

# **Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) Alternatives for Consideration by the Merced County Association of Governments Governing Board January 2018**

This document contains a list of options for how to proceed regarding the RTIF. The MCAG Governing Board has considerable discretion regarding the RTIF, however, several options require action by individual jurisdictions for implementation.

## **Option 1: Status quo**

The Board could act at any time to allocate existing funds to eligible projects. As the 2016 study was not fully implemented, projects would need to be selected from the approved 2008 list. If projects from the 2016 study were desired, each of the seven jurisdictions would need to adopt the 2016 study. The continued collection of RTIF by selected jurisdictions is up to the jurisdictions.

## **Option 2: Re-commitment to RTIF and adopt the 2016 study**

All jurisdictions approve the 2016 study and those jurisdictions which have suspended collections resume doing so. Current and future funds would be available throughout the county for projects on the 2016 list at the discretion of the Board. A new study could be conducted in the future as an update to the 2016 study as needed.

## **Option 3: Termination of the RTIF and distribution of available funds by the Board**

Without all jurisdictions participating, all jurisdictions cease collecting RTIF. While the RTIF implementation could terminate with withdrawal of jurisdictions, that would render any jurisdiction which withdrew ineligible for funding. Rescission of the 2005 implementation agreement by all jurisdictions would terminate the RTIF and leave all jurisdictions eligible to receive some of the remaining available RTIF funds. Under this option there are many possibilities for the distribution and use of funds.

- **Option 3A: Allocation of funds to eligible projects**

Like Option 1, the Board could act to allocate existing funds to eligible projects. As the 2016 study was not fully implemented, projects would need to be selected from the approved 2008 list. If projects from the 2016 study were desired, each of the seven jurisdictions would need to adopt the 2016 study.

- **Option 3B: Allocation of funds to east and west regions**

While final authority remains with the Board, the Board could elect to allocate the remaining funds to the east and west sides of the county as geographically defined in the Measure V Transportation Expenditure Plan. The available funding could then be

12/21/17  
273

considered by the Measure V Eastside and Westside Regional Projects Committees for recommendations to be made to the full board. Projects would need to be selected from the 2008 list unless all jurisdictions adopt the 2016 study.

- **Option 3B-1: Allocate funds by Measure V formula**  
Divide the funds between the east and west based only on the Measure V method (50% by percentage of population and 50% by percentage of road mileage)
- **Option 3B-2: Allocate funds by contribution of jurisdiction**  
Divide the funds between the east and west based on the contributions by individual jurisdictions. Amount of contributions by each city could be used to determine city-related contributions for each side of the county. The County's portion of contribution would still need to be split between the east and west regions. The allocation of the County's portion could be done by the Measure V formula or another method.
- **Option 3B-3: Allocate funds by other considerations**  
Funds could be allocated using other considerations including continued collection of funds, previous use of funds, or any other applicable considerations.
- **Option 3C: Allocate remaining funds to all jurisdictions based on contributions**  
Under this option, the funds would be allocated to all seven jurisdictions based on the amount of funds each contributed to the RTIF over the entire length of the program. This would account for jurisdictions which did and did not continue to collect RTIF funds. As a majority of all funds collected have already been expended, each jurisdiction would receive a pro-rated amount of the remaining funds. An estimated \$4.9 million is available of the total net revenue of \$14.2 million from the life of the program. That means that each jurisdiction would receive about 34.5 percent of the funds which were contributed. The Board has the ability to allocate funds to eligible projects, which is currently the 2008 list. The 2016 study would need to be adopted by all jurisdictions to make the 2016 projects available.

While the Board could allocate funds to each jurisdiction in this manner, the funds could only be used for eligible projects. This could result in some jurisdictions receiving amounts of funds that would not be meaningful compared to the costs of eligible projects. Options would need to be pursued by jurisdictions and the Board to ensure that final allocations would be made to jurisdictions in amounts that could be utilized effectively.

# Quarterly Reporting

Date Updated: 10/23/2017

TABLE 1

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES (RTIF) COLLECTED BY JURISDICTION FOR FY 2017-2018					
JURISDICTION	1 <sup>ST</sup> QTR	2 <sup>ND</sup> QTR	3 <sup>RD</sup> QTR	4 <sup>TH</sup> QTR	TOTAL
Alwater	41,912.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	41,912.26
Dos Palos					0.00
Gustine					0.00
Livingston					0.00
Los Banos Note 1					0.00
Merced City			0.00	0.00	0.00
Merced County	87,439.30		0.00	0.00	87,439.30
Interest Earnings	12,125.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,125.94
Total	141,477.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	141,477.50

