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PIP-Subjects

- Geo-Demography
- GIS model
- Participation model
- Results
- What’s next
Industrial Employment by Sector -- 2000

- Educ: 21%
- Prof: 6%
- FIRE: 3%
- Info: 3%
- TCPU: 5%
- Retail: 11%
- Whole: 4%
- Manu: 13%
- Const: 7%
- Pub Admin: 4%
- Oth Svc: 4%
- A&E: 7%
- Ag-min: 12%
Ethnicity in Merced County - 2000

- Latino: 47%
- White: 41%
- Black or African American: 4%
- American Indian and Alaska Native: 1%
- Asian: 1%
- Pacific Islander: 0%
GIS Model- U-Plan

- Developed by UC Davis
- Scenario development and evaluation
- Impact measurement
- Tool to start the discussions
Data Layers

- All 7 local General Plans
- Existing Urban
- Transportation: Roads, Railways, Airports, …
- Hydrology: Lakes, Rivers, Flood Zone
- Public Lands: Parks, Refuges, BLM, …
- Agriculture: Farmlands, Grazing Lands
- Habitat and Species: NDDB, Wetlands, Vernal Pools, Linkages, Easements
- Cultural Resources
Data Sources, Agencies

- US EPA
- Local Jurisdictions
- Caltrans
- CA Dept. of Fish & Game
- CA Dept. of Conservation
- State Office of Historic Preservation
- US Fish & Wildlife
- US Army Corps of Engineers
- FEMA
- The Nature Conservancy
- Ducks Unlimited
- Endangered Species Recovery Program
2020 Land Use Scenario

Preliminary scenario of Merced County in 2020
Aggressive Public Outreach
Public Participation Model

MCAG Governing Board

- Technical Review Board
- Citizens Advisory Committee
- MCAG Staff
- Technical Planning Committee
- PIP Advisory Committee- 2 members from each focus group

Focus Groups:
- Seniors
- Business/Education
- SE Asian
- Latino
- Environ/Outdoor Rec.
- Commuters
- Youth
- Agriculture
- Public Workshops
- City Planning Commissions
- Unincorporated Community Meetings
Transportation Planning Process

