


Joint TTC/PAC Meeting



***ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
AGENDA ITEM III. E.***

BEFORE THE
COUNCIL OF FRESNO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 2006-42

In the Matter of:)
)
PROPOSITION 1B)
)
)
_____)

RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL OF
STATE ROUTE 99 & CORRIDOR
MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT ACCOUNT
PROGRAM SUBMITTALS

WHEREAS, the Council of Fresno County Governments (Fresno COG) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Fresno County; and

WHEREAS, with the passage of Proposition 1B, the Fresno COG has a responsibility to participate in the funding components that comprise Proposition 1B; and

WHEREAS, the first responsibility is developing and submitting Fresno COG's list of candidate projects for the State Route 99 Corridor Improvements program and the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA)) program which are consistent with the Guidelines provided by the CTC for each of these programs; and

WHEREAS, the regional candidate project submittals are required to be submitted to Caltrans Headquarters and the California Transportation Commission by January 16, 2007; and

WHEREAS, these projects will compete with other regional candidates for the available Proposition 1B funding; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the proposed list was reviewed and analyzed by Fresno COG, Caltrans, District 06, and Fresno County Transportation Authority staff and consensus was reached that based on the guidelines and performance criteria as outlined in the CTC Guidelines, the attached list of projects would be submitted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Fresno COG hereby approves the submittal of the attached list of candidate projects to Caltrans Headquarters and the California Transportation Commission by January 16, 2007.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was passed and adopted by the Council of Fresno County Governments this 14th day of December, 2006.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Signed: _____
Trinidad M. Rodriguez, Chairman

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution of the Council of Fresno County Governments duly adopted at a regular meeting thereof held on the 14th day of December, 2006.

Signed: _____
Barbara Goodwin, Executive Director

Candidate Projects

Fresno COG SR 99 Corridor Improvement Plan

Facility	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Cost	Delivery Date
SR 99	Ashlan Ave. to Ave. 7	Const 4 Ln. to 6 Ln.	\$ 98 mil	2011

Fresno COG Candidate Projects CMIA Program (Prop. 1B)

Facility	Project Limits	Project Description	Est. Cost (\$mil.)	Delivery Date
State Route 180 East (Interregional CMIA)	Academy Ave. to Trimmer Springs Rd..	Widen Existing SR 180 to a 4 Ln divided Expressway	\$61.0	2010/11
State Route 180 East (Interregional CMIA)	Trimmer Springs Rd. to Frankwood Ave.	Widen Existing SR 180 to a 4 Ln divided Expressway	\$66.0	2010/11
SR 180/168/41 (Urban CMIA)	SR 180/168/41	Braided Ramps to Improve Safety and Connectivity Between State Routes	\$50.0	2012
State Route 41 (Urban CMIA)	Divisadero Ave. to Shields Ave.	Convert 6 Ln. Freeway to 8 Ln Freeway & Widen SB off-ramp at Divisadero	\$65.0	2011

Fresno COG Candidate Projects CMIA Program (Prop. 1B)

Facility	Project Description	Project Limits	PSR Phase or beyond (y/n)	Delivery Date	Project Manager	Funding Strategy	Est. Cost (\$mil.)	Prior Funding Commitments (\$mil.)	2006 Measure C Plan Commitment (\$mil.)	Other Transp Bond Funding Opport.
State Route 180 East	Widen Existing SR 180 to a 4 Ln divided Expressway	Academy Ave. to Trimmer Springs Rd..	Design 45% Completed	2010/11	Neil Bretz	CMIA Candidate Project	\$61.0	STIP \$5.60 RW-\$3.71 PS&E-\$772 R/W Sup-\$1.12	\$38.97-\$73.54	SLPP GM
State Route 180 East	Widen Existing SR 180 to a 4 Ln divided Expressway	Trimmer Springs Rd. to Frankwood Ave.	Design 35% Completed	2010/11	Neil Bretz	CMIA Candidate Project	\$66.0	STIP \$2.35 RW-\$750 PS&E-564 R/W Sup-\$1.04	\$42.67-\$80.51	SLPP GM
SR 180/168/41	Braided Ramps to Improve Safety and Connectivity Between State Routes	SR 180/168/41	No	2012	?	CMIA Candidate Project	\$50.0	NA	\$29.98-\$56.56	SLPP GM
State Route 41	Convert 6 Ln. Freeway to 8 Ln Freeway & Widen SB off-ramp at Divisadero	Divisadero Ave. to Shields Ave.	No	2011	Jim Bane	CMIA Candidate Project	\$65.0	NA	NA	SLPP GM

SLPP-State-Local Partnership Program (Prop 1B)

GM- Goods Movement Program (Prop 1B)

ARB-Air Resources Board –Goods Movement (Prop 1B)

Fresno COG Candidate Projects

CMIA Program (Prop. 1B)

(continued)

Facility	Project Limits	Project Description	Est. Cost (\$mil.)	Bond Program	PSR	Delivery Date	Project Manager
State Route 41	Convert 6 Ln Freeway to 8 Ln Freeway. Add lanes in median.	Shields Ave. to Bullard Ave.	\$75.0	CMIA Candidate Project	No	2011	Jim Bane
State Route 41	Convert 6 Ln Freeway to 8 Ln Freeway. Add lanes in median.	Bullard Ave. to Friant Rd.	\$50.0	CMIA Candidate Project	No	2011	Jim Bane
State Route 41	Ashlan Ave. to Shaw Ave.	Add NB Auxiliary Lane	\$20.0	CMIA Candidate Project	No	2012	Jim Bane
State Route 41	Tulare St. to O St.	Add SB Auxiliary Lane	\$30.0	CMIA Candidate Project	No	2013	Jim Bane
State Route 41 06-442401	2 Lane Expressway to 4 Lane Expressway	Excelsior Ave to Elkhorn Ave	\$64.8 total project. Needs \$53.7 in construction funding.	ITIP Candidate project/ CMIA Candidate Project	PA&ED 12/15/05	2009	Abdul El-Danabi

