California Transportation Commission

INVENTORY OF TEN-YEAR FUNDING NEEDS FOR CALIFORNIA'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 8 (Burton, 1999)

May 5, 1999

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Edward B. Sylvester, Chairman
Dana W. Reed, Vice Chairman
Jeremiah F. Hallisey
James W. Kellogg
Roger A. Kozberg
Esteban E. Torres
Robert A. Wolf

COMMISSION STAFF

Robert I. Remen, Executive Director
Pete Hathaway, Chief Deputy Director
David Brewer, Deputy Director for Highway & Programming
Robert Chung, Deputy Director for Transit
Charles C. Oldham, Deputy Director for Policy & Planning
Rick Gumz, Program Manager
Patti Lowry, Executive Assistant
Bruce Cox, Clerical Support
Carol Peterson, Clerical Support
Terri Rosnow, Clerical Support

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

INVENTORY OF TEN-YEAR FUNDING NEEDS FOR CALIFORNIA'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

May 5, 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND - SUMMARY OF SENATE RESOLUTION 8 (BURTON, 1999)

II. OVERVIEW OF EFFORT IN RESPONSE TO SR 8

INVENTORY OF TEN-YEAR FUNDING NEEDS FOR CALIFORNIA'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

Background

Senate Resolution 8 (Burton, 1999) requested the California Transportation Commission, in consultation with the California Department of Transportation and the state's regional transportation planning agencies, to produce and submit to the Senate Transportation Committee and the Senate President pro Tempore, by May 10, 1999, a "10-year needs assessment of the state's transportation system", including, but not limited to, the following:

1. unfunded rehabilitation and operations needs for state highways, local streets and roads, the state's intercity rail programs, and urban, commuter, and regional transit systems, including ferry systems, over the next 10 years;
2. high-priority projects expected to reduce congestion and provide economic and environmental benefits to the state, which should be advanced for completion as expeditiously as possible;
3. a workload projection and staffing estimate necessary for the Department of Transportation to perform project support work required to complete the projects contained in the assessment;
4. measures to be instituted by the Department of Transportation to ensure that the projects contained in the assessment can be delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner.

Overview of Effort in Response to SR 8

The effort undertaken by the Commission, in response to SR 8, has been both ambitious and collaborative. It has involved both questionnaires and individual inquiries to all cities and counties, transit operators, regional transportation planning agencies, seaports and commercial airports. It also involved extensive analysis provided by Caltrans relative to state highways, with emphasis on rehabilitation, operational improvements, and interregional highway and passenger rail improvements. In all, nearly 1,000 transportation agencies were contacted, with most of those providing input for this effort.

With the relatively limited time available to complete this effort, it is worth noting that the report is essentially limited to a compilation of surveys. It does not offer a tightly integrated, prioritized, planning exercise. The various surveys have not been normalized for compatibility. Rather, the responses from all respondents have been summarized and assembled. The summaries for some 20 topic areas are attached, with the more detailed project listings and spreadsheets offered as a back-up reference in an appendix to this report.

The report demonstrates substantial unfunded need for reinvesting in California's existing transportation systems. It also demonstrates the substantial funding requirements to expand those systems, both through lower cost operational improvements and through more costly capacity increases. These costs, while substantial, reflect the challenges of aging transportation systems and "catching up" with three decades of population growth that out-paced highway and roadway capacity increases by a factor of over two, and growth in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) that out-paced population by a factor of nearly three:

Total Population	**VMT-State hwys.**	**lane miles-hwys.**	**VMT-hwy/roads**	**lane miles-hwy/roads**
(% incr.)	***(% incr.)***	***(% incr.)***	***(% incr.)***	***(% incr.)***

1967	19.2m (0%)	51 billion (0%)	39,480 (0%)	100 billion (0%)	*297,128 (0%)
1977	22.4m (17%)	81 billion (58%)	47,305 (20%)	149 billion (48%)	*328,573 (*11%)
1987	27.7m (45%)	122 billion (139%)	48,257 (22%)	228 billion (127%)	345,257 (*16%)
1997	32.7m **(70%)**	153 billion **(200%)**	49,527 **(25%)**	285 billion **(184%)**	**381,827 (*29%)**

*-estimated

Four points of caution:

1. **Gaps and Duplications:** as noted earlier, the investment needs set forth in this report reflect largely the responses by individual transportation agencies. Some agencies did not respond at all to a particular questionnaire, and some only reported in some categories. Moreover, by their very nature, individual sections of this report may carry some duplication. For example, Caltrans and select regional agencies may each have cited the same improvements for a given interregional route; Caltrans, regional agencies and port authorities may each have cited the same ground access improvements; regional agencies and transit operators may have cited the same transit system improvements or expansions. By and large, the potential for such duplication is relatively limited, given the overall scope and magnitude of this survey. Nevertheless, given the differences in data and the potential for some overlap, the reader of this report should resist the temptation to simply add up individual cost estimates for each section of the report and reach a precise "bottom-line" conclusion as to the total need for transportation investments over the next ten years. In effect, the report represents a series of snap shots, rather than a well-crafted mosaic.

2. **Order of Magnitude:** there are clear differences among respondents in how they track and report data. Responses varied based on different assumptions used by different jurisdictions. However, statewide "highs" and "lows" seem to balance and cancel out against each other. Accordingly, the Commission is reasonably confident of the orders of magnitude, in part because of cross-checks against local, regional and statewide sources.

3. **Priorities and Trade-Offs:** time and discretion did not permit a centralized reassessment by the Commission of priorities assigned by respondents to the surveys incorporated into this report. However, the Commission regards it appropriate for the Legislature to consider the funding needs for reinvestments in existing transportation systems as a priority to expansion of these systems. Yet, the sheer magnitude of the need to rehabilitate these systems, when compared against the magnitude of funding increases being contemplated by the Legislature, will necessitate the consideration of trade-offs between rehabilitation, operational improvements and system expansion. This report does not attempt such an undertaking.

4. **Implementation Processes:** this report focuses on expenditure needs, as defined by California's transportation agencies. It does not consider, let alone, recommend how any new funds should be programmed or expended. The Legislature could choose to rely upon the established and newly-reformed STIP process to distribute new funds among transportation agencies. Alternatively, it could establish a series of categorical programs, specifying ground rules and responsible agencies, weighting the priorities of these programs by way of distributing projected new revenues among them. Or, it could pursue a combination of the above. Again, as with prioritizing projects and considering trade-offs, this report does not address options for implementing any new funds.

Summary of Findings

III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Regional Agencies: Highways, Arterials, Urban/Commuter Rail, Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects - Of California's 48 regional transportation agencies, 38 responded to a questionnaire asking for high-priority projects expected to reduce congestion and provide economic and environmental benefits within 10 years, excluding projects believed to be fundable in that time frame. The 38 respondents represent 98% of the state's population. Regions were asked to identify projects in 7 categories. Regional responses for 4 of these categories (state highway expansion, local arterial road expansion, urban and commuter rail expansion and bicycle and pedestrian projects) were the principal source of data for the SR 8 study in these areas; responses to the other 3 categories (new technology and system management, seaports and airports) were used largely to cross-check responses from other agencies, including transit operators, cities and counties, port authorities, and Caltrans.

Unlike other respondents to the various surveys prepared for the SR 8 study, regional agencies tended to take widely varying approaches to their responses. All were asked to rely upon their long-range regional transportation plans as the basis for identifying projects and costs over and above those believed to be fundable from existing revenue sources over the next 10 years. In fact, some regions were much more aggressive than others--particularly in the category of Local Arterial Road Expansion projects--some specifying projects totally outside their regional plans, while others limited themselves to accelerating projects from the outer 10 years of their plans into the first 10 years. Thus, because of these greatly varying approaches, caution should be taken in simply adding up the dollar needs expressed by regional agencies to derive a statewide expression of need in any given category. At the same time, the **project-specific listings of high priority projects from each regional agency offer an invaluable source of projects that could be funded** given an increase of statewide and/or regional revenue.

With that caveat, regional agencies identified **$19.6 billion** in high priority state highway expansion projects (not including another $3.8 billion in projects also identified by Caltrans as high priority for interregional routes), $16 billion of these projects are found in 5 urban regions: Los Angeles, the 9-county Metropolitan Transportation Commission, San Bernardino, San Diego and Riverside. Regions also identified **$13.1 billion** in high priority local arterial expansion projects, with great variances among responses. Regions also identified **$15.4 billion** for high priority urban rail and busway expansion projects: $3.7 billion in the Bay Area, $9.2 billion in Los Angeles, and $0.8 billion each in Orange County, Sacramento and, San Diego; they identified another **$4.0 billion** for high priority commuter rail expansion in the Bay Area, Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, and Ventura. Regions also identified **$1.3 billion** in high priority bicycle and pedestrian projects, with $0.5 billion in the MTC region and $0.4 billion in Los Angeles, San Diego and the 4-county Sacramento area regional agency.

Local Streets and Roads: Pavement Rehabilitation - 57 of California's 58 counties and nearly 400 of its 471 cities responded to a questionnaire regarding pavement rehabilitation. The local agencies provided data about the size of local systems, annual expenditures for pavement rehabilitation, the adequacy or shortfall of annual expenditures relative to maintaining the current level of repair, and the estimated one-time cost of retiring any backlog necessary to bring a local pavement up to a rating of "good" or 70 out of 100. The combined one-time backlog, extrapolated for 100% of cities and counties, totaled **$10.5 billion**; the annual combined increase in backlog, at current funding levels, totals **$400 million**.

Local Streets and Roads: Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement - Caltrans has provided a county-by-county survey of off-highway system bridge replacement needs projected over the next

10 years. The total estimated cost of critical replacement is $1.1 billion and the total estimated cost of critical rehabilitation is $1.2 billion. In addition, another $0.4 billion is the estimated remaining cost for seismic retrofitting local bridges. Against this combined ten-year projected need of $2.7 billion, Caltrans projects $2.1 billion in federal BR funds plus the required 20% local match, leaving a funding shortfall of **$0.6 billion**.

Native American Reservation Roads and Access Roads - The federal Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) submitted a 10-year list of projected road improvements on or leading to Native American reservations and rancherias in California that will not be funded under the BIA's $5 million annual Road Construction Program. That unfunded list totals just over **$0.2 billion**. Subsequently, the Commission surveyed all 102 tribes recognized by the federal government in order to identify any added projects not on the BIA list. The few additional responses to date have reported less than **$10 million** in added projects; as other responses come in, they will be summarized and forwarded to the Legislature.

State Highways: Interregional Improvements - Non-Urbanized Areas - Drawing from its Interregional Strategic Plan, Caltrans has identified $7.8 billion projects on interregional highways outside of urban areas on routes identified as Focus Routes, Other High Emphasis Routes, and Other Priority Routes. These routes represent the major through routes and backbone of state's highway network and serve as primary links between the state's major economic centers and geographic regions, serving agriculture and recreation, and linking rural and smaller urban centers. Interregional projects offer completion of these corridors or address recurrent congestion and safety problems. Of the total $7.8 billion in projects, $4.8 billion, more than half, are on Focus Routes, $1.9 billion are on Other High Emphasis Routes, and $1.1 billion are on Other Priority Routes. Assuming an estimated $2 billion in additional Interregional programming available through the STIP process in the coming decade (i.e., the 2000, 2002, 2004 and 2006 STIPs), approximately **$5.8 billion** of the identified interregional projects are unfunded, although that figure can be further diminished to the extent that regional agencies participate in these projects with their regional programs or other local funds.

State Highways: Interregional Improvements - Urbanized Areas - The interregional state highways that connect California's cities also extend into and through them. For example, several interstate highways in Southern California reach into downtown Los Angeles, and connect to airports and seaports. Route 99 passes through or adjacent to 9 urban areas up and down the Central Valley. Route 101 along the coast passes through the Bay Area, and serves as an important part of the local freeway network there. A statewide highway network depends on investments on routes within and through urban areas. As part of the interregional network, Caltrans also identifies three principal "gateway" areas--in Los Angeles, the Bay Area, and along the Mexican border--for international and national trade and commerce and intermodal goods movements connectivity and transfer; capacity additions, operational strategies, and new technology strategies are all needed for current and project traffic growth on both urban and gateway routes (this growth is discussed elsewhere in this report). In contrast to interregional projects outside of urban areas, **Caltrans has not provided cost estimates for unfunded high priority interregional improvements with in urban areas**. These are viewed by Caltrans, as, in part, the funding responsibilities of regional agencies and, as such, are encouraged to be considered within the on-going regional and interregional planning processes.

