



UPDATED

Business Plan

SEPTEMBER 2009

Financial Program

VOLUME II

*"Decision - Makers
Guide to Improving
the Route 99 Corridor"*



Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	1
List of Figures.....	2
Attachments.....	2
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	3
1.1 Purpose of the Financial Program.....	3
1.2 Financial Partnerships.....	4
1.3 Financial Opportunities and Challenges.....	4
1.4 Legacy Of Partnership To Meet Corridor Objective.....	4
Chapter 2 Status of Business Plan Projects.....	6
2.1 Priority Categories.....	6
2.2 Project Delivery Status.....	6
2.3 Other Improvement Projects.....	11
2.4 Remaining Investment Cost.....	11
Chapter 3 Fund Sources.....	12
3.1 Fund Source Detail.....	12
3.1.1 State Fuel Excise Taxes.....	12
3.1.2 Federal Fuel Excise Taxes.....	12
3.1.3 Sales Tax on Fuel.....	13
3.1.4 Truck Weight Fees.....	13
3.1.5 Roadway Tolls.....	13
3.1.6 Vehicle License Fee Surcharge.....	14
3.1.7 Vehicle Use Mileage Fee.....	15
3.1.8 Local Sales Tax Measures.....	15
3.1.9 New Development Fees.....	15
3.1.10 State and Local General Funds.....	16
3.1.11 Property Donations and Dedications.....	16
3.2 Funding Foundation Levels.....	17
3.2.1 First Level Finance Foundation.....	17
3.2.2 Second Level Finance Foundation.....	19
3.2.3 Third Level Finance Foundation.....	20
3.2.4 Fourth Level Finance Foundation.....	20
Chapter 4 Alternative Funding Approaches.....	22
4.1 Overview.....	22
4.2 Project Funding Prioritization Guiding Principles.....	22
4.3 Full Corridor Approach.....	23
4.4 County by County.....	24
4.5 Collaborative Multi-jurisdictional Segments.....	25
4.6 Fund Source Specific.....	26
Chapter 5 Recommendation.....	28
5.1 Recommended Financial Approach.....	28
Chapter 6 Financial Arrangements.....	29
6.1 Formal Agreements.....	29
6.2 Conceptual Understandings.....	29
Chapter 7 Corridor Annual Financial Review.....	30
7.1 Annual Report.....	30



List of Figures

Figure 1.1	Pre-SB45 Route 99 Widening Projects.....	5
Figure 2.1	Route 99 Programmed Capacity and Interchange Projects Not Yet Advertised.....	7
Figure 2.2	Priority Category 2 Project Listing.....	8
Figure 2.3	Priority Category 3 Project Listing.....	9
Figure 2.4	Priority Category 4 Project Listing.....	10
Figure 2.5	Route 99 Candidate Improvement Projects.....	11
Figure 3.1	Two STIP Funding Programs.....	18
Figure 3.2	STIP Programming History.....	18
Figure 3.3	Current San Joaquin Valley Measure Programs.....	19
Figure 3.4	No. of Projects Trend of Fed. Transp. Act Earmarks.....	21
Figure 3.5	Costs Trend of Fed. Transp. Act Earmarks.....	21
Figure 4.1	Example of Full Corridor Project Funding Approach.....	24
Figure 4.2a	Example of County by County Project Funding Approach - Madera County.....	25
Figure 4.2b	Example of County by County Project Funding Approach - Merced County.....	25
Figure 4.3	Example of Collaborative Multi-jurisdictional Project Funding Approach.....	26
Figure 4.4	Example of Fund Source Specific Project Funding Approach.....	27
Figure 5.1	Example of Recommended Funding Approach.....	28

Attachments

Attachment A:	Sample Memorandum of Understanding.....	31
Attachment B:	Sample Letter of Understanding.....	35



Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Financial Program

State Route 99 is the primary north-south corridor serving the population centers of the San Joaquin Valley. Its safe and efficient operation is vital to the economic well being of the San Joaquin Valley. In recognition of this importance the eight Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) of the San Joaquin Valley and Caltrans Districts 6 and 10 have jointly designated the Route 99 Corridor their top interregional priority corridor for transportation investment.

As a result of joint recognition of the importance of State Route 99 to the San Joaquin Valley Caltrans, in partnership with the eight MPOs and the Great Valley Center, prepared the San Joaquin Valley Route 99 Corridor Master Plan. It was universally endorsed by all eight MPOs in 2005. The Master Plan consists of a Corridor Enhancement Plan Element and a Business Plan Element with a \$6 billion price tag in 2005 dollars.

