

# AGENDA

## 2022 Measure T Renewal Investment Plan

### Steering Committee

Date: April 28, 2022 / Time: 1:30 - 3:30 P.M. / Place: Zoom Meeting #11

You are strongly encouraged to participate by joining the meeting from your computer, tablet, or smartphone. Public

Participants must register in advance to participate using the following link:

[https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_N07003ATRgSbpmBktK4\\_Sw](https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_N07003ATRgSbpmBktK4_Sw)

*After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar*

Item #	Description	Action/Presenter
I.	Introductions	Informational/Approval – Co-Chairs Poythress and Frazier
II.	Public Comment Related to Items on the Agenda	Informational - Co-Chairs Poythress and Frazier
III.	Measure T Renewal – Staff Modal Allocation Proposal – Allocation to Subprograms	Continued Review and Potential Approval - G. Vivian, VRPA Technologies, P. Taylor & T. McNeil, MCTC/MCTA, E. Moy, Moy & Associates
IV.	Measure T Renewal – Regional Program	Introduction and Review - G. Vivian, VRPA Technologies, P. Taylor, T. McNeil, & D. Stone MCTC/MCTA
V.	Public Engagement Update	Informational – C. Heath & A. Wara-Macapinlac, TBWBH Props & Measures, Dylan Stone, MCTC
a.	Polling Status	
b.	Mailer Status	
c.	Other Outreach Activity Status	
VI.	Next Steps:	
a.	Staff Items	Informational – P. Taylor, MCTA, G. Vivian, VRPA Technologies
b.	Renewal Schedule	Informational – G. Vivian, VRPA & P. Taylor, MCTA
c.	Next Meeting Date – May 5, 2022	Informational - Co-Chairs
VII.	Public Comment Related to Items Not on the Agenda	Informational - Co-Chairs

#### **Important Notice Regarding COVID 19:**

This Steering Committee meeting will take place remotely in accordance with Government Code Section 54953(e) et seq. (AB 361), and Resolution No. 21-15 Amendment No. 7, as adopted by the Madera County Transportation Commission Policy Board on April 20, 2022. The meeting will be conducted via teleconference using the Zoom platform. In the interest of maintaining appropriate social distancing measures, members of the public may participate in the meeting electronically and shall have the right to observe and offer public comment during the meeting.

If you are participating via telephone only, please dial \*9 to raise your hand and use \*6 to unmute yourself once called upon. You can also submit your comments via email to [publiccomment@maderactc.org](mailto:publiccomment@maderactc.org) or by calling 559-675-0721 Ext. 7. Comments will be shared with the Steering Committee and placed into the record at the meeting. Every effort will be made to read comments received during the meeting into the record, but some comments may not be read due to time limitations. Comments received after an agenda item will be made part of the record if received prior to the end of the meeting.

Regarding any disruption that prevents the Steering Committee from broadcasting the meeting to members of the public, then (1) if public access can be restored quickly, the meeting will resume in five (5) minutes to allow re-connection of all members of the Committee and members of the public; or (2) if service cannot be restored quickly, the meeting shall stop, no further action shall be taken on the remaining agenda items and notice of the continued meeting will be provided.



2001 Howard Road, Suite 201  
Madera, CA 93637 / (559) 675-0721  
[www.maderactc.org](http://www.maderactc.org)



# Meeting Minutes

## 2022 Measure T Renewal Investment Plan Steering Committee Meeting #10

Date: April 14, 2022

Time: 1:30 – 3:30 P.M.

Place: Zoom Meeting

*To review the meeting in its entirety, please use the following link:*

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8AOHdUg9Cys&t=21s&ab\\_](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8AOHdUg9Cys&t=21s&ab_)

### IN ATTENDANCE:

**Steering Committee Members:** Madera County Board of Supervisors; Supervisor Brett Frazier (Co-Chair), Robert Poythress, County of Madera (Co-Chair); Geoffrey Wheeler, Active Transportation Advocate; Michael Prandini, Building Industry Association of Fresno and Madera Counties; Michael Navarro, California Department of Transportation Caltrans); Council Member Diana Palmer, City of Chowchilla; Rod Pruett, City of Chowchilla; Jason Rogers, City of Chowchilla; Ellen Bitter, City of Madera; Mayor Santos Garcia, City of Madera; Keith Helmuth, City of Madera; David Huff, City of Madera; Stephanie Nathan, County of Madera; Jared Carter, County of Madera; Matt Treber, County of Madera; Jay Varney, County of Madera; Davinder Mahil, Creekside Farming; Madeline Harris, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability; Leticia Casillas Luquin, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability; Bobby Kahn, Madera County Economic Development Commission (EDC); Patricia Taylor, Madera County Transportation Commission/Madera County Transportation Authority (MCTC/MCTA); Frank Simonis, Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC); Tim Curley, Valley Children’s Hospital; Monte Cox, Madera County; Jose Rodriguez, City of Madera; Arnoldo Rodriguez, City of Madera; David Padilla, Caltrans; Derek Robinson