State Highways: Bridge and Highway Rehabilitation - Caltrans has provided 10-year estimates for highway-related rehabilitation, including:

	Roadway Rehab.	Long-Life Pavement	Structure Rehab.	Roadside Rehab.	Total
10-Yr SHOPP	$3.3 billion	$1.1 billion	$2.2 billion	$0.4 billion	$ 7.0 billion
10-Yr Needs	$3.5 billion	$5.5 billion	$3.0 billion	$0.5 billion	$12.5 billion
UNFUNDED					**$ 5.5 billion**

Against this combined estimated need of $12.5 billion, Caltrans' most recent 10-Year Highway Rehabilitation Plan calls for $7.0 billion for the above activities; in that funding for that Plan is provided for in the Commission's Biennial STIP Fund Estimate, an unfunded shortfall of **$5.5 billion** remains to accomplish this 10-year estimate of rehabilitation needs. It should be noted that the substantial cost increases for roadway rehabilitation and longer-life pavement result from use of higher standards than assumed in most recent 10-Year Highway Rehabilitation Plan. Also, Caltrans reports under Lands and Buildings a need of $0.2 billion for maintenance facilities, with other types of facilities likely exceeding $0.5 billion.

State Highways: Safety Improvements - Caltrans has identified 10-year needs for safety improvements on State highways as totaling $1.8 billion. This estimate is well above the $0.7 billion in the current 10-Year SHOPP Plan, leaving the differential of **$1.1 billion** as essentially unfunded. The increase is due to recalculations of accident costs for fatalities and injuries, despite decreases in the fatal-plus-injury crash rate since 1992. Safety projects include intersection modifications, curve corrections, median barriers, rumble strips and lane widenings on 2- and 3-lane roads, and CURE projects to remove or shield obstructions alongside highways.

State Highways: Recurrent Problems - Caltrans has identified some 1,000 locations on the State Highway System that face repeated closures due to drainage and flooding problems, erosion, rockfall and slope movement. These recurrent closures disrupt movement of people, goods and service and pose costly and repeated repair work. Caltrans estimates that to date, some $0.8 billion have been spent on repeated or short-term repairs. Until now, Caltrans has not included in the SHOPP more permanent solutions to these problems, ranging from upgrading highway features to major re-design on new alignments. Caltrans has identified some **$4.3 billion** in projects to cure most of these reoccurring problems; however, because none are included in the 10-year Highway Rehabilitation Program, this work is essentially unfunded.

State Highways: Operational Improvements - Caltrans has identified $3.1 billion of operational improvements for State highways, well above the $0.4 billion included in the most recent 10-Year SHOPP, leaving a funding shortfall of **$2.7 billion**. This increased cost estimate is the result of increases for traditional operational improvements ($1.5 billion) and initial funding of Intelligent Transportation System deployment ($1.2 billion), related to the Level 1 funding of Caltrans' Traffic Operations Program (TOPS) in Southern California, the Greater Bay Area, the Central Valley and elsewhere in Northern California locations. (Caltrans also assumes $7.2 billion in operational improvements funded over 10 years through the STIP.)

California Alliance for Advanced Transportation Systems (CAATS) - CAATS is a non-profit partnership of public agencies, academia, and private firms, with the objective of deploying advanced transportation technologies for efficient, seamless transportation systems to improve safety and mobility, reduce congestion, minimize environmental impacts and reduce life cycle costs, in a way that helps to develop and expand the intelligent transportation industry in California. CAATS has identified **$2 billion** in public investment to improve California's operational systems, accommodate 40% of California's anticipated traffic growth, and add to safety and reliability of individual trips. CAATS estimates this investment also would provide a foundation for an $11 billion market in California over 10 years. The largest element of the proposed public investment is for traffic management and operations. Other elements include: traveler information, public transit enhancements, goods movement enhancements, electronic payment, and vehicle safety and control.

State Highways: Storm Drainage Retrofit - Caltrans reports a need for as much as **$6 billion** for drainage system improvements and water treatment facilities to ensure that runoff from state highway storm drains complies with federal and state water quality standards statewide. (Caltrans also reports that local agencies could face a considerably larger cost for runoff from local streets, roads and other sources.) Caltrans must contend with a 1994 U.S. Court decision for runoff mitigation in Los Angeles, a 1997 consent decree for a similar complaint in San Diego, renewal of 7 soon-to-expire storm water discharge permits in California's larger urban areas and expansion of permit requirements into smaller urban and possibly rural areas.

State Highways: Retrofit Soundwalls - Caltrans reports a cost of $625 million to fund "retrofit soundwalls", with 75% located in Los Angeles County alone. (LACMTA estimates the cost of unfunded retrofit soundwalls in Los Angeles County as $900 million higher than Caltrans.) "Retrofit soundwalls" are located on highways or freeways where traffic noise levels exceed federal standards, the highway or freeway was built before 1974, and adjacent development pre-dates construction. Currently, 58 retrofit soundwall projects remain unfunded from the 1989 Transportation Blueprint's program, at a cost of $205 million. Since 1989, Caltrans has identified 158 more locations that meet the "retrofit soundwall" criteria, due to higher noise levels from increased traffic or surface deterioration, at an added cost of $420 million. Under 1997 STIP reform legislation, the only means of funding retrofit soundwalls is through the regional program component of the STIP; thus, it is difficult to determine how many retrofit soundwalls will be funded over the next 10 years through the STIP cycles in 2000, 2002, 2004, and 2006.

Airports: Ground Access Improvements - California can expect a doubling or even tripling of air passenger and air cargo traffic over the next 20 years. In conjunction with the 1999 update of Aeronautics Capital Improvement Plan, some 34 general aviation airports identified 65 ground access improvements at a total cost of nearly **$0.3 billion**. In addition, Commission staff surveyed 17 large commercial airports; of these, Los Angeles International reports the greatest ground access need totaling **$2 billion**; 8 others report ground access needs of **$0.6 billion** (including $222 million for Oakland, $160 million for San Diego and $150 million for Palmdale.) Essentially all of these projects are unfunded, other than by way of respective regional and interregional components of the STIP through the decade.

Seaports: Ground Access Improvements - California's commercial deep water ports are critical to California's economy, accounting for $138 billion in imports, $447.5 billion in exports and supporting 1.5 million in California jobs during 1997. Of California's 11 commercial seaports, 7 have identified projected ground access needs over the next 10 years of **$569 million** in road and rail improvements in the immediate vicinity of the ports, including $305 million around the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, $90 million around the Port of San Diego, $81 million around the Port of San Francisco and $80 million around the Port of Oakland. Moreover, the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles have identified another **$43 million** for specified State highway improvements, with yet another **$455 million** needed to improve the Long Beach Freeway (I-710). Essentially all of these projects are unfunded, other than by way of respective regional and interregional components of the STIP through the decade.

North American Free Trade Agreement Transportation Infrastructure - Caltrans reports $254 million in remaining highway improvements needed as the unfunded remnant of $1.5 billion of improvements identified as necessary to serve commercial vehicle traffic increases over the next 10 years resulting from the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). These unprogrammed projects include $174 million for highway improvements in San Diego County and $80 million in Imperial County. Moreover, Caltrans has identified $135 million of investments in the San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railway between Calexico and the Port of San Diego. This funding shortfall, totaling **$389 million,** could be diminished to the extent that regional agencies participate in these projects with their regional programs or other local funds.

Los Angeles Basin Rail Consolidation and Grade Separation Needs - Following upon the funding and current construction of the Alameda Corridor, which will provide a grade-separated freight rail corridor from the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to downtown Los Angeles, attention must now shift to move freight beyond the congested Los Angeles basin. The extension of such a corridor would provide public benefits of improved safety and air quality and private sector economic benefits resulting from increased shipping speed and reliability. Unlike the initial Alameda Corridor, which entails a single, consolidated rail corridor, rail traffic east of downtown Los Angeles operates in 3 corridors. A study by Southern California Association of Governments of grade-separating all 3 corridors through Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties identifies a total cost of **$2.3 billion**, divided into $2.1 billion for the 2 Los Angeles-San Bernardino rail corridors (including a key rail-to-rail grade separation in Colton) and $0.2 million for grade crossings in Orange County. The cost of this easterly extension could be substantially reduced if agreement could be reached on a single corridor consolidation.

Short Line Railroads - Eight of California's 30 short line railroads identified **$225 million** of unfunded 10-year needs for storm damage, railbed, trestle and other work. Short line railroads must face various situations, depending on such factors as inherited deferred maintenance, storm damage, existing track condition, strength of market, and financial base. The two public short lines, the Northwestern Pacific and San Diego & Arizona Eastern, face challenging futures, with more than 100 miles of track closed by storm damage, serious deferred maintenance, marginal markets, and $130 million of unfunded needs to reopen and stay open. Some of the short line railroad needs may be duplicated elsewhere, in seaport access or NAFTA border access estimates.

Intercity Passenger Rail Service - Caltrans has identified $3.4 billion in expenditures to maintain and enhance intercity passenger rail service on 3 existing service routes (San Diegan, San Joaquin, and Capitol Corridors) and another $0.8 billion for new service on 6 more routes (Coast, Monterey, Redding, Reno, Las Vegas, and Coachella Valley). These expenditures would help implement Caltrans' Intercity Rail Program Vision, tripling rail passenger miles over the next decade, so rail can achieve a 5% modal share of intercity and regional commute travel by making rail travel more competitive with the automobile. Caltrans' Vision depends on major expenditure increases to increase capacity for more daily trains, improve on-time performance, enhance reliability, reduce running times, and make service more efficient. Projects and increased expenditures include:

$2.4 billion - track and signals ($1.9 billion for existing routes; $381 million for new routes);
$1.1 billion - operations ($952 million for existing routes; $173 million for new routes);
$0.5 billion - rolling stock ($336 million for existing routes; $169 million for new routes);
$0.1 billion - station improvements ($127 million for existing routes; $15 million for new routes)
$0.1 billion - maintenance facilities ($25 million for existing routes; $20 million for new routes)
$0.1 billion - grade crossing improvements ($91 million for existing routes).
$4.2 billion - TOTAL ($3.1 billion for capital projects and $1.1 billion for increased operations)

Reliance upon existing revenues would preclude most of these improvements. Through the coming decade (i.e., the 2000, 2002, 2004 and 2006 STIPs), the STIP process will provide $200-400 million for Intercity Rail capital projects, leaving a funding shortfall for capital projects of **at least $2.7 billion**; and the entire **$1.1 billion** for increased operational costs must come from the Public Transportation Account (PTA) which is projected to run at a $37 million deficit over the next 6 years. Moreover, the **$0.5 billion** needed for increased rolling stock is ineligible for State Highway Account funds, and is thus dependent upon the already-oversubscribed PTA Account.

Bus and Rail Transit: Operating Shortfall - The Commission surveyed 270 public transit operators, inquiring into 3 levels of service: maintaining *existing* levels of service over the next 10 years; *enhancing* service to meet current unmet demand; and *expanding* service to achieve 50% growth in ridership over 10 years. To date, 63 operators responded to the survey, including the 12 largest operators, 14 of the 18 mid-sized operators, and 37 smaller operators. The larger and mid-sized respondents alone represent some 85% of the transit service provided in California. The cost of operating at *existing levels* of service, over 10 years, was reported at $6.6 billion for rail and $17 billion for bus; respondents estimate a shortfall in expected State revenue for *existing* operations of **$0.7 billion** for rail and bus. The 10-year added cost of operations at *enhanced* levels of service is projected to require an additional $1 billion for rail and nearly $3 billion more for bus; added costs for *expanded* service would increase by yet another $1.3 billion for rail and $3.5 billion for bus. The 10-year shortfalls in State operating support, combined for bus and rail, were reported as **$1.6 billion** for *enhanced* service and another **$1.5 billion** for *expanded* service. (Any shortfalls in non-State funds were not reported in this survey.)

Bus and Rail Transit: Rolling Stock - Respondents to the survey of transit operators identified a projected 10-year need for bus and rail rolling stock of $4.3 billion, just to maintain *existing* levels of service; another $1.2 billion to provide *enhanced* service in response to existing unserved demand; and yet another $1.7 billion to *expand* current service by 50% over 10 years. (The survey did not differentiate between new equipment, rehabilitation of existing equipment and spare parts.) In all, operators project shortfalls in State funding for rolling stock of **$0.7 billion**, **$0.6 billion**, and **$1.1 billion**, respectively, for *existing*, *enhanced* and *expanded* levels of service. (As noted, any shortfalls in non-State funds were not reported in this survey.)

Bus and Rail Transit: Capital Improvements - bus and rail transit operators report 10-year funding cumulative shortfalls of **$0.8 billion to $2.1 billion** for ***existing*** through ***expanded*** service, for a variety of capital improvements, including: maintenance facilities and equipment (up to $0.6 billion), rail station improvements (up to $0.6 billion), alternative fuel conversion (up to $0.1 billion), and power and signaling systems (up to $0.9 billion). Rail operators also report rail extensions totaling up to $10.4 billion for *expanded* service, with projected shortfalls of up to **$4.1 billion;** the nature of these extensions, their projected ridership, and outlook for other "outside" funding sources (e.g., federal new rail start funds) were not reported in the survey.