The Master Plan, Business Plan Element identifies four “Priority Categories” of corridor improvements. These categories are: Priority Category 1 - Freeway Conversion; Priority Category 2 - Capacity Increasing Projects; Priority Category 3 - Major Operational Improvements; Priority Category 4 - New Interchanges. All major improvements are grouped into one of these four priority categories. Major improvements are defined as projects with a construction cost of \$8 million or more. This threshold was established to assure that Business Plan Element focus was toward projects that would contribute to significant corridor improvement. It has been universally understood that projects in a lower category such as Priority Category 3 versus Priority Category 2 are not excluded from consideration of being funded and built even though all of Category 2 projects may not have been fully funded and built.

Although there has been a universally endorsed Route 99 Master Plan Business Plan Element in place since 2005 it is not yet fully implemented. The primary purpose of this Financial Program is to chart the course toward full implementation. In addition the Financial Program serves as a guide to all entities with a role associated with financing transportation improvements in the San Joaquin Valley. In addition, the Financial Program provides intent and guidance to other Route 99 corridor stakeholders such as cities, counties, Chambers of Commerce, Economic Development Corporations, businesses, and the tourism industry.

Financial Program Purpose

The primary purpose of this Financial Program is to chart the course toward full implementation. In addition the Financial Program serves as a guide to everyone with a role associated with financing transportation improvements in the San Joaquin Valley.

About \$2 billion of the original \$6 billion estimate for the initial Master Plan improvements have either been constructed or have attained “fully funded” status. However, with ongoing materials cost increases and annual inflation since 2005 there are still about \$5 billion of unfunded improvements remaining. Of the remaining unfunded balance about half, or \$2.5 billion, is needed to complete the corridor primary objective, which is to achieve a minimum 6 lane freeway throughout the 275 mile San Joaquin Valley corridor. With consideration of current project commitments 64% of the corridor will have met the



facility objective when constructed. This is up from 42% prior to 2005 and results in a 52% increase in miles of Route 99 satisfying the corridor objective.

Although significant progress has been accomplished since the original Business Plan Element was endorsed in 2005 there remains much to do. To fully satisfy the primary objective plus complete the remaining “priority category” project improvements it is now appropriate to prepare and jointly endorse a Financial Program for completion as the foundation to guide collaborative near term and ongoing funding commitments from responsible stakeholders. Only through an endorsed Financial Program, as a guide to individual stakeholders making funding and programming decisions in the most informed manner, can meaningful progress be accomplished to finish its implementation.

1.2 Financial Partnership

No single entity or fund source can accomplish Business Plan completion in a reasonably near term timeframe. This Financial Program presents a series of financial alternative scenarios for Caltrans and other financial stakeholders to consider. Through review and consultation with stakeholders a recommended financial approach has been established.

1.3 Financial Opportunities and Challenges

A Financial Program of this importance offers both opportunities and challenges to all corridor stakeholders. On the opportunities side of the equation a Financial Program establishes the necessary roadmap and guidance for those with financial decision making authority. The net result is that decision makers can make the most informed decisions during deliberations on how they choose to use those funds under their decision authority.

This Financial Program can also provide an opportunity to bring both additional and new funds to the San Joaquin Valley. The \$1.0 billion dedicated to the Route 99 corridor as part of the successful \$19.9 billion Proposition 1B transportation bond initiative is an example. The upcoming Federal Transportation Act, expected in 2010, offers another opportunity to garner additional funds for the Route 99 corridor.

Challenges are many, but manageable with proper foresight, understanding and commitment. All entities with transportation funding decision authority, out of practical necessity, have to consider many competing issues. Of course it is and has been an annual reality that there are insufficient funds available to address all identified transportation needs, even those of highest priority. For example there are numerous east-west corridors sprinkled throughout the eight San Joaquin Valley that are also very important and have historically been under funded. It is also very difficult to make Financial Program commitments that could limit future funding flexibility.

1.4 Legacy Of Partnership To Meet Corridor Objective

As mentioned earlier the Master Plan supports the primary objective to achieve a minimum 6 lane freeway throughout the 275 mile San Joaquin Valley corridor. Much of this has already been accomplished due to a long history of financial decision making partnership between Caltrans and the Metropolitan Planning Organizations within the San Joaquin Valley. Two counties, in particular, have historically demonstrated their commitment to accomplishing this primary objective for decades prior to the establishment of the Business Plan Element in 2005. Both Stanislaus and Kern counties have fully satisfied the minimum of 6 lane freeway objective throughout their county mostly by agreeing to use significant amounts of their “county minimum” State Highway Account funds for this purpose. Of course



this accomplishment came at significant expense to being able to meet other important needs on east-west corridors.