PROPOSITION 1B - CALIFORNIA'S TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE BOND-CALL FOR PROJECTS

Respondents

City of Selma
City of Reedley
City of Kingsburg
County of Fresno

1 Corridor Mobility Improvement Account			Member		Amount
	Realignment of State Route 43 and Construction of the State Route 43/State Route 99/ Dinuba Avenue Interchange		Selma		\$30MM
1					
2	Reed Avenue Expansion: grind and overlay remaining from I street to North City Limits.		Reedley		\$5MM
2 State Route 99 Corridor Improvements					
3	State Route 99/Floral Ave. Interchange Improvements		Selma		\$5MM
4	Manning Avenue Expansion: grind and overlay remaining from City limits to City limits		Reedley		\$15MM
3 Ports Infrastructure, Security and Air Quality					
4 School bus Retrofit for Air Quality					
5 State Transportation Improvement Program Augmentation					
5	Reconstruct and increase capacity of Dinuba Ave. from Golden State Blvd., to Orange Ave. and Highland Ave. from Dinuba Ave. to Golden State Blvd. and construct Dinuba Aveue under-crossing for the UP Railroad Tracks/Golden State Blvd. Intersections.		Selma		\$6.5MM
6	The City of Kingsburg will be nominating the following projects for inclusion in the STIP:		Kingsburg		
6a	1.) Academy Parkway				
6b	2.) Kamm/Bethel grade crossing at Golden State				
6c	3.) Golden State upgrades				
7	Button Willow from Manning to south City limits: grind overlay and widening		Reedley		\$3MM
6 Public Transportation Modernization Improvement and Service Enhancement					
8	Construct Roadway under-crossings to the UP Railroad at Floral Avenue.		Selma		\$7.5MM
9	Floral Avenue from East to Buttonwillow RR crossing		Reedley		\$3MM
7 State-Local Partnership Program					
10	City match for the Floral Avenue Reconstruction Project - From McCall to Dockery		Selma		\$97,700
11	City match for the Wright Street Reconstruction Project - From Dinuba to Arrants		Selma		\$148,423
12	City match for the Selma Branch Canal Class I Bike Path project (Phase II) - from Floral Avenue to Stillman Street.		Selma		\$143,930

13	UP Railroad Alignment Class I Bike Path (Phase II) - from North Street to Third Street.	Selma	\$32,518
14	Manning Avenue Bridge HBRR work	Reedley	\$1.3MM
15	Frankwood Avenue	Reedley	\$100,000
16	Reed Avenue North	Reedley	\$450,000
8 Transit System Safety, Security & Disaster Repouse Account			
17	Kingsburg Depot Loading Platform	Kingsburg	
9 Local Bridge Seismic Safety Retrofit			
18	Manning Avenue Bridge	Reedley	\$1.5MM
10 Highway-Railroad Crossing Safety Account			
19	Improve "At-Grade" R/R crossing at Third Street, Second Street, and Thompson Avenue.	Selma	\$1.5MM
20	Kamm/Bethel Railroad crossing and grade separation.	Kingsburg	
21	Sierra Street pedestrian crossing at Railroad and Simpson Street	Kingsburg	
22	Floral at Buttonwillow	Reedley	\$1.1MM
23	The County currently has about 7 projects that are on a proposed Federal 130 program list. The estimated match is unknown at this time but would estimate to be approximately \$25K. There are approximately around 50 crossings that may require upgrading to flashing lights and crossing arms, which would be dependent on approval from the Federal 130 program. Cost unknown at this time but could be estimated to be approximately \$175K. There are approximately 3 locations that have been plan lined and may be eligible for grade separation funding. There are 2 locations (Manning at Union Pacific and Mt. View at Union Pacific) that would require other agency approval. There is 1 location that may be controversial. Estimated cost for grade separations would be approximately \$20MM per location.	Fresno Co	\$20MM
11 State Highways Operations & Protection Program (SHOPP)			
24	Add Traffic count capabilities to existing signal interconnect system and other improvements	Selma	\$3MM
25	Signal interconnect in the City	Reedley	\$400,000
12 Local Streets and Roads, Congestion Relief and Traffic Safety Account of 2006			
26	This account can be used for the reconstruction/rehabilitation of local streets. This category may also be used to supplement currently programmed projects (2 to 3 years in the future) that are under-funded.	Selma	\$3MM
27	Highland Avenue from Dinuba to Golden State Blvd. (Increase Capacity) would be eligible for this program.	Selma	\$1.75MM

	Rehabilitation of downtown streets: G street from North Avenue to East Avenue: 10th street from I Street to E Street; 11th Street from I Street to East Avenue: 12th Street from I street to E street; 13th street from I street to E street: 14th street from I street to E street; F street from 9th to 15th street; E street from 9th street to 15th street.		
28		Reedley	\$1.5MM
29	Local Street Improvements	Reedley	\$2MM

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Corridor Mobility Improvement Account Program Guidelines
Adopted November 8, 2006

The Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) presents a unique opportunity for the state's transportation community to provide demonstrable congestion relief, enhanced mobility, improved safety, and stronger connectivity to benefit traveling Californians. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) will work in partnership and collaboration with Caltrans and regional agencies to identify, program, and deliver priority projects in key corridors that yield the mobility and connectivity benefits Californians expect, consistent with the following CMIA guidelines. In taking advantage of this opportunity, it is vital that the transportation community maintain the trust and confidence of those who have provided the wherewithal to implement this program. The transportation community can fulfill the promise of the CMIA program through strategic investments statewide, consistent with regional and state priorities, combined with a renewed focus on achieving and maintaining needed corridor mobility and continuity benefits, and through efficient and timely project delivery. The Commission recognizes that this program will require flexibility to implement, that no one strategy or approach will work equally well throughout the state, and that success can only be achieved when the Commission, Caltrans and regional agencies share equally in the commitment to implement these high priority corridor investments.

General Program Policy

1. Authority and purpose of CMIA guidelines. The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, approved by the voters as Proposition 1B on November 7, 2006, includes a program of funding from \$4.5 billion to be deposited in the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA). The funds in the CMIA are to be available to the California Transportation Commission, upon appropriation in the annual Budget Act by the Legislature, for allocation for performance improvements on the state highway system or major access routes to the state highway system.

The Bond Act mandates that the Commission develop and adopt guidelines for the CMIA program, including regional programming targets, by December 1, 2006. It further mandates that the Commission allocate funds from the CMIA to projects after reviewing project nominations submitted by the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the same regional agencies that prepare regional transportation improvement programs (RTIPs) nominating projects for the state transportation improvement program (STIP).

The purpose of these guidelines is to identify the Commission's policy and expectations for the CMIA program and thus to provide guidance to Caltrans, regional agencies, and other project proponents and implementing agencies in carrying out their responsibilities under the program. The program is subject to the provisions of the Bond Act, in particular subdivision (a) of Section 8879.23 of the Government Code, and these guidelines are not intended to preclude any project

nomination or any project selection that is consistent with the Bond Act. The Commission cannot anticipate all circumstances that may arise in the course of program implementation, and the Commission may find it appropriate to make exceptions to any provision in these guidelines or to revise or adapt its policies as issues arise in program implementation.

