



Regular Meeting of the Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee

LOCATION

Merced County Administration Building
Room 310
2222 M Street
Merced, CA 95340

DATE

Thursday, January 24, 2019

TIME

2:00 pm

East Side Regional Projects Committee Members

City of Livingston	Juan Aguilar, Councilman
City of Atwater	Paul Creighton, Mayor
City of Merced	Mike Murphy, Mayor – Vice Chair
County of Merced, District 1	Rodrigo Espinoza, Supervisor
County of Merced, District 2	Lee Lor, Supervisor
County of Merced, District 3	Daron McDaniel, Supervisor - Chair
County of Merced, District 4	Lloyd Pareira, Supervisor
County of Merced, District 5	Scott Silveira, Supervisor

Welcome to the Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee Meeting

AGENDA

At least 72 hours prior to each regular Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee meeting, a complete agenda packet is available for review on the Measure V website at www.measurev-mcag.com and at the MCAG office, 369 W. 18th Street, Merced, CA 95340. All public records relating to an open session item and copies of staff reports or other written documentation relating to items of business referred to on the agenda are on file at MCAG. Persons with questions concerning agenda items may call MCAG to make an inquiry regarding the nature of items described on the agenda.

TRANSLATION SERVICES

Translation Services are not provided at MCAG's public meeting unless requested at least three (3) business days in advance. Please contact Eva Garibay at (209) 723-3153 x 108 during regular business hours to request translation services.

Servicios de interpretación no son ofrecidos en las juntas públicas de MCAG al menos de que se soliciten tres (3) días de negociación en anticipación. Para solicitar estos servicios por favor contacte a Eva Garibay al (209) 723-3153 x 108 durante horas de oficina.

INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Representatives or individuals with disabilities should contact MCAG at (209)723-3153 at least three (3) days in advance of the meeting to request auxiliary aids or other accommodations necessary to participate in the public meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Members of the public wishing to address agenda items or comment on any item not on the agenda may do so during agenda item 2 – Public Comment. Persons may also address any item on the agenda during consideration of that item. Comments are limited to three (3) minutes per person. Please state your name and city or community of residence for the record. For items not on the agenda, no action will be taken. If it requires action, the item will be referred to staff and/or placed on the next agenda.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Measure V www.measurev-mcag.com

Merced County Association of Governments www.mcagov.org



**Regular Meeting of the
Measure V East Side Regional Projects Committee**

**Thursday, January 24, 2018 – 2:00 pm
Merced County Administration Building, Room 310
2222 M Street, Merced, CA 95340**

AGENDA

1.	Roll Call		Chair
2.	Public Comment		Chair
3.	Approval of Agenda	Action	Chair
4.	Approval of Minutes from May 15, 2018 East Side Regional Projects Committee Meeting	Action	Chair
5.	Implementation Plan 2019 Process and Schedule	Info	Stacie Dabbs
6.	Select an Implementation Plan Approach for the Eastside	Action	Stacie Dabbs
7.	Revenue Outlook	Info	Matt Fell
8.	Regional Project Candidates	Info	Matt Fell
9.	Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">Identify Goals of February RPC Meeting with KNN Financial	Info	Stacie Dabbs
10.	Adjourn		Chair



PH: 209.723.3153
FAX: 209.723.0322
www.mcagov.org
369 W. 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340

Meeting Minutes

Measure V Eastside Regional Projects Committee

May 15, 2018, 10:00 AM

Livingston City Hall, 1416 C Street, Livingston CA

Staff and Other Attendees:

Patrick Pittenger, Executive Director, MCAG
Stacie Dabbs, Deputy Director, MCAG
Matt Fell, Senior Planner, MCAG
Nav Bagri, Finance Director, MCAG
Emily Haden, MCAG Counsel
Blake Dunford, MCAG
Kendall Flint, RGS
Steve Flint, RGS
Dana Hertfelder, Merced County Public Works Director