Figure 1.1 Pre-SB-45* Route 99 Widening Projects

County	Rt e	Location	Length	Project Description	Project Cost	Const . Yr
Kern	99	Panama Lane to Ming Ave	4.0 miles	Widen 4Ln to 6 Lane	\$4.4 million	87-88
Kern	99	Herring Rd to Panama Lane	8.2.miles	Widen 4 Ln to 6 Ln Fwy	\$10.4 million	92-93
Kern	99	Ming Ave to SR 204	4.9 miles	Widen 6 Ln to 8 Ln Fwy	\$17.2 million	93-94
Kern	99	Sherwood to Tulare Co. Line	8.2 miles	Widen 4 Ln to 6 Ln Fwy	\$16.9 million	97-98
Fresno	99	El Dorado St OC to Ashlan Ave.	6.0 miles	Widen 4 Ln to 6 Ln Fwy	\$6.3 million	87-88
Fresno	99	Jensen Ave. to Ventura St.	2.0 miles	Add NB Auxiliary Ln	\$2.9 million	98-99
Merced	99	Dwight Way to August Ave. (Livingston Bypass)		4 Ln Expwy to 4 Ln Fwy on new alignment	\$32.9 million	94-95
Merced	99	Merced River Br to South Turlock OC?	4.0 miles	4 Ln Expwy to 4 Ln Fwy	\$26.3 million	98-99
Stanislaus	99	Near Taylor Rd to 2.2 mi S of Service Rd OC	3.5 miles	4 Ln Expwy to 4 Ln Fwy	\$6.5 million	83-84
Stanislaus	99	Near Taylor Rd to Service Rd OC (Keyes Fwy)	5.0 miles	Widen 4 Ln Fwy to 6 Ln Fwy	\$12.5 million	93-94
San Joaquin	99	Stanislaus CL to Rte. 120	6.0 miles	Widen 4 Ln Fwy to 6 Ln Fwy	Not Available	Not Avail.
San Joaquin	99	Hammer Lane to Lodi	8.0 miles	Widen 4 Ln Fwy to 6 Ln Fwy	Not Available	Not Avail.

*Senate Bill 45 (1998) established revised State Highway Account project recommendation authority between Caltrans and Metropolitan Planning Organizations.



Chapter 2 Status Of Current Business Plan Projects

2.1 Priority Categories

The Master Plan - Business Plan Element identifies four “Priority Categories” of corridor improvements. These categories are: Priority Category 1 - Freeway Conversion; Priority Category 2 – Capacity Increasing Projects; Priority Category 3 – Major Operational Improvements; Priority Category 4 – New Interchanges. **All Priority Category 1 projects have now either been constructed or have full funding commitments.** Therefore, there are no remaining unfunded Priority Category 1 projects. It has been universally understood that projects in a lower category such as Priority Category 3 versus Priority Category 2 are not excluded from being funded and built even though all of Category 2 projects may not have been fully funded.

“It has been universally understood that projects in a lower category such as Priority Category 3 versus Priority Category 2 are not excluded from being funded and built even though all of Category 2 projects may not have been fully funded.”

2.2 Project Delivery Status

Progress has occurred over the past 3 years. In the original 2005 Route 99 Business Plan there were 13 programmed projects listed. Currently, there are 16 either fully programmed or partially programmed projects. In addition, four of those projects originally listed as programmed have now been constructed. These 20 projects are shown in Figure 2.1.

In Priority Category 2, there currently are 21 projects. Of those 21 projects 12 are to widen the existing freeway from 4 to 6 lanes and 9 projects to widen from 6 to 8 lanes. All 12 of the projects to widen from 4 to 6 lanes remain unfunded at an estimated cost of \$1.5 billion in 2007 dollars. All 8 of the projects to widen from 6 to 8 lanes also remain unfunded and are estimated to cost of about \$900 million in 2007 dollars. These projects are listed in Figure 2.2.

In addition there are 26 projects in Priority Category 3 all of which remain unfunded at an estimated cost of about \$1.8 billion. There are 3 Priority Category 4 projects that all remain unfunded. The current cost estimate to complete these remaining 50 projects is near \$5 billion. This Financial Program is directed toward meeting this tremendous financial challenge.