2. CMIA Program Intent. In selecting projects for funding under the CMIA program, the Commission intends to balance the following three general mandates provided in the Bond Act:
 - a. Mobility improvement and other project benefits. The basic CMIA policy objective is to improve performance on highly congested travel corridors. Improvements may be on the state highway system or on major access routes to the state highway system on the local road system that relieve congestion by expanding capacity, enhancing operations, or otherwise improving travel times within high-congestion travel corridors. To include a project in the CMIA program, the Commission must find that it “improves mobility in a high-congestion corridor by improving travel times or reducing the number of daily vehicle hours of delay, improves the connectivity of the state highway system between rural, suburban, and urban areas, or improves the operation or safety of a highway or road segment.”
 - b. Geographic balance between regions. The Bond Act requires the Commission, in adopting a program for the CMIA, to find that the program is geographically balanced, consistent with the north/south split that applies to the STIP (40% north, 60% south), and to find that it “provides mobility improvements in highly traveled or highly congested corridors in all regions of California.”
 - c. Early delivery. The Bond Act requires the Commission, in adopting a program for the CMIA, to find that the program targets funding “to provide the mobility benefit in the earliest possible timeframe.” It also mandates that the inclusion of a project in the CMIA program be based on a demonstration that the project can commence construction or implementation no later than December 31, 2012.
3. Urban and Interregional Corridors. In selecting projects for funding under the CMIA program, the Commission intends also to balance improvements to mobility in highly congested urban corridors and improvements to mobility and connectivity in interregional state highway corridors. The Commission expects to evaluate urban corridor and interregional corridor improvements separately. The Commission expects that CMIA program improvements outside urbanized areas will be focused primarily, but not exclusively, on the focus routes identified by Caltrans in its Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP), as presented to the Commission in 1998. **However, this statement of intent does not exclude the**

nomination and consideration of any project eligible for funding under the program.

4. Evaluation of Project Benefits. The Commission intends to give priority to those projects that provide the greatest benefit in relationship to project cost, as demonstrated by a project nomination and supporting documents. The Commission will consider measurable benefits using the California Life-Cycle Benefit/Cost Analysis Model (Cal-B/C) developed and in use by Caltrans. This model includes measures of annual travel time savings and annual safety benefits (reduced injury and fatality rates) in the corridor. The model, however, is but one measure of benefits, and the Commission will also consider other assessments of time savings, safety benefits, quantifiable air quality benefits, and other benefits identified in the project nominations. The Commission's evaluation of project cost effectiveness will be based on the full cost of construction and right-of-way, including engineering costs, without regard for the sources of funding that may be used to meet those costs.
5. Local Funding Contribution. The Commission intends also to consider the contribution of local funding in the selection of projects for CMIA funding. The Commission's expectation of local funding may increase with the size of the project, the share of local traffic in the corridor, and the ability of the regional agency or a local implementing agency to contribute funding to the project.
6. Project eligibility. Under the Bond Act, a CMIA project must be on the state highway system or on a major access route to the state highway system on the local road system. The Commission must also find that:
 - The project either (1) reduces travel time or delay, (2) improves connectivity of the state highway system between rural, suburban, and urban areas, or (3) improves the operation or safety of a highway or road segment.
 - The project improves access to jobs, housing, markets, and commerce.
 - The project can commence construction no later than December 31, 2012.

Under the Bond Act, the Commission may not program a project unless it is nominated by either or both Caltrans and a regional agency. Projects will be programmed according to the same project components used for the STIP—(1) environmental and permits, (2) plans, specifications, and estimates, (3) right-of-way, and (4) construction.

The Commission's general expectation is that each CMIA project will have a full funding commitment through construction, either from the CMIA alone or from a combination of CMIA and other state, local, or federal funds.

The Commission expects the CMIA program to include, though not necessarily be limited to:

- Traffic system management elements, including traffic detection equipment.

- Ramp metering and other operational improvements.
- New traffic lanes to add capacity.
- New or improved alignments for access control, including the conversion of conventional highways to expressway or expressways to freeways.

The Commission expects the inclusion of an interchange project in the CMIA program to be based on the contribution of the interchange to the improvement of traffic flow in a highly congested urban corridor or to the provision of new access control in an interregional corridor.

7. Corridor system management plan. The Commission expects Caltrans and regional agencies to preserve the mobility gains of urban corridor capacity improvements over time and to describe how they intend to do so in project nominations. For urban corridor capacity improvements, the Commission intends to give priority to projects where there is a corridor system management plan in place to preserve corridor mobility or where there is a documented regional and local commitment to the development and effective implementation of a corridor system management plan, which may include the installation of traffic detection equipment, the use of ramp metering, operational improvements, and other traffic management elements as appropriate. Development of a corridor system management plan may occur simultaneously with project implementation, as described in the project nomination.

The capital cost of traffic detection equipment and other elements of a congestion management plan may be included in the cost of an improvement project to be funded from the CMIA. Where they are included in the project nomination, the Commission may require the installation of traffic detection equipment and the implementation of other elements of a congestion management plan as a part of the project approved for CMIA funding.

8. Other funding sources. The Commission recognizes the important funding role that regional agencies play in implementing projects on the state system. The Commission may find it appropriate to develop full funding commitments to CMIA projects that take into consideration additional investments already made, or to be made, by agencies to enhance corridor mobility and connectivity.

However, as a matter of general policy, the Commission does not intend to program CMIA funding to replace funding already programmed in the STIP, including funding from other sources identified in the STIP as providing the full funding commitment for a STIP project component. The Commission may make an exception if it finds that replacing funds already programmed would further the objectives of the CMIA program.

The Commission does not intend generally to program CMIA funding to cover cost increases for project components already programmed in the STIP. The Commission's general expectation is that STIP project cost increases will be

covered from the STIP, including other sources already identified as providing the full funding commitment for the STIP project. However, the Commission may make an exception if it finds that there is no reasonable funding alternative and that covering the cost increase with CMIA funding would further the objectives of the CMIA program.

In selecting projects for CMIA funding, the Commission may also consider the availability and appropriateness of funding for the project from other Bond Act programs.

Project Nomination and Selection Process

9. Initial Program. The Commission will adopt an initial CMIA program of projects by March 1, 2007. The initial CMIA program will include only projects that are nominated by Caltrans or by a regional agency no later than January 16, 2007. Between March 1, 2007 and the adoption of the first program update (in conjunction with the 2008 STIP), the Commission may amend the initial CMIA program, but will do so only for projects that were nominated for the initial program by January 16, 2007. The consideration of programming for projects not nominated for the initial program will await the first full program update in 2008.
10. Program Updates. The Commission intends to program CMIA funds as soon as possible, consistent with the objectives and statutory mandates of the program. If a portion of the \$4.5 billion authorized for the program remains unprogrammed, the Commission will adopt an update to the CMIA program biennially in conjunction with the development and adoption of the biennial STIP. Each program update will be adopted no later than the date of adoption for the STIP and will include only projects that are nominated by Caltrans or by a regional agency no later than the date on which regional transportation improvement programs nominating projects for the STIP are due.
11. Project nominations. Project nominations and their supporting documentation will form the primary basis for the Commission's CMIA program project selection. Under the Bond Act, all projects nominated to the Commission for CMIA funds shall be included in a regional transportation plan. Each project nomination should include:
 - A cover letter with signature authorizing and approving the nomination.
 - A project fact sheet (see Appendix A) that describes the project scope, cost, funding plan, project delivery milestones, and major benefits.
 - A brief narrative (1-3 pages) that provides:
 - A description of the travel corridor and its function, and how the project would improve mobility, reliability, safety, and connectivity within the corridor.