Increased Outreach

Transportation Modeling

U plan & Environmental Evaluation

RTP
Participation at each Step

- Vision
- Goals
- Scenario Options
- Funding Options
- Scenario Evaluation
- Scenario Selection
- Plan Approval
## Scenario Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
<th>No Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meet with the Public
## Funding Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Not Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fee</td>
<td>$91 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½¢ sales tax</td>
<td>$261 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10¢ gas tax</td>
<td>$212 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg’n Fee</td>
<td>$12.8 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint Dist.</td>
<td>$277 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meet with the Public Again
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Description</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same as existing Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>$582,000,000</td>
<td>$855,210,000</td>
<td>$1,038,210,000</td>
<td>$582,000,000</td>
<td>$1,010,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Policy Some Changes</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$273,210,000</td>
<td>$456,210,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$428,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads &amp; Highways</td>
<td>8 major improvements to highways 152, 59, 140 and 99 and regional roads</td>
<td>11 major improvements to highways and regional roads</td>
<td>22 major improvements to highways and regional roads</td>
<td>Only 3 projects: 152 Bypass, Existing 59, 140 Bradley Overhead</td>
<td>15 major improvements to highways and regional roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Cost: $242,000,000</td>
<td>$375,000,000</td>
<td>$535,000,000</td>
<td>$84,000,000</td>
<td>$450,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Change from B: $0</td>
<td>$133,000,000</td>
<td>$293,000,000</td>
<td>($158,000,000)</td>
<td>($208,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Road Maintenance</td>
<td>Continues at existing levels. Roads deteriorate.</td>
<td>Much more funding for maintenance</td>
<td>Much more funding for maintenance</td>
<td>More funding for maintenance</td>
<td>Much more funding for maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Cost: $209,000,000</td>
<td>$331,000,000</td>
<td>$354,000,000</td>
<td>$390,000,000</td>
<td>$352,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Change from B: $0</td>
<td>$122,000,000</td>
<td>$145,000,000</td>
<td>$81,000,000</td>
<td>$143,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit (Bus)</td>
<td>Transit service meets the needs of the transit dependent.</td>
<td>Some improvement: 30 minute frequency in urban areas, 60 minute between areas.</td>
<td>Some improvement: 30 minute frequency in urban areas, 60 minute between areas.</td>
<td>Transit is a viable trip choice. Greater coverage, higher frequencies (15/30), aggressive marketing</td>
<td>Transit is a viable trip choice. Greater coverage, higher frequencies (15/30), aggressive marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Cost: $130,000,000</td>
<td>$143,000,000</td>
<td>$143,000,000</td>
<td>$195,000,000</td>
<td>$195,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Change from B: $0</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Considered a local issue.</td>
<td>Local jurisdictions encouraged to require pedestrian-friendly development.</td>
<td>Local jurisdictions encouraged to require pedestrian-friendly development.</td>
<td>New communities are walkable and transit-friendly. Financial incentives are provided.</td>
<td>New communities are walkable and transit-friendly. Financial incentives are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Cost: $0</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Change from B: $0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Bicycle improvements are consistent with plans but dependent on grants.</td>
<td>Bike paths are well-planned and have connectivity. Several priority projects are funded.</td>
<td>Bike paths are well-planned and have connectivity. Several priority projects are funded.</td>
<td>More priority bike projects are funded. New communities are planned to be bike-friendly.</td>
<td>More priority bike projects are funded. New communities are planned to be bike-friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Cost: $1,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Change from B: $0</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Rail</td>
<td>&quot;Commute by Rail&quot; program. Rail schedules are adjusted to meet northern commutes.</td>
<td>&quot;Commute by Rail&quot; program. Rail schedules are adjusted to meet northern commutes.</td>
<td>Rail also promoted for recreational trips and vacations.</td>
<td>Rail also promoted for recreational trips and vacations.</td>
<td>Rail also promoted for recreational trips and vacations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Cost: $0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Change from B: $0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>Same as today: Merced to Las Vegas four times a day.</td>
<td>Expanded air service to Los Angeles and San Francisco.</td>
<td>Expanded air service to Las Angeles and San Francisco.</td>
<td>Air is a viable alternative to auto for long trips: service to LA, SF, other hubs, a variety of airlines, good transit to airports.</td>
<td>Air is a viable alternative to auto for long trips: service to LA, SF, other hubs, a variety of airlines, good transit to airports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Assumption</td>
<td>Existing Funding</td>
<td>1/2 cent Transportation Measure</td>
<td>New Development Fee and 1/2 cent Transportation Measure</td>
<td>Existing Funding</td>
<td>New Development Fee and 1/2 cent Transportation Measure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More Public Outreach
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unit</th>
<th>measurement</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>High or low?</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>square miles</td>
<td>Land converted to urban uses</td>
<td>26.65</td>
<td>26.62</td>
<td>26.51</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>lower is better</td>
<td>No difference between scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lane-miles</td>
<td>Lane-miles of congestion in 2030</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>lower is better</td>
<td>C2 is best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition index</td>
<td>Average Pavement Condition in 2030</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>higher is better</td>
<td>C2,D2 are best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accidents</td>
<td>Accidents Reduced in next 25 years</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>2582</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>2583</td>
<td>higher is better</td>
<td>C2,D2 are best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millions of riders / year</td>
<td>Transit Ridership in 2030</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>higher is better</td>
<td>D,D2 -most service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millions of dollars</td>
<td>Funding for bike paths and sidewalks</td>
<td>$ 1.0</td>
<td>$ 6.0</td>
<td>$ 6.0</td>
<td>$ 12.0</td>
<td>$ 12.0</td>
<td>higher is better</td>
<td>D,D2 are best, C, C2 -big improvments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres</td>
<td>Acres of Farmlands directly impacted</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>lower is better</td>
<td>D is best - all impact less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millions of dollars</td>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Cost</td>
<td>$ 8.2</td>
<td>$ 9.9</td>
<td>$ 12.3</td>
<td>$ 6.9</td>
<td>$ 10.9</td>
<td>lower is better</td>
<td>D is best - all impact less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tons per day</td>
<td>Emissions (pollution) in 2030</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td>26.54</td>
<td>26.98</td>
<td>26.68</td>
<td>lower is better</td>
<td>No difference between scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millions of dollars</td>
<td>Total regional cost per scenario</td>
<td>$ 582</td>
<td>$ 855</td>
<td>$1,038</td>
<td>$ 582</td>
<td>$1,010</td>
<td>Depends on perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And More Public Outreach
2004 Regional Transportation Plan
- Merced County -

Adopted
August 19, 2004

Prepared by:
Merced County Association of Governments
369 West 18th Street, Merced, CA 95340 - Phone: 209-723-3153 - Fax: 209-723-0322

The preparation of this report has been financed in part by the State of California Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration and the member agencies of the Merced County Association of Governments.
Results

• RTP ADOPTED
• RTIF ADOPTED
• Measure Plan ADOPTED
• Measure A June 2006
What’s Next?

San Joaquin Blueprint
San Joaquin Valley Regional Blueprint Proposal

Collaboration with the San Joaquin Valley Partnership

SAN JOAQUIN
STANISLAUS
MERCED
MADERA
FRESNO
KINGS
TULARE
KERN

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

Project Location Map
Blueprint Objectives

• Transportation system
• Housing supply
• Supporting infrastructure
• Air quality
• Habitat protection strategy
• Agriculture preservation strategy
• Economic development
Last Friday in Modesto
Merced County Association of Governments