**Members of the Public:** Andrew Russell, Sirenia Lopez, Amalia Bernardo, Ofelia Abundez

**Madera County Transportation Commission/Madera County Transportation Authority Staff and Consultants:** Patricia Taylor, MCTC/MCTA; Troy McNeil, MCTC/MCTA; Dylan Stone, MCTC/MCTA; Jeff Findley, MCTC/MCTA; Sheila Kingsley, MCTC; Georgiena Vivian, VRPA Technologies, Inc. (VRPA); Rose Willems, VRPA; Richard Lee, VRPA; Dena Graham, VRPA; Maria Hernandez, VRPA; Charles Heath, TBWBH Props & Measures; Alex Wara-Macapinlac, TBWBH Props & Measures; Ellen Moy, Moy & Associates; Tim McLarney, True North Research; Alex Zajdman, Linguistica; Reyna Rodriguez, Linguistica



## **I. Introductions and February 17, 2022 Meeting Minutes**

Co-Chair Robert Poythress welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance and participation. Reyna Rodriguez, Linguistica reviewed the webinar protocols in Spanish and Georgiena Vivian, VRPA, reviewed the available interpretation services and discussed the webinar protocols.

Mr. Poythress asked if anyone had corrections to the meeting minutes for March 17 & March 31.

- Madeline Harris asked that the March 31, 2022 minutes should reflect that Mayor Garcia stated that he wished that there were higher allocations for the active transportation and public transit programs within the allocation alternatives.
- Geoffrey Wheeler also noted that the minutes for March 31, 2022 reflect that the Steering Committee requested additional alternatives and that the request was ignored. The March 31, 2022 meeting minutes should also reflect that the Steering Committee implicitly requested that maintenance be shown as a separate item in the allocation alternatives.

A motion to approve the March 17 & March 31, 2022 meeting minutes was made by Jay Varney, County of Madera and was seconded by Jason Rogers, City of Chowchilla. Mr. Poythress asked if there was anyone who was opposed to the motion. There were none. Motion approved by consensus.

## **II. Public Comment Related to Items on the Agenda**

Georgiena Vivian, VRPA, explained the public comment protocol. Comment received during the item generally included:

- I understand we are going to be looking at some new material today and I requested that slides be available before the meeting so we could review those with community residents and to receive their feedback. It is difficult for us to receive community feedback if we do not have the materials ahead of time.
- Would like specifics on an agenda item that I saw on one of the technical meetings about the RTP/SCS update. The request was referred to MCTC staff.
- I am concerned about street maintenance along certain facilities and also about the mailer that was released. The mailer was not provided in Spanish. Finally, I would like to see a higher percentage allocation in active transportation.

## **III. Measure T Renewal – Staff Modal Allocation Proposal – Allocation to Subprograms**

Ms. Vivian presented an overview of the programs and subprograms. Ms. Vivian mentioned that the committee approved programs referenced in Allocation Alternative 2 at the March 31, 2022 meeting, which provided for 57.5% of the Measure Renewal to the Local Streets and Roads Program (including Maintenance, Other Local Transportation Improvements, and Flexible Subprogram funding), an allocation of 30% to the Regional Program, 4% to the Active Transportation Program, 4% to the Public Transit program, 3% to the Clean and New Technologies Program, and 1.5% to Administration for a total of 100%. She then mentioned that the next step is to allocate the 57.5% included for the Community and Neighborhood Streets and Roads Program to the three subprograms including Maintenance, Local Streets and Roads, and Flexible.

Troy McNeil, MCTC then presented the proposed MT3 annualized allocations to each of the three subprograms under the Community and Neighborhood Program and mentioned that fiscal year 27/28 would be the first year of the renewal measure. He noted that for analytical purposes, he used \$20 million as an estimate of what MCTA would receive during that 1<sup>st</sup> fiscal year considering past receipts. He stated that the subprogram allocations should be large enough to deliver projects in a timely manner. Mr. McNeil then reviewed the 30-year allocation to each of the three subprograms highlighting allocations to the County of Madera and the Cities of Madera and Chowchilla.