- A description of project benefits, including how the project would improve travel times or reduce the number of daily vehicle hours of delay, improve the connectivity of the state highway system between areas, or improve the safety of a highway or roadway segment. The description should also include air quality benefits and other benefits. To the extent possible, the narrative should quantify project benefits and cite documentation, including environmental documents, in support of any estimates of project benefits.
 - A description of how the project would improve access to jobs, housing, markets, and commerce.
 - A description of the risks inherent in the nomination's estimates of project cost, schedule, and benefit.
 - A description of the corridor management approach to preserving project mobility gains, which may include the corridor system management plan or the commitment of regional and local agencies to develop and implement a plan.
- A project benefit/cost analysis input sheet (see Appendix B).
 - Documentation of the basis for the costs, benefits and schedules cited in the project nomination. As appropriate and available, the documentation should include the project study report, the environmental document, the corridor system management plan or documentation of the commitment to the development and implementation of a plan, the regional transportation plan, and any other studies and analyses that provide documentation regarding the quantitative and qualitative measures validating the project's consistency with CMIA program objectives.

If the nomination includes CMIA funding to replace other funding for a STIP project component or funding to cover a STIP project cost increase, the narrative should also include a description of how the proposed CMIA funding would further the objectives of the CMIA program.

An agency may nominate a project by submitting an endorsement of a nomination submitted by another agency without submitting a duplicate nomination package and documentation.

An agency that submits or endorses project nominations for more than one project should also identify its project funding priorities and the basis for those priorities.

12. Project Cost Estimates. All cost estimates cited in the project fact sheet and in the benefit/cost analysis input sheet will be escalated to the year of proposed delivery. For projects on the state highway system, only cost estimates approved by the Director of Transportation or by a person authorized by the Director to approve cost estimates for programming will be used. For other projects, only cost

estimates approved by the Chief Executive Officer or other authorized officer of the responsible local implementing agency will be used.

13. Submittal of Project Nominations. For the initial program, the Commission will consider only projects for which a nomination and supporting documentation are **received in the Commission office by 5:00 p.m., January 16, 2007, in hard copy.** A nomination from a regional agency will include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or other authorized officer of the agency. A nomination from Caltrans will include the signature of the Director of Transportation or a person authorized by the Director to submit the nomination. Where the project is to be implemented by an agency other than Caltrans or the regional agency, the nomination will also include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or other authorized officer of the implementing agency. The Commission requests that each project nomination include five copies of the cover letter, the project fact sheet, the narrative description, and the benefit/cost analysis input sheet, together with two copies of all supporting documentation.

All nomination materials should be addressed or delivered to:

John Barna, Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
Mail Station 52, Room 2222
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

14. Cost and Delivery Commitments and Expectations. Because estimated project costs and delivery dates are important elements of project evaluation and selection for the CMIA program, the Commission will actively monitor project development and will reevaluate projects as costs and delivery dates may change.

The standards for project programming and project readiness for allocation will be the same as for the STIP. Project components will be programmed for a particular dollar amount in a particular fiscal year, corresponding to the fiscal year when construction (or other component implementation) is to begin.

If the estimated cost for a project increases or if a project fails to meet a project delivery milestone, the Commission will expect Caltrans or the regional agency to report on its plan to bring the project within cost and schedule or to revise the project's funding plan and schedule. The Commission may amend the project's CMIA programming accordingly. If the Commission finds that, as a result of cost increases or schedule delays, the project is either no longer fundable or no longer competitive in terms of cost effectiveness, the Commission may delete the project from the CMIA program. The Commission's intent, however, is to work with Caltrans and regional and local implementing agencies to see that projects proceed to construction.

An implementing agency may identify a project cost increase or delay at any time and request an amendment of the project's programming. With each biennial program update, every project in the program will be reevaluated for cost and delivery schedule.

15. Quarterly CMIA Delivery Report. Commission staff, in cooperation with the Caltrans, regional agencies and local implementing agencies, will report to the Commission each quarter on the status of each project in the CMIA program. The report will identify progress against delivery milestones and any changes in project costs or schedules that may require amendment of the CMIA program.

Regional Programming Targets

16. Intent for Targets. The Bond Act calls for the Commission's guidelines to include "regional programming targets," though it does not specify how the targets are to be used or how they are to be determined. The Commission's intent is that target amounts be provided only as general guidance to Caltrans and regional agencies for carrying out their responsibilities in making project nominations. The targets do not constitute an allocation, a guarantee, a minimum, or a limit on programming in any particular county or region of the state.

For this purpose and in consultation with regional agencies, the Commission has defined the following broad regions of the state for use in establishing regional programming targets:

- San Diego County;
- Southern California, to include the six counties of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG);
- Eastern Sierra, to include Inyo and Mono counties;
- Central Coast, to include the five counties of Caltrans District 5;
- San Joaquin Valley, include the thirteen counties of Caltrans Districts 6 and 10;
- San Francisco Bay Area, to include the nine counties of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC);
- Sacramento Valley, to include the ten counties of Caltrans District 3, excluding Glenn County; and
- North State, to include the remaining twelve counties, including Glenn County and Caltrans Districts 1 and 2.

Each regional agency is permitted to make its own project nominations and to identify its own priorities for the Commission. However, the Commission welcomes and encourages the development of joint priorities and proposals from the nominating agencies located within each of these broader regions or between regions. The Commission encourages the two regions that include counties in both the north and south (San Joaquin Valley and Central Coast) to develop their priorities and proposals without regard to the north/south split.

17. Regional Programming Targets. The Commission is providing regional programming targets for the CMIA program, intended as general guidance only. The targets are neither minimums nor maximums. They do not constrain what any agency may propose or what the Commission may approve for programming and allocation within any particular area of the state. The only geographic constraints on the Commission's programming are that, over the life of the CMIA program, the program must be consistent with the north/south split and it must provide mobility improvements in each of the target regions.