Item 1: Roll Call

City of Livingston	Alex McCabe, Councilman
City of Atwater	Jim Price, Mayor
City of Merced	Michael Belluomini, Councilman
County of Merced, District 1	Rodrigo Espinoza, Supervisor
County of Merced, District 2	Lee Lor, Supervisor
County of Merced, District 3	Daron McDaniel, Supervisor/Chairman
County of Merced, District 4	Lloyd Pareira, Supervisor
County of Merced, District 5	Jerry O'Banion, Supervisor

Item 2: Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Item 3: Approval of Agenda

Motion approved unanimously.

Item 4: Approval of Minutes

Motion approved unanimously.

Item 5: Overview of Implementation Plan – Development Process

Stacie Dabbs presented the overview of the Implementation Plan required by Measure V. The Implementation Plan specifies how much money is available to spend for projects over a given period of time and identifies the projects to be constructed and when. Most projects are currently conceptual. Also on the agenda are potential policies and strategies that may guide the implementation like leveraging opportunities or programming all or part of the funds. Staff recommends that the Board with the agreement of the eastside and westside committees, consider releasing a draft in August with a focus on projects to be programmed in the first two years. The document must be updated every two years and must align with the STIP. After the first plan is completed the process to develop a strategy for future programming would begin.

Q: If we're going after grants, do those need to be in the STIP?

Stacie: No

Q: Does that mean that the first projects will be smaller?

Stacie: Yes, because of the amount of money available.

Comment: Better to get projects on the ground sooner rather than making the taxpayers wait five years.

The summary reflects five years of projects, and whether these are priority projects, and the revenue generated in two years and in five years is shown as well.

Item 6: Policies and Strategies

Patrick Pittenger initiated the discussion of the list of policies.

- First, do you want to program all the money up front for two years or carry over?
- Do you want to set aside funds that could be used for leveraging various funds and grant opportunities?
- Do you want to set priority projects?
- Do you want to designate funds for project construction or project development?

Comment: Identify the most critical projects.

Comment: Need to consider cost increases over time

Kendall: You can decide a percentage for projects to build now, a percentage to set aside for future projects, a percentage for leveraging.

Patrick: Set aside for rail can be considered.

Q: Doesn't funding for rail come from alternate modes? Why fund rail now, rather see larger allocation to roads now, fund rail later.

Q: Does setting money aside diminish the amount available?

Patrick: It would in the early stages when less money has been collected.

Q: Which projects have most regional significance? There are more projects than money.

Stacie: You could select projects to be funded in the first two years.

Comment: Not a lot of grants are available until a project is shovel ready.

Comment: The committee can establish which are regional projects within the next two years and develop a strategy for determining projects in subsequent years.

Q: Which one of these projects provide the greatest benefit?

Staff has compiled a list of projects that meet the criteria, based on their estimation, but the Committee needs to weigh in as it will make the recommendation to the Board.

Set asides for rail are more appropriate for the eastside committee to make since that is where rail will serve.

5% for transit, but it could be more specific like 3% rail and 2% bus.

Comment: 20% for set asides in the first two years is too high.

Comment: You need to start somewhere.

Comment: The set aside is not for rail only.

Item 7: Definition of a Regional Project

Matt Fell led the discussion. The purpose of this discussion is to clarify what constitutes a regional project. The Committee was provided with a map and list of the project areas. Criteria include 1) projects that are located in more than one jurisdiction and 2) projects that benefit more than one jurisdiction.

Item 8: Revenue Update

Stacie presented a brief update, indicating that based on sales tax revenues collected through March will be closer to \$16 mil. Staff will continue to use the \$15 mil per year estimate. KNN may provide other projections based on cash flow.

Q: How does that affect later projections when more money is available?

Patrick: This is the reason that the 2-year plan is valuable because more money is available for projects sooner.

Comment: How many projects can be completed?

