



FINAL – NOVEMBER 23, 2011

# MADERA COUNTY 2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM



*Madera County Transportation Commission*

**2012**  
**Regional Transportation**  
**Improvement Program**

Fiscal Years 2012/13 through 2016/17

**ADOPTED**  
**November 23, 2011**

**2012**

**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

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>STIP FUND ESTIMATE .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>PROPOSED 2012 RTIP PROGRAMMING .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2012 RTIP PROJECT NEED STATEMENTS .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2012 RTIP PERFORMANCE MEASURES .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>APPENDIX A - 2012 STIP FUND ESTIMATE.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>APPENDIX B - 2012 RTIP RIP FUNDED PROJECT INVENTORY AND SJ VALLEY COORDINATED PROGRAMMING.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>APPENDIX C - 2012 MADERA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>APPENDIX D - 2012 RTIP PROJECT NOMINATION SHEETS.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>APPENDIX E - RESOLUTION APPROVING 2012 REGIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>19</b>

## **Executive Summary**

The 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for Madera County is prepared by the Madera County Transportation Commission (MCTC) and proposes how \$14.5 million in regional discretionary transportation dollars should be programmed from Fiscal Year (FY) 2013-2017. The deadline for regions to submit programming requests for the 2012 STIP is December 15, 2011. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) will adopt the 2012 STIP in March of 2012. For purposes of this 2012 RTIP, the 2012 STIP Guidelines and Fund Estimate of August 10, 2011 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, 2012 through June 30, 2017 (State fiscal years 2012/13 – 2016/17).

### **San Joaquin Valley 2012 STIP Programming Coordination**

The coordinated programming of the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) follows the coordination effort accomplished by the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) for the 2010 RTIP. The SJV RTPAs Coordinated 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) effort was in response to the significant reprogramming required by the state budget limitations on the 2010 Fund Estimate and the STIP Guidelines. The requiring the reprogramming of 30% of the funding programmed for the early years of the STIP cycle (FYs 09/10 to 12/13) to later years (FYs 13/14 and 14/15). The SJV RTPAs coordination was also an effort to assist the California Transportation Commission (CTC) Staff in their statewide programming decisions. These efforts resulted in the accomplishment of exceeding the target set by the CTC and the SJV RTPAs moved more than 35% of the programming from the early years to the later years.

The 2012 RTIPs for the SJV Region have been developed in collaboration with the eight SJV RTPAs and Caltrans Districts 6 and 10. The 2012 RTIP programming collectively balances capacity and project delivery needs for the eight individual RTPAs and the two Caltrans Districts. The programming is consistent with the CTC adopted 2012 Fund Estimate (FE), and the CTC adopted 2011-12 Allocation Plan for both RIP and IIP flexible funding shares.

The San Joaquin Valley RTPAs and Caltrans have collectively programmed projects based upon regional priorities, project deliverability, and prior CTC identified project priorities. The intent of the San Joaquin Valley RTPAs and the associated Caltrans Districts is to again present a comprehensive and collective annual programming recommendation for San Joaquin Valley projects; rather than having CTC staff try to make these decisions based upon individual RTPA project priorities while at the same time trying to balance the state's limited resources.

The 2012 RTIP programming supports maintaining the open to traffic dates of regionally significant projects that will need to be modeled in the 2011 and 2013 Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) and programmed in the appropriate Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) of each San Joaquin Valley RTPAs.

The SJV RTPAs have also developed some basic guidelines for amendments to the STIP programming among the regions. The emphasis of these guidelines being that participation in any of the coordination efforts is voluntary for each regional agency and that it is important that any potential unprogrammed

shares within the valley be available to the other valley regions prior to becoming part of the statewide programming capacity.

## **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 2012 STIP Fund Estimate – County and Interregional shares for FY 2012/13 – 2016/17.

### **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 2012 RTIP is due to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) by December 15, 2011. The 2012 STIP will include programming for five fiscal years from 2012-13 through 2016-17. The 2012 STIP does contain a level of new programming capacity therefore MCTC is proposing that three (3) new projects be added to the program.

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 RTIP 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 2012 STIP Fund Estimate and Guidelines in August of 2011. The deadline for submitting the RTIP to CTC is December 15, 2011. 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 2012 RTIP reflects policy and procedural changes as outlined in the 2012 STIP Fund Estimate and 2012 STIP Guidelines adopted August 2011 by the CTC. The 2012 STIP Guidelines address the particular circumstances of the 2012 fund estimate and include the following changes:

The following specific policies and procedures address the particular circumstances of the 2012 STIP:

- Schedule. The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the 2012 STIP:

Caltrans presents draft Fund Estimate	July 15, 2011
Fund Estimate Workshop & STIP Guidelines hearing	July 27, 2011
CTC adopts Fund Estimate	August 10, 2011
Caltrans identifies State highway needs	September 14, 2011
Regions submit RTIPs	December 15, 2011
Caltrans submits ITIP	December 15, 2011
CTC STIP hearing, South	February 1, 2012
CTC STIP hearing, North	February 8, 2012
CTC publishes staff recommendations	March 8, 2012
CTC adopts STIP	March 28, 2012

- Statewide fund estimate. The statewide capacity for the 2012 STIP fund estimate identifies net new capacity available in the two years added to the STIP, 2015-16 and 2016-17, as well as net increase and decreases in capacity in earlier years. The estimate incorporates the 2011-12 Budget Act and other 2011 legislation enacted prior to the fund estimate adoption. Programming in the 2012 STIP will be constrained by fiscal year, with most new programming in the two years added to the STIP, 2015-16 and 2016-17.



- County shares and targets. The Fund Estimate tables of county shares and targets take into account all county and interregional share balances on June 30, 2011. For each county and the interregional share, the table identifies the following amounts:

- Base (minimum). This is the share for each county and the interregional program through 2015-16, the end of the county share period that falls within the 2012 STIP period. It is calculated as the sum of the share balance through the June 2011 Commission meeting and the STIP formula share of the statewide new capacity available through 2015-16. In accordance with statute and the STIP guidelines, the Commission will program all RTIP proposals that fall within this amount unless it rejects the RTIP in its entirety.

- Total Target. This target is determined by calculating the STIP formula share of all new capacity through 2016-17. The Total Target is not a minimum, guarantee, or limit on project nominations or on project selection in any county or region for the 2012 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. The 2012 STIP Fund Estimate indicates that there is negative (-\$542 million) program capacity for the Public Transportation Account (PTA). This means that many of the **transit projects currently programmed in the STIP will either have to be delivered with other funds (if the transit project is eligible for State Highway Account or Federal funds) or be unprogrammed.** A region in its RTIP, and Caltrans in the ITIP, shall indicate, for all currently programmed and new transit and rail projects, if the projects are eligible to be funded with Federal or State Highway Account funds. **Transit and rail projects currently programmed in 2012-13 through 2014-15 that are not eligible to be funded with Federal or State Highway Account funds must be unprogrammed. A region that unprograms a transit or rail project because the project cannot be funded with Federal or State Highway Account funds may nominate another project in its place.**

Article XIX of the California Constitution restricts transit and rail projects that can be funded with nearly all SHA revenues to the “research, planning, construction, and improvement of exclusive public mass transit guideways (and their related fixed facilities), including the mitigation of their environmental effects, the payment for property taken or damaged for such purposes, the administrative costs necessarily incurred in the foregoing purposes, and the maintenance of the structures and the immediate right-of-way for the public mass transit guideways, but excluding the maintenance and operating costs for mass transit power systems and mass transit passenger facilities, vehicles, equipment, and services.”