CMIA Regional Programming Targets (Range, in \$ millions)		
	Low	High
Urban Corridors		
Sacramento Valley	\$ 82	\$ 197
San Francisco Bay Area (MTC)	342	821
San Joaquin Valley	93	222
Southern California (SCAG)	901	2,162
San Diego	157	377
Subtotal, urban	\$1,575	\$3,780
Interregional Corridors		
North State	\$ 202	\$ 486
Sacramento Valley	46	110
San Francisco Bay Area (MTC)	24	58
Central Coast	54	130
San Joaquin Valley	241	578
Eastern Sierra	15	36
Southern California (SCAG)	88	211
San Diego	5	11
Subtotal, interregional	\$ 675	\$1,620
Total	\$2,250	\$5,400

The factors used to determine targets were population for urbanized areas over 200,000 and deficient mileage identified by Caltrans for state highway focus routes. The use of these factors, however, does not prescribe or limit where projects may be proposed by any agency or where they may be selected by the Commission.

Allocations and Amendments

18. Allocations from the CMIA. The Commission will consider the allocation of funds from the CMIA for a project or project component when it receives an allocation request and recommendation from Caltrans, in the same manner as for the STIP. The recommendation will include a determination of the availability of appropriated CMIA funds. The Commission will approve the allocation if the funds are available, the allocation is necessary to implement the project as included

in the adopted CMIA program, and the project has the required environmental clearance.

19. CMIA Program Amendments. Caltrans and regional agencies may request CMIA program amendments and the Commission will approve amendments in the same manner as for STIP amendments, except that:

- CMIA program amendments will not add new projects that were not included in the nominations for the initial program or the current biennial update.
- CMIA program amendments may amend projects at any time, including projects programmed for the current fiscal year.
- CMIA program amendments need only appear on the agenda published 10 days in advance of the Commission meeting. They do not require the 30-day notice that applies to STIP amendments. However, the Commission will not act on program amendments with less than a 30-day notice without agreement from all project funding partners.
- The Commission may initiate a CMIA program amendment to delete a project, or to revise its scope, cost, or schedule, after a review of the progress of project delivery.

Where the Commission finds that a project nomination is insufficiently developed or documented to support inclusion in the program, it may invite the nominating agency to resubmit the nomination for later amendment into the program.

CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACCOUNT

Project Nomination Fact Sheet

Nominating Agency:		Fact Sheet Date:	
Contact Person			
Phone Number		Fax Number	
Email Address			

Project Information:							
County	Caltrans District	PPNO *	EA *	Region/MPO/ TIP ID*	Route / Corridor *	Post Mile Back *	Post Mile Ahead *
* NOTE: PPNO & EA assigned by Caltrans. Region/MPO/TIP ID assigned by RTP/MPO. Route/Corridor & Post Mile Back/Ahead used for State Highway System.							
Legislative Districts	Senate:			Congressional:			
	Assembly:						
Implementing Agency (by component)	PA&ED:			PS&E:			
	R/W:			CON:			
Project Title							
Location - Project Limits - Description and Scope of Work (Provide a project location map on a separate sheet and attach to this form)							
Description of Major Project Benefits							
Expected Source(s) of Additional Funding Necessary to Complete Project - as Identified Under 'Additional Need'							
Project Delivery Milestones (month/year):							
Project Study Report (PSR) complete							
Notice of Preparation	Document Type:						
Begin Circulation of Draft Environmental Document							
Final Approval of Environmental Document							
Completion of plans, specifications, and estimates							
Right-of-way certification							
Ready for advertisement							
Construction contract award							
Construction contract acceptance							

NOTE: The CTC Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) Program Guidelines should have been read and understood prior to preparation of the CMIA Fact Sheet. A copy of the CTC CMIA Guidelines and a template of the Project Fact Sheet are available at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/> and at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/>

CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACCOUNT
Project Nomination Fact Sheet - Project Cost and Funding Plan
(dollars in thousands and escalated)

Shaded fields are automatically calculated. Please do not fill these fields.

				Date: 0-Jan-00
County	CT District	PPNO *	EA*	Region/MPO/TIP ID *
0	0	0	0	0
Project Title: 0				

* NOTE: PPNO and EA assigned by Caltrans. Region/MPO/TIP ID assigned by RTPA/MPO

Proposed Total Project Cost								Project Total
Component	Prior	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	
E&P (PA&ED)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PS&E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R/W SUP (CT) *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CON SUP (CT) *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R/W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CON	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Corridor Management Improvement Account (CMIA) Program

Component	Prior	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	Total
E&P (PA&ED)								0
PS&E								0
R/W SUP (CT) *								0
CON SUP (CT) *								0
R/W								0
CON								0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* NOTE: R/W SUP and CON SUP to be used only for projects implemented by Caltrans

Funding Source:

Component	Prior	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	Total
E&P (PA&ED)								0
PS&E								0
R/W SUP (CT) *								0
CON SUP (CT) *								0
R/W								0
CON								0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Funding Source:

Component	Prior	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	Total
E&P (PA&ED)								0
PS&E								0
R/W SUP (CT) *								0
CON SUP (CT) *								0
R/W								0
CON								0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Funding Source:

Component	Prior	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	Total
E&P (PA&ED)								0
PS&E								0
R/W SUP (CT) *								0
CON SUP (CT) *								0
R/W								0
CON								0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Shaded fields are automatically calculated. Please do not fill these fields.

CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACCOUNT
Project Nomination Fact Sheet - Project Cost and Funding Plan
(dollars in thousands and escalated)

Shaded fields are automatically calculated. Please do not fill these fields.

County	CT District	PPNO *	EA*	Date: 0-Jan-00
0	0	0	0	Region/MPO/TIP ID *
Project Title:	0			

* NOTE: PPNO and EA assigned by Caltrans. Region/MPO/TIP ID assigned by RTPA/MPO

Funding Source:								
Component	Prior	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	Total
E&P (PA&ED)								0
PS&E								0
R/W SUP (CT) *								0
CON SUP (CT) *								0
R/W								0
CON								0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Funding Source:								
Component	Prior	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	Total
E&P (PA&ED)								0
PS&E								0
R/W SUP (CT) *								0
CON SUP (CT) *								0
R/W								0
CON								0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Funding Source:								
Component	Prior	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	Total
E&P (PA&ED)								0
PS&E								0
R/W SUP (CT) *								0
CON SUP (CT) *								0
R/W								0
CON								0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Funding Source:								
Component	Prior	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	Total
E&P (PA&ED)								0
PS&E								0
R/W SUP (CT) *								0
CON SUP (CT) *								0
R/W								0
CON								0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Additional Funding Needs (funding needs not yet committed)								
Component	Prior	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13+	Total
E&P (PA&ED)								0
PS&E								0
R/W SUP (CT) *								0
CON SUP (CT) *								0
R/W								0
CON								0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Shaded fields are automatically calculated. Please do not fill these fields.