Specific project listings by Priority Category are included in Figures 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4.



Figure 2.1 Route 99 Programmed Capacity and Interchange Projects Not Yet Advertised

MAP PROJ. NUMBER	COUNTY	ROUTE 99 POSTMILE	EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION	LOCATION	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ADVERTISE SCHEDULE	R/W AND CONSTRUCTION CAPITAL COSTS (X \$1,000)	SUPPORT COSTS (\$1,000)	TOTAL COSTS PER PROJECT (X \$1,000)	REGIONAL PRIORITY CATEGORY
2	Kern	16.0/19.2	06-009300	At Hosking Rd	Hosking Rd Interchange	Construct New Interchange	2010	\$36,000	\$1,800	\$38,000	4
8	Kern	R30.5/R31.1	05-433504	At 7th Standard Rd Interchange	7th Standard Road Widening	Modify Interchange	Constructed	\$17,200	\$1,700	\$18,900	3
12	Tulare	31.3/32.6	06-332200	At Carmel Ave	Carmel Ave Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange	2010	\$54,500	\$11,000	\$65,500	3
14	Tulare	36.6/41.3	06-360200	Prosperity Ave to North Coast Overhead	Tulare to Goshen 6-Lane	Widen from 4F to 6F	2016	\$161,000	\$28,400	\$209,400	2
15	Tulare	39.6/41.3	06-471500	In Goshen at Betty Drive	Betty Drive Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange	2014	\$44,000	\$11,200	\$55,200	3
16	Tulare/Fresno	41.3/53.9, 0.0/1.0	06-324501	N of Goshen to N of Sierra Ave	Goshen to Kingsburg 6-Lane	Widen from 4F and 5F to 6F	2010	\$151,800	\$21,000	\$172,800	2
25a	Fresno	26.7/30.6	06-442510	From Ashland Overhead to 2 Miles N of Sigurdson Ave Overcrossing	North Fresno 6-Lane	Widen from 4F to 6F	2010	\$20,000	\$6,000	\$26,000	2
25b	Fresno	30.3/31.6, 0.0/1.6	06-442520	Grandland to Ave 7 I/C	Island Park 6-Lane	Widen from 4F to 6F	2012	\$55,000	\$11,000	\$66,000	2
29	Madera	R7.1/R7.9	06-471000	At Avenue 12	Avenue 12 Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange	2012	\$57,000	\$11,000	\$68,000	3
30	Madera	10.1/10.4	06-407214	At Route 145	Route 145 Widening at SR99	Modify Interchange	2008	\$9,100	\$1,800	\$7,900	3
35	Madera	16.5/22.8	06-293304	Ave 21 to the Rte 99/152 Separation Interchange	Fairmead Freeway and Interchange	Widen 4E to 6F with Interchange at 22	Constructed	\$62,000	\$9,000	\$71,000	1
39	Merced	0.0/4.6	10-415801	Madera County Line to Buchanan Hollow Rd.	Plainsburg RD Freeway	Widen from 4E to 6F on 8 Lane R/W Alignment	2010	\$101,200	\$18,000	\$119,200	1
40	Merced	4.6/10.5	10-415701	Buchanan Hollow Road to 0.5 Km N of McHenry Rd	Abolade Drive Freeway	Widen from 4E to 6F on 8 Lane R/W Alignment	2010	\$52,200	\$25,000	\$77,200	1
44	Merced	23.8/28.5	10-414814	0.5 mi. N. of Alwater, OH to 0.5 mi. S of Aren Way	Alwater Freeway	Widen from 4E to 6F on 8 Lane R/W Alignment	Constructed	\$58,000	\$12,100	\$70,100	1
45	Merced	28.8/R37.3	10-001200	S of Hammet Ave Corresponding to Standish/Merced Central Line	Merced Median Widening	Widen from 4F to 6F	2014	\$67,000	\$13,000	\$80,000	2
48	Stanislaus	9.7/10.9	10-1A6900	0.5 Km S to 1.0 Km N. of Mitchell Rd	Mitchell Rd/ Service Rd Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange	2016	\$60,000	\$12,000	\$72,000	3
51	Stanislaus	R11.9	10-2A7704	City of Ceres at Whitmore Ave. Overcrossing	Rte 99/Whitmore Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange	Constructed	\$16,100	\$14,200	\$32,300	3
55	Stanislaus	R16.2/R17.0	10-403501	Rte 132 to Kansas Ave	Route 132 West Expressway	Reconstruct Interchange	2013	\$31,000	\$13,400	\$44,400	3
59	Stanislaus	21.0/22.4	10-472100	At Pelandale Ave	Pelandale Interchange	Modify Interchange	2011	\$78,000	\$3,700	\$81,700	3
62	San Joaquin	5.3/15.0	10-069100	SR 120 West to Arch Road	Menicea 6-Lane	Widen from 4F to 6F	2012	\$225,300	\$24,700	\$250,000	2
63	San Joaquin	15.0/18.8	10-3A1001	0.4 Mile N of Arch Rd to Rte 4 West	South Stockton 6-Lane	Widen from 4F to 6F	2012	\$231,000	\$19,500	\$250,500	2
64	San Joaquin	16.4/17.5	10-3A1001	Mariposa Rd and Farmington Rd	Combined into Proj. #63	Reconstruct and Combine Interchanges	2012	NA	NA	NA	3
65	San Joaquin	23.5/24.5	10-011400	At Morada Lane	Morada 69 Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange	2012	\$25,000	\$2,800	\$27,800	3
66	San Joaquin	24.9/25.9	10-011300	At Eight Mile Rd	Eight Mile 69 Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange	2012	\$34,200	\$10,000	\$44,200	3