Stacie: The draft plan that will be available in August will include an estimate.

Item 9: Review of Regional Project Candidates

Stacie began the discussion describing the list of candidate projects.

The Chairman called for a five minute recess.

-BREAK @11:20-

Stacie pointed out that the most of Measure V requests are for a portion, but not the entire amount available for the project. For example Hwy 59 Black Rascal Bridge has more than \$4 mil designated, but the request is for \$460 k.

Q: Should "Shovel-Ready" projects be a priority?

Stacie: This would be important in implementing a two-year plan.

The Chairman summarized the priority of projects as:

- 1) Sandy Mush Road Phase 1 (County)
- 2) Sandy Mush Road Phase 2 (County)
- 3) Bradbury Road (County)
- 4) Winton Way (Atwater)
- 5) Highway 99/Winton Way Parkway (Livingston)
- 6) Highway 59 Black Rascal Bridge (Merced)

The total is around \$12.3 million

Comment: Each jurisdiction has designated their #1 priority project.

Comment: This Committee should report to Westside that Sandy Mush is priority, maybe they will prioritize Sandy Mush on the west (as a Regional project).

Item 10: Next Steps

Stacie asked the Committee if there were other topics to discuss with the Board at the meeting w/ KNN on June 6 where the primary purpose is to discuss bonding, project availability, funding options. No other topics were mentioned.

Item 11: Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 AM



PH: 209.723.3153
FAX: 209.723.0322
www.mcagov.org
369 W. 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340

ITEM 5

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 16, 2019

TO: Measure V Eastside Regional Projects Committee

FROM: Stacie Dabbs, Executive Director

RE: Implementation Plan 2019 Process and Schedule

The Expenditure Plan requires an Implementation Plan outlining project expenditures be prepared/updated at a minimum of every two years.

In September 2018, the MCAG Governing Board adopted the 2018 Implementation Plan which programmed two fiscal years (FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19) of Measure V Regional Projects Funding and Transit Funding to specific projects and programs. At the recommendation of the East and West Side Regional Projects Committees, the 2018 plan reflects a pay-as-you-go approach for 80% of the estimated regional funding. 20% of the east and west side regional funding accounts was set aside for future unidentified leveraging opportunities.

During the development of the 2018 Implementation Plan, it was the expressed intention for MCAG to develop a longer-term plan by June 2019 in order to align the plan schedule with the next State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) cycle, as specified in the Transportation Expenditure Plan.

In October 2018, the MCAG Governing Board directed staff to begin the development of the 2019 Implementation Plan with a call for projects with two lists including a 5-year horizon and a 10-year horizon.

SCHEDULE

To meet the June 2019 goal, staff is following the attached schedule. Subsequent actions include selecting an approach, reviewing candidate projects, and recommending projects to the Governing Board for funding in the 2019 Implementation Plan.

If you have any questions regarding this staff report, please contact Stacie Dabbs at 723.3153 x 109 or stacie.dabbs@mcagov.org.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

Attachment

Measure V 2019 Implementation Plan

Proposed Development Process and Schedule

Updated January, 2019

Date	Meetings	Goals	
2018			
October 18	Governing Board	Direct staff to issue call for projects	✓ DONE
October	One-on-one meetings with jurisdictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss and identify any new candidate projects; • Update on existing candidate and funded projects 	✓ DONE
2019			
January 9	n/a	Deadline for jurisdictions to submit candidate projects and/or updated information to MCAG	✓ DONE
January 23-24	East and West Side Regional Projects Committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select an approach for East and West sides; • Review revenue outlook; • Initial review of candidate projects. 	
February 28	East and West Side Regional Projects Committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential session with KNN Public Finance Team; • Discuss financing strategies; • Review candidate projects; • Make project funding recommendations to the Board. 	
March 21	Governing Board	Approve Regional Project Committees' recommendations	
March	n/a	Staff circulates pre-draft Plan to jurisdictions for review and feedback	
April 18	Governing Board	Release Draft Plan for public review and comment	
May	Public Hearings	as required by Expenditure Plan	
May 16	Governing Board	Action on 2019 Implementation Plan	