APPENDIX B

CORRIDOR MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT ACCOUNT PROGRAM BENEFIT/COST ANALYSIS: PROJECT INPUT SHEET

Region/District: County: EA:
 Describe Project: Post mile: PPNO:

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project	Hwy Capacity Expansion	Enter "X"
	Operational Improvement	
	Transp MGMT System (TMS)	
	Other (describe: _____)	
Project Location (1 = So. Cal., 2 = No. Cal., or 3 = rural)		
Length of Construction Period years		
Duration of Peak Period (AM+PM) hours		

HIGHWAY ACCIDENT DATA

Actual 3-Year Accident Data for Facility		Count (No.)
Fatal Accidents		
Injury Accidents		
Property Damage Only (PDO) Accidents		
Statewide Average for Highway Classification		w/o Project w/ Project
Accident Rate (per mil. veh-miles)		
% Fatal Accidents		
% Injury Accidents		

HIGHWAY DESIGN AND TRAFFIC DATA

Highway Design	w/o Project	w/ Project	HOV Restriction
Number of General Traffic Lanes			
Number of HOV Lanes			(2 or 3)
Highway Free-Flow Speed (in mph)			
Project Length (in miles)			

Average Daily Traffic	w/o Project	w/ Project
Current		
Forecast (20 years after construction)		
Average Hourly HOV Traffic (if HOV lanes)		
Percent Trucks (include RVs, if applicable)		
Truck Speed (if passing lane project)		

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (in escalated dollars)

From Project Nomination Fact Sheet:

Fiscal Year:	
2007-08	\$
2008-09	\$
2009-10	\$
2010-11	\$
2011-12	\$
2012-13	\$

COMMENTS:

Prepared by: _____

Phone No: _____

E-Mail: _____

CONTACT: _____

Mahmoud Mahdavi

916-653-9525

mahmoud_mahdavi@dot.ca.gov

FAX: 916-653-1447

DRAFT

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION State Route 99 Bond Act Program Guidelines

1. Purpose of guidelines. The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, approved by the voters as Proposition 1B on November 7, 2006, includes an authorization of \$1 billion to be available to the Department of Transportation, upon appropriation in the annual Budget Act by the Legislature, for safety, operational enhancements, rehabilitation, or capacity improvements necessary to improve the State Route (SR) 99 corridor in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys.

The purpose of these guidelines is to identify the Commission's policy and expectations for the program and thus to provide guidance to the Department, regional agencies, and other project proponents and implementing agencies in carrying out their responsibilities under the program. The program is subject to the provisions of the Bond Act, in particular subdivision (b) of Section 8879.23 of the Government Code, and these guidelines are not intended to preclude any project nomination or any project selection that is consistent with the Bond Act.

The Department and the Commission agree that the SR 99 Bond Act program will be developed by the Department in consultation with the San Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs). The Department has agreed with the Commission that the \$1 billion made available under the Bond Act for SR 99 should be made available and administered in a manner that is consistent with the administration of the Commission's CMIA program.

The Department and the Commission cannot anticipate all circumstances that may arise in the course of program implementation, and may find it appropriate to make revisions to any provision in these guidelines or to amend policies as issues arise in program implementation.

2. Project eligibility. Under the Bond Act, Route 99 Bond Act funding is available for safety, operational enhancements, rehabilitation, or capacity improvements necessary to improve Route 99 in the Central Valley. The Commission expects that project nominations submitted by the Department from the San Joaquin Valley will be consistent with the Caltrans *State Route 99 Business Plan Element of the Master Plan* and that project nominations from the Sacramento Valley will be consistent with the Sacramento Valley *Route 70/99 Corridor Business Plan*. Nothing in these guidelines or in the CMIA guidelines is intended to limit the projects that the Department or a regional agency may propose or that the Commission may program from these funds, consistent with the Bond Act.

Projects will be programmed according to the same project components used for the STIP-(1) environmental and permits, (2) plans, specifications, and estimates, (3) right-

Deleted: The Department and the Commission therefore agree that the SR 99 Bond Act program will be subject to the provisions of the CMIA program, except as otherwise provided in these guidelines. This includes the schedule and standards for project nominations, adoption of the initial program, program amendments, program updates, project allocation, and project delivery.

Deleted: the Commission

Deleted: exceptions

Deleted: revise or adapt its

November 22, 2006

of-way, and (4) construction. The Commission's general expectation is that each SR 99 program project will have a full funding commitment through construction, either from the SR 99 program alone or from a combination of the Route 99 program and other state, local, or federal funds.

3. Completion of Environmental Process. Funding for project right-of-way or construction may be programmed only if the environmental review process can be implemented in time to have the project ready for construction by 2012.
4. Caltrans/Regional Consultations. Caltrans and regional agencies shall consult with each other in the development of the SR 99 Bond Program. As a part of this consultation, Caltrans will consult early with regional agencies, as far in advance as is practicable, of projects that may be or are likely to be included in the Bond Program, including the potential for joint funding from other county and local sources, and will seek the advice of the regional agencies regarding these projects. The consultation should allow regional agencies to consider and advise Caltrans regarding the potential impact of the programming of these projects.
5. Submittal of SR 99 Bond Program. After consulting with Central Valley RTPAs, The Department shall submit the SR 99 Bond Program (first program document) to the CTC no later than January 16, 2007 and the program submittal will include comments from consultation with RTPAs. At the same time, the Department will transmit a copy to each RTPA. The CTC will meet in February to approve the initial SR 99 Bond Program. The time period from January 16, 2007 thru February 28, 2007 will be considered the public comment period.

The SR 99 Bond Program will not cover project cost increases; these should be addressed by other funding sources. To address cost increases the Department in consultation with the RTPAs may:

- a. Identify appropriate funding source.
- b. Amend project scope accordingly.
- c. If appropriate, amend scope of other projects within the SR 99 Bond Program.
- d. Delete projects as necessary in keeping with the priorities as set forth in these guidelines.

The SR 99 Bond Program encompasses the entire State route commencing at Interstate 5 in Kern County and terminating at State Route 36 in Tehama County. Regional agencies and The Department have agreed upon distribution of SR 99 Bond funds based on a north/south 15 percent /85 percent split. Approximately 15 percent to the

Deleted: a

Deleted: 16

Deleted: sponsoring agency will complete the

Deleted: and

Deleted: advise

Deleted: 5

Deleted: T

Deleted: These proposals may include new projects, program reserves, changes to prior STIP projects, and proposals for jointly funding new projects.

Deleted: The SR 99 Bond Program should include, for each proposed project, information (including assumptions and calculations) to support an objective analysis of the priorities. At minimum, the information should be based on a PSR. The information may also be based on the latest version of the draft project report, project report, PS&E submittal information, or funds requests information. This information should include, but not be limited to, the following

Deleted: • an estimate of total project costs, including mitigation costs and support costs;¶
• an estimate of the time of completion of project construction;¶
• an estimate of annual project benefits (at project opening) due to vehicle time savings and vehicle operating costs;¶
• for road projects, an estimate of annual project benefits (at project opening) due to reductions in fatalities and injuries;¶
• an outline of how bond funds are used to leverage other funding sources particularly of non-state and non-federal sources

Deleted: increases.