Additionally, SHA revenues may not be expended for these purposes “unless such use is approved by a majority of the votes cast on the proposition authorizing such use of such

revenues in an election held throughout the county or counties, or a specified area of a county or counties, within which the revenues are to be expended.”

This means, for example, that rail rolling stock and buses may be funded only from the Federal revenues in the STIP. For such projects, the non-Federal match (generally a minimum of 11½%) will have to be provided from a non-STIP source.

While PTA program capacity has been nearly eliminated, a region may still nominate transit and rail project in its RTIP within the aforementioned State Highway Account and Federal funding constraints.

- Transportation Enhancement (TE) target. The fund estimate tables include targets for TE programming from each county and the interregional share. This target is the formula distribution of the new statewide TE capacity for the two new years in the STIP period. The TE targets are calculated as share formula proportions of the estimated statewide TE apportionments available for new programming. They are

provided for guidance only. In order to improve delivery of TE projects, the Commission encourages Caltrans and larger regions to program larger TE projects.

**It is important to note that while separate TE targets are provided there are no separate TE shares. Programmed TE projects count against a county’s total share.** As specified in section 22 of the STIP guidelines, an RTIP may propose, and the Commission may program, either more or less than the TE target in a county for TE projects.

While nearly all new TE capacity is in the two new years of the Fund Estimate (2015-16 and 2016-17), an RTIP or ITIP may propose to program any amount in any fiscal year for TE, including changes in the programming of currently programmed projects or reserves. The Commission may change the proposed programming years for TE projects in the adopted STIP if, and only if, statewide TE proposals exceed statewide TE apportionments. Where that occurs, the Commission will give priority to projects carried forward from the prior STIP and may give priority to identified projects over TE reserves.

- TE Allocations. In order to improve delivery of TE projects, the Commission will, in the fourth quarter of the fiscal year, consider advancing for allocation TE projects programmed in outer years if in the first three quarters of the fiscal year less than 75% of the current-year TE projects have been allocated. The Commission’s priority for advancing TE projects will be construction allocations for non-motorized transportation projects. If there is not sufficient TE allocation capacity to allocate funds to all TE-eligible projects programmed in that year, the Commission, consistent with Streets and Highways Code section 2373 and section 22 of these guidelines, intends to give priority for allocation to TE projects selected using criteria developed per SB 286.

- Limitations on planning, programming, and monitoring (PPM). The fund estimate includes a table of PPM limitations that identifies the 5% limit for county and interregional shares for the 2012-13 through 2015-16 share period and for 2016-17, based upon the 2008, 2010, and 2012 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 2012 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 2012 STIP. The Commission will consider AB 3090 or GARVEE bonding proposals as amendments to the STIP after the initial adoption.
- Commission expectations and priorities. For the 2012 STIP, the Commission expects to give first priority to the reprogramming of projects from the 2010 STIP, as amended, and to new projects to meet county shares for the period ending in 2015-16.

Because of the loss of PTA revenues anticipated in the 2012 STIP fund estimate, **transit and rail projects currently programmed in 2012-13 through 2014-15 that are not eligible to be funded with Federal or State Highway Account funds must be unprogrammed.** Additionally, **excluding TE the STIP is overprogrammed (underfunded) by approximately \$101 million though 2012-13. This may require that some projects programmed in 2012-13 be delayed (reprogrammed) to 2013-14.** Any cost increases or other new programming in early years will require more reprogramming to later years.

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 needs as described in section 20 of the guidelines. As specified in section 20, the Department may nominate or recommend State highway improvement projects for inclusion in RTIPs and identify any additional State highway improvement needs within each region that could be programmed by 2019-20 (three years beyond the end of the STIP period) using revenue assumptions similar to those adopted for the 2012 STIP fund estimate. The Department should provide a copy or list of the identified state highway needs to regional agencies and present this information to the Commission at the Commission's September 14, 2011 meeting.

#### 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 2012 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 SAFETEA-LU Compliant Madera County 2011 Regional Transportation Plan.

## **STIP Fund Estimate**

The 2012 RTIP is consistent with the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program Fund Estimate, adopted by the California Transportation Commission on August 10 2011. Madera County's total programming target is \$14,895,000. 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 2012 STIP Fund Estimate (FE) projects that there will be almost \$1.5 billion available in the STIP program over the FE period in highway capacity.

## **Proposed 2012 RTIP Programming**

### **2012 RTIP – PROPOSED PROGRAM**

**2012 RTIP (RIP) Funded Projects**

	prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	total
Total County Share, June 30, 2010 (includes TE)	\$ 25,019,000						
2012 STIP Target (includes TE)	\$ 4,226,000						
	\$ 29,245,000						
<b>Proposed 2012 STIP Program</b>							
MCTC PPM	\$ 400,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 141,000	\$ 891,000
<b>Madera Region Priorities</b>							
Ave 12, SR 99 IC Recon (SR 99 Bond) (PS&E)(E&P)(RW)	\$ 8,023,000						\$ 8,023,000
SR 99 Fourth Street Interchange Improvements (CON)	\$ 6,100,000						\$ 6,100,000
Schnoor (Undercrossing)(TE)	\$ 139,000						\$ 139,000
<b>NEW</b>							
SR 41 Passing Lanes (CON)					\$ 11,047,000		\$ 11,047,000
SR 99 - Ave 7 to Ave 12 - Widen to 6 Lanes (E&P)						\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000
SR 99 - Ave 12 to Ave 17 - Widen to 6 Lanes & Ave 17 Interchange Improvements (E&P)						\$ 1,545,000	\$ 1,545,000
Balance	\$ 14,662,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 11,134,000	\$ 3,186,000	\$ 29,245,000
Total County Share (includes TE)	\$ 29,245,000						
Total Now Programmed	\$ 29,245,000						

**2012 RTIP Priorities and New Project Need Statements**

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 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.

3. SR 99 – Ave 12 to Ave 17 – Widen to 6 Lanes & Ave 17 Interchange Improvements

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. The Ave 17 Interchange is located near an existing industrial park and the Madera Airport and a planned Casino and major retail development. The reconstruction of the interchange and corresponding interface with SR 99 6-lane capacity is necessary for the economic development of the City of Madera.

## **2012 RTIP Performance Measures**

The overall goal of the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update promotes the development of a coordinated multimodal transportation system that is integrated with our land resource management strategies and air quality goals. The vision of where we want to be through Fiscal Year 2030 will help public and private decision-makers make informed choices on transportation and land use matters.

This Policy Element directly reflects the legislative, planning, financial and institutional history that has shaped the region's transportation system. The Policy Element is intended to frame and drive actions that will affect the direction and nature of transportation, and its impact on Madera County. This can be accomplished by either reinforcing positive opportunities and trends already in place, or stimulating change in a new direction to achieve certain outcomes.

The transportation strategy focuses on maintaining and improving the existing system and establishing a balanced set of transportation improvements. The challenge is to develop a transportation system that provides efficient choices, improves access to opportunities and preserves the existing infrastructure. It should also support regional and local land resource management strategies and contribute to the region's attainment of national air quality standards. The plan must balance the needs of the urban and rural areas, enhance the region's competitiveness, and minimize negative social and environmental impacts.

It is important that municipalities, counties and the State participate together with the private sector and the general public, in the development of our regional goal so that a desirable quality of life is reflected in the RTP. These same public officials will be developing policies and taking actions at the local level to support the regional goals and objectives.