PH: 209.723.3153
FAX: 209.723.0322
www.mcagov.org
369 W. 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340

ITEM 6

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 16, 2019

TO: Measure V Eastside Regional Projects Committee

FROM: Stacie Dabbs, Executive Director

RE: Implementation Plan 2019 Approach

BACKGROUND

Staff requests direction on an approach the Regional Projects Committee would like to pursue for the 2019 Implementation Plan. Choosing an approach will help staff to better prepare materials for the next Regional Projects Committee when evaluating candidate projects. Options chosen are independent of region; the approach taken by the Eastside Regional Projects Committee does not affect the Westside Projects Committee and vice versa.

Staff also requests consideration of the duration, that is the number of years of funding to be programmed in the Implementation Plan. For example, 5 years or 10 years. This could also be different on the Eastside and the Westside; for example, the Implementation Plan could program a different number of years on each side and one side would have some number of later years unprogrammed and to be decided in a future Plan.

Note that subsequent items on the agenda present the revenue outlook and the candidate project lists, but for purposes of this discussion it is important to note that on both the East and West sides, the sum of all the candidate project requests is more than the entire 30-year time frame of Measure V.

Option A: Major Projects and Leveraging

This approach emphasizes projects with broad regional benefits, long-term economic growth and increasing opportunities for leveraging outside funds. These projects make regionally significant changes to the transportation network. This option will also address regional issues that Merced County faces, such as congestion on major highways, goods movement and through traffic, the growth of the University of California Merced, and long-distance commuting. While these projects may be more expensive, they offer clear economic and health benefits to the region. Examples of these projects include highways, expressways, regional multi-use trails, passenger rail, and other mass transportation projects. These types of projects are the most likely to be able to leverage federal and state funding; each dollar committed has stronger purchasing power than all other options. The Major Projects approach may include bonding at the request of the Governing Board. This approach is the most common practice in other self-help counties in California.

To proceed with this option, the Regional Projects Committee is encouraged to designate long-term priority projects that will guide future programming. Creating a long-term priority project list will also improve chances for additional funding from federal and state sources as it will demonstrate a commitment to transportation improvements.

Option B: Pay-as-you-go, **Something-for-everyone**

This approach prioritizes projects for each jurisdiction, which in general will be smaller, and potentially could be quicker to deliver. There are many small projects across Merced County that have been deferred indefinitely due to lack of funding. Completion of these projects addresses concerns on the jurisdiction level with some impact to the overall regional system by building or repairing arterial projects or promoting active transportation. Choosing this approach may set the stage for larger projects or may provide relief on congested regional roads and highways. Small projects can be completed quickly, and regional funding can be stretched to cover more projects in more areas. However, by choosing to focus on smaller projects, it is more difficult to leverage or attract funding from State and Federal sources, and major or large-ticket projects with regional benefits will be delayed. This approach is designed to address immediate to short-term problems on the regional transportation network. This approach was chosen for the 2018 Implementation Plan.

Option C: **Complete Existing Commitments**

This approach prioritizes projects that received Regional Projects Funding in the 2018 Implementation Plan. Any funds above and beyond what is needed to complete partially-programmed projects could use any other approach.

This approach focuses on assuring that projects get completed and have a better chance of full funding from the start. Jurisdictions could benefit from this option as they have more certainty on being able to count on funding. However, this approach could reduce the ability of Measure V to fund new projects and to deliver major projects.

Option D: **Hybrid**

This approach allows the Regional Projects Committee to combine other approaches. Doing so could potentially garner benefits of multiple types, but to a lesser degree than a full commitment to one. The approach may also mitigate negative effects of any one choice. An example of a Hybrid approach would be to dedicate 75% of funding to Major Projects and 25% to the Something-for-Everyone approaches.