Deleted: The Caltrans SR 99 Bond Program should be based on the SR 99 Master Plan: Business Plan Element or the Sacramento Valley SR 99 Business Plan ¶

Deleted: Interstate 5

Deleted: propose

Deleted: an approximate

November 22, 2006

Deleted: a

Deleted: 16

north for the Sacramento Valley and counties north of Sacramento/San Joaquin County line, and 85 percent to the south for the San Joaquin Valley.

6. Project Amendment. Caltrans and regional agencies shall consult with each other in the development of an amendment to the SR 99 Bond Program. As a part of this consultation, Caltrans will consult early with RTPAs to develop consensus on program amendments. Similar to the initial program submittal process, program amendments will be submitted to CTC for approval. Any change to the scope, cost, and schedule on the initial program submittal will require a program amendment as stipulated in the CMIA Program.

Deleted: Study Reports (PSR)

A new project may not be included in the SR 99 Bond Program without a completed PSR. This requirement applies to the programming of project development components as well as to right-of-way and construction. A PSR is a report that meets the standards of the CTC's PSR guidelines. The PSR need not be submitted at the time of the SR 99 Bond Program nominations if the Department agrees to the scope, cost, and schedule presented in the Project Nomination Sheet.

Deleted: or in either an RTIP or the ITIP

7. Project Cost Estimates. All cost estimates cited in the project fact sheet and in the benefit/cost analysis input sheet will be escalated to the year of proposed delivery. Only cost estimates approved by the Director of Transportation or by a person authorized by the Director to approve cost estimates for programming will be used.
8. Nomination Forms. The SR 99 Bond Program project fact and funding sheets will be used for nomination of bond funded projects to maintain consistency.

Deleted: ¶

<#>Programming Project Components.
Given that the SR 99 Bond Program will fully obligate the entire \$1 billion, it is unlikely that sequential programming will occur with bond funds. However, other fund sources may be used for sequential programming with the bond funds. ¶


¶
A project component may only be programmed if it finds that the component itself is fully funded from committed funds. The Commission will regard non-STIP and non-bond funds as committed when the agency with discretionary authority over the funds has made its commitment to the project by ordinance or resolution. For federal formula funds, including RSTP, CMAQ, and federal formula transit funds, the commitment may be by federal TIP approval and or amendment. For federal discretionary funds, the commitment may be by federal approval of a full funding grant agreement or by grant approval. ¶

¶
When proposing to program only pre-construction components for a project, the Department or the RTPA should demonstrate the ability to fund the construction of a useable segment, consistent with the RTP or the Caltrans Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan. ¶

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: should

Joint TTC/PAC Meeting



***ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
AGENDA ITEM III. G.***



January 11, 2007



What's your vision for the future?

The San Joaquin Valley Blueprint is a chance to plan for the future of transportation and land use in the Fresno Area and the Valley.

Share Your Views

Fresno County will grow from 950,000 people today, to 1.6 million in 2050. What are your most important "quality of life" concerns?

- Should clean air and water be our focus?
- What about affordable housing or preserving farmland?
- How do we meet the transportation needs of all community members?

Your Vote Counts

At the Blueprint 2050 event we'll be using "clicker technology" to count your votes on what issues you think are most important. A facilitator will ask questions, while attendees use hand held clickers to signal their answers. The clickers will provide immediate feedback.

Today's Choices Will Affect Future Generations

Please join us for this opportunity to shape Fresno County's future. Choices today will have a tremendous impact on our children's and grandchildren's future. Be part of the Blueprint 2050 vision, and share this unique invitation with your friends, family and co-workers!

What: Blueprint 2050
Fresno Region's future vision for generations

When: Thursday, January 11, 2007
Registration begins at 4:30 p.m.
Event starts promptly at 5:00 p.m.

Where: University of California Center
550 E. Shaw Avenue, Fresno CA
(Across from Fresno Fashion Fair Mall)

RSVP: smaxwell@fresnocog.org
(559) 233-4148
(Seating is limited)

Free to the public. Refreshments will be served.



For more information on the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint visit the Fresno COG website at www.fresnocog.org

or

Phone Fresno COG staff at 559-233-4148


or

E-mail the Blueprint project manager for the Fresno region at: bjsteck@fresnocog.org

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Accommodations

The Fresno COG offices and restrooms are ADA accessible. Representatives or individuals with disabilities should contact Fresno COG, (559) 233-4148, at least 3 days in advance, to request auxiliary aids and/or translation services necessary to participate in the public meeting / public hearing. If Fresno COG is unable to accommodate an auxiliary aid or translation request for a public hearing, after receiving proper notice, the hearing will be continued on a specified date when accommodations are available.

Joint TTC/PAC Meeting



ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
AGENDA ITEM III. H.

ONE VOICE 2007 PROJECT SCORE/RANKING

(1) The selection criterion "Transportation/Infrastructure" is excluded from the scoring because all the projects are Transportation and/or Infrastructure. (2) For the selection criterion "Project on 2006 Priority List," all the 2006 priority projects are given a score of 5=Strongly Agree and the remaining projects are given no score.


RANK		TOTAL SCORE	\$ REQUEST
1	State Route 180 Freeway Improvements	42.1292	\$5.00 M
2	Friant Corridor Road Widening	41.2500	\$3.50 M
3	State Route 180 - Temperance to Academy Ave.	40.7125	\$5.00 M
4	Golden State Corridor Ec. Dev. Infrastructure	39.8500	\$2.75 M
5	Future of the 144th Fighter Wing, California Air National Guard	37.6287	Support
6	Highway 269 Bridge Project	37.4338	\$1.50 M
7	Westside Vocational Center	36.9154	\$3.00 M
8	Fresno Yosemite International Airport	36.5535	Support
9	Mendota Federal Correctional Institution	34.3897	Restore funding
10	New Central Library for Fresno County	32.4405	\$4.50 M
11	Veteran's Boulevard	32.1000	\$1.00 M
12	Recycled Water Master Plan System - Phase C	31.8354	\$2.30 M
13	Manning Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation and Reconstruction.	30.4333	\$.45 M
14	Bethel Avenue/SR 99 Interchange realignment	29.4173	\$37.00 M
15	Southeast Corridor/Golden State Blvd. Grade Separation and Intersection Improvements	29.4042	\$29.00 M
16	Parlier Industrial Park Infrastructure	29.3372	\$2.50 M
17	Reedley Regional Sports Complex	29.1167	\$1.50 M
18	Kerman Industrial Infrastructure Extension Project	26.3869	\$.50 M

No money is requested for the projects highlighted in gray. The requests are for support of the project or the support for the restoration of project funding.