## **2004 RTP Project Prioritization Study**

In 2003, the MCTC Policy Board directed staff to initiate a RTP capacity increasing project prioritization study. VRPA Technologies, Inc was retained to develop a technical prioritization methodology utilizing objective criteria and analysis that results in an open, fair, and consistent RTP project prioritization policy. The project team consisted of the consultant, the MCTC TAC, and MCTC Staff. The project team met several times from November 2003 through May 2004 to consult on the methodology and project scoring criteria. A series of five public workshops were held in the Spring of 2004 to solicit input on local community priorities. In addition presentations were made to the individual local agency city councils and board to obtain recommendations from those bodies to the MCTC Policy Board. The purposes of the prioritization study are as follows:

- Identify the most critical capacity increasing street and highway projects in the region.
- Maximize the efficiency of the transportation funding resources available to Madera County.

- Enable MCTC to immediately address, capture, and leverage other potential State and Federal funding for regional projects.
- Establish a consistent and fair regional project prioritization process with local agency assistance.

## Methodology

The project team developed a defensible prioritization process based primarily on the Madera County 2030 Traffic Model and upon evaluation criteria that focused on a benefit/cost ratio determined for each project. It is important to note that State Route 99 was not included in the study as Caltrans has identified the corridor as a “High Emphasis Focus Route” and is committed to providing a 6-lane mainline through Madera County by 2030 through the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). Also, several projects that are currently programmed in the STIP and Measure “A” programs were not included as they are considered funded priorities. The financial constraints of the study are the Madera County regional shares of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and local developer mitigation and road impact fees.

The 2030 housing and employment assumptions used in the traffic model are consistent with the general plans of Madera County and were developed in consultation with the local planning departments. The 2030 land use assumptions were run against the existing year 2004 transportation network to determine the LOS E and LOS F deficient street and highways. Exhibit 4-1 displays the deficient roadways forecasted for 2030 by the Madera County Traffic Model. Consistent with the forecasted deficiencies a list of 87 capacity increasing improvement projects totaling \$697.4 million was developed. Developer Mitigation and County Road Impact Fees associated with the projects were identified totaling \$137.4 million leaving a total balance of \$560 million need to complete the projects by 2030. However, MCTC financial forecasts show only \$93.5 million dollars available for capacity increasing projects by 2030 through Madera County regional shares of the STIP. The improvement projects were evaluated (scored) based upon the following criteria:

- Benefit/Cost
- Ability to improve deficient level of service
- Existing level of service conditions
- Extent of environmental sensitivity/effect on project delivery
- Extent that the street or highway volume exceeds the capacity of the facility

The local agencies were allowed to nominate projects to improve system deficiencies that are not detectable by the traffic model such as geometric deficiencies in the network. Each local agency was also asked to prioritize the projects in their respective jurisdictions. A regional prioritized list of projects was then developed considering:

- Evaluation point score
- Agency Staff priority
- Project connectivity/consistency

## Prioritization Study Recommendations and Conclusion

Local Agency Staff requested that a portion of regional STIP dollars be utilized for local street and road rehabilitation projects and submitted a list of projects totaling \$36.9 million dollars for consideration by the MCTC Policy Board. Rehabilitation projects are eligible for STIP dollars under the current STIP Guidelines.

MCTC Staff's recommended that 100% of the regional share of STIP monies be used exclusively for capacity increasing projects, specifically the projects identified in the Regional Project Prioritization Study. There are several other funding sources available for rehabilitation projects including: RSTP; LTF; and Prop. 42. Rehabilitation projects rank low on the California Transportation Commission's (CTC) priorities and are not competitive statewide.

The MCTC Policy Board was asked to consider three options for adoption of a prioritization policy for the 2004 RTP. The prioritization policy options were as follows:

- Option A: Regional Prioritized Projects - 100% Capacity Increasing Projects
- Option B: Regional Prioritized Projects - 60% Capacity Increasing Projects / 40% Rehabilitation Projects
- Option C: Agency Prioritized Projects - 60% Capacity Increasing Projects / 40% Rehabilitation Projects

In May 2004, the MCTC Policy Board chose Option B thereby identifying the Regional Project Priorities for Madera County. The Policy Board also demonstrated a commitment to funding rehabilitation projects through the STIP. Table 4-1 shows the final Regional Priority Projects including the amount of STIP funds committed to the project and the anticipated construction year. The implementation of the RTP Project Prioritization Study will allow MCTC to capture potential funding sources as they materialize through the political process in a more effective manner. Regional planning, programming, and monitoring of projects will be enhanced a prioritization methodology that identifies the most important transportation improvement projects needed and allocates resources based upon the most cost effective solutions.

## 2011 RTP POLICY – MEASURE T INVESTMENT PLAN

The Measure T Investment Plan was approved by 73% of voters in November 2006. Measure T is projected to generate approximately \$213 million in transportation revenues over the 20 year life of the measure. The Regional Transportation Program allocates 26% of revenues to Tier 1 list of capacity increasing projects. This project list was developed from the 2004 RTP Project Prioritization Study. Tier 1 identifies priority projects totaling \$283 million of which \$161.8 million from STIP/Measure T revenues and \$121.3 million from Impact fees and/or other local funds. The Measure T Investment Plan allocates 100% of the Madera Regions STIP funding at a 2 to 1 ratio with Measure T funding toward the Tier 1 Regional Program. The Investment Plan also requires at least a minimum 20% developer impact fee contribution to the Tier projects and program. Table 4-1 indicates the projects included in the Regional Streets and Highways program in the Measure T Investment Plan. Projects are listed in general priority order, however projects will advance based upon project delivery readiness; leveraging of State and Federal funds; and upon the availability of impact fees/other local funds.