Option E: **Clean future**

This approach will prepare Merced County for clean energy and transportation goals set by the State of California and the long-term direction the State is heading toward. Projects that are focused on mass transportation, electrification, technology such as automated vehicles, or alternative modes could be prioritized. Working ahead of or with state timelines could drive economic development by creating more accessible downtown areas, reliable mass transportation, and cleaner, safer neighborhoods.

Example projects might include intercity and passenger rail, express or commuter bus service, automated streetcars, wide scale electrical charging infrastructure, clean energy express lanes on

highways, or others. These types of projects could leverage a variety of state and federal funding sources focused on clean transportation and clean energy.

If you have any questions regarding this staff report, please contact Stacie Dabbs at 723.3153 x 109 or stacie.dabbs@mcagov.org.

REQUESTED ACTION

Select an approach above or another approach.



PH: 209.723.3153
 FAX: 209.723.0322
www.mcagov.org
 369 W. 18th Street
 Merced, CA 95340

ITEM 7

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 16, 2019

TO: Measure V Eastside Regional Projects Committee

FROM: Matt Fell, Transportation Planning Manager

RE: Revenue Outlook

MEASURE V REVENUE

In order to recommend projects for funding, it is necessary for each Regional Projects Committee to have an estimate of future revenue that will be available for projects.

The 2018 Implementation Plan used the same estimate as the voter-approved Expenditure Plan, which is \$15,000,000 in total revenues per year. Since the Eastside share is 27% of the total and the Westside share is 17% of the total, that corresponds to:

- \$4,050,000 per year for the Eastside share
- \$2,550,000 per year for the Westside share

Actual revenues in the first 18 months (since April 2017) have been somewhat more than the estimate, however staff recommends using these same conservative estimates for the 2019 Implementation Plan. In the next Implementation Plan in two years there will be three years of revenue to look at and at that time if revenues continue to be higher, then the projection could be adjusted upward.

The Governing Board’s initial direction in October 2018 was to look at both a 5-year horizon and a 10-year horizon. The table below shows in millions of today’s dollars (unescalated) what the East and West shares and Measure V total would be for 5 years, 10 years, and the entire 30 years:

Share	% of Total	1 Year	5 Years	10 Years	30 Years
Eastside	27%	4.05	20.25	40.50	121.50
Westside	17%	2.55	12.75	25.50	76.50
Measure V Total (including Local and Transit)	100%	15.00	75.00	150.00	450.00

If a Regional Projects Committee were to continue to recommend a 20% set aside for future leveraging opportunities, then the amounts available for consideration in this 2019 Implementation Plan would be as shown in the following table:

Share	1 Year	5 Years	10 Years
Eastside – Projects	3.24	16.20	32.40
Eastside – 20% set-aside	0.81	4.05	8.10
Eastside – Total	4.05	20.25	40.50
Westside – Projects	2.04	10.20	20.40
Westside – 20% set-aside	0.51	2.55	5.10
Westside – Total	2.55	12.75	25.50

Or taking the highlighted numbers from the table:

- Eastside Available Funding (with 20% set-aside), 5 years = \$16.2 million
- Eastside Available Funding (with 20% set-aside), 10 years = \$32.4 million
- Westside Available Funding (with 20% set-aside), 5 years = \$10.2 million
- Westside Available Funding (with 20% set-aside), 10 years = \$20.4 million

OTHER FUNDING SOURCES

The larger and more expensive a project is, the more likely it needs multiple funding sources to accomplish. It is a common practice in self-help counties in California to use self-help / measure funds to try to leverage outside agency funds on the large and regional improvement projects.

It is thus useful to consider which other funding sources might be available for possible combined funding for Measure V Regional Projects. The table below is a selected set of funding programs, with indications for what level of government decides them, and an estimated annual funding amount. In the past, MCAG has successfully leveraged State ITIP/STIP and State TCEP.