- I have brought up on two different meetings that I would like to see that the Clean and New Technology Program not be a competitive program, but that those allocations should be automatically distributed to each jurisdiction, so that communities can take advantage of the funding without having to submit applications to MCTC, and if that comment has been ignored, I would like to know why.
- From MCTC staff's perspective, having it as a competitive program actually gives it more teeth, more ability to deliver projects sooner, and gives MCTA more control to make sure the money is spent in a timely manner.
- Why is the maintenance allocation amount so low when the entire goal of Measure T originally was to fix the roads and bring our cost per square foot or PCI to a 75, which then frees up funding to do other improvements that we would like to do?
- Maintenance is a huge concern to the voters and residents/businesses in Madera County. People want the roads fixed.
- When we look at maps of the city of Madera showing projects that we have done over the last 10 years, we show that a large number of maintenance and other projects has been done. The city intends to keep allocating funding to maintenance to bring the PCI up. This is a goal for the city.
- This allocation breakdown is more than what was being allocated under the current Measure T Program. We are showing an increase from what the current Measure T is doing, which is important and needs to be communicated with the public moving forward.
- It may be a hard sell to the public if we only have 30% of Measure T Renewal funding allocated to maintenance and if we have just half as much going to local road improvements. Those roads will need to be maintained as well. As a result, I would like to advocate for a higher percentage to maintenance and less for local road improvements.
- Keep in mind that the local road improvements do not just include lane widening. Many are bridge improvement projects, gap projects, grade separation projects, and operational improvements including traffic signals, shoulder improvements, roundabouts, passing lanes, and safety improvements.
- The city of Madera has spent over \$19 million for renewable energy projects with 76% of the over \$19 million for solar panels throughout the community; nearly every city facility or a larger number of city facilities now have solar. Some of the other funding went for EV charging stations, including two of them that are free of charge to the public in front of City Hall, and then the remaining funding went to wind or solar streetlights.

- There was a comment made that giving the Clean and New Technology allocation to the local may require them to bank the funds until they have enough funding for a project. I do not believe that is true and think that if MCTA provides money to the jurisdictions, that they will find uses for it. Will there be a penalty if they do not use it?
- We will talk about that issue when we get to the implementing guidelines. The committee has already approved the program allocations and now we are just asking for input on the allocation of 57.5% to the Community and Local Roads Subprograms.
- People want higher percentages for active transportation even though there's other funding sources.
- Can the committee overrule what has already been voted on as per clean technology, etc.?
- The committee can change any of the allocations they want; they are not approved until the board has approved them.
- If we use the allocation method based on population, would that prevent jurisdictions from working together to create some kind of a clean technology project? Yes, we encourage cooperation.
- I would suggest that consideration should be given to lane miles rather than population if we are going to really apply clean technology to improve the environment.

The committee continued discussing aspects of the Clean and New Technologies Program and whether it should be competitive or non-competitive and allocated to the local agencies based on population.

Mayor Santo Garcia made a motion to allocate the clean technology category to the various jurisdictions based on population. The motion was seconded by Arnoldo Rodriguez, City of Madera. Motion passed. Comment received during the item generally included:

- My motion was to spend more allocation money on maintenance to get our PCI to 75.
- Even if we gave all the money to maintenance, it would not be enough to get Madera County to a PCI of 75.
- Maybe we should consider raising the tax to two thirds of a cent instead of a half cent in order to generate the funds because we cannot go backwards. We cannot have our PCI drop each year because we will end up spending not only all the Measure T funding, but other funding as well just to keep the roads from falling apart.
- I agree with the point about allocating more of the percentage to maintenance than to the local road improvements and to the flexible subprogram mostly because we hear consistently from folks that we work with want to see more investments from the measure go to local streets and roads in their communities and fixing potholes.
- In theory, could not all of the sub programs go to the maintenance at the local agencies discretion so an agency could dedicate all of those parts to maintenance if they chose?
- Only the flexible part can be allocated to maintenance or any other program.

- A motion was Geoffrey Wheeler, Frank Simonis, Active Transportation Advocates to allocate 40% to maintenance, 5% to local road improvements and 12.5% to flexible. Frank Simonis, Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) seconded the motion.
- That allocation would significantly reduce funding to local roadway improvements like grade separations, gap projects, etc.

Following additional discussion, it was decided to table the motion and have the local agencies review the allocation alternative and have MCTA staff present their recommended allocations considering local agency needs at the next meeting.

**IV. Measure T Renewal – Regional Project Listing**

The item was tabled.

**V. Public Engagement Update**

The item was tabled.

**VI. Next Steps – The item was tabled.**

**VII. Public Comments Related to Items Not on the Agenda**

There was no further public comment received.