**TABLE 4-1**

<b>20-YEAR MEASURE 1/2 CENT TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX</b>							
<b>1. Regional Streets and Highways Program</b>							
<b>Candidate Capacity Increasing Projects and Recommended Priorities</b>							
<i>Approved by the Steering Committee on March 16, 2006 and approved by local agencies in June 2006</i>							
Map #	Route	Limits	Description	Cost <sup>1</sup>	Other Funds (at least 20%) <sup>2</sup>	Measure + STIP/TE (Cost Minus Other Funds) <sup>3</sup>	Balance of Measure & STIP/TE <sup>4</sup>
<b>TIER 1 PROJECTS<sup>5</sup></b>							
1A	SR 41	Between SR 145 and Road 200	Construct passing lanes	\$30,560,000	\$6,112,000	\$24,448,000	\$139,906,000
1B	SR 145 <sup>7</sup>	At SR 99	Reconstruct/widen interchange	\$6,800,000	\$6,800,000	\$0	\$139,906,000
1C	4th Street	At SR 99	Reconstruct/widen interchange	\$11,000,000	\$2,200,000	\$8,800,000	\$131,106,000
1D	Ave 12 <sup>8,9</sup>	At SR 99	Reconstruct/widen interchange	\$39,292,000	\$19,646,000	\$19,646,000	\$111,460,000
1E	SR 41 <sup>9</sup>	Ave 10 to Ave 12 w/interchange at Ave 12	Extend freeway/build interchange	\$46,400,000	\$23,200,000	\$23,200,000	\$88,260,000
1F	SR 233 <sup>9,10</sup>	At SR 99	Reconstruct/widen interchange	\$35,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$78,260,000
1G	Ellis/Avenue 16	Granada to Road 26 & new SR99 Overcrossing	Reconstruct street & Construct overcrossing	\$25,447,665	\$12,723,833	\$12,723,833	\$65,536,168
1H	Gateway Ave	Cleveland to Yosemite	Reconstruct/widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$3,200,000	\$640,000	\$2,560,000	\$62,976,168
1I	Gateway (SR 145)	Yosemite to SR 99	Reconstruct/widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$2,800,000	\$560,000	\$2,240,000	\$60,736,168
1J	Cleveland	Schnoor to SR 99	Reconstruct/widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$3,400,000	\$680,000	\$2,720,000	\$58,016,168
1K	SR 41	Road 420 to SR 49 (South of Oakhurst)	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$22,900,000	\$4,580,000	\$18,320,000	\$39,696,168
1L	AVE. 12 <sup>9</sup>	Road 38 to SR 41	2 to 4 lanes	\$21,239,169	\$10,619,585	\$10,619,585	\$29,076,583
1M	Rd 29	Olive to Ave 13	2 to 4 lanes	\$4,857,311	\$1,943,000	\$2,914,311	\$26,162,272
1N	4th	SR 99 to Lake	Reconstruct/widen from 2 to 4 lanes w/RR Xing	\$1,800,000	\$360,000	\$1,440,000	\$24,722,272
1O	Ave 12	SR 99 to Road 32	2 to 4 lanes	\$12,200,000	\$2,440,000	\$9,760,000	\$14,962,272
1P	Rd 29 <sup>11</sup>	Ave 12 to Ave 13	2 to 4 lanes and realignment	\$9,567,994	\$3,828,057	\$5,739,937	\$9,222,335
1Q	Gateway	At SR 99	Reconstruct/widen interchange	\$6,650,000	\$0	\$6,650,000	\$2,572,335
				<b>\$283,114,139</b>	<b>\$121,332,474</b>	<b>\$161,781,665</b>	
<b>TIER 2 PROJECTS (if funding available)<sup>6</sup></b>							
2A	Cleveland	Tozer to Lake	Restripe to 4 lanes	\$280,000	\$280,000	\$0	\$0
2B	Children's Blvd	SR 41 NB Ramps to Peck Blvd.	6 to 8 lanes	\$3,800,795	\$3,800,795	\$0	\$0
2C	Ave 12	SR 41 to North Rio Mesa Blvd	2 to 6 lanes	\$2,451,208	\$2,451,208	\$0	\$0
2D	Airport	Ave 17 to Yeager	Restripe to 4 lanes	\$270,000	\$270,000	\$0	\$0
2E	Children's Blvd	Road 401/2 to Peck Blvd	2/4 to 6 lanes	\$2,280,000	\$2,280,000	\$0	\$0
2F	Cleveland	Lake to Rd. 26 (Country Club Dr.)	Restripe to 4 lanes	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0
2G	Schnoor	Trevor to Sunset	Pavement rehab & restripe to 4 lanes	\$830,000	\$830,000	\$0	\$0
2H	Yeager	Airport to Falcon	Pavement rehab & restripe to 4 lanes	\$270,000	\$270,000	\$0	\$0
2I	Ave 10	Road 401/2 to SR 41	2 to 4 lanes	\$4,336,462	\$4,336,462	\$0	\$0
2J	Peck	At Children's Blvd	2 to 6 lanes	\$2,933,441	\$2,933,441	\$0	\$0
2K	Rd 30 1/2	Ave 12 to Ave 13	2 to 4 lanes	\$4,830,687	\$4,830,687	\$0	\$0
2L	Sunset/4th	RR Xing/K to SR 99	Reconstruct/widen from 2 to 4 lanes w/RR Xing	\$1,600,000	\$320,000	\$1,280,000	\$0
2M	Lake	4th to Cleveland	Reconstruct/widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$1,600,000	\$320,000	\$1,280,000	\$0
2N	Sunrise	B Street to Road 28	Reconstruct/widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$1,600,000	\$320,000	\$1,280,000	\$0
2O	SR 41	NB On Ramp/SR 41 @ Children's Blvd	1 to 2 lanes	\$20,200,000	\$20,200,000	\$0	\$0
2P	SR 41	Madera County Ln to Ave 10	4 to 6 lanes	\$4,700,000	\$4,700,000	\$0	\$0
2Q	Cleveland	Rd 26 to SR 99	Reconstruct/widen from 4 to 6 lanes w/RR Xing	\$8,300,000	\$1,660,000	\$6,640,000	\$0
2R	Fig tree Overpass	Over SR 99	Overpass	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000	\$0	\$0
2S	Ave 26	SR 99 to Coronado	Widen to 4 lanes	\$5,400,000	\$5,400,000	\$0	\$0
				<b>\$76,512,593</b>	<b>\$66,032,593</b>	<b>\$10,480,000</b>	
				<b>\$359,626,732</b>	<b>\$187,365,067</b>	<b>\$172,261,665</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Costs derived from County Road Impact Fee Program Update estimates, City of Madera or Chowchilla estimates, or from Caltrans estimates increased by 5% per year for 17 years.

<sup>2</sup> Other funds identified for the project (local or developer funds). Assumes a minimum of 20% developer funding. SR 99 at Ave 12 Interchange, SR 99 at SR 233 Interchange, SR 41 @ Avenue 12, and Ellis Street Overcrossing projects assume major funding from development or other funds with between \$10 and \$15 Million from Measure/STIP/TE as indicated in Tier 1. The City of Chowchilla identified the amount requested from Measure/STIP/TE funding.

<sup>3</sup> Remaining project costs to be addressed using Measure/STIP/TE funding.

<sup>4</sup> Measure portion of funding availability (of the \$164.4 Million) is \$55.4 Million from Table 1 - Measure Regional Streets & Highways Program for Tier 1 projects. STIP/TE portion of available funding is assumed to be 100% of total STIP/TE to be available to Madera County and was calculated using the following formula: Total STIP/TE for 20 years beginning July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2027 is estimated by MCTC to be \$102.12 Million.

<sup>5</sup> Tier 1 projects will be delivered during the life of the Measure based upon current MCTC staff assumptions. The projects will require at least 20% of the total cost from Traffic Impact Fee Programs and other funding. The minimum 20% from Traffic Impact Fees would apply to the total cost of all projects within a jurisdiction, not to individual projects. Tier 2 projects will be moved into Tier 1 as funding from other funding sources (including at least 20% from Traffic Impact Fee Program) is available to augment Measure funds.

<sup>6</sup> Measure funds are intended to "leverage" additional funds to finance the project. The minimum 20% from Traffic Impact Fees would apply to the total cost of all projects within a jurisdiction, not to individual projects.

<sup>7</sup> MCTC staff has indicated that the funding for the project has been secured from funds in addition to the available STIP/TE funds applied in this table.

<sup>8</sup> Assumes the least costly alternative (\$18 million) from the Ave. 12 / SR 99 Interchange Project Study Report (PSR) plus inflated costs.

<sup>9</sup> Actual local funds to be exacted from new development beyond those funds identified in the column "Other Funds" will replace the amount of "Other Funds" referenced and assumed in this Table.

<sup>10</sup> Measure Steering Committee requested that a project should be added in the City of Chowchilla. The City nominated improvements at the SR 99/SR 233 Interchange.

<sup>11</sup> This project is critical to the operation and improvement of the Ave 12 / SR 99 Interchange project.