Bus and Rail Transit: ADA Operations - Maintaining *existing* levels of ADA operations by public transit operators are projected to cost $0.6 billion over 10 years, with State funds expected to provide $0.2 billion of that amount, leaving an estimated shortfall in State funding of just under **$0.1 billion**. *Enhanced* and *expanded* levels of ADA operations over 10 years are projected to carry added costs of $0.2 billion and $0.4 billion combined, with estimated shortfalls in State funding of **$26 million** for *enhanced* service and another **$114 million** for *expanded* service. The aggregate shortfall in State funds for all three levels of service is identified as $0.2 billion. (As noted, any shortfalls in non-State funds were not reported in this survey.)

Bus and Rail Transit: ADA Capital Improvements - *Existing* levels of ADA operations by public transit operators are expected to require capital investments of $176 million over 10 years, with a shortfall in projected State funding of **$24 million**. *Enhanced* and *expanded* levels of ADA operations will require $57 million and $56 million in capital investments, respectively, of which a shortfall in State funds is projected at **$29 million** and **$9 million**, respectively. The aggregate shortfall in State funds for all three levels of service is identified as $62 million. (As noted, any shortfalls in non-State funds were not reported in this survey.)

Elderly and Disabled Paratransit Non-Profit Providers - Based on historic trends and projected growth in elderly and disabled population, Commission staff projects 10-year capital needs of $0.3 billion, including 4,900 paratransit vehicles for $0.3 billion and $10 million for related computer and communications equipment. Approximately 2,800 vehicles will likely be funded under the Federal Elderly and Disabled Transit Program, leaving a shortfall of over **$0.1 billion.**

Project Delivery Workload and Streamlining

SR 8 also asked for the Commission, in consultation with Caltrans, to provide:

- a workload projection and staffing estimate necessary for Caltrans to perform project support work required to complete the projects contained in the assessment;

- measures to be instituted by the Department of Transportation to ensure that the projects contained in the assessment can be delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner.

Caltrans' statements regarding workload projections staffing estimates, and measures to ensure timely, cost-effective delivery are included at the end of this report.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF 10-YEAR FUNDING NEEDS

	UNFUNDED
Regional Agencies: Highways, Arterials, Rail, Bicycle and Pedestrian	$53.6 billion
Highways	$19.6 billion
Arterials	$13.1 billion
Urban and Commuter Rail	$19.6 billion
Bicycle and Pedestrian	$1.3 billion
Local Streets and Roads: Pavement Rehabilitation	$10.5 billion
Local Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement	$ 0.6 billion
Native American Reservation Roads and Access Roads	$ 0.2 billion
State Highways: Interregional Improvements in Rural Areas	$ 5.8 billion
State Highways: Interregional Improvements in Urban Areas	unspecified
State Highways: Bridge and Highway Rehabilitation	$ 5.5 billion
State Highways: Safety Improvements	$ 1.1 billion
State Highways: Recurrent Problems	$ 4.3 billion
State Highways: Operational Improvements	$ 2.7 billion
California Alliance for Advanced Transportation Systems (CAATS)	$ 2.0 billion
State Highways: Storm Drainage Retrofit	$ 6.0 billion
State Highways: Retrofit Soundwalls	$ 0.6 billion
Airports: Ground Access Improvements	$ 2.9 billion
Seaports: Ground Access Improvements	$ 1.1 billion
North American Free Trade Agreement Transportation Infrastructure	$ 0.4 billion
Los Angeles Basin Rail Consolidation and Grade Separation Needs	$ 2.3 billion
Short Line Railroads	$ 0.2 billion
Intercity Passenger Rail Service	$ 4.3 billion
Bus and Rail Transit: Operating Shortfall (3 levels of service)	$0.7 - 3.8 billion
Bus and Rail Transit: Rolling Stock (3 levels of service)	$0.7 - 2.4 billion
Bus and Rail Transit: Capital Improvements (3 levels of service)	$1.0 - 6.2 billion
Bus and Rail Transit: ADA Operations (3 levels of service)	$0.1 - 0.2 billion
Bus and Rail Transit: ADA Capital Improvements (3 levels of service)	<$0.1 - <0.1 billion
Elderly and Disabled Paratransit Non-Profit Providers	$ 0.1 billion

IV. DETAILED FINDINGS OF 10-YEAR FUNDING NEEDS

Regional Agencies: Highways, Arterials, Rail, Bicycle and Pedestrian

REGIONAL AGENCIES: HIGHWAYS, ARTERIALS, RAIL, BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN

As part of the SR 8 needs assessment, the Commission and the state's regional transportation planning agencies cooperated in a survey of the individual regional agencies throughout the state. The survey asked each regional agency to identify high priority projects that could be expected to reduce congestion and provide economic and environmental benefits within a 10-year period, excluding projects for which funding is already projected to be available within 10 years. The survey asked each agency to identify dollar amounts and projects within each of the following categories:

- State highway expansion.
- Transit and other rail expansion (capital and operating).
- Local arterial road expansion.
- Bike/pedestrian projects.
- New technology and system management (capital and operating).
- Seaports.
- Airports.

The Commission received survey responses from 38 of the state's 48 regional transportation planning agencies, representing 98.5% of the state's population.

These surveys were the primary source of data for the categories of State highway expansion, urban and commuter rail expansion, local arterial road expansion, and bike/pedestrian projects. For the other categories, the regional data provided a secondary source to back up and cross-check the data provided by other agencies and reviewed elsewhere in this report. Within each category, the survey asked regional agencies to list and provide cost estimates for major projects individually, grouping smaller projects together.

The survey asked regional agencies to draw primarily upon their current regional transportation plans. These plans, by definition, are constrained to foreseeable revenues over a 20-year period. However, the highest priority unfunded projects for most regions would be the projects already identified in regional plans that, under current funding constraints, would have to wait until the outer 10 years of the plan for funding.

Different regional agencies took widely varying approaches in developing their responses, particularly in identifying high priority local arterial road expansion priorities. In part, this may reflect the varying levels of specificity in the current regional transportation plans across the state. Some regional agencies identified long lists of specific projects while others provided only dollar amounts by project category or jurisdiction. Some agencies were more aggressive than others, identifying project needs from sources outside their current regional transportation plans, while others strictly limited themselves to currently adopted plans. Some identified all planned projects not actually programmed (which might overstate the amount not fundable within 10 years) while others identified relatively little or nothing because of the lack of specificity in their long range plans.

On the following page is a table summarizing the needs identified by regional agencies for State highway expansion, urban and commuter rail expansion, local arterial road expansion, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. In the Appendix are complete listings of the high priority projects identified by each regional agency. Given the widely varying approaches taken by the various regional agencies in providing these data, the Commission cautions that statewide summary totals should not be taken as a precise expression of need in any particular category. The project lists, however, may serve as a valuable example of the types of needs that could be met through an increase in state or regional transportation revenues.

State Highway Expansion. The survey of regional agencies identified **$23.4 billion** in high priority projects for expansion on the State highway system. Of that amount, about $3.4 billion represents a duplication of the $7.2 billion in rural interregional road system projects identified separately by Caltrans. The remainder represent urban needs on State highways, both on and off the freeway system, and rural needs on State highways that are primarily local or regional in character. Over two-thirds of the total ($16 billion) was identified in 5 urban regions: Los Angeles, the Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), San Bernardino, San Diego, and Riverside.

Urban and Commuter Rail Expansion. The regional agencies identified about **$19.4 billion** in high priority projects for expansion of urban and commuter rail systems (including exclusive busway alternatives) statewide. Of that amount, $15.4 billion was identified for urban rail systems, including $9.2 billion in Los Angeles, $3.7 billion in the MCT area, and $0.8 billion each in Orange, Sacramento, and San Diego counties. Another $4.0 billion was identified for commuter rail expansion in the Bay Area and in Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, and San Diego counties.

Local Arterial Road Expansion. The regional agencies identified about **$13 billion** in high priority projects for expansion of local arterial road systems statewide. Though the need is great, the survey results are less consistent across the state than they are for State highway expansion. The survey responses from some regions, for example, provided long lists of specific projects, while others provided a breakdown by jurisdiction or a single countywide figure. The Commission attributes these differences and inconsistencies to several factors, among them:

- the large number of local agencies responsible for local road development;
- the large number of smaller projects, as compared with the State highway system;
- the competition between expansion and rehabilitation for available local road funding; and
- the wide differences that exist among the regions of the state in policies and procedures for the planning and funding of arterial road system development.

Bicycle and pedestrian projects. The regions identified about **$1.3 billion** in high priority projects for new or expanded bicycle and pedestrian facilities statewide. Of that amount, MTC alone identified about $500 million. Three other urban regions, the multicounty Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), Los Angeles, and San Diego, together identified another $400 million.

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
SUMMARY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
($ millions)

County/Region	State Highways	Urban and Commuter Rail	Local Arterials	Bike and Pedestrian
MTC	3,285	5,460	728	499
SACOG	872	837	488	141
Alpine	---	---	0	5
Amador	56	---	13	0
Butte	219	---	31	13
Calaveras	64	---	37	62
Colusa	104	---	0	0
Del Norte	225	---	3	0
El Dorado LTC	233	---	50	17
Fresno	267	---	987	2
Glenn	---	---	---	---
Humboldt	---	---	---	---
Imperial	---	---	50	0
Inyo	0	---	0	5
Kern	719	---	38	8
Kings	140	---	0	0
Lake	35	---	16	6
Lassen	---	---	---	---
Los Angeles	6,363	9,717	1,924	147
Madera	---	---	---	---
Mariposa	---	---	---	---
Mendocino	157	---	75	7
Merced	373	---	85	1
Modoc	---	---	---	---
Mono	---	---	23	16
Monterey	247	---	166	4
Nevada	279	---	25	0
Orange	669	1,550	700	6
Placer TPA	190	---	304	4
Plumas	9	---	5	0
Riverside	1,581	---	2,425	18
San Benito	---	---	16	3
San Bernardino	2,388	---	909	15
San Diego	2,261	1,701	1,960	99
San Joaquin	887	---	489	11
San Luis Obispo	248	---	20	7
Santa Barbara	258	---	103	42
Santa Cruz	40	---	57	37
Shasta	179	---	159	20
Sierra	---	---	---	---
Siskiyou	---	---	---	---
Stanislaus	192	---	297	16
Tahoe RPA	---	---	---	---
Tehama	---	---	---	---
Trinity	---	---	0	0
Tulare	446	---	297	0
Tuolumne	---	---	---	---
Ventura	415	159	578	61
STATEWIDE TOTAL	**23,399**	**19,424**	**13,059**	**1,270**

Local Streets and Roads: Pavement Rehabilitation

LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS: PAVEMENT REHABILITATION

Counties and cities report an estimated $10.5 billion in unfunded needs for local road and street rehabilitation, to retire a backlog of deferred maintenance statewide, plus an annual shortfall of about $400 million to keep up with annual maintenance and rehabilitation expenditure needs. The backlog, built up since the 1970s, represents nearly 8 years of current annual rehabilitation needs.

California's 58 counties and 471 cities own and maintain 136,000 miles of roads and streets, comprised of 310,000 lane-miles of pavement. These counties and cities currently spend a mix of state gas tax subventions, local general funds, local sales taxes (where available), federal and state local assistance funds, and other specific local funds, to own, operate, maintain, reconstruct, and improve their local road and street systems. The mix of funds varies from one county and city to another. The state and federal funds generally come by formula, so the biggest variations come in local funds. The level of funding available varies from one jurisdiction to another, some relatively adequate and some not, with cities having a strong local tax base or access to local sales taxes generally in better shape and rural counties and small cities generally in worse shape. Furthermore, county sales tax programs currently provide more than $300 million per year for local roads, much of which goes into maintenance and rehabilitation; except for Los Angeles, these sales tax programs expire at specified dates, which come prior to 2010 in every county that has one, and the present two-thirds public vote requirement for renewal puts at risk what amounts to a substantial source in the current funding base for local road and street maintenance and rehabilitation.

The California State Association of Counties and the League of California Cities surveyed their members concerning local road and street rehabilitation expenditures and needs in early 1999, and 57 out of 58 counties and 80% of cities responded to the survey. The responses vary greatly, many in a middle range but some very high and others quite low; the results, while not comparable on a jurisdiction by jurisdiction basis, yield a reasonably accurate overall statewide picture. Commission staff has been able to cross-check the survey results against regional pavement management systems, a Caltrans statewide local road data base, the State Controller's Annual Report of Street & Road Expenditures, and a statistical estimate using typical conditions. The various results correlate within 20%, certainly within order of magnitude:

- all counties and cities collectively reported $900 million of annual expenditures for pavement rehabilitation through the survey, and the State Controller's report showed expenditures of $1.03 billion for the same purposes;
- all counties and cities collectively reported $1.3 billion in annual expenditure needs for pavement rehabilitation through the survey, while a statistical analysis assuming a need for an asphalt overlay on half of all lane-miles and a chip seal on the other half once every 12 years would lead to an annual expenditure need for $1.5 billion;
- all counties and cities collectively reported $10.5 billion in deferred maintenance backlog, and the Caltrans data base shows 40% of all lane-miles in fair or poor condition at $100,000 per lane-mile for resurfacing yielding a backlog need of $12.6 billion;

- all counties and cities reported unfunded 10-year pavement maintenance and rehabilitation needs (made up of backlog plus annual shortfalls) that add to $14.9 billion, and regional pavement management systems collectively estimated the same 10-year need at $15.3 billion.

