 - All Projects**Approvals**

I hereby certify that the above information is complete and accurate and all approvals have been obtained for the processing of this amendment request.*

Name (Print or Type)	Signature	Title	Date

Attachments

- 1) Concurrence from Implementing Agency and/or Regional Transportation Planning Agency
- 2) Project Location Map

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

Date: 08/20/13

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD	99	47090	0600000973	5335	
Project Title: Madera 6-Lane						

Existing Total Project Cost									Implementing Agency
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	
E&P (PA&ED)				3,150				3,150	Caltrans
PS&E					6,000			6,000	Caltrans
R/W SUP (CT)					2,000			2,000	
CON SUP (CT)					10,000			10,000	
R/W					10,000			10,000	Caltrans
CON					100,000			100,000	Caltrans
TOTAL				3,150	128,000			131,150	
Net Change									
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E					-2,800			-2,800	
R/W SUP (CT)					-1,500			-1,500	
CON SUP (CT)					-10,000		5,200	-4,800	
R/W					-9,400			-9,400	
CON					-100,000		35,500	-64,500	
TOTAL					-123,700		40,700	-83,000	
Proposed New Result									
E&P (PA&ED)				3,150				3,150	
PS&E					3,200			3,200	
R/W SUP (CT)					500			500	
CON SUP (CT)							5,200	5,200	
R/W					600			600	
CON							35,500	35,500	
TOTAL				3,150	4,300		40,700	48,150	

Fund No. 1:	RIP - State Cash (ST-CASH)								Program Code
Existing Funding									20.XX.075.600
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)				1,545				1,545	Madera CTC
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,545				1,545	
Change									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL									
Proposed Funding									
E&P (PA&ED)				1,545				1,545	
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,545				1,545	

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

Date: 08/20/13

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD	99	47090	0600000973	5335	
Project Title: Madera 6-Lane						

Fund No. 2:	Local Funds - Local Measure (MEA)								Program Code
Existing Funding									20.10.400.100
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)				1,605				1,605	Madera CTC
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,605				1,605	
Change									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL									
Proposed Funding									
E&P (PA&ED)				1,605				1,605	
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,605				1,605	

Fund No. 3:	Future Need - Future Funds (NO-FUND)								Program Code
Existing Funding									FUTURE
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E					6,000			6,000	
R/W SUP (CT)					2,000			2,000	
CON SUP (CT)					10,000			10,000	
R/W					10,000			10,000	
CON					100,000			100,000	
TOTAL					128,000			128,000	
Change									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E					-6,000			-6,000	
R/W SUP (CT)					-2,000			-2,000	
CON SUP (CT)					-10,000		5,200	-4,800	
R/W					-10,000			-10,000	
CON					-100,000		35,500	-64,500	
TOTAL					-128,000		40,700	-87,300	
Proposed Funding									
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)							5,200	5,200	
R/W									
CON							35,500	35,500	
TOTAL							40,700	40,700	

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

General Instructions

<input type="checkbox"/> New Project		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment (Existing Project)			Date:	08/20/15
District	EA	Project ID	PPNO	MPO ID	TCRP No.	
06	0H220	0612000158	6297			
County	Route/Corridor	PM Bk	PM Ahd	Project Sponsor/Lead Agency		
MAD	99	1.7	7.5	Caltrans		
				MPO	Element	
				Madera	CO	
Project Mgr/Contact		Phone		E-mail Address		
Anand Kapoor		(559) 243-3588		anand_kapoor@dot.ca.gov		
Project Title						
South Madera 6 Lane						
Location, Project Limits, Description, Scope of Work, Legislative Description						
On Route 99 near Madera between PM 1.7 (North of Avenue 7) and PM 7.5 (Avenue 12).						
Component	Implementing Agency				Reimbursements	
PA&ED	Caltrans					
PS&E	Caltrans					
Right of Way	Caltrans					
Construction	Caltrans					
Legislative Districts						
Assembly:	5		Senate:	12		
Congressional:	16					
Purpose and Need						
Widening of this section of SR 99 is needed to improve safety, reduce congestion, increase connectivity of the highway system, and preserve acceptable facility operation. The pupose of this project would be to increase capacity to reduce congestion, increase connectivity of the highway system, and preserve acceptable facility operation of Route 99.						
Project Benefits						
Project Milestone				Existing	Proposed	
Project Study Report Approved						
Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase				07/01/15	07/01/16	
Circulate Draft Environmental Document			Document Type ND/FONSI	07/01/17	07/01/18	
Draft Project Report				07/01/17	05/01/18	
End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone)				01/03/18	01/02/19	
Begin Design (PS&E) Phase				01/03/18	01/02/19	
End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone)				01/01/20	01/02/21	
Begin Right of Way Phase				01/03/18	01/02/19	
End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone)				07/01/19	07/01/20	
Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone)				01/03/21	01/02/22	
End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone)				02/01/24	02/01/24	
Begin Closeout Phase				12/01/24	02/01/24	
End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report)				07/01/26	07/01/26	