## Appendix A

### 2012 STIP Fund Estimate

# 2011 SUMMARY OF STIP COUNTY SHARES

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

Total County Share, June 30, 2010 (from 2010 Report)	25,219
Less 2009-10 Allocations and closed projects	(200)
Less Projects Lapsed, July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011	0
Total County Share, June 30, 2011 (Includes TE)	25,019

## Madera

Agency	Rte	PNO/ Project	Ext	Del.	Voted	Total	Prior	Project Totals by Fiscal Year						RW	Project Totals by Component				
								10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	Const		E & P	PS&E	RW Sup	Con Sup	
<b>Highway Projects:</b>																			
Madera CTC	99	6L05 Planning, programming, and monitoring			Sep-10	200	0	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Madera	6436	Ave 12 Interchange (Route 99 Bond)(05S-53)				8,023	8,023	0	0	0	0	0	2,023	0	2,000	4,000	0		
Madera CTC	6L05	Rt 99/4th Street Interchange Improvements (ext 5-11)	Feb-12			6,100	0	6,100	0	0	0	0	0	6,100	0	0	0		
		Planning, programming, and monitoring				488	0	0	96	96	96	96	0	488	0	0	0		
		<b>Subtotal, Highway Projects</b>				14,811	8,023	6,300	200	96	96	96	2,023	6,788	2,000	4,000	0		
<b>Transportation Enhancement (TE) Projects:</b>																			
Madera	A010	Schnoor Av bikedped undercrossing (ext 5-10)	Jun-11		Jun-11	139	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	0	0	0		
		<b>Subtotal TE Projects</b>				139	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	0	0	0		
		<b>Total Programmed or Voted since July 1, 2010</b>				14,950													
<b>Balance of STIP County Share, Madera</b>																			
		Total County Share, June 30, 2011				25,019													
		Total New Programmed or Voted Since July 1, 2010				14,950													
		Unprogrammed Share Balance				10,069													
		Share Balance Advanced or Overdrawn				0													

## 2012 STIP Fund Estimate County and Interregional Shares

Table 1. Reconciliation to County and Interregional Shares  
(\$ in millions)

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	5-Year Total	6-Year Total
<b>Public Transportation Account (PTA)</b>								
2012 FE PTA Target Capacity	\$25	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25
<b>Total 2010 STIP FE PTA Target Capacity</b>	<b>\$25</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$25</b>
<b>2010 STIP Program <sup>1</sup></b>	<b>\$146</b>	<b>\$276</b>	<b>\$67</b>	<b>\$104</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$447</b>	<b>\$593</b>
Extensions	\$9	\$56	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$56	\$65
Delivered But Not Allocated	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Advances	(\$35)	(\$1)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$1)	(\$36)
<b>Net PTA STIP Program</b>	<b>\$120</b>	<b>\$331</b>	<b>\$67</b>	<b>\$104</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$502</b>	<b>\$622</b>
<b>PTA Capacity for County Shares</b>	<b>(\$95)</b>	<b>(\$331)</b>	<b>(\$67)</b>	<b>(\$104)</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$502)</b>	<b>(\$597)</b>
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>(\$95)</b>	<b>(\$426)</b>	<b>(\$493)</b>	<b>(\$597)</b>	<b>(\$597)</b>	<b>(\$597)</b>		
<b>Non-PTA (SHA, TIF, TFA)</b>								
2012 FE Non-PTA Target Capacity	\$910	\$771	\$643	\$693	\$670	\$670	\$3,447	\$4,357
2012 FE Non-PTA GARVEE Debt Service	(\$84)	(\$84)	(\$84)	(\$84)	(\$11)	(\$11)	(\$274)	(\$358)
TE State Match (Estimated program totals)	(\$9)	(\$9)	(\$9)	(\$9)	(\$9)	(\$9)	(\$45)	(\$54)
<b>Total 2010 STIP FE Non-PTA Capacity</b>	<b>\$817</b>	<b>\$678</b>	<b>\$550</b>	<b>\$600</b>	<b>\$650</b>	<b>\$650</b>	<b>\$3,128</b>	<b>\$3,945</b>
<b>2010 STIP Program <sup>1</sup></b>	<b>\$456</b>	<b>\$496</b>	<b>\$355</b>	<b>\$447</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,298</b>	<b>\$1,754</b>
Extensions	\$228	\$8	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8	\$236
Delivered But Not Allocated	\$42	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$42
Advances	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Net Non-PTA STIP Program</b>	<b>\$726</b>	<b>\$504</b>	<b>\$355</b>	<b>\$447</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,306</b>	<b>\$2,031</b>
<b>Non-PTA Capacity for County Shares</b>	<b>\$91</b>	<b>\$174</b>	<b>\$195</b>	<b>\$153</b>	<b>\$650</b>	<b>\$650</b>	<b>\$1,822</b>	<b>\$1,914</b>
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>\$91</b>	<b>\$266</b>	<b>\$461</b>	<b>\$614</b>	<b>\$1,264</b>	<b>\$1,914</b>		
<b>Transportation Enhancements (TE)</b>								
2012 STIP FE TE Capacity (Federal)	\$74	\$74	\$74	\$74	\$74	\$74	\$371	\$445
TE State Match (Estimated program totals)	\$9	\$9	\$9	\$9	\$9	\$9	\$45	\$54
<b>Total 2010 STIP FE TE Capacity</b>	<b>\$83</b>	<b>\$83</b>	<b>\$83</b>	<b>\$83</b>	<b>\$83</b>	<b>\$83</b>	<b>\$416</b>	<b>\$499</b>
<b>2010 STIP Program <sup>1</sup></b>	<b>\$71</b>	<b>\$96</b>	<b>\$84</b>	<b>\$73</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$253</b>	<b>\$324</b>
Extensions	\$8	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8
Advances	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Net TE</b>	<b>\$79</b>	<b>\$96</b>	<b>\$84</b>	<b>\$73</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$253</b>	<b>\$332</b>
<b>TE Capacity for County Shares</b>	<b>\$4</b>	<b>(\$13)</b>	<b>(\$1)</b>	<b>\$10</b>	<b>\$83</b>	<b>\$83</b>	<b>\$162</b>	<b>\$167</b>
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>\$4</b>	<b>(\$9)</b>	<b>(\$9)</b>	<b>\$1</b>	<b>\$84</b>	<b>\$167</b>		
<b>Total Capacity</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$170)</b>	<b>\$127</b>	<b>\$59</b>	<b>\$733</b>	<b>\$733</b>	<b>\$1,483</b>	<b>\$1,483</b>

**Notes:**

General note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> 2010 STIP through June 2011



**2012 STIP Fund Estimate**  
**County and Interregional Shares**  
**Table 2. Summary of Targets and Shares**  
 (\$ in thousands)