Counties and cities spend about $1.0 billion per year for rehabilitation of pavement, plus another $1.0 billion on road maintenance and other roadway features such as traffic signals, signs and striping, bridges, and drainage facilities. After years of inadequate funding, public works departments do what they have to to keep roads serviceable, and temporary "band-aid" pavement repair work somewhat distorts spending patterns between maintenance and rehabilitation. Regardless, the estimated need for pavement rehabilitation, including resurfacing but not pothole patching (with some grey area in between), totals as much as $1.6 billion per year under today's conditions, so at present spending levels the backlog of deferred maintenance grows by about $400 million annually.

The deferred maintenance problem seems to be worse for county roads than city streets in many cases (most noticeably in counties without local transportation sales taxes), and definitely is worse in rural areas than urban areas. Cities, more than counties, appear to have options available to supplement state and federal funds for road maintenance needs to some degree.

Deferred maintenance today comes at the price of costlier rehabilitation needs in the future. Periodic resurfacing is relatively cheap, at $100,000 per lane-mile or less, but rehabilitation of damaged roadbed can cost as much as $500,000 per lane-mile. If roads are not resurfaced in a timely way, the roadbed underneath may deteriorate, leading to a need for full-scale rehabilitation costing as much as five times higher per lane-mile. Conversely, with no deferred maintenance backlog and enough money for a proper cycle of pavement care, the overall funding need for pavement work might actually decrease somewhat in the future.

State statutes require maintenance and rehabilitation to be the top priority for state highway expenditures, and require Caltrans to have a 10-year plan linked to a 4-year program that is funded off the top before the STIP. The statutes impose no similar requirements for local agencies. Most local agencies do tend to spend available funds with maintenance and rehabilitation as their top priority, but available funds do not stretch far enough. Even so, not every local agency needs more funding for more road maintenance and rehabilitation: a few agencies have little or no deferred maintenance backlog and spend much of their available funding on road improvements and new construction.

Three factors seem to correlate closely with underfunding of road maintenance and rehabilitation: low population, high average annual rainfall, and high heavy truck use per lane-mile. Formulas that distribute funds for local road and street maintenance and rehabilitation based on population, registered vehicles, and road mileage do not match well against current and evolving need. Funding formulas based mainly on population and vehicle registration compensate only marginally for substantial rural road use by urban recreational travelers and trucks hauling foodstuffs, timber and mining resources to urban markets.

The deferred maintenance backlog, while both current and urgent, has built up over 20 years or longer. The State Controller's report shows that local agencies are presently sitting on about $1.5 billion in unspent reserves, albeit fragmented among 500 agencies and including a large chunk of federal funds that are more onerous to spend. Nevertheless, the capacity of local agencies and the road contracting industry probably indicate that catch-up must be spread over a period of years.

In summary, county and city road and street programs show the following 10-year pavement rehabilitation needs:

- 10 years of annual pavement rehabilitation $10 billion (funded)
- current deferred maintenance backlog $10.5 billion (unfunded)

The current $400 million annual shortfall in maintenance and rehabilitation expenditures could, to some degree, be mitigated by the timely elimination of the $10.5 billion backlog in deferred maintenance.

The chart on the next page shows the results from the county and city survey, aggregated to the county level (using average numbers plugged in for those cities that did not respond), along with key comparative information from regional pavement management systems, the Caltrans statewide local road data base, the State Controller's Annual Report of Street & Road Expenditures, and a statistical estimate using typical conditions.

County Name	1997 Population	Maintained Mileage Lane-Miles	Average Annual Rainfall	Annual Large Truck Use VMT per Ln-Mi	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Rehab.	Mntce.	Total Annual Exp. Need from local agcy.	Total Annual Exp. Need statistical calc.	Deferred Mntce. Backlog from local agcy.	Pavement Rehab Need per CT % of Lane-Miles	Deferred Mntce. Backlog calc. w/ CT data	10-Year Funding Shortfall per local agcy.
Alameda	1,376,294	7,806	19	170	$21,675,809	$6,924,928	$41,478,000	$39,028,500	$247,962,709	46%	$359,618,476	$376,735,339
Alpine	1,180	266	7.5	8	$0	$40,000	$120,000	$1,330,000	$19,407,143	49%	$12,938,095	$20,207,143
Amador	33,805	936	32.5	5	$532,000	$379,564	$2,727,837	$4,680,450	$27,738,000	89%	$82,866,984	$45,900,730
Butte	200,670	3,549	26	39	$9,833,000	$845,000	$4,933,000	$17,747,200	$66,724,599	33%	$118,474,228	$9,274,599
Calaveras	36,350	1,399	32	1	$483,000	$276,700	$5,672,700	$6,996,300	$38,964,255	75%	$104,685,378	$88,094,255
Colusa	18,377	1,548	15	45	$525,978	$493,000	$1,300,000	$7,740,000	$34,500,000	56%	$86,688,000	$37,310,220
Contra Costa	886,957	6,462	23	65	$22,941,356	$7,051,600	$38,512,184	$32,312,350	$248,816,028	41%	$264,585,229	$334,008,308
Del Norte	28,700	645	60	46	$1,693,000	$1,262,000	$1,850,000	$3,227,000	$70,200,000	65%	$42,265,133	$59,150,000
El Dorado	142,663	2,501	33	44	$985,200	$1,318,000	$4,906,000	$12,505,350	$79,249,691	43%	$106,746,699	$105,277,691
Fresno	778,337	12,503	10.5	75	$25,609,000	$7,078,158	$56,038,000	$62,513,000	$277,732,601	17%	$208,431,851	$511,241,021
Glenn	26,850	1,838	18	87	$1,695,000	$508,000	$3,885,000	$9,190,000	$46,244,615	46%	$84,123,846	$63,064,615
Humboldt	127,254	3,835	40	31	$1,683,800	$483,450	$3,820,000	$19,177,000	$141,343,400	60%	$231,396,282	$157,870,900
Imperial	141,481	5,775	2	64	$4,860,000	$685,000	$10,035,000	$28,873,100	$43,876,575	28%	$160,753,328	$88,776,575
Inyo	18,320	2,279	5.5	22	$638,000	$832,000	$1,350,000	$11,392,500	$58,000,000	8%	$17,771,965	$56,800,000
Kern	630,132	11,406	6	142	$21,925,500	$7,532,000	$39,842,000	$57,031,750	$245,124,395	29%	$328,571,377	$348,969,395
Kings	118,550	2,638	6.5	99	$3,111,000	$1,311,000	$9,110,000	$13,188,000	$71,456,763	32%	$84,616,647	$118,336,763
Lake	54,900	1,534	44	16	$430,000	$880,000	$7,400,000	$7,670,000	$174,000,000	78%	$119,471,529	$234,900,000
Lassen	34,850	1,890	14.5	48	$1,078,300	$580,800	$3,900,000	$9,450,000	$18,800,000	18%	$34,345,377	$41,209,000
Los Angeles	9,264,560	56,026	14	79	$152,320,499	$38,663,863	$279,411,800	$280,131,850	$2,640,694,160	50%	$2,784,089,626	$3,524,968,540
Madera	112,391	3,469	11	27	$3,983,367	$3,072,783	$15,213,064	$17,347,000	$351,500,000	62%	$213,539,828	$433,069,144
Marin	306,994	2,109	37	62	$11,420,000	$1,882,000	$16,712,000	$10,545,650	$105,986,375	19%	$40,631,226	$140,086,375
Mariposa	16,100	1,119	30.5	0	$561,000	$348,000	$1,500,000	$5,593,400	$18,000,000	0%	$0	$23,910,000
Mendocino	86,960	2,277	39	22	$2,441,646	$2,809,500	$6,339,500	$11,383,800	$90,038,741	87%	$198,518,583	$100,922,281
Merced	205,014	4,603	12	39	$3,429,000	$3,074,855	$10,375,931	$23,013,050	$100,716,174	23%	$104,448,257	$139,436,934
Modoc	10,150	2,067	12.5	12	$560,000	$1,720,000	$3,315,000	$10,336,000	$69,500,000	36%	$74,270,659	$79,850,000
Mono	10,414	1,524	7	23	$852,000	$125,000	$2,240,000	$7,620,000	$26,200,000	0%	$0	$38,830,000
Monterey	371,877	4,003	17.5	75	$8,924,100	$2,868,000	$10,630,000	$20,014,700	$117,749,834	44%	$175,876,683	$106,128,834
Napa	122,131	1,515	24	36	$884,025	$3,108,635	$6,068,978	$7,575,500	$93,644,517	67%	$101,372,633	$114,407,697
Nevada	113,805	1,536	36	65	$5,909,497	$2,810,479	$5,152,000	$7,680,000	$50,817,750	59%	$90,871,523	$15,137,990
Orange	2,679,972	15,292	11.5	113	$56,914,835	$14,341,819	$106,304,587	$76,458,300	$690,188,196	44%	$675,423,611	$1,040,667,526
Placer	213,190	3,508	34	57	$3,174,412	$1,478,000	$9,426,050	$17,541,000	$123,397,544	33%	$115,210,118	$171,133,924
Plumas	20,350	1,376	18.5	15	$5,000	$102,000	$1,200,000	$6,880,000	$16,645,000	11%	$14,484,211	$27,575,000
Riverside	1,394,655	14,711	9.5	131	$37,643,000	$5,942,966	$69,672,000	$73,557,450	$447,992,061	47%	$691,737,916	$708,852,401
Sacramento	1,151,190	10,162	18	77	$9,100,000	$6,198,000	$32,925,000	$50,810,000	$153,855,506	34%	$341,841,729	$330,125,506
San Benito	45,700	1,040	13.5	24	$269,000	$689,094	$4,126,994	$5,200,000	$47,000,000	89%	$92,888,889	$78,688,997
San Bernardino	1,618,108	18,999	11.5	169	$21,790,176	$8,741,432	$58,403,487	$94,995,850	$880,691,835	44%	$834,942,144	$1,159,410,625
San Diego	2,714,557	17,619	9	93	$28,232,000	$23,023,471	$114,140,000	$88,097,000	$361,485,681	42%	$745,854,571	$990,330,971
San Francisco	760,000	2,160	20.5	51	$14,000,000	$5,000,000	$22,000,000	$10,800,000	$142,000,000	62%	$133,826,087	$172,000,000
San Joaquin	557,391	6,222	13.5	93	$13,097,514	$3,881,855	$44,150,000	$31,110,750	$172,950,486	36%	$226,683,029	$444,656,796
San Luis Obispo	236,160	3,855	20	44	$5,152,000	$6,507,000	$6,750,000	$19,274,000	$95,935,379	59%	$225,582,100	$46,845,379
San Mateo	703,932	4,330	19	49	$17,044,000	$5,210,600	$35,674,000	$21,647,750	$221,015,397	52%	$222,991,367	$355,209,397
Santa Barbara	402,930	3,250	13	65	$6,796,105	$6,071,599	$11,340,328	$16,251,000	$96,311,849	44%	$144,141,523	$81,038,089
Santa Clara	1,644,901	10,467	14	82	$32,838,000	$11,134,000	$35,974,000	$52,336,500	$222,524,770	22%	$227,767,169	$142,544,770
Santa Cruz	241,900	1,795	29	33	$3,174,000	$1,121,000	$4,950,000	$8,975,000	$48,783,572	30%	$53,169,431	$55,333,572
Shasta	164,900	3,550	41	76	$960,000	$5,295,000	$14,750,000	$17,751,000	$52,500,000	43%	$152,254,512	$137,450,000
Sierra	3,350	791	16	19	$49,932	$129,891	$1,050,000	$3,954,600	$5,500,000	63%	$49,854,199	$14,201,770
Siskiyou	44,839	3,088	19.5	58	$1,188,900	$2,391,500	$10,571,800	$15,439,500	$74,357,905	18%	$55,248,521	$144,271,905
Solano	379,832	3,277	21	122	$4,834,172	$5,046,500	$21,400,000	$16,385,850	$145,500,000	30%	$97,198,629	$260,693,280
Sonoma	435,741	4,714	30	85	$11,328,555	$5,190,700	$17,076,635	$23,568,500	$181,657,477	61%	$287,563,743	$187,231,277
Stanislaus	746,005	5,754	12	56	$5,311,849	$5,992,500	$23,368,000	$28,770,000	$119,527,731	52%	$297,370,588	$240,164,241
Sutter	74,650	1,962	19	56	$1,627,000	$891,000	$5,254,000	$9,808,500	$42,410,953	28%	$55,746,151	$69,770,953
Tehama	54,960	2,397	22	92	$790,000	$1,054,000	$3,875,700	$11,983,000	$46,837,935	58%	$139,330,954	$67,154,935
Trinity	13,200	1,399	35	14	$535,000	$125,000	$1,700,000	$6,995,000	$26,600,000	36%	$51,037,593	$37,000,000
Tulare	357,445	7,891	10	39	$8,602,252	$2,107,348	$15,767,700	$39,454,000	$174,926,452	24%	$186,664,086	$225,507,452
Tuolumne	52,450	1,264	31	6	$1,402,491	$527,248	$4,080,600	$6,320,000	$22,200,000	27%	$34,097,003	$43,708,610
Ventura	719,699	5,911	19.5	103	$36,665,000	$3,394,808	$31,576,000	$29,556,743	$163,584,450	56%	$330,104,020	$78,746,370
Yolo	154,262	2,528	17	134	$1,493,000	$1,053,000	$5,180,000	$12,641,000	$49,667,304	27%	$68,435,526	$76,007,304
Yuba	60,520	1,329	22.5	49	$592,000	$497,000	$4,888,000	$6,644,500	$72,384,588	55%	$73,674,115	$110,374,588
TOTAL	**32,922,855**	**309,700**	**20.8**	**84**	**$635,595,270**	**$232,102,646**	**$1,311,412,875**	**$1,548,500,243**	**$10,473,420,396**	**41%**	**$12,593,348,545**	**$14,910,569,987**