TABLE 2

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES (RTIF) COLLECTED BY JURISDICTION TO-DATE SEPTEMBER 2017*										
JURISDICTION	TOTAL	FY 2017-18	FY 2016-17	FY 2015-16	FY 2014-15	FY 2013-14	FY 2012-13	FY 2011-12	FY 2010-11	
Alwater	1,210,950.17	41,912.26	241,544.08	348,808.13	237,695.01	88,365.04	33,663.76	72,258.88	58,832.41	
Dos Palos	109,527.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Cash Balance in Fund @ 9/30/2017	4,711,441.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	18,641.70	0.00	0.00	
Livingston	117,251.00	0.00	0.00	117,251.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Los Banos	1,776,781.73	0.00	1,375.00	5,289.84	0.00	28,189.99	3,115.00	41,203.34	58,308.90	
Merced City	5,181,108.72	0.00	0.00	314,543.48	385,162.34	161,796.29	233,879.12	316,747.97	100,137.23	
Merced County	5,143,446.13	87,439.30	460,714.36	440,973.64	303,784.59	499,886.80	484,556.55	304,487.63	282,524.22	
Total Jurisdictions	18,253,515.90	129,351.56	703,634.05	1,224,674.09	936,841.84	779,250.12	773,856.13	734,397.80	480,602.78	
Interest Earnings	718,826.37	12,125.94	40,729.42	20,304.37	14,102.92	11,481.71	22,364.35	35,024.26	57,147.27	
Total Collections	18,973,341.27	141,477.50	744,363.47	1,244,978.46	950,744.86	780,731.83	796,220.48	769,722.06	537,750.03	
Refunds	-200,895.08	0.00	-16,120.10	-1,375.00	0.00	0.00	-42,436.94	-20,388.17	0.00	
Total Net	18,772,346.19	141,477.50	728,243.37	1,243,603.46	950,744.86	780,731.83	753,783.54	749,333.89	537,750.03	

## REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE PROJECT LISTS

### 2008 RTIF Study Project List (Adopted)

Project Location	Project Description	Cost
Bellevue Road	connection to 99 - from new interchange to Atwater	\$5,000,000
Mission Avenue Improvements	from 59 to 99 (not adding lanes)	\$8,400,000
Hwy 59 north realignment	"Merced-Atwater Highway" - re-align from 99 to Bellevue with new 99 Interchange	\$214,000,000
Hwy 59 Mission to Childs	widen to 4 lanes from Mission Ave. to Childs Ave.	\$5,000,000
Hwy 59 - 152 to Mission	widen to 4 lanes from SR 152 to Mission Ave.	\$50,000,000
Hwy 140 Brady Overhead	widen to 4/5 lanes - from Parsons to Santa Fe Ave.	\$48,000,000
Hwy 140 to Campus Parkway	widen to 4/5 lanes - from Santa Fe Ave. to Campus Parkway	\$13,500,000
Hwy 140/33 Gustine Truck Route	Bypass	\$5,000,000
Hwy 152 Los Banos Bypass		\$497,000,000
Hwy 165 North of Hilmar	widen to 4/5 lanes - from Hilmar to Stanislaus County or alternate project to reduce traffic on SR 165 through Hilmar	\$43,000,000
Dos Palos Road Improvements		\$5,000,000
Winton Parkway	Interchange improvements and widening (Livingston)	\$15,000,000
Campus Parkway	From SR 99 to Yosemite Ave.	\$63,000,000
TOTAL		\$971,900,000

### 2016 RTIF Study Project List (Not Adopted as of Dec 2017)

Project	Project Description	Cost
Atwater-Merced Expressway - Phase 1b	Construct two-lane extension from Green Sands to Santa Fe	\$62,200,000
Campus Parkway from Childs Avenue to north of SR 140	Construct Phase 2 of four-lane divided expressway	\$30,524,000
Campus Parkway from north of SR 140 to Yosemite Avenue	Construct Phase 3 of four-lane divided expressway	\$55,000,000
E. Mission Avenue from SR 59 to west of Henry Street in south Merced	Construct two-lane roadway	\$4,911,600
Bellevue Road from Vine Avenue to Orchard Park near Dole plant.	Construct two-lane roadway	\$2,206,240
Hammatt Avenue at SR 99 in Livingston	Construct traffic signals & roadway improvements at interchange	\$1,674,400
Lander Avenue (SR 165) from American Avenue to August Avenue	Construct center two way left turn lane for 0.4 miles	\$785,900
SR 33 at SR 140 in Gustine	Construct a roundabout	\$2,300,000
SR 59 from Merced to SR 152	Construct two sets of passing lanes	\$2,158,000
SR 33 (Elgin Avenue) from Valeria Street to Christian Street in Dos Palos	Construct four-lane roadway	\$5,000,000
Los Banos improvement project	Construct RTIF project, to replace Los Banos Bypass	\$50,000,000
TOTAL		\$216,760,140

12/21/18

277