County	2012 STIP Programming			
	Base	Total Target	Maximum	TE Target
	Share Through 2015-16	Target through 2016-17	Estimated Share through 2019-20	Target through 2016-17
Alameda	15,024	35,372	94,150	4,358
Alpine - Amador - Calaveras	6,605	10,212	20,630	771
Butte	11,448	15,479	27,123	863
Colusa	1,721	2,802	5,923	232
Contra Costa	63,047	76,928	117,028	2,973
Del Norte	0	0	0	216
El Dorado LTC	0	0	6,197	601
Fresno	36,987	52,353	96,741	3,290
Glenn	3,465	4,597	7,867	241
Humboldt	8,542	12,608	24,353	871
Imperial	5,010	12,228	33,078	1,546
Inyo	12,370	17,987	34,213	1,204
Kern	2,808	23,506	83,299	4,433
Kings	0	0	0	649
Lake	4,761	6,530	11,640	378
Lassen	9,167	11,752	19,220	555
Los Angeles	51,242	173,970	528,501	26,281
Madera	11,485	14,295	22,410	600
Marin	0	0	0	813
Mariposa	1,728	2,786	5,840	225
Mendocino	1,283	5,082	16,058	815
Merced	8,168	13,172	27,627	1,073
Modoc	0	1,367	5,350	294
Mono	15,915	20,095	32,170	895
Monterey	39,630	46,857	67,734	1,548
Napa	2,205	4,702	11,914	534
Nevada	6,646	8,792	14,990	459
Orange	27,687	65,658	175,349	8,132
Placer TPA	0	0	0	1,101
Plumas	3,198	4,740	9,193	330
Riverside	57,558	90,928	187,325	7,145
Sacramento	15,418	34,645	90,187	4,116
San Benito	0	0	0	285
San Bernardino	62,080	100,416	211,159	8,208
San Diego	10,873	53,999	178,579	9,233
San Francisco	2,831	13,114	42,822	2,202
San Joaquin	16,137	26,544	56,608	2,230
San Luis Obispo	4,166	11,895	34,220	1,654
San Mateo	12,060	22,677	53,345	2,274
Santa Barbara	1,475	10,119	35,092	1,851
Santa Clara	0	0	61,927	5,164
Santa Cruz	4,775	8,939	20,969	890
Shasta	7,670	12,106	24,920	950
Sierra	0	632	2,746	157
Siskiyou	3,814	6,850	15,622	651
Solano	3,815	10,092	28,225	1,345
Sonoma	0	0	13,118	1,675
Stanislaus	17,609	25,327	47,622	1,652
Sutter	435	2,210	7,336	381
Tahoe RPA	3,307	4,249	6,969	201
Tehama	6,144	8,413	14,968	486
Trinity	184	1,779	6,388	341
Tulare	4,874	14,405	41,937	2,040
Tuolumne	5,713	7,493	12,635	381
Ventura	12,815	25,682	62,849	2,756
Yolo	6,064	9,755	20,419	791
Yuba	10,331	11,688	15,607	291
<b>Statewide Regional</b>	<b>620,290</b>	<b>1,157,827</b>	<b>2,792,192</b>	<b>125,631</b>
Interregional	129,682	325,245	890,180	41,876
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>749,972</b>	<b>1,483,072</b>	<b>3,682,372</b>	<b>167,507</b>
		<b>New Capacity</b>		
Statewide Flexible Capacity		1,913,572		
Statewide PTA Capacity		(597,207)		
Statewide TE Capacity		166,707		
<b>Total STIP Capacity</b>		<b>1,483,072</b>		



## 2012 STIP Fund Estimate County and Interregional Shares

Table 6 – Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) Limitations  
(\$ thousands)

County	Base				FY 2016/17	5% PPM Limitation	
	2008 STIP 12/13	2010 STIP 12/13 - 14/15	2012 STIP 12/13-15/16	Total 12/13-15/16		FY 2012/13 - FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17
Alameda	43,877	3,068	8,910	55,855	20,348	2,793	1,017
Alpine/Amador/Calaveras	7,412	519	1,579	9,510	3,607	475	180
Butte	8,400	586	1,765	10,751	4,031	538	202
Colusa	2,207	154	473	2,834	1,081	142	54
Contra Costa	28,427	1,988	6,079	36,494	13,881	1,825	694
Del Norte	2,125	149	443	2,717	1,011	136	51
El Dorado LTC	5,368	375	1,228	6,971	2,806	349	140
Fresno	30,409	2,120	6,729	39,258	15,366	1,963	768
Glenn	2,356	165	496	3,017	1,132	151	57
Humboldt	8,493	594	1,780	10,867	4,066	543	203
Imperial	14,207	1,009	3,161	18,377	7,218	919	361
Inyo	11,505	810	2,460	14,775	5,617	739	281
Kern	39,831	2,796	9,064	51,691	20,698	2,585	1,035
Kings	5,943	418	1,329	7,690	3,035	384	152
Lake	3,657	254	775	4,686	1,769	234	88
Lassen	5,384	377	1,132	6,893	2,585	345	129
Los Angeles	268,621	18,770	53,745	341,136	122,728	17,057	6,136
Madera	5,386	377	1,230	6,993	2,810	350	141
Marin	8,309	581	1,661	10,551	3,792	528	190
Mariposa	2,193	153	463	2,809	1,058	140	53
Mendocino	7,997	560	1,664	10,221	3,799	511	190
Merced	9,677	677	2,191	12,545	5,004	627	250
Modoc	2,859	200	604	3,663	1,379	183	69
Mono	8,526	601	1,831	10,958	4,180	548	209
Monterey	15,563	1,089	3,165	19,817	7,227	991	361
Napa	5,154	360	1,093	6,607	2,497	330	125
Nevada	4,545	313	940	5,798	2,146	290	107
Orange	81,023	5,672	16,629	103,324	37,971	5,166	1,899
Placer TPA	8,539	597	2,251	11,387	5,140	569	257
Plumas	3,250	227	675	4,152	1,542	208	77
Riverside	58,047	4,019	14,613	76,679	33,370	3,834	1,669
Sacramento	37,682	2,636	8,420	48,738	19,227	2,437	961
San Benito	2,818	197	582	3,597	1,328	180	66
San Bernardino	75,436	5,270	16,788	97,494	38,336	4,875	1,917
San Diego	88,798	6,215	18,886	113,899	43,126	5,695	2,156
San Francisco	22,448	1,568	4,504	28,520	10,283	1,426	514
San Joaquin	19,724	1,380	4,558	25,662	10,407	1,283	520
San Luis Obispo	15,852	1,115	3,384	20,351	7,729	1,018	386
San Mateo	23,296	1,635	4,649	29,580	10,617	1,479	531
Santa Barbara	18,037	1,270	3,786	23,093	8,644	1,155	432
Santa Clara	51,388	3,594	10,560	65,542	24,115	3,277	1,206
Santa Cruz	8,954	633	1,824	11,411	4,164	571	208
Shasta	9,193	643	1,943	11,779	4,436	589	222
Sierra	1,525	107	320	1,952	732	98	37
Siskiyou	6,349	444	1,330	8,123	3,036	406	152
Solano	13,454	940	2,749	17,143	6,277	857	314
Sonoma	16,387	1,162	3,424	20,973	7,819	1,049	391
Stanislaus	15,283	1,070	3,380	19,733	7,718	987	386
Sutter	3,451	241	777	4,469	1,775	223	89
Tahoe RPA	2,255	156	412	2,823	942	141	47
Tehama	4,626	324	994	5,944	2,269	297	113
Trinity	3,300	231	699	4,230	1,595	211	80
Tulare	18,693	1,311	4,174	24,178	9,531	1,209	477
Tuolumne	3,736	262	780	4,778	1,780	239	89
Ventura	26,543	1,862	5,634	34,039	12,867	1,702	643
Yolo	7,373	505	1,617	9,495	3,691	475	185
Yuba	2,641	185	594	3,420	1,357	171	68
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>1,208,532</b>	<b>84,534</b>	<b>256,925</b>	<b>1,549,991</b>	<b>586,696</b>	<b>77,500</b>	<b>29,335</b>

Note: Limitation amounts include amounts already programmed.