Local Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement

LOCAL BRIDGE REHABILITATION AND REPLACEMENT

Caltrans reports a need for $570 million for rehabilitation or replacement of bridges on local roads (off the state highway system). This shortfall assumes that local agencies will be able to use all available federal bridge funds and provide $350 million in local match funds over the next 10 years.

Counties and cities own 12,000 bridges on their local road and street systems. Caltrans, as required under federal regulations, keeps a record of the condition of all of these bridges, reports deficiencies to the local agencies responsible for the bridges, and in fact inspects bridges for many smaller local agencies which do not have the structural engineering expertise that Caltrans has. Caltrans estimates that 2600 bridges (just over 20%) are currently listed as deficient, and perhaps 100-200 on average come onto the list during each 2-year inspection cycle. A deficiency in traffic capacity does not by itself qualify a bridge for replacement. The cost of rehabilitation or replacement of course varies greatly by the size, design, age, and condition of a given bridge. Replacement typically costs about 2.5 times more than rehabilitation, and the decision is often made on the basis of remaining useful life afterwards.

If a local bridge is found deficient, it becomes eligible for rehabilitation or replacement using federal bridge funds, with a 20% local match required. Caltrans estimates a 10-year need for $1.1 billion for local bridge replacement, $1.2 billion for local bridge rehabilitation, and $400 million for remaining seismic retrofit, a total of $2.7 billion. Federal bridge funds are estimated to come to $1.7 billion over the next ten years, plus $50 million currently available that local agencies have not used. Local agencies must provide $350 million in required local match to go along with these federal funds, which some agencies may be able to provide and others may regard as unfunded. The remaining shortfall comes to about $570 million.

Some local agencies, particularly small ones, are not keeping up with bridge rehabilitation and replacement. As of September 1998, about half a year's federal funds remained unused. One problem has been inability to come up with local match funds, which may be a symptom of having to fund other more-urgent priorities in the context of the larger shortfall in local road rehabilitation funding as much as anything. In addition, the federal bridge program is hampered by a particularly tedious and difficult process, even more so than other federal programs.

Regional agencies also estimated unfunded local non-pavement road rehabilitation needs for the next ten years, including both bridges and other needs such as traffic signals, signs, lighting, and drainage all in one category. The regional total of about $2 billion, which did not include any estimate from the greater Los Angeles region but did include other kinds of non-pavement non-bridge needs and may have included at least some local match as unfunded, certainly falls in line with Caltrans' estimate of local bridge needs at least for order of magnitude.

In summary, Caltrans on behalf of counties and cities shows the following 10-year local bridge rehabilitation and replacement needs:

- deficient bridge rehabilitation and replacement federally funded $1.77 billion (funded)
- deficient bridge rehabilitation and replacement local match funded $350 million (? funded)
- additional deficient bridge rehabilitation and replacement $570 million (unfunded)

The attached chart shows Caltrans' estimate of local bridge needs by county for the next 10 years.

Local Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Needs Assessment

	Bridge Replacement	Bridge Rehabilitation	County Totals
County	**Required Critical Need Funding (10 Year-Includes COS Cost)**	**Required Critical Need Funding (10 Year-Includes COS Cost)**	**Required Critical Need Funding (10 Year-Includes COS Cost)**
Alameda	$22,305,500	$41,902,350	$64,207,850
Alpine	$0	$167,286	$167,286
Amador	$3,394,405	$637,798	$4,032,203
Butte	$19,186,615	$9,500,918	$28,687,533
Calaveras	$7,237,440	$562,086	$7,799,526
Colusa	$9,934,050	$6,613,432	$16,547,482
Contra Costa	$14,406,280	$26,281,304	$40,687,584
Del Norte	$582,435	$1,357,874	$1,940,309
El Dorado	$7,058,835	$5,499,900	$12,558,735
Fresno	$33,286,890	$21,863,212	$55,150,102
Glenn	$19,511,310	$5,177,284	$24,688,594
Humbolt	$13,208,475	$14,102,858	$27,311,333
Imperial	$2,554,930	$2,850,694	$5,405,624
Inyo	$1,020,635	$180,138	$1,200,773
Kern	$6,343,505	$27,192,536	$33,536,041
Kings	$3,263,435	$994,910	$4,258,345
Lake	$6,154,050	$3,045,602	$9,199,652
Lassen	$5,125,505	$366,548	$5,492,053
Los Angeles	$130,039,455	$514,890,852	$644,930,307
Madera	$7,541,975	$3,542,308	$11,084,283
Marin	$8,525,965	$4,970,238	$13,496,203
Mariposa	$3,816,925	$1,177,260	$4,994,185
Mendocino	$12,903,450	$8,354,612	$21,258,062
Merced	$6,557,985	$5,565,700	$12,123,685
Modoc	$1,418,060	$345,520	$1,763,580
Mono	$0	$0	$0
Monterey	$45,551,695	$13,836,746	$59,388,441
Napa	$10,477,005	$5,707,744	$16,184,749
Nevada	$11,130,070	$964,684	$12,094,754
Orange	$10,911,950	$21,407,414	$32,319,364
Placer	$20,938,750	$6,244,014	$27,182,764
Plumas	$12,621,945	$3,716,272	$16,338,217
Riverside	$10,272,115	$30,944,242	$41,216,357
Sacramento	$64,698,025	$27,067,544	$91,765,569
San Benito	$5,067,055	$751,940	$5,818,995
San Bernadino	$46,840,570	$17,570,070	$64,410,640

San Diego	$52,252,305	$56,085,414	$108,337,719
San Francisco	$4,271,925	$19,573,414	$23,845,339
San Joaquin	$23,155,930	$17,095,190	$40,251,120
San Luis Obispo	$15,964,620	$8,890,252	$24,854,872
San Mateo	$17,629,570	$54,550,678	$72,180,248
Santa Barbara	$13,106,835	$17,110,254	$30,217,089
Santa Clara	$29,381,695	$45,774,470	$75,156,165
Santa Cruz	$36,108,555	$11,308,234	$47,416,789
Shasta	$16,739,030	$26,959,184	$43,698,214
Sierra	$3,479,595	$708,806	$4,188,401
Siskiyou	$13,361,425	$8,828,708	$22,190,133
Solano	$8,694,805	$3,147,410	$11,842,215
Sonoma	$52,327,555	$20,926,220	$73,253,775
Stanislaus	$72,439,325	$33,898,676	$106,338,001
Sutter	$7,956,375	$4,981,326	$12,937,701
Tehama	$58,402,470	$7,632,296	$66,034,766
Trinity	$4,456,305	$3,261,104	$7,717,409
Tulare	$8,435,210	$18,781,812	$27,217,022
Tuolumne	$3,852,450	$3,991,708	$7,844,158
Ventura	$3,981,250	$19,629,260	$23,610,510
Yolo	$23,774,415	$7,436,926	$31,211,341
Yuba	$7,215,705	$2,719,626	$9,935,331
State Wide Totals	$1,060,874,640	$1,228,644,858	$2,289,519,498
Call	**$1,061,000,000**	**$1,229,000,000**	**$2,290,000,000**
		Remaining Seismic Retrofit of Local Bridges	**$400,000,000**
		Total Need for Local Bridges	**$2,690,000,000**
		Anticipated TEA-21 Funding for 10 years	$1,720,000,000
		Unused ISTEA fund balance (as of 9/98)	$51,900,000
		Local Funding Needed for Local Bridges	**$918,100,000**
		Expected Local 20% Share of HBRR Funding	**$354,380,000**
		Additional Unfunded Local Share	**$563,720,000**

Native American Reservation Roads and Access Roads

NATIVE AMERICAN RESERVATION ROADS AND ACCESS ROADS

The federal Bureau of Indian Affairs reports $218 million in unfunded needs for access or internal roads for 65 Native American reservations and rancherias. Caltrans also has surveyed 102 Native American groups, including these 65, and responses to date identify further needs totaling less than $10 million.

The federal Bureau of Indian Affairs, in partnership with the Federal Highway Administration, funds an average of about $5 million per year in road construction for Native American reservations, including both county roads that provide direct access to reservations and roads for internal circulation on the reservation. California contains 132 Native American reservations and rancherias, of which 102 can participate in the Bureau of Indian Affairs road program. Road needs vary depending on population, geographic size, remoteness of location, the condition of the existing road system, and traffic generated by business activities, particularly where casinos or mining are involved.

Beyond roads funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Native American tribes may propose projects for federal transportation programs administered by the states, which would include the STIP. States must consider and may fund road rehabilitation, improvements, and construction using regular federal transportation funds from TEA-21. California has not explicitly funded reservation access roads in the past except where incidental to other purposes.

The unfunded needs identified by Bureau of Indian Affairs include about 30 specific county road projects plus about 110 on-site reservation and rancheria roads, as follows:

- $77 million of unfunded road needs for 22 reservations or rancherias in Southern California,
- $40 million of unfunded road needs for 29 reservations or rancherias in Central California, and
- $102 million of unfunded road needs for 14 reservations or rancherias in Northern California.

Except for the Hoopa Valley Reservation in Humboldt County, which identified $85 million in unfunded road needs, the needs per reservation come to, at most, a few million dollars, and the typical road project costs in the range $200,000 to $2,000,000.

In summary, Native American groups identify the following ten-year road needs:

- projects for federal Bureau of Indian Affairs road program $50 million (funded)
- additional reservation and rancheria road needs $225 million (unfunded)

The attached chart summarizes unfunded road needs by reservation and rancheria.