ADA Notice

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in alternate formats. For information call (916) 654-6410 or TDD (916) 654-3880 or write Records and Forms Management, 1120 N Street, MS-89, Sacramento, CA 95814.

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

Date: 08/20/15

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD	99	0H220	0612000158	6297	
Project Title: South Madera 6 Lane						

Existing Total Project Cost									Implementing Agency
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	
E&P (PA&ED)				3,000				3,000	Caltrans
PS&E					8,928			8,928	Caltrans
R/W SUP (CT)					2,452			2,452	
CON SUP (CT)					12,650			12,650	
R/W					10,650			10,650	Caltrans
CON					146,945			146,945	Caltrans
TOTAL				3,000	181,625			184,625	
Proposed Total Project Cost									
E&P (PA&ED)				3,000				3,000	
PS&E						6,000		6,000	
R/W SUP (CT)						500		500	
CON SUP (CT)							7,000	7,000	
R/W						500		500	
CON							60,000	60,000	
TOTAL				3,000		7,000	67,000	77,000	

Fund No. 1:	RIP - State Cash (ST-CASH)								Program Code
Existing Funding									20.XX.075.600
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)				1,500				1,500	Madera County Transportation Cor
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,500				1,500	
Proposed Funding									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)				1,500				1,500	
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,500				1,500	

Fund No. 2:	IIP - State Cash (ST-CASH)								Program Code
Existing Funding									20.XX.025.700
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)				1,500				1,500	Caltrans
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,500				1,500	
Proposed Funding									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)				1,500				1,500	
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL				1,500				1,500	

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

Date: 08/20/15

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD	99	0H220	0612000158	6297	
Project Title: South Madera 6 Lane						

Fund No. 3: Future Need - Future Funds (NO-FUND)									Program Code
Existing Funding									FUTURE
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E					8,928			8,928	
R/W SUP (CT)					2,452			2,452	
CON SUP (CT)					12,650			12,650	
R/W					10,650			10,650	
CON					146,945			146,945	
TOTAL					181,625			181,625	
Proposed Funding									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)							7,000	7,000	
R/W									
CON							60,000	60,000	
TOTAL							67,000	67,000	

Fund No. 4: RIP									Program Code
Existing Funding									20.XX.075.700
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL									
Proposed Funding									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E						6,000		6,000	
R/W SUP (CT)						500		500	
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W						500		500	
CON									
TOTAL						7,000		7,000	

Fund No. 5:									Program Code
Existing Funding									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL									
Proposed Funding									Notes
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL									

PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

Complete this page for amendments only

Date: 08/20/15

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD	99	0H220	0612000158	6297	

SECTION 1 - All Projects**Project Background**

--

Programming Change Requested

Lower cost estimate for PS&E, RW, and Construction

Reason for Proposed Change

Proposed cost estimate is for most probable Alternative 1 (median widening requiring nonstandard design exceptions) instead of Alternative 2 (full standard widening with no nonstandard design exception). Under the current funding environment, Alternative 2 appears more feasible. However, the PDT will select the feasible alternative in the PA&ED phase.