Note: Data in this table should not be used to program projects.

PROGRAMMED PROJECTS TOTAL COSTS

\$2,046,900

Legend:

Shaded = Fully Funded
Constructed



Figure 2.2 Priority Category 2 Project Listing

MAP PROJECT NUMBER	COUNTY	ROUTE 99 POSTMILE	EXPEND. AUTHORIZ.	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	CONSTRUCT. CAPITAL COST X \$1,000	RW CAPITAL COST X \$1,000	SUPPORT COST X \$1,000	TOTAL COSTS PER PROJECT X \$1,000	DELIVERY STATUS	RTP STATUS	REGIONAL PRIORITY CATEGORY	August 25, 2009	
													(Capital Costs Greater than \$8 million)	
1a	Kern	13.4/17.0		Bear Mountain Blvd to SR 119	Widen from 6F to 8F	\$40,000	\$0	\$12,000	\$52,000			2		
1b	Kern	17.0/22.1	06-0G630K	SR 119 to Wilson Rd	Widen from 6F to 8F	\$40,000	\$8,000	\$10,000	\$58,000	PSR in Prep	In RTP	2		
7	Tulare	0.0/16.0		Kern Co Line to South of Tipton	Widen from 4F to 6F	\$149,000	\$1,000	\$45,000	\$195,000		In RTP	2		
8	Tulare	16.0/25.5		South of Tipton to Avenue 200	Widen from 4F to 6F	\$105,000	\$1,000	\$31,500	\$137,500		In RTP	2		
11	Tulare	25.4/30.5	06-48950K	Avenue 200 to Prosperity Ave	Widen from 4F to 6F	\$124,000	\$47,000	\$32,000	\$203,000	3/18/09	In RTP	2		
19	Fresno	15.8/19.5		Central Ave to Jensen Ave	Widen from 6F to 8F	\$36,000	\$0	\$11,100	\$47,100		In RTP	2		
21	Fresno	18.5/26.6		Jensen Ave to Ashlan Ave	Widen from 6F to 8F	\$165,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$215,000	PSR Expired	In RTP	2		
28	Madera	1.7/7.5	06-0H220K	Avenue 7 to Avenue 12	Widen from 4F to 6F	\$46,000	\$16,000	\$19,400	\$81,400	3/1/08	In RTP	2		
32	Madera	7.5/12.8	06-47090K	Avenue 12 to Avenue 16	Widen from 4F to 6F	\$74,000	\$7,500	\$36,300	\$117,800	Inactive PSR	In RTP	2		
34a	Madera	12.8/20.5		Avenue 16 to Avenue 21 1/2	Widen from 4F to 6F	\$66,200	\$7,000	\$17,100	\$90,300		In RTP	2		
38	Madera	22.5/29.4		SR 152 Interchange to Merced Co Line	Widen from 4F to 6F	\$89,200	\$1,700	\$21,400	\$92,300		In RTP	2		
41	Merced	12.7/19.2	10-0U230K	S of Childs Ave to Weber Canal	Widen from 4F to 6F	\$120,000	\$20,000	\$28,000	\$168,000	Inactive PSR		2		
42	Merced	17.6/21.3		Black Rascal Creek to East Atwater OH	Widen from 4F to 6F	\$90,000	\$30,000	\$20,000	\$140,000			2		
43	Merced	20.3/23.8	10-0Q060K	Weber Canal to West Atwater OH	Widen from 4F to 6F	\$60,000	\$5,000	\$14,000	\$79,000	PSR in Prep		2		
49	Stanislaus	R10.9/R13.2	10-0E560K	Mitchell Road to Hatch Road	Widen from 6F to 8F	\$105,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$155,000	Inactive PSR		2		
52	Stanislaus	R13.2/R15.1	10-0E560K	Hatch Road to Tuolumne Blvd	Widen from 6F to 8F	\$65,000	\$0	\$20,000	\$85,000	Inactive PSR		2		
54	Stanislaus	R15.1/R16.8	10-0E560K	Tuolumne Blvd to Kansas Avenue	Widen from 6F to 8F	\$65,000	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$100,000	Inactive PSR		2		
56	Stanislaus	R16.8/R18.5	10-0E560K	Kansas Avenue to Carpenter Road	Widen from 6F to 8F	\$35,000	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$60,000	Inactive PSR		2		
59	Stanislaus	R18.5/R24.7	10-0E560K	Carpenter Road to San Joaquin County Line	Widen from 6F to 8F	\$65,000	\$0	\$18,000	\$73,000	Inactive PSR		2		
67	San Joaquin	28.3/38.8		Harney Road to Sacramento County Line	Widen from 4F to 6F	\$140,000	\$0	\$40,000	\$180,000			2		
									TOTAL				\$2,329,400	