NATIVE AMERICAN RESERVATION ROADS AND ACCESS ROADS

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

RESERVATION	COUNTY	Number of Projects	TOTAL COST ($1,000)
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians	Riverside		
Alturas Rancheria	Modoc	1	$154
Auburn United Indian Community	Placer		
Augustine Band of Mission Indians	Riverside		
Barona Band of Mission Indians	San Diego	1	$4,800
Benton Paiute Reservation	Mono	4	$3,560
Berry Creek Rancheria	Butte		
Big Lagoon Rancheria	Humboldt		
Big Pine Reservation	Inyo	2	$776
Big Sandy Rancheria	Fresno	7	$1,217
Big Valley Rancheria	Lake	1	$625
Bishop Reservation	Inyo	1	$450
Blue Lake Rancheria	Humboldt		
Bridgeport Indian Colony	Mono		
Buena Vista Rancheria	Amador		
Cabazon Band of Mission Indians	Riverside	1	$281
Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians	Riverside	4	$5,390
Campo Band of Mission Indians	San Diego	3	$2,312
Cedarville Rancheria	Modoc	2	$338
Chicken Ranch Rancheria	Tuolumne		
Chico Rancheria	Butte		
Cloverdale Rancheria	Sonoma		
Cold Springs Rancheria	Fresno		
Colusa Rancheria	Colusa	1	$412
Cortina Rancheria	Colusa	1	$6,221
Coyote Valley Rancheria	Mendocino	1	$305
Cuyapaipe Band of Mission Indians	Alpine		
Elk Valley Rancheria	Del Norte	1	$60
Ewiiaapaayp	San Diego	3	$4,334
Dry Creek Rancheria	Sonoma	1	$735
Elem Indian Colony	Lake		
Enterprise Rancheria	Butte		
Fort Bidwell Reservation	Modoc		
Fort Independence Reservation	Inyo		
Greenville Rancheria	Plumas	1	$12
Grindstone Rancheria	Glenn	1	$750
Guidiville Rancheria	Mendocino		
Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Humboldt	19	$85,394
Hopland Reservation	Mendocino	1	$325
Inaja-Cosmit Reservation	San Diego	1	$4,802
Jackson Rancheria	Amador		
Jamul Indian Village	San Diego	2	$830
Karuk Tribe of California	Siskiyou	5	$1,761
La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians	San Diego	4	$2,281
La Posta Band of Mission Indians	San Diego	4	$3,339
Laytonville Rancheria	Mendocino	1	$350
Likely	Modoc	1	$239
Lone Pine Reservation	Inyo	2	$1,222
Look Out	Modoc	1	$232
Los Coyotes Reservation	San Diego	6	$8,468
Lytton Rancheria	Sonoma		
Manchester/Point Arena Rancheria	Mendocino	1	$1,200

Manzanita Band of Mission Indians	San Diego		
Mdpn. P.D. Allotment	Mariposa	1	$375
Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians	San Diego	2	$6,446
Middletown Rancheria	Lake	3	$1,025
Mooretown Rancheria	Butte	1	$450
Morongo Band of Mission Indians	Riverside	4	$6,778
North Fork Rancheria	Madera	1	$1,092
Pala Band of Mission Indians	San Diego		
Paskenta Rancheria	Glenn		
Pauma/Yuima Band of Mission Indians	San Diego		
Pechanga Band of Mission Indians	Riverside	2	$1,126
Picayune Rancheria	Madera		
Pinoleville Rancheria	Mendocino		
Pit River Tribe	Shasta		
Potter Valley Rancheria	Mendocino		
Quartz Valley Reservation	Siskiyou	3	$592
Ramona Band of Mission Indians	San Diego	3	$2,565
Redding Rancheria	Shasta		
Redwood Valley Rancheria	Mendocino	1	$350
Resighini Rancheria	Del Norte	2	$507
Rincon Band of Mission Indians	San Diego	8	$2,202
Roaring Creek	Shasta	1	$7,527
Robinson Rancheria	Lake	2	$475
Rohnerville Rancheria	Humboldt		
Round Valley Reservation	Mendocino	5	$1,597
Rumsey Rancheria	Yolo		
San Luis Rey Indian Water Authority	San Diego		
San Manual Band of Mission Indians	San diego		
San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians	San Diego	5	$2,442
Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians	Riverside	5	$9,789
Santa Rosa Rancheria	Kings	2	$300
Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians	Santa Barbara	1	$594
Santa Ysabel Band of Mission Indians	San Diego	5	$4,442
Scotts Valley Rancheria	Lake		
Sheep Ranch Rancheria	Calaveras		
Sherwood Valley Rancheria	Mendocino	3	$822
Shingle Springs Rancheria	El Dorado	1	$500
Smith River Rancheria	Del Norte		
Soboba Band of Mission Indians	Riverside	4	$1,108
Stve Mrnda P.D. Allotment	Kern	1	$726
Stewart Point Rancheria	Sonoma	2	$265
Susanville Indian Rancheria	Lassen	1	$573
Sycuan Band of Mission Indians	San Diego		
Table Bluff Rancheria	Humboldt		
Table Mountain Rancheria	Fresno		
Timbisha Shoshone Tribe	Inyo		
Torres-Martinez Band of Desert Cahuilla Indians	San Diego & Imperial	3	$1,729
Trinidad Rancheria	Humboldt	3	$663
Tule River Reservation	Tulare	10	$12,690
Tuolumne Rancheria	Tuolumne	3	$696
Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians	Riverside		
Upper Lake Rancheria	Lake		
Viejas Band of Mission Indians	San Diego	2	$619
X-L Ranch	Modoc	1	$554
Yurok Tribe	Humboldt	6	$3,774
TOTAL		182	$218,568

State Highways:
Interregional Improvements in Rural Areas

STATE HIGHWAYS: INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENTS IN RURAL AREAS

Caltrans reports at least $5.8 billion of rural interregional state highway needs beyond expected funding through the 2006 STIP (to year 2010), assuming Caltrans will fund only rural projects with its interregional share of the STIP during that time; if Caltrans were to choose to spend up to the statutory maximum of 40% of its interregional share on urban projects, the unfunded need for rural interregional projects could go as high as $6.6 billion. Regional agencies have separately identified slightly less than half of the same $7.8 billion worth of rural interregional needs as Caltrans, totaling about $3.4 billion; if regional agencies were to fund some of these needs with regional shares in the STIP, the unfunded need would be reduced, but duplication in identifying needs does not necessarily indicate intent by the region to provide funding.

Caltrans owns and maintains a 15,000 mile state highway system. Of this total, the statutes designate all or portions of 87 state routes (8,500 miles) as interregional routes, exclusively outside urban areas. The purpose of the interregional system is to connect California's urban areas and serve rural access. Caltrans receives 25% of STIP funding for interregional projects, estimated at about $2 billion not yet programmed for STIPs going out through 2010. Of this amount, Caltrans must spend at least 60% ($1.2 billion), and may spend as much as 100%, on designated rural interregional routes.

The Commission and Caltrans have defined objectives for the state's interregional program investments: to complete a trunk system of high standard highways, connecting all urban areas (including high growth urbanizing areas) and geographic gateways, and linking rural and small urban areas to the system. The existing trunk system has been partly completed as freeways and expressways, but still contains some significant stretches of two-lane highway, even on main trunk routes. Caltrans has further divided its interregional system into three parts for purposes of setting investment priorities.

1. Focus Routes -- 10 interregional corridors comprised of non-interstate routes with critical underdeveloped and incomplete sections of freeway and expressway, such as Routes 99, 101, and 152, on which Caltrans identifies a need for $4.8 billion for improvements out to 2010;
2. Other High Emphasis Routes -- the remainder of the 34 routes of the main trunk system, particularly including interstate routes, which may need added capacity or other improvements on some sections, for example Routes 5, 15, and 138, on which Caltrans identifies a need for $1.9 billion for improvements out to year 2020; and
3. Other Interregional Routes – state highways (53 other routes) providing access into rural recreation, farm, and resource areas, most of which will remain as two-lane highways but with some widening, realignment, and passing lanes needed, such as Routes 49, 79, and 89, on which Caltrans identifies a need for $1.1 billion for improvements out to 2010.

Caltrans has directed its top priority for investment toward the focus routes, with north-south routes first and east-west routes following, with second priority toward adding capacity on some of the high emphasis routes, and third priority to selected improvements on rural recreational and agricultural access routes. The $7.8 billion of projects Caltrans identifies as 10-year needs are all located on currently-deficient sections of the interregional system, and include projects Caltrans would want to have at least under construction by 2010. Caltrans believes it neither feasible nor

necessary to complete all intended improvements on the interregional system within 10 years; in some areas, such as on the Route 20 or 299 corridors across the north state, traffic conditions will remain at least marginally acceptable on the existing two-lane highway until beyond 10 years. More urgent investments will be needed on rural interregional routes extending into and through urban areas.

In summary, Caltrans' plans indicate the following 10-year needs for rural interregional state highway improvements, assuming Caltrans directs all STIP funding available for state share to rural interregional routes:

- Interregional program through the 2006 STIP (to 2010) (est'd) $2 billion (funded)
- Further interregional needs through 2010 $5.8 billion (unfunded)

Some of these needs may be funded partially or wholly with regional program investments.

The following chart summarizes rural interregional needs by corridor:

State Highways: Rural Interregional Improvement Needs

Route 101 North Coast: San Francisco - Oregon line	$984 million
Route 101 Central Coast: Los Angeles - San Jose	$245 million
Route 99 Sacramento Valley: Sacramento - Redding	$756 million
Route 99 San Joaquin Valley: Bakersfield- Sacramento	$548 million
Routes 14-395 corridor: Southern California - Oregon line	$637 million
Routes 86-111 corridor: Indio - Mexican border	$65 million
Routes 299-44 corridor: Eureka - Susanville	$191 million
Routes 20-49 corridor: Willits - Auburn	$98 million
Routes 152-156 corridor: Monterey/Gilroy - Merced Co.	$477 million
Routes 41-46-198 corridor: Central Coast - Central Valley	$248 million
Route 58 corridor: Bakersfield - Barstow	$446 million
Route 905: San Diego - Mexican border	$136 million
SUBTOTAL: Focus Routes	**$4.8 billion**
Route 5 corridor Central Valley: Grapevine - Oregon line	$301 million
Routes 17-1 corridor Monterey Bay: San Jose - Monterey	$265 million
Route 10 Low Desert: San Bernardino - Indio	$377 million
Route 15 Mojave Desert: San Bernardino - Nevada line	$569 million
Route 138 High Desert : Palmdale - Victorville	$100 million
Other: Scattered locations on Routes 41, 50, 80, 120, 215	$240 million
SUBTOTAL: Other High Emphasis Routes	**$1.9 billion**
Routes 74 & 79: Orange & Riverside Cos.	$262 million
Route 11 San Diego: Mexican border access	$140 million
Other: Scattered locations on 16 routes statewide	$659 million
SUBTOTAL: Other Interregional Routes	**$1.1 billion**
TOTAL: Rural Interregional State Highways	**$7.8 billion**

State Highways:
Interregional Improvements in Urban Areas

STATE HIGHWAYS: INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENTS IN URBAN AREAS

Caltrans made no estimate of urban interregional state highway needs to be funded through the STIP by year 2010, except for traffic operational improvements (discussed elsewhere) that it intends to fund through the SHOPP. Caltrans noted urban state highway needs would be defined in partnership with regional agencies, and funded in partnership with regional shares in the STIP, in line with SB 45. Thus Caltrans has not tried to speculate how much of its estimated $2 billion interregional share of STIP funds during the coming decade might end up being used for urgent urban projects, although as much as $800 million could be spent that way out through the 2006 STIP. Regional agencies have separately identified somewhere near $20 billion worth of urban state highway needs, some on the extensions of rural interregional routes and some on other state highways.

Caltrans owns and maintains a 15,000 mile state highway system. Of this total, the statutes designate all or portions of 87 state routes (8,500 miles) as interregional routes, exclusively outside urban areas. Many of these interregional routes, particularly the main trunk interregional routes, extend into or through urban areas. For example, Route 99 passes through or adjacent to nine urban areas up and down the Central Valley, Route 101 along the coast passes through the Bay Area and serves as an important part of the urban freeway network there, and several interstate highways in Southern California reach into downtown Los Angeles and connect to airports and seaports. Thus an interregional system cannot serve its primary function of intercity connection without its urban extensions.

Regional agencies receive 75% of STIP funding for regional projects, and Caltrans receives the remaining 25% of STIP funding for interregional projects. Caltrans' interregional share not yet programmed is estimated at about $2 billion for STIPs going out through 2010. Of this amount, Caltrans may spend as much as 40% ($800 million) on urban state highways. The Commission and Caltrans have defined objectives for the state's interregional program investments: to complete a trunk system of high standard highways, connecting all urban areas (including high growth urbanizing areas) and geographic gateways, and linking rural and small urban areas to the system. In line with these objectives, Caltrans would focus any urban interregional investments it does choose to make specifically on interregional route extensions into and across urban areas, and in almost every case would make these investments relying on funding partnerships with regional programs. For the present analysis of unfunded needs, the Commission has assigned all $2 billion of Caltrans' 25% STIP share toward funding rural interregional needs and none to urban interregional needs; if the mix of investments Caltrans actually proposes over the next decade turns out to be different, the unfunded need just shifts from urban to rural.

In summary, Caltrans has not estimated or specified 10-year needs for urban interregional state highway improvements, instead deferring to needs to be defined -- and funded – in partnership with the regions.

State Highways:
Bridge and Highway Rehabilitation

STATE HIGHWAYS: BRIDGE & HIGHWAY REHABILITATION

Caltrans reports a need for an additional $5.5 billion for pavement, bridge, and roadside rehabilitation, beyond the amounts funded from its State Highway Operation & Protection Programs (SHOPP) out through 2008. These needs come on top of Caltrans' regular highway maintenance expenditures, and in addition to safety and traffic operations needs also funded through the SHOPP.