Of special note are the highlighted rows: LPP and RTIP/STIP.

The Local Partnership Program Formula funding was established by SB 1 and goes to transportation self-help agencies throughout the state, including MCAG.

The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) funds are recommended by MCAG every two years for inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The next “STIP” cycle will be coming up this Summer, with the RTIP due by December 2019. Currently MCAG has \$26 million of unprogrammed STIP funding and may get more in the next cycle. This will be available in a future year to be programmed as MCAG decides, subject to state requirements. Historically this funding has gone to major projects with broad regional benefits.

Funding Program	Annual Funding (\$ millions)
<i>Decided by Local jurisdictions:</i>	
Measure V – Local, unrestricted	6
<i>Decided by MCAG:</i>	
Measure V – Regional East	4
Measure V – Regional West	2.6
Local Partnership Program (LPP) Formula	0.6
Regional Improvement Program (RTIP / STIP)	0 to 10
<i>Awarded by State or Federal agencies:</i>	
Interregional Improvement Program (ITIP / STIP)	50 - 300
Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP)	200 - 400
Solutions for Congested Corridors	250
Local Partnership Program (LPP) Competitive	100
Federal Grants – BUILD, INFRA	0 or more

If you have any questions regarding this staff report, please contact Matt Fell at 723.3153 x 128 or matt.fell@mcagov.org.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.



PH: 209.723.3153
FAX: 209.723.0322
www.mcagov.org
369 W. 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340

ITEM 8

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 16, 2019

TO: Measure V Eastside Regional Projects Committee

FROM: Matt Fell, Transportation Planning Manager

RE: Regional Project Candidates

In October 2018, the MCAG Governing Board directed staff to begin the development of the 2019 Implementation Plan with a call for projects with two lists including:

- a. A 5-year horizon; and
- b. A 10-year horizon

Staff issued the call for projects following the Board meeting. The candidate project forms were the same as those created during the development of the 2018 Implementation Plan. They were based on discussions at the East and West Regional Projects Committees in 2017, in which committee members brainstormed regional projects for consideration and discussed potential evaluation criteria.

Attached is page 6 of the Expenditure Plan with a red box around the language defining a Regional Project for the purposes of Measure V Regional Project funding.

The due date for candidate project forms was in December, later extended to January 9, 2018.

24 project candidates were submitted on the Eastside. A one-page summary table is attached and the complete packet of information/evaluation forms are enclosed.

If you have any questions regarding this staff report, please contact Matt Fell at 723.3153 x 128 or matt.fell@mcagov.org.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.

Attachments: Expenditure Plan, page 6, "Regional Projects"
Summary of Eastside Regional Project Candidates

Enclosure: Eastside Regional Project Candidate Forms

1. Regional Projects – 44% of total

If \$450 million is collected over 30 years, then \$198 million will be available for Regional Projects - \$121.5 million on the Eastside and \$76.5 million on the Westside.

Forty-four percent (44%) of the funds will be allocated to this category.

- 27% of the total is for an Eastside share, to be spent on projects east of the San Joaquin River.
- 17% of the total is for a Westside share, to be spent on projects west of the San Joaquin River.

The dividing line between Eastside and Westside shares is the San Joaquin River. Two committees will be created to recommend projects:

- The Eastside Regional Projects Committee will consist of one council person from each City that includes area east of the San Joaquin River and each County Supervisor whose district includes area east of the River.
- The Westside Regional Projects Committee will consist of one council person from each City that includes area west of the San Joaquin River and each County Supervisor whose district includes area west of the River.

As the Local Transportation Authority overseeing the funds, the Governing Board of Merced County Association of Governments has the authority to approve recommendations made by the Regional Projects Committees. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the MCAG Governing Board shall not approve a project that has not been recommended by a Regional Projects Committee.