Note: Data in this table should not be used to program projects.



Figure 2.3 Priority Category 3 Project Listing

MAP PROJECT NUMBER	COUNTY	ROUTE 99 POSTMILE	EXPEND. AUTHORIZ.	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	CONSTRUCT. CAPITAL COST X \$1,000	RW CAPITAL COST X \$1,000	SUPPORT COST X \$1,000	TOTAL COSTS PER PROJECT X \$1,000	DELIVERY STATUS	RTP STATUS	REGIONAL PRIORITY CATEGORY	August 25, 2009	
													(Capital Costs Greater than \$8 million)	
3	Kern	22.7/23.2	06-46011K	Ming Ave to SR58	Construct Auxiliary Lane	\$19,000	\$1,100	\$4,300	\$24,400	10/18/05	In RTP	3		
4	Kern	23.9/24.6	06-46012K	California Ave to SR58	Construct Auxiliary Lane	\$21,800	\$2,200	\$4,800	\$28,800	10/6/05	In RTP	3		
5	Kern	27.8/28.1	06-49710K	Olive Dr. Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange	\$36,000	\$4,700	\$10,800	\$51,500	Inactive	In RTP	3		
10	Tulare	27.6/28.0	06-33990K	Paige Ave Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange	\$39,000	\$6,000	\$10,000	\$54,000		In RTP	3		
13	Tulare	36.1/36.8	06-48740K	Caldwell Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange	\$25,000	\$4,500	\$7,300	\$36,800	PSR Expired	In RTP	3		
17	Fresno	6.5	06-0H410K	Floral Rd/SR 43 Interchange	Replace bridge structure and Floral Rd	\$10,000	\$0	\$3,000	\$13,000	Inactive	In RTP	3		
19	Fresno	15.8		Central Ave/Chestnut Ave Interchange	Interchange Improvements	\$42,000	\$20,000	\$12,600	\$74,600		In RTP	3		
20	Fresno	16.7/17.5	06-0H240K	Cedar Ave/North Ave Interchange	Interchange Improvements	\$50,000	\$18,000	\$14,700	\$82,700	PSR in Prep	In RTP	3		
22	Fresno	20.3		Ventura Ave Interchange	Interchange Improvements	\$42,000	\$20,000	\$12,600	\$74,600		In RTP	3		
23	Fresno	20.7/24.4	06-39210K	Fresno St to Clinton Ave	Add NB and SB auxiliary lanes	\$37,000	\$69,000	\$19,000	\$125,000	PSR Expired	In RTP	3		
24	Fresno	20.5/21	N/A	Toullume St to Stanislaus St	Interchange Improvements	\$10,000	\$0	\$3,000	\$13,000		In RTP	3		
26	Fresno	27.3/28.3	06-442700	Shaw Ave Interchange	Interchange Improvements	\$29,000	\$25,000	\$6,700	\$62,700	PSR Expired	In RTP	3		
31	Madera	9.7/10.7		Route 99/145	Reconstruct Interchange	\$32,000	\$7,200	\$7,500	\$46,700		In RTP	3		
34b	Madera	13.8/14.5	06-0H330K	Avenue 17	Modify Interchange	\$56,000	\$3,000	\$15,000	\$74,000		In RTP	3		
36	Madera	21.7/23.7		SR 152 Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange and rail crossing	\$69,400	\$3,200	\$18,200	\$90,800		In RTP	3		
37	Madera	26.3/26.8	06-0C920K	Route 99/233	Reconstruct Interchange	\$36,000	\$2,900	\$7,000	\$45,900	PSR in Prep	In RTP	3		
46	Stanislaus	R1.4		SR99 @ SR165 (Lander Ave)	Modify Interchange	\$35,000	\$5,000	\$12,000	\$52,000	?		3		
47	Stanislaus	R3.2/R4.0	10-0F410K	West Main Street	Reconstruct Interchange	\$12,000	\$5,000	\$7,000	\$24,000	2/1/06		3		
50	Stanislaus	R11.3	10-0E560K	Pine Street	Reconstruct Interchange	\$50,000	\$25,000	\$15,000	\$90,000	Inactive		3		
53	Stanislaus	R14.9/R15.6	10-0H770K	SR99 @ SR132 to SR132 East	New Freeway to Freeway Interchange	\$70,000	\$6,000	\$20,000	\$96,000	Inactive		3		
57	Stanislaus	R19.9		SR99 @ Standiford	Modify Interchange	\$75,000	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$105,000			3		
60	Stanislaus	R21.9/R23.2	10-0L330K	Kierman Avenue/SR219	Reconstruct Interchange	\$60,000	\$10,000	\$11,000	\$81,000	6/4/09		3		
61	Stanislaus	R23.8/R24.8	10-0L320K	Hammett Road	Reconstruct Interchange	\$70,000	\$3,000	\$20,000	\$93,000	PSR in Prep		3		
TOTAL													1,439,500	