Caltrans owns, operates, maintains, and rehabilitates the 15,000 mile (48,000 lane-mile) state highway system. Streets & Highways Code Section 167(a) defines operations, maintenance, rehabilitation, and safety as the top priorities for state highway expenditures. Toward keeping the state highways in sound and safe condition, Caltrans prepares a 10-year SHOPP plan, which identifies projects to be funded in 4-year SHOPP programs, with the current program extending to 2002. The SHOPP covers a number of kinds of projects:

- Resurfacing and pavement rehabilitation, including long-life pavements,
- Bridge rehabilitation and replacement,
- Roadside rehabilitation, including drainage, planting, and rest areas,
- Protective betterments to forestall chronic problems, most often from erosion or drainage,
- Safety improvements, including for the roadway, intersections, and roadside,
- Traffic operations improvements, to help traffic move more smoothly, and
- Lands and buildings improvements, including maintenance facility modernization.

Caltrans' 10-year SHOPP plan forecasted a need for $9.0 billion for SHOPP purposes overall, covering the current SHOPP period through 2002 plus three succeeding programs going out through 2008. For the state highway and bridge rehabilitation component (including roadside work and protective betterments) the need totaled $7.0 billion.

Caltrans' highway rehabilitation program covers a wide range of work, both on the roadway and roadside. The current SHOPP estimate calls for $3.5 billion for resurfacing, rehabilitation, or replacement of worn pavement, 5% higher than in the SHOPP 10-year plan. Caltrans intends to shift from a worst-case-first pavement repair policy to a preventive strategy, reduce its current 12,800 lane-miles of deteriorated pavement by 60%, and then roll it over at that level year-by-year. The current SHOPP calls for $3.0 billion for replacement rehabilitation or replacement of deficient bridges (including seismic retrofit, which is fully funded), 40% higher than in the SHOPP 10-year plan, based on results from Caltrans' periodic inspection and analysis program. The current need for $500 million for roadside rehabilitation includes drainage repair and improvements, landscaping, and roadside rest area improvements, and includes an $80 million increase for 2500 acres of new landscaping.

In addition, Caltrans now proposes to spend $5.5 billion for installation of long life pavement when pavement rehabilitation comes due, considerably more than the $1.1 billion called for in the SHOPP 10-year plan. Caltrans has determined that long life pavement (which provides a 30-40 year life span instead of the normal 20 years) can provide a net benefit in life cycle cost in a much wider application than was originally contemplated during testing, especially on urban freeways where high traffic loads preclude roadwork except for a few hours in the middle of the night. All SHOPP needs, for pavement, bridge, and roadside work, now total $12.5 billion.

In summary, the SHOPP's highway and bridge rehabilitation programs now show the following 10-year needs:

- State highway and bridge rehabilitation, w/ some long life pavement $7.0 billion (funded)
- Additional long life pavement and other rehabilitation needs $5.5 billion (unfunded)

Caltrans has also estimated a need for $240 million to renovate or replace some of its 400 highway maintenance facilities, concentrating on 130 outdated and inadequate buildings that will exceed their 50-year useful service life during the next 10 years. This need shows up in its Lands & Buildings program, along with as much as $500 million in Caltrans' state office building needs, an estimate Caltrans calls preliminary and possibly low.

The following chart shows Caltrans' estimate of future state highway rehabilitation needs by county.

County	Pavement Rehabilitation	Long-Life Pavement	Bridge Rehabilitation	Roadside Rehabilitation	Lands & Buildings	($ in millions)
Alameda	$ 92.4	$ 373.7	$ 235.8	$ 5.1	$ 27.9	
Alpine	$ 6.5	$ -	$ 1.0	$ -	$ -	
Amador	$ 24.4	$ -	$ 4.4	$ -	$ 4.6	
Butte	$ 20.4	$ -	$ 28.9	$ 4.7	$ -	
Calaveras	$ 21.1	$ -	$ 2.9	$ -	$ 4.3	
Colusa	$ 18.9	$ -	$ 2.1	$ 3.4	$ -	
Contra Costa	$ 29.6	$ 175.2	$ 57.4	$ 6.7	$ 9.0	
Del Norte	$ 5.8	$ -	$ 9.5	$ -	$ 3.0	
El Dorado	$ 36.1	$ -	$ 5.1	$ 5.3	$ 6.2	
Fresno	$ 87.5	$ -	$ 22.7	$ 17.4	$ 3.0	
Glenn	$ 37.5	$ -	$ 23.9	$ 3.2	$ -	
Humboldt	$ 27.4	$ -	$ 181.7	$ -	$ 11.6	
Imperial	$ 19.3	$ -	$ 15.5	$ 1.2	$ 10.0	
Inyo	$ 25.3	$ -	$ 1.3	$ 2.0	$ 1.4	
Kern	$ 179.3	$ 14.7	$ 41.3	$ 16.3	$ 5.0	
Kings	$ 26.5	$ -	$ 5.9	$ 3.1	$ -	
Lake	$ 6.5	$ -	$ 8.1	$ -	$ -	
Lassen	$ 41.4	$ -	$ 2.3	$ 2.4	$ 4.5	
Los Angeles	$ 756.1	$ 2,210.3	$ 976.4	$ 57.1	$ 14.2	
Madera	$ 30.8	$ -	$ 14.3	$ 4.1	$ -	
Marin	$ 35.4	$ 78.2	$ 81.8	$ 3.4	$ -	
Mariposa	$ 9.6	$ -	$ 3.8	$ -	$ -	
Mendocino	$ 71.0	$ -	$ 53.1	$ -	$ 10.9	
Merced	$ 37.3	$ -	$ 45.3	$ 2.1	$ -	
Modoc	$ 45.1	$ -	$ 1.3	$ -	$ 2.7	
Mono	$ 30.1	$ -	$ 0.8	$ 1.0	$ 8.0	
Monterey	$ 50.6	$ -	$ 17.6	$ 17.3	$ -	
Napa	$ 23.0	$ -	$ 36.2	$ 0.7	$ 2.6	
Nevada	$ 33.0	$ -	$ 22.2	$ 3.8	$ 21.5	
Orange	$ 89.2	$ 763.0	$ 26.4	$ 63.0	$ 3.2	
Placer	$ 34.4	$ -	$ 13.5	$ 5.9	$ 8.6	
Plumas	$ 13.0	$ -	$ 30.8	$ 2.7	$ 6.8	
Riverside	$ 226.5	$ 162.3	$ 19.9	$ 49.2	$ 1.6	
Sacramento	$ 38.8	$ 179.4	$ 62.3	$ 14.8	$ 7.7	
San Benito	$ 7.2	$ -	$ 4.2	$ -	$ -	
San Bernardino	$ 287.7	$ 283.4	$ 77.6	$ 50.7	$ 4.0	
San Diego	$ 94.8	$ 796.0	$ 89.5	$ 53.0	$ -	
San Francisco	$ 14.7	$ 68.1	$ 250.7	$ -	$ -	
San Joaquin	$ 67.0	$ 44.7	$ 65.9	$ 9.4	$ 4.9	
San Luis Obispo	$ 42.8	$ -	$ 45.9	$ 10.3	$ 4.9	
San Mateo	$ 53.3	$ 206.0	$ 69.7	$ 4.6	$ -	
Santa Barbara	$ 50.1	$ -	$ 38.0	$ 11.4	$ -	
Santa Clara	$ 66.2	$ -	$ 28.9	$ 9.6	$ 6.0	
Santa Cruz	$ 23.5	$ -	$ 6.6	$ -	$ 0.9	
Shasta	$ 71.1	$ -	$ 29.7	$ 3.9	$ 6.5	
Sierra	$ 5.6	$ -	$ 1.0	$ 0.1	$ 1.2	
Siskiyou	$ 28.9	$ -	$ 22.9	$ 3.6	$ 6.0	
Solano	$ 66.8	$ 38.8	$ 33.1	$ 4.6	$ 2.8	
Sonoma	$ 61.4	$ -	$ 25.0	$ 4.6	$ 0.9	
Stanislaus	$ 44.3	$ 12.5	$ 7.8	$ 5.6	$ -	
Sutter	$ 1.6	$ -	$ 16.9	$ 2.4	$ -	
Tehama	$ 33.0	$ -	$ 31.1	$ 4.3	$ 4.1	
Trinity	$ 5.4	$ -	$ 5.9	$ -	$ 4.7	
Tulare	$ 66.1	$ -	$ 13.9	$ 8.0	$ 6.7	
Tuolumne	$ 14.2	$ -	$ 4.0	$ 12.0	$ 0.5	
Ventura	$ 81.1	$ 48.5	$ 44.1	$ -	$ 2.9	
Yolo	$ 31.5	$ -	$ 31.9	$ 2.2	$ -	
Yuba	$ 5.0	$ -	$ 30.7	$ 0.6	$ 6.3	
Total	$ 3,453.1	$ 5,454.8	$ 3,030.5	$ 496.8	$ 241.6	$ 12,435.2
10-Yr SHOPP Plan	$ 3,299.0	$ 1,051.0	$ 2,167.0	$ 410.0	$ 446.0	$ 6,927.0
Net Difference	$ 154.1	$ 4,403.8	$ 863.5	$ 86.8	$ (204.4)	$ 5,508.2

State Highways:
Safety Improvements

STATE HIGHWAYS: SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

Caltrans reports a need for an additional $1.2 billion for safety improvements, beyond the amounts funded from its State Highway Operation & Protection Programs (SHOPP) out through 2008. Caltrans has recently re-evaluated the parameters it uses to identify safety projects for the SHOPP, expanding the forecast of need threefold.

Caltrans owns and operates, maintains, and rehabilitates the 15,000 mile (48,000 lane-mile) state highway system. Streets & Highways Code Section 167(a) defines operations, maintenance, rehabilitation, and safety as the top priorities for state highway expenditures. Toward keeping the state highways in sound and safe condition, Caltrans prepares a 10-year SHOPP plan, which identifies projects to be funded in 4-year SHOPP programs, with the current program extending to 2002. The SHOPP covers a number of kinds of projects:

- Resurfacing and pavement rehabilitation, including long-life pavements,
- Bridge rehabilitation and replacement,
- Roadside rehabilitation, including drainage, planting, and rest areas,
- Protective betterments to forestall chronic problems, most often from erosion or drainage,
- Safety improvements, including for the roadway, intersections, and roadside,
- Traffic operations improvements, to help traffic move more smoothly, and
- Lands and buildings improvements, including maintenance facility modernization.

Caltrans' 10-year SHOPP plan forecasted a need for $9.0 billion for SHOPP purposes overall, covering the current SHOPP period through 2002 plus three succeeding programs going out through 2008. For the safety improvements component, the need totaled $660 million.

Caltrans' safety program covers various kinds of roadway improvements such as straightening curves and improving intersections, protection from roadside hazards, median barriers, and motorist warning devices. The safety program is reactive, making improvements at locations where too many accidents have occurred. The program works within extremely strict limits, requiring the estimated value of lives that could be saved and injuries and damage that could be prevented by a safety project to exceed the cost of the project, so that Caltrans builds <u>all</u> safety projects that meet this warrant and none that do not, and thus insulates itself from arbitrary judgment and liability where more subjective projects outside the limit might be involved.

Caltrans periodically recalculates the values it assigns to loss of lives and injury losses in traffic accidents, based on actuarial tables, average wage rates, medical costs, and so forth, and it did so last year. It's no surprise that the cost side has increased substantially, so the threshold for a 2:1 safety project has increased as well, meaning more projects (and a wider universe of projects) can meet the warrant. Caltrans also proposes to expand its use of concrete median barriers. With the broadened safety warrants, Caltrans now estimates $1.8 billion may be needed for safety projects.

In summary, the SHOPP's safety program now shows the following 10-year needs:

- Safety program in the current 10-year SHOPP plan — $660 million (funded)
- Additional safety program needs based on new warrants — $1.2 billion (unfunded)

The following chart shows Caltrans' estimate of future state highway safety needs by county.

County	Safety	($ in millions)
Alameda	$ 37.4	
Alpine	$ 3.1	
Amador	$ 15.9	
Butte	$ 26.2	
Calaveras	$ 16.1	
Colusa	$ 7.0	
Contra Costa	$ 18.8	
Del Norte	$ 8.9	
El Dorado	$ 24.0	
Fresno	$ 45.9	
Glenn	$ 4.9	
Humboldt	$ 16.9	
Imperial	$ 34.2	
Inyo	$ 25.2	
Kern	$ 72.0	
Kings	$ 16.9	
Lake	$ 17.5	
Lassen	$ 18.7	
Los Angeles	$ 184.5	
Madera	$ 25.8	
Marin	$ 23.2	
Mariposa	$ 7.6	
Mendocino	$ 34.6	
Merced	$ 49.1	
Modoc	$ 5.9	
Mono	$ 16.1	
Monterey	$ 47.7	
Napa	$ 24.3	
Nevada	$ 19.5	
Orange	$ 35.9	
Placer	$ 30.3	
Plumas	$ 11.9	
Riverside	$ 86.3	
Sacramento	$ 53.7	
San Benito	$ 11.7	
San Bernardino	$ 125.4	
San Diego	$ 71.2	
San Francisco	$ 10.7	
San Joaquin	$ 36.8	
San Luis Obispo	$ 42.7	
San Mateo	$ 41.9	
Santa Barbara	$ 53.3	
Santa Clara	$ 71.1	
Santa Cruz	$ 20.7	
Shasta	$ 20.1	
Sierra	$ 3.4	
Siskiyou	$ 13.2	
Solano	$ 28.2	
Sonoma	$ 40.1	
Stanislaus	$ 26.8	
Sutter	$ 18.6	
Tehama	$ 10.4	
Trinity	$ 8.0	
Tulare	$ 29.9	
Tuolumne	$ 18.2	
Ventura	$ 35.1	
Yolo	$ 12.4	
Yuba	$ 9.2	
Total	$ 1,825.1	
10-Year SHOPP	$ 659.0	
Net Difference	$ 1,166.1	

State Highways: Recurrent Problems

STATE HIGHWAYS: RECURRENT PROBLEMS

Caltrans reports a need for $4.4 billion for preventive projects to forestall or bypass state highway locations prone to chronic road closures during severe wet weather. Caltrans would fund smaller projects through its State Highway Operation & Protection Program (SHOPP) and larger ones would be major projects in the STIP, but none are currently funded.