Regional Projects must be listed in the applicable Regional Transportation Plan, which is updated every four years and can be amended as needed. These projects provide for the movement of goods, services, and people throughout Merced County. Projects on the State Highway system or the Regional Road System or the Regional Transportation System defined by MCAG are Regional Projects. Projects located in or directly benefitting more than one jurisdiction are Regional Projects.

Examples of Regional Projects include but are not limited to:

- Improving highway and freeways
- Adding lanes to projects on the Regional Road System
- Improvements on the Regional Transportation System
- Passenger Rail
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Regional bikeways and trails
- Improvements to Regional Airports
- Transportation Demand Management benefitting more than one jurisdiction, such as vanpools and ridesharing.

Summary of Eastside Regional Project Candidates for 2019 Implementation Plan

January, 2019

Agency	Agency Priority	Project	2019 Request	CON Year	2018 Plan Funding	Total Cost
Atwater	1	Winton Way Improvements, phase 2	\$2,250,000	2019	\$1,000,000	\$3,385,000
Atwater	2	Hwy. 99 Applegate Rd. Interchange	\$62,000,000	2023	\$0	\$62,000,000
Atwater	2	Atwater Transit Center	\$13,408,278	2021	\$0	\$13,408,278
Livingston	1	Livingston Transit Center, phase 1	\$3,500,000	2021	\$0	\$3,500,000
Livingston	2	Livingston Transit Center, phase 2	\$2,500,000	2023	\$0	\$2,500,000
Livingston	3	Main Street Corridor	\$13,000,000	2020	\$0	\$13,000,000
Livingston	4	B Street Corridor	\$3,900,000	2021	\$0	\$3,900,000
Merced	1	Hwy. 59 Black Rascal Bridge	\$3,630,000	2020	\$460,000	\$4,090,000
Merced	2	Hwy. 59 Widening 16th to Olive	\$5,179,720	2020	\$764,580	\$5,944,300
Merced	3	Hwy. 59 Widening Olive to Yosemite Ave.	\$18,879,885	2022	\$0	\$18,879,885
Merced	4	Parsons Ave. Bridge over Bear Creek	\$2,850,000	2021	\$0	\$2,850,000
Merced	5	Parsons Ave. from 140 to Yosemite Ave.	\$33,400,666	2022	\$0	\$33,400,666
Merced	7	Mission Ave. Widening	\$9,535,823	2022	\$0	\$9,535,823
Merced	8	Bellevue Rd. Widening from 59 to Lake Rd.	\$41,374,909	2022	\$0	\$41,374,909
Merced	9	Hwy. 59 Widening Olive to Bellevue	\$38,537,923	2021	\$0	\$38,537,923
County	1	Atwater-Merced Expressway, phase 1B	\$13,700,000	2026	\$0	\$75,000,000
County	2	Bellevue Road Connection to Highway 99	\$150,000	2022	\$0	\$3,350,000
County	2	Mission Ave Road Widening	\$700,000	2022	\$0	\$5,300,000
City/County	6/3	Childs Ave Sidewalks	\$18,372,382	2021	\$0	\$18,372,382
County	3	Sandy Mush Rd. Reconstruction, phase 2	\$4,575,000	2020	\$2,465,420	\$7,040,420
County	3	Hwy. 140 & Plainsburg Roundabout	\$450,000	2023	\$0	\$4,750,000
County	3	Washington Rd. Rehabilitation	\$2,025,000	2020	\$0	\$2,025,000
County	3	Atwater-Merced Bike Path	\$1,250,000	2026	\$0	\$8,250,000
County	3	McKee Rd. Pedestrian Bridge	\$250,000	2022	\$0	\$2,800,000
Total			\$295,419,586			\$383,194,586

Estimated Revenue

1 Year	\$4,050,000
5 Years (to June 2024)	\$20,250,000
10 Years (to June 2029)	\$40,500,000
30 Years	\$121,500,000