Note: Data in this table should not be used to program projects.



Figure 2.4 Priority Category 4 Project Listing

MAP PROJECT NUMBER	COUNTY	ROUTE 99 POSTMILE	EXPEND. AUTHORIZ.	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	CONSTRUCT. CAPITAL COST X \$1,000	RW CAPITAL COST X \$1,000	SUPPORT COST X \$1,000	TOTAL COSTS PER PROJECT X \$1,000	August 25, 2009		
										DELIVERY STATUS	RTP STATUS	REGIONAL PRIORITY CATEGORY
9	Tulare	25.4/27.6	06-43040K	at Commercial Avenue at Agri-Center	Construct New Interchange	36,000	3,000	5,000	\$44,000	Inactive	In RTP	4
27	Fresno	28.1/30.9	06-0H360K	at Veteran's Blvd	Construct New Interchange	55,000	18,000	17,000	\$90,000	PSR In Prep	In RTP	4
33	Merced	R12.3/R14.3	06-48820K	at Ellis Avenue	Construct New Interchange	46,000	9,000	20,000	\$75,000	PSR Expired		4
TOTAL									\$209,000			

Note: Data in this table should not be used to program projects.



2.3 Other Improvement Projects

Since the original Business Plan was endorsed, in December 2005, additional candidate improvement projects have been identified. It is appropriate that these improvements be identified for consideration for addition to the Business Plan. These and other projects could be added to the appropriate Priority Category listing of projects upon mutual agreement among Caltrans and Metropolitan Planning Organizations in the San Joaquin Valley.