Fresno COG 2007 One Voice - Project Recommendations

Project/Bill/Account	Project Description	Project Location	Total Request	Applicant
Friant Corridor Road Widening <i>TTHUD (TCSP)</i>	Widen two- lane road to four-lane divided road with class II bicycle lanes.	Friant Rd. Copper/Millbrook Aves to Millerton Rd.	\$3,500,000	Fresno County Public Works.
Golden State Corridor Ec. Dev. Infrastructure <i>TTHUD (STP)</i>	Roadway rehabilitation, improvements and enhancements to facilitate economic development.	Golden State Boulevard through Kingsburg, Selma, Fowler, and portions of Fresno Co.	\$2,750,000	Fresno County Public Works
State Route 180 - Temperance to Academy Ave. <i>TTHUD (STP)</i>	Completion of construction of the segment of SR 180 from Temperance to Academy	Southeast Fresno County	\$5,000,000	City of Sanger
Highway 269 Bridge Project <i>TTHUD (STP)</i>	Build a 500 foot bridge across the Arroyo Pasajero Creek	City of Huron	\$1,500,000	I-5 Business Development Corridor
Westside Vocational Center <i>TTHUD (EDI)</i>	Build a 20,000 sq. ft flexible vocational facility to provide trade skills training to low income area of county.	City of Mendota	\$3,000,000	I-5 Business Development Corridor
Recycled Water Master Plan System – Phase C <i>Interior (EPA-STAG)</i>	Complete build-out of main water transmission lines. Developed in 5 phases – Total Cost - \$35 million	City of Clovis	\$2,300,000	City of Clovis
The following projects are considered more policy oriented:				
Future of the 144th Fighter Wing, California Air National Guard <i>Defense (Authorization)</i>	To assign F-15 aircraft to the 144th Fighter Wing to replace the F-16 dated to expire in the year 2012.	Fresno Yosemite International Airport	\$0	City of Fresno
Fresno Yosemite International Airport <i>DHS (Authorization)</i>	Establish FYI as an international Port of Entry (POE) with the US Dept. of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection Agency (CBP)	Fresno Yosemite International Airport	\$0	City of Fresno - Dept. of Airports
Mendota Federal Correctional Institution <i>(Byrne-JAG)</i>	Completion of correctional institution	City of Mendota	Restoration of \$87,000,000	City of Mendota

Joint TTC/PAC Meeting



***ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
AGENDA ITEM III. J.***

DRAFT TRANSPORTATION CONCEPT REPORT (TCR)

FOR

STATE ROUTE 33



A SYNOPSIS ...

What is a Transportation Concept Report (TCR)?

A Transportation Concept Report (TCR) is a Caltrans long term system planning document that establishes a planning concept for a highway and/or corridor through the year 2030. A planning concept consists of a target (i.e. Concept) level of service (LOS) and a facility type(s).

Capacity-enhancing improvements, such as lane additions, new interchanges etc., are identified if the Concept LOS is not met (i.e. the Actual LOS is D compared to Concept LOS of C).

The Ultimate Transportation Corridor (UTC) is the facility projected beyond the year 2030.

Concept Level of Service (2030):

A 2030 Concept LOS D has been assigned to all segments of this route, both the rural and urban portions. A vast majority of the route is rural, connected with some small communities that are not projected to have significant growth. There is little diversity in the route and in the existing level of service.

Concept Facility - By Year 2030:

1. Fresno County – Unconstructed JCT Route 180 to Mendota City Limits (Segment 24): 2-lane expressway improved to a 4-lane expressway.

No improvements are recommended beyond the route's 2 and 4-lane Existing Facilities in Segments 1-23, 25-28 (Fresno County).

Ultimate Transportation Corridor (UTC) - Beyond the Year 2030:


1. Kern County – San Luis Obispo/Kern County Line to Junction Route 58 West (Segments 1-3,5-7): 2-lane conventional highway with improvements ***improved to a*** 4-LANE CONVENTIONAL HIGHWAY.
2. Kings County – 36th Avenue to Kings/Fresno County Line (Segment 14): 2-lane conventional highway with improvements ***improved to a*** 4-LANE CONVENTIONAL HIGHWAY.

3. Fresno County – Junction Route 180 to Helm Canal Road (Segment 26): 2-lane conventional highway with improvements improved to a 4-LANE CONVENTIONAL HIGHWAY.

No improvements are recommended beyond the route's 2030 Concept Facility in Segments (8-11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 21-23 and 28).

To review and/or print a copy of this Draft TCR please visit <http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist6/planning/tcrs/index.htm>. If you have any comments or suggestions please forward them to this report's Project Manager, Pedro Ramirez, Associate Transportation Planner, at Caltrans District 6 System Planning, 1352 West Olive Avenue, Fresno, CA 93728, by email at pedro_ramirez@dot.ca.gov, by FAX at (559) 445-5875 or by telephone at (559) 445-6792, by January 5, 2007.

Joint TTC/PAC Meeting



***ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
AGENDA ITEM III. K.***

BEFORE THE
COUNCIL OF FRESNO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 2006-44

In the Matter of:	RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR
	THE APPOINTMENT OF SUPERVISOR
SUPPORTING	JUDY CASE TO THE CALIFORNIA AIR
APPOINTMENT TO	RESOURCES BOARD
California Air Resources Board	

WHEREAS, the Council of Fresno County Governments (Fresno COG) supports the appointment of Supervisor Judy Case to the California Air Resources Board ("ARB") as the representative from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Governing Board ("SJVAPCD"); and

WHEREAS, Supervisor Case has served on the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Governing Board from 1999 to 2004 and served as Chairman of the Board in 2004. Supervisor Case was reappointed as the Fresno County representative on the SJVAPCD in July 2006; and

WHEREAS, Supervisor Case is a registered nurse with a strong background in air-quality issues. Supervisor Case's proven track record of balancing the need for improving air quality with economic stability in the valley brings an objective approach to the ARB; and

WHEREAS, during Supervisor Case's time on the SJVAPCD Governing Board, there have been tremendous strides made in cleaning the Valley's air, even during a time of explosive population growth, and as there are still many challenges ahead; and

WHEREAS, during Supervisor Case's term as Chairman of the District Board, the largest U.S. study of particulate matter and ozone formation was initiated by the SJVAPCD. This information is critical to continuing efforts to improve air quality in California; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Fresno COG respectfully supports and recommends the appointment of Supervisor Judy Case to the California Air Resources Board as the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District representative. Supervisor Case's healthcare background and passion for clean air make her the appropriate choice for this appointment.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was passed and adopted by the Council of Fresno County Governments this 14th day of December, 2006.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Signed: _____
Trinidad M. Rodriguez, Chairman

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution of the Council of Fresno County Governments duly adopted at a regular meeting thereof held on the 14th day of December, 2006.

Signed: _____
Barbara Goodwin, Executive Director