If proposed change will delay one or more components, clearly explain 1) reason the delay, 2) cost increase related to the delay, and 3) how cost increase will be funded

--

Other Significant Information

--

SECTION 2 - For TCRP Projects Only

- Alternative Project Request (Please follow Instructions at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/tcrp/LETTERguidelines>)
- Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) (Please follow Guidelines at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/tcrp/docs/042706.pdf>)

SECTION 3 - All Projects**Approvals**

I hereby certify that the above information is complete and accurate and all approvals have been obtained for the processing of this amendment request.*

Name (Print or Type)	Signature	Title	Date

Attachments

- 1) Concurrence from Implementing Agency and/or Regional Transportation Planning Agency
- 2) Project Location Map

Appendix E

Resolution Approving 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

**BEFORE
THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE MADERA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
COUNTY OF MADERA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the matter of) Resolution No. **13-11**
)
THE 2014 MADERA COUNTY REGIONAL)
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT)
PROGRAM)

WHEREAS, the Madera County Transportation Commission is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Madera County pursuant to state law; and

WHEREAS, state funding known as “County Share” is made available to the Madera County Transportation Commission in five year increments with said funds to be used for capital projects to improve transportation in the region. These projects may include improvements to state highways, local roads, public transit, intercity rail, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, grade separations, transportation systems and demand management programs, soundwalls, intermodal facilities, and safety improvements; and

WHEREAS, the “County Share” is allocated to Madera County based upon a formula which first divides the statewide regional program with 40% to the north 45 counties and 60% to the south 13 counties and within each grouping the funds are distributed on a formula basis weighted 75% on population and 25% on state highway miles within each county; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to adopted California Transportation Commission policies, STIP Guidelines (Adopted on August 6, 2013, and amended on October 8, 2013) the Madera County Transportation Commission is authorized to develop and submit the Regional Transportation Improvement Program by December 15, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the 2014 Madera County Regional Transportation Improvement Program has been prepared by the Madera County Transportation Commission in cooperation with its member agencies and Caltrans in accordance with CTC programming policies and guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the MCTC proposes the following projects be included in the 2014 STIP:

2014 RTIP (RIP) Funded Projects	prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	total	
Total County Share, June 12, 2012 (From 2012 Report)	\$ 28,906,000							
Less 2011-12 Allocations and closed projects	\$ (28,171,000)							
Total County Share, June 30, 2013	\$ 735,000							
Prior 2014 STIP Program								
MCTC PPM	\$ 176,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 87,000				\$ 350,000	
Rt 145 Interchange Improvements (supplement)	\$ 230,000						\$ 230,000	
Proposed 2014 STIP Program								
Madera Region Priorities								
MCTC PPM				\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 121,000	\$ 361,000	PPM Target
1. SR 41 Passing Lanes (CON)		\$ 11,047,000					\$ 11,047,000	
2. SR 99 - Ave 12 to Ave 17 - Widen to 6 Lanes (E&P)				\$ 1,500,000			\$ 1,500,000	
3. SR 99 - Ave 7 to Ave 12 - Widen to 6 Lanes (E&P)				\$ 1,545,000			\$ 1,545,000	
NEW								
None							\$ -	
							\$ -	
							\$ -	
Balance	\$ 406,000	\$ 11,134,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 3,165,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 121,000	\$ 15,033,000	
Total County Share	\$ 735,000							
Total Now Programmed	\$ 15,033,000							
Share Balance Advanced or Overdrawn	\$ (14,298,000)							
2014 STIP Formula Distribution								
Share Balance Advanced or Overdrawn	\$ (9,893,000)							
2014 STIP Advance PPM	\$ 220,000							
	\$ (9,673,000)							


WHEREAS, The Madera County RTIP has been reviewed for consistency with the adopted Regional Transportation Plan; and

1 **WHEREAS,** The Madera County Transportation Commission Policy Board considered the 2014 Regional
2 Transportation Improvement Program at its December 11, 2013 meeting.

3
4 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** the Madera County Transportation Commission does hereby
5 adopt the 2014 Madera County Regional Transportation Improvement Program and directs staff to submit the
6 program to the Department of Transportation and CTC by December 15, 2013.

7
8 This Resolution is adopted this 11 day of December, 2013, by the following vote:

9
10 Commissioner Rogers Voted Yes
11 Commissioner Rodriguez Voted Absent
12 Commissioner Wheeler Voted Yes
13 Commissioner Svanda Voted Yes
14 Commissioner Poythress Voted Absent
15 Commissioner Hebert Voted Yes

16
17 
18 _____
19 Vice Chairman, Madera County Transportation Commission

20
21 
22 _____
23 Executive Director, Madera County Transportation Commission
24
25