Figure 2.5 Route 99 Candidate Improvement Projects

CO	Begin PM	End PM	From	To	Project Description	Proj. Cost (\$1000s)	Prior Cat.	RTP Status	Deliv. Status
Ker	27.0	27.1	Hagemen Rd	SR 204	Overcrossing	\$60,300	3	In RTP	Prep. PSR
Ker	22.7	24.6	SR 58 South	Centennial Corridor	½ Fwy to Fwy Interchange	\$150,000	4	In RTP	Prep. PSR
Ker	27.0	27.8	SR 204	Olive Dr.	Const. NB Aux Ln	\$2,000	3	In RTP	Prep. PSR
Ker	27.0	27.8	SR 204	Olive Dr.	Const. SB Aux Ln	\$3,000	3	In RTP	Prep. PSR
Ker	27.0	31.1	SR 204	7 th Std Rd	6F to 8F	\$101,500	2	Out	Prep. PSR
Ker	48.4	48.9	Hanawalt Rd.		New I/C Hanwalt Align	\$60,300	4	Out	PSR Inact.
Ker	54.4		Woolomes Ave		Modify I/C	\$3,750	3	Out	Prep. PSR
Fre	14.7		American Ave.		Modify I/C	\$26,800	3	In RTP	Prep. PSR
Mad	10.7	11.2	4 th St		Modify I/C	\$11,000	3	In RTP	Prep. PSR
Mad	13.5	15.0	17 th Ave		Modify I/C	TBD	3	Out	Inactive

2.4 Remaining Investment Cost

Over the past three years fifteen of the original 67 Business Plan projects have been either constructed, are in construction or are fully funded. Since three projects have been split into two segments each there are now 70 total projects. The funding behind these fifteen projects amounts to \$1.4 billion. This is a tribute to the strong partnership among San Joaquin Valley transportation officials. With the passage of Proposition 1B in 2006 over \$800 million is dedicated to the Route 99 corridor in the San Joaquin Valley. These bond monies represented a strong catalyst to generate financial partnerships that resulted in fully funding seven Business Plan projects at a total cost of \$1.1 billion.

While there has been significant progress there remain 55 projects that are in various stages of funding status. There are 5 projects that have partial funding committed but 50 that have no dedicated funds. When considering recent materials cost increases and annual inflation increases the remaining financial obligation is about \$4.9 billion to complete the Business Plan. There will be difficult decisions to be made. This Financial Program is designed to help transportation decision makers make the most informed decisions when they make these tough transportation funding choices.



Chapter 3 Fund Sources

3.1 Fund Source Detail

Numerous potential fund sources are available for possible Route 99 project funding. Some fund sources have a higher likelihood of being available than others. This Financial Program identifies a group of fund sources as candidates that can be considered toward alternative funding scenarios and project financial agreements.

“This Financial Program identifies a group of fund sources as candidates that can be considered toward alternative funding scenarios and project financial agreements.”

Bonds are not identified as a fund source because bonding is a form of “debt financing” that advances the availability of funds but must still be retired through dedicated one or more of the ongoing the fund sources listed below. Similarly, innovative financing techniques such as advance construction, tapered non-federal match, flexible non-federal match, and credit assistance are all fund management techniques that must have one or more committed fund resource available for project improvements.

Transportation funds can be categorized into traditional and non-traditional sources.

Traditional transportation fund sources:

- State Fuel Excise Taxes (*State Highway Account*)
- Federal Fuel Excise Taxes (*Federal Highway Trust Fund then to State Highway Account*)
- Sales Taxes on Fuel (*Transportation Investment Fund/Public Transportation Account*)
- Truck Weight Fees (*State Highway Account*)
- Roadway Tolls/HOT Lanes (*Dedicated to Specified Routes or Corridors*)
- Local Sales Tax Measures (*Expenditure Plan Specified Projects*)
 - Please refer to Section 3.2 – Second Level Funding Foundation discussion for specific details.
- Development Mitigation Fees (*Conditions of Approval Specified Uses*)
- State and Local General Funds (*Budget Authority*)

Non-traditional transportation fund sources:

- Corridor Wide Development Mitigation Fee Program (*Total Corridor JPA Account*)
- Vehicle License Fee Surcharge (*State Controller*)
- Vehicle Mileage User Fee (*State Controller*)
- Donations (*Private Sector*)

3.1.1 State Fuel Excise Taxes

This is the primary State generated transportation fund source for transportation improvements. Currently 18.0 cents per gallon of gasoline and diesel sold is generated with 11.4 cents going into the State Highway Account and 6.46 cents per gallon going to cities and counties. Over \$2 billion per year are generated from State fuel excise taxes.

Please refer to Section 3.2 – First Level Funding Foundation discussion for specific details.

3.1.2 Federal Fuel Excise Taxes

This is the primary federal transportation fund source for road and highway improvements nationwide. Currently 18.4 cents per gallon of gasoline and 24.4 cents per gallon of diesel fuel goes into the Federal Highway Trust Fund. These funds are typically distributed to states by formula or grants, with California’s apportionment typically over \$3 billion per year.