## **Appendix B**

### **2012 RTIP RIP Funded Project Inventory and**

### **SJ Valley Coordinated Programming**



**2012 Coordinated San Joaquin Valley STIP Proposal - RIP**  
(\$1,000)

	12-13			13-14			14-15			2012 Programming			Total Shares	Total Programming	Share Advance/Delay	
	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17											
Fresno	\$316	\$322	\$0	\$35,329	\$13,734								\$49,701	\$57,732	\$8,031	
New/Revised	-\$482	\$3,206	\$322	\$4,022	\$49,700								\$65,797	\$70,354	\$4,557	
Kern	\$28,224	\$8,410	\$10,090	\$574	\$18,499								\$17,770	\$17,920	\$150	
New/Revised	\$27,978	\$8,165	\$9,845	\$24,366	\$0								\$14,583	\$13,555	\$0	
Kings	\$0	\$17,770	\$0	\$0	\$0								\$64,532	\$64,282	-\$250	
New/Revised	\$75	\$17,770	\$75	\$16,961	\$274								\$28,713	\$28,713	\$0	
Madera	\$88	\$88	\$87	\$11,134	\$3,186								\$33,568	\$35,520	\$1,952	
New/Revised	\$88	\$88	\$87	\$11,134	\$3,186								\$288,219	\$302,659	\$14,440	
Merced	\$300	\$83	\$0	\$8,168	\$5,004											
New/Revised	\$383	\$244	\$0	\$0	\$12,928											
San Joaquin	\$38,188	\$2,030	\$0	\$15,013	\$9,301											
New/Revised	\$32,689	\$5,699	\$4,394	\$9,200	\$12,300											
Stanislaus	\$764	\$4,090	\$0	\$16,961	\$6,898											
New/Revised	\$4,365	\$275	\$275	\$23,524	\$274											
Tulare	\$4,258	\$7,792	\$7,113	\$4,874	\$9,531											
New/Revised	\$5,783	\$6,492	\$1,925	\$19,763	\$1,557											
SJ Valley Total =	\$72,138	\$40,585	\$17,290	\$92,053	\$66,153											
New/Revised	\$71,843	\$41,939	\$16,923	\$92,009	\$79,945											
<b>Difference =</b>	<b>\$295</b>	<b>-\$1,354</b>	<b>\$367</b>	<b>\$44</b>	<b>-\$13,792</b>											

**Tier 1 Requests For Share Advances From Future STIP Shares:**

Fresno	\$8,031
Kern	\$4,557
Tulare	\$1,952
Kings	\$150
<b>Total =</b>	<b>\$14,690</b>

**Tier 2 Additional Request for Share Advance From Future STIP Shares:**

Kern	\$49,000
<b>Total =</b>	<b>\$49,000</b>

**Total TE Shares Programmed in RTIP as Flex Funds:**

Madera	\$600
Merced	\$1,073
Stanislaus	\$1,024
Tulare	\$2,040
<b>Total =</b>	<b>\$4,737</b>



## Appendix C

### 2012 Madera County Regional Transportation Improvement Program

**Madera County 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program**

**2012 RTIP (RIP) Funded Projects**

	prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	total
Total County Share, June 30, 2010 (includes TE)	\$ 25,019,000						
2012 STIP Target (includes TE)	\$ 4,226,000						
	\$ 29,245,000						

**Proposed 2012 STIP Program**

**MCTC PPM**

**Madera Region Priorities**

Ave 12, SR 99 IC Recon (SR 99 Bond) (PS&E)(E&P)(RW)	\$ 8,023,000						\$ 8,023,000
SR 99 Fourth Street Interchange Improvements (CON)	\$ 6,100,000						\$ 6,100,000
Schnoor (Undercrossing)(TE)	\$ 139,000						\$ 139,000

**NEW**

SR 41 Passing Lanes (CON)					\$ 11,047,000		\$ 11,047,000
SR 99 - Ave 7 to Ave 12 - Widen to 6 Lanes (E&P)					\$ 1,500,000		\$ 1,500,000
SR 99 - Ave 12 to Ave 17 - Widen to 6 Lanes & Ave 17 Interchange Improvements (E&P)					\$ 1,545,000		\$ 1,545,000

**Balance**

	\$ 14,662,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 11,134,000	\$ 3,186,000	\$ 29,245,000
Total County Share (includes TE)	\$ 29,245,000						
Total Now Programmed	\$ 29,245,000						
Unprogrammed Share Balance	\$ -						

## Appendix D

### 2012 RTIP Project Nomination Sheets

**PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST**

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

General Instructions

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Project					<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment (Existing Project)		Date:	11/23/11
District	EA	Project ID		PPNO	MPO ID	TCRP No.		
06	0G900	0600000112			MCTC			
County	Route/Corridor	PM Bk	PM Ahd	Project Sponsor/Lead Agency				
MAD	41	11.7	13.6	MCTC/CALTRANS				
				MPO	Element			
				Madera	Capital Outlay			
Project Mgr/Contact		Phone		E-mail Address				
Anand Kapoor		(559)243-3588		anand_kapoor@dot.ca.gov				
<b>Project Title</b>								
Madera 41 Passing Lane								
<b>Location, Project Limits, Description, Scope of Work, Legislative Description</b>								
On State Route 41 between 0.3 mile north of Road 208 and 2.2 mile north of Road 208. Construct Passing Lanes.								
Component	Implementing Agency					Reimbursements		
PA&ED	Caltrans							
PS&E	Caltrans							
Right of Way	Caltrans							
Construction	Caltrans							
<b>Legislative Districts</b>								
Assembly:	29			Senate:	12			
Congressional:	19							
<b>Purpose and Need</b>								
Purpose: 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'.								
<b>Project Benefits</b>								
Passing lanes will improve LOS considerably by providing passing opportunities and smoother traffic operations.								
<b>Project Milestone</b>							<b>Proposed</b>	
Project Study Report Approved							05/08/08	
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	
Begin Right of Way Phase							09/01/11	
End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone)							07/01/13	
Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone)							03/01/14	
End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone)							01/01/16	
Begin Closeout Phase							01/01/16	
End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report)							07/01/17	

**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: 11/23/11

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD	41	0G900	0600000112		
<b>Project Title:</b> Madera 41 Passing Lane						

Proposed Total Project Cost									Notes
Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	
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	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,577</b>				<b>15,571</b>			<b>22,148</b>	

<b>Fund No. 1:</b>	<b>Local Funds - Local Measure (MEA)</b>								<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding</b>									LOCAL FUNDS
Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)	2,033							2,033	Madera Co. Transp. Authority
PS&E	997							997	Measure T
R/W SUP (CT)	400							400	
CON SUP (CT)					2,271			2,271	
R/W	3,147							3,147	
CON					2,253			2,253	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,577</b>				<b>4,524</b>			<b>11,101</b>	

<b>Fund No. 2:</b>	<b>RIP</b>								<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding</b>									20.XX.075.600
Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON					11,047			11,047	
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>11,047</b>			<b>11,047</b>	

<b>Fund No. 3:</b>									<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding</b>									
Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

**PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST**

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

General Instructions

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Project <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment (Existing Project)					<b>Date:</b> 11/03/11	
<b>District</b>	<b>EA</b>	<b>Project ID</b>		<b>PPNO</b>	<b>MPO ID</b>	<b>TCRP No.</b>
06	0H220	0612000158		6297		
<b>County</b>	<b>Route/Corridor</b>	<b>PM Bk</b>	<b>PM Ahd</b>	<b>Project Sponsor/Lead Agency</b>		
MAD	99	1.7	7.5	Caltrans		
				<b>MPO</b>	<b>Element</b>	
				Madera	Capital Outlay	
<b>Project Mgr/Contact</b>		<b>Phone</b>		<b>E-mail Address</b>		
Jim Bane		(559)243-3469		jim_bane@dot.ca.gov		
<b>Project Title</b>						
South Madera 6 Lane						
<b>Location, Project Limits, Description, Scope of Work, Legislative Description</b>						
ON ROUTE 99 NEAR MADERA BETWEEN PM 1.7 (NORTH OF AVENUE 7) AND PM 7.5 (AVENUE 12)						
<b>Component</b>	<b>Implementing Agency</b>				<b>Reimbursements</b>	
PA&ED	Caltrans					
PS&E	Caltrans					
Right of Way	Caltrans					
Construction	Caltrans					
<b>Legislative Districts</b>						
<b>Assembly:</b>	05			<b>Senate:</b>	12	
<b>Congressional:</b>	16					
<b>Purpose and Need</b>						
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.						
<b>Project Benefits</b>						
The proposed 6-lane freeway would accommodate the traffic demand at or above LOS D by 2025.						
<b>Project Milestone</b>						<b>Proposed</b>
Project Study Report Approved						03/11/08
Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase						07/01/15
Circulate Draft Environmental Document				<b>Document Type</b>	ND/FONSI	07/01/17
Draft Project Report						07/01/17
End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone)						01/03/18
Begin Design (PS&E) Phase						01/03/18
End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone)						01/01/20
Begin Right of Way Phase						01/03/18
End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone)						07/01/19
Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone)						01/03/21
End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone)						02/01/24
Begin Closeout Phase						12/01/24
End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report)						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: 11/03/11

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

Proposed Total Project Cost									Notes
Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	
E&P (PA&ED)						3,000		3,000	
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	
<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>3,000</b>	<b>181,625</b>	<b>184,625</b>	

<b>Fund No. 1:</b>	<b>IIP</b>	<b>Proposed Funding</b>							<b>Program Code</b>		
		Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	20.XX.025.700
		E&P (PA&ED)						1,500		1,500	<b>Funding Agency</b>
		PS&E									CALTRANS
		R/W SUP (CT)									2012 STIP IIP
		CON SUP (CT)									
		R/W									
		CON									
		<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>1,500</b>		<b>1,500</b>	

<b>Fund No. 2:</b>	<b>RIP</b>	<b>Proposed Funding</b>							<b>Program Code</b>		
		Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	20.XX.075.600
		E&P (PA&ED)						1,500		1,500	<b>Funding Agency</b>
		PS&E									2012 STIP RIP
		R/W SUP (CT)									
		CON SUP (CT)									
		R/W									
		CON									
		<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>1,500</b>		<b>1,500</b>	

<b>Fund No. 3:</b>		<b>Proposed Funding</b>							<b>Program Code</b>		
		Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	
		E&P (PA&ED)									<b>Funding Agency</b>
		PS&E							8,928	8,928	FUTURE
		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	
		<b>TOTAL</b>							<b>181,625</b>	<b>181,625</b>	

## PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

General Instructions

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Project		<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment (Existing Project)			Date:	11/03/11
District	EA	Project ID	PPNO	MPO ID	TCRP No.	
06						
County	Route/Corridor	PM Bk	PM Ahd	Project Sponsor/Lead Agency		
MAD	99			Caltrans		
				MPO	Element	
				Madera	Capital Outlay	
Project Mgr/Contact		Phone		E-mail Address		
Anand Kapoor		(559)243-3588		anand_kapoor@dot.ca.gov		
<b>Project Title</b>						
Madera 6 Lane						
<b>Location, Project Limits, Description, Scope of Work, Legislative Description</b>						
On Route 99 in Madera between Ave 12 and Ave 17 Widen to 6 Lanes and interchange improvements at Ave 17.						
<b>Component</b>	<b>Implementing Agency</b>				<b>Reimbursements</b>	
PA&ED	Caltrans					
PS&E	Caltrans					
Right of Way	Caltrans					
Construction	Caltrans					
<b>Legislative Districts</b>						
Assembly:				Senate:		
Congressional:						
<b>Purpose and Need</b>						
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 Ave 17 Interchange is located near an existing industrial park and the Madera Airport and a planned Casino and major retail development. The reconstruction of the interchange and corresponding interface with SR 99 6-lane capacity is necessary for the economic development of the City of Madera.						
<b>Project Benefits</b>						
The proposed 6-lane freeway would accommodate the traffic demand at or above LOS D by 2025.						
<b>Project Milestone</b>					<b>Proposed</b>	
Project Study Report Approved					03/11/08	
Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase					07/01/15	
Circulate Draft Environmental Document			Document Type	ND/FONSI	01/03/18	
Draft Project Report					07/01/18	
End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone)					10/01/18	
Begin Design (PS&E) Phase					07/01/19	
End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone)					07/01/21	
Begin Right of Way Phase					07/01/19	
End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone)					07/01/21	
Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone)					07/01/21	
End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone)					02/01/24	
Begin Closeout Phase					02/01/24	
End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report)					07/01/25	

**PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST**

DTP-0001 (REV. 6/11)

Date: 11/03/11

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
06	MAD	99				
<b>Project Title:</b> Avenue 17 Interchange Improvements and Mad 99 widening from Ave 12 to Ave 17						

Proposed Total Project Cost									Notes
Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	
E&P (PA&ED)						3,150		3,150	
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	
<b>TOTAL</b>						3,150	128,000	131,150	

<b>Fund No. 1:</b>	<b>Local Funds - Local Measure (MEA)</b>								<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding</b>									LOCAL FUNDS
Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)						1,605		1,605	Madera Co. Transp. Authority
PS&E									Measure T
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>						1,605		1,605	

<b>Fund No. 2:</b>	<b>RIP</b>								<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding</b>									20.XX.075.600
Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)						1,545		1,545	
PS&E									2012 STIP RIP
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>						1,545		1,545	

<b>Fund No. 3:</b>									<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding</b>									
Component	Prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E							6,000	6,000	FUTURE
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	
<b>TOTAL</b>							128,000	128,000	

## Appendix E

### Resolution Approving 2012 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. **11-15**  
) )  
**THE 2012 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 (August 10, 2011) the Madera County Transportation Commission is authorized to develop and submit the Regional Transportation Improvement Program by December 15, 2011; and

**WHEREAS,** the 2012 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 2012 STIP:

<b>2012 RTIP (RIP) Funded Projects</b>	prior	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	total
Total County Share, June 30, 2010 (includes TE)	\$ 25,019,000						
2012 STIP Target (includes TE)	\$ 4,226,000						
	\$ 29,245,000						
<b>Proposed 2012 STIP Program</b>							
MCTC PPM	\$ 400,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 141,000	\$ 891,000
<b>Madera Region Priorities</b>							
Ave 12, SR 99 IC Recon (SR 99 Bond) (PS&E)(E&P)(RW)	\$ 8,023,000						\$ 8,023,000
SR 99 Fourth Street Interchange Improvements (CON)	\$ 6,100,000						\$ 6,100,000
Schnoor (Undercrossing)(TE)	\$ 139,000						\$ 139,000
<b>NEW</b>							
SR 41 Passing Lanes (CON)				\$ 11,047,000			\$ 11,047,000
SR 99 - Ave 7 to Ave 12 - Widen to 6 Lanes (E&P)					\$ 1,500,000		\$ 1,500,000
SR 99 - Ave 12 to Ave 17 - Widen to 6 Lanes & Ave 17 Interchange Improvements (E&P)					\$ 1,545,000		\$ 1,545,000
Balance	\$ 14,662,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 11,134,000	\$ 3,186,000	\$ 29,245,000
Total County Share (includes TE)	\$ 29,245,000						
Total Now Programmed	\$ 29,245,000						

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

**WHEREAS,** The Madera County Transportation Commission Policy Board considered the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program at its November 23, 2011 meeting.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** the Madera County Transportation Commission does hereby adopt the 2012 Madera County Regional Transportation Improvement Program and directs staff to submit the program to the Department of Transportation and CTC by December 15, 2011.

This Resolution is adopted this 23 day of NOVEMBER, 2011, by the following vote:

- Commissioner Bigelow Voted Absent
- Commissioner Rodriguez Voted Absent
- Commissioner Wheeler Voted Yes
- Commissioner Frazier Voted Absent
- Commissioner Poythress Voted Yes
- Commissioner Hebert Voted Yes
- ~~Commissioner~~ Commissioner Dominici Voted Yes

*Robert L. Poythress*  
Chairman, Madera County Transportation Commission

*[Signature]*  
Executive Director, Madera County Transportation Commission

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22