Caltrans owns and operates, maintains, and rehabilitates the 15,000 mile (48,000 lane-mile) state highway system. Streets & Highways Code Section 167(a) defines operations, maintenance, rehabilitation, and safety as the top priorities for state highway expenditures. Toward keeping the state highways in sound and safe condition, Caltrans prepares a 10-year SHOPP plan, which identifies projects to be funded in 4-year SHOPP programs, with the current program extending to 2002. The SHOPP covers a number of kinds of projects:

- Resurfacing and pavement rehabilitation, including long-life pavements,
- Bridge rehabilitation and replacement,
- Roadside rehabilitation, including drainage, planting, and rest areas,
- Protective betterments to forestall chronic problems, most often from erosion or drainage,
- Safety improvements, including for the roadway, intersections, and roadside,
- Traffic operations improvements, to help traffic move more smoothly, and
- Lands and buildings improvements, including maintenance facility modernization.

The Commission, in the course of examining what amounted to $800 million in Caltrans' emergency storm damage repair expenditures in 1997 and 1998, asked Caltrans what it would take to avoid road closures and costly repeated repair work at certain chronic locations. Caltrans had in fact been studying the same problem itself. Besides for the basically unproductive repair cost, road closures disrupt travel and commerce and cut economic lifelines to communities. Chronic road problems basically stem from four causes: poor drainage and flooding, rockfalls, erosion and washouts, and slope movement. The most notorious locations are well known through the news media: along the coast highway (Malibu, Devil's Slide), in mountain canyons, along flood-prone river banks, crossing desert washes, and in some low-lying valley areas. Although the SHOPP can and does fund spot protective betterments to forestall road damage, the 10-year SHOPP plan contains no funding for a wide-scale program.

By early 1999, Caltrans had defined a program aimed at forestalling or bypassing nearly 1000 locations around the state highway system prone to chronic damage and road closure during severe wet weather. Projects would be designed to solve the road damage and closure problems permanently. Proposed scope of work varies widely, from improving drainage facilities, removing rock or soil from hillsides, buttressing slopes, raising the highway grade, building structures, or realigning the highway, all the way to bypassing the problem location altogether on a new route. Some of these projects would be extremely worthwhile from a direct cost-benefit standpoint, some only marginally so; for some places, no permanent and affordable cure may be feasible.

In summary, Caltrans identifies the following 10-year unfunded need to prevent costly and repeated storm damage and road closures at known chronic locations on state highways:

- Preventive program for chronic storm damage locations $4.4 billion (unfunded)

The following chart shows Caltrans' estimate of recurrent problem needs by county.

County	Recurrent Problems	($ in millions
Alameda	$ 25.4	
Alpine	$ 3.0	
Amador	$ 9.4	
Butte	$ 239.2	
Calaveras	$ 9.0	
Colusa	$ 5.0	
Contra Costa	$ 17.1	
Del Norte	$ 9.6	
El Dorado	$ 8.9	
Fresno	$ 87.2	
Glenn	$ 7.9	
Humboldt	$ 63.5	
Imperial	$ 11.7	
Inyo	$ 9.8	
Kern	$ 336.8	
Kings	$ 9.0	
Lake	$ 8.9	
Lassen	$ 97.2	
Los Angeles	$ 1,148.5	
Madera	$ 3.0	
Marin	$ 34.3	
Mariposa	$ 3.0	
Mendocino	$ 205.8	
Merced	$ 4.5	
Modoc	$ 11.0	
Mono	$ 15.7	
Monterey	$ 30.2	
Napa	$ 3.0	
Nevada	$ 5.2	
Orange	$ 82.5	
Placer	$ 3.3	
Plumas	$ 487.9	
Riverside	$ 3.0	
Sacramento	$ 3.0	
San Benito	$ 3.0	
San Bernardino	$ 14.1	
San Diego	$ 15.8	
San Francisco	$ 3.0	
San Joaquin	$ 3.0	
San Luis Obispo	$ 5.4	
San Mateo	$ 322.2	
Santa Barbara	$ 3.4	
Santa Clara	$ 7.5	
Santa Cruz	$ 5.6	
Shasta	$ 216.0	
Sierra	$ 20.7	
Siskiyou	$ 258.6	
Solano	$ 10.5	
Sonoma	$ 112.8	
Stanislaus	$ 8.5	
Sutter	$ 5.0	
Tehama	$ 27.5	
Trinity	$ 211.9	
Tulare	$ 9.0	
Tuolumne	$ 3.0	
Ventura	$ 61.2	
Yolo	$ 14.1	
Yuba	$ 3.0	
Total	$ 4,347.3	
10-Year SHOPP	$ -	
Net Difference	$ 4,347.3	

State Highways:
Operational Improvements

STATE HIGHWAYS: OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

Caltrans reports a need for an additional $2.6 billion for traffic operational improvements, beyond the amounts funded from its State Highway Operation & Protection Programs (SHOPP) out through 2008. This unfunded need would cover the first phase of a new Traffic Operations Program Strategies (TOPS) aimed at deploying new technologies and building strategic spot improvements to manage and reduce urban highway congestion systemwide.

Caltrans owns and operates, maintains, and rehabilitates the 15,000 mile (48,000 lane-mile) state highway system. Streets & Highways Code Section 167(a) defines operations, maintenance, rehabilitation, and safety as the top priorities for state highway expenditures. Toward keeping the state highways in sound and safe condition, Caltrans prepares a 10-year SHOPP plan, which identifies projects to be funded in 4-year SHOPP programs, with the current program extending to 2002. The SHOPP covers a number of kinds of projects:

- Resurfacing and pavement rehabilitation, including long-life pavements,
- Bridge rehabilitation and replacement,
- Roadside rehabilitation, including drainage, planting, and rest areas,
- Protective betterments to forestall chronic problems, most often from erosion or drainage,
- Safety improvements, including for the roadway, intersections, and roadside,
- Traffic operations improvements, to help traffic move more smoothly, and
- Lands and buildings improvements, including maintenance facility modernization.

Caltrans' 10-year SHOPP plan forecasted a need for $9.0 billion for SHOPP purposes overall, covering the current SHOPP period through 2002 plus three succeeding programs going out through 2008. For the traffic operational improvements component, needs totaled $610 million.

Caltrans' traditional traffic operations program covers various kinds of highway improvements to help traffic move more smoothly, such as ramp meters, carpool and bus lanes, turn lanes, auxiliary lanes, message signs, passing lanes, truck bypass lanes, and truck weigh stations, and supporting activities such as traffic management centers and freeway service patrols. Caltrans in its first phase of TOPS, to be funded through the SHOPP, intends to deploy new technology, such as ramp meters interconnected with city street signal systems, real time traveler communications, advanced incident management to deal with accidents and spills, and demand management to reduce traffic volumes, in tandem with strategic spot highway improvements. Caltrans has in the past year or two begun designing and testing TOPS in Southern California, and intends to expand it to wherever urban congestion occurs during the next decade. TOPS tests show potential to keep traffic flowing at 40 MPH, using 95% of highway capacity, with 95% reliable travel times. In later phases of TOPS, Caltrans intends to add to the carpool lane system and build bus lanes at key locations, and eventually to rebuild major urban freeway interchanges to improve connections and capacity in tandem with modern traffic management technology, involving large capital investments through the STIP.

In summary, the SHOPP's operational improvements program now shows the following 10-year needs:

- Traditional operational improvements in the 10-year SHOPP plan $580 million (funded)
- TOPS first phase & related additional operational improvements $2.6 billion (unfunded)

The following chart shows Caltrans' estimate of future state highway operations needs by county.

County	Operational Improvements	Truck Weigh Stations	($ in millions)
Alameda	$ 91.3	$ 26.8	
Alpine	$ 3.1	$ -	
Amador	$ 9.2	$ -	
Butte	$ 23.1	$ -	
Calaveras	$ 16.7	$ 0.1	
Colusa	$ 1.4	$ -	
Contra Costa	$ 72.6	$ 0.5	
Del Norte	$ 59.2	$ -	
El Dorado	$ 21.9	$ 0.3	
Fresno	$ 29.9	$ -	
Glenn	$ 1.1	$ -	
Humboldt	$ 32.4	$ 0.5	
Imperial	$ 64.5	$ 14.3	
Inyo	$ 15.1	$ -	
Kern	$ 27.7	$ 1.6	
Kings	$ 14.1	$ -	
Lake	$ 12.1	$ -	
Lassen	$ 4.4	$ -	
Los Angeles	$ 574.2	$ 15.1	
Madera	$ 10.5	$ -	
Marin	$ 19.0	$ 0.5	
Mariposa	$ 2.7	$ -	
Mendocino	$ 32.2	$ 0.5	
Merced	$ 35.6	$ 4.9	
Modoc	$ 0.5	$ -	
Mono	$ 44.2	$ -	
Monterey	$ 15.8	$ -	
Napa	$ 1.0	$ -	
Nevada	$ 12.6	$ 1.0	
Orange	$ 198.2	$ 0.5	
Placer	$ 22.5	$ -	
Plumas	$ 8.6	$ 0.3	
Riverside	$ 95.8	$ 13.0	
Sacramento	$ 97.4	$ 0.5	
San Benito	$ 5.5	$ -	
San Bernardino	$ 114.0	$ 34.3	
San Diego	$ 720.5	$ 3.5	
San Francisco	$ 60.3	$ -	
San Joaquin	$ 78.1	$ -	
San Luis Obispo	$ 21.9	$ -	
San Mateo	$ 19.3	$ -	
Santa Barbara	$ 25.1	$ -	
Santa Clara	$ 33.3	$ 2.0	
Santa Cruz	$ 13.6	$ -	
Shasta	$ 32.9	$ 0.3	
Sierra	$ -	$ -	
Siskiyou	$ 6.9	$ 1.1	
Solano	$ 33.0	$ 14.8	
Sonoma	$ 29.0	$ -	
Stanislaus	$ 15.7	$ -	
Sutter	$ 1.8	$ -	
Tehama	$ 13.1	$ 1.4	
Trinity	$ 1.0	$ -	
Tulare	$ 4.5	$ -	
Tuolumne	$ 3.1	$ 0.3	
Ventura	$ 143.6	$ 1.6	
Yolo	$ 3.8	$ -	
Yuba	$ 5.3	$ -	
Total	$ 3,055.9	$ 139.7	$ 3,195.6
10-Year SHOPP	$ 442.0	$ 166.0	$ 608.0
Net Difference	$ 2,613.9	$ (26.3)	$ 2,587.6

California Alliance for Advanced Transportation Systems (CAATS)

CALIFORNIA ALLIANCE FOR ADVANCED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

As expansion of California's transportation facilities faces economic, environmental and land constraints, ever-increasing demands are placed on existing facilities. Over the next 10 years, growth in vehicle miles traveled is expected to outpace growth in population 27% vs. 18%. This trend continues the 20-year growth pattern of increasing travel outpacing population growth—90% vs. 46%. In light of these trends, public transportation agencies have turned increasingly, and of necessity, to approaches that make more efficient use of existing facilities.

California Alliance for Advanced Transportation Systems (CAATS) was established as a non-profit working partnership of public agencies, academia, and private firms to deploy advanced transportation technologies for efficient, seamless transportation systems to improve safety and mobility, reduce congestion, minimize environmental impact and reduce life cycle costs—doing so in a way that helps to develop and expand the intelligent transportation industry within California.

CAATS has responded to a request from the California Transportation Commission for input into the SR 8 survey for transportation investment needs over the next 10 years. CAATS identified **$2 billion in public investment** to improve California's operational systems, accommodate 40% of California's anticipated traffic growth, and add to safety and reliability of individual trips. This investment also would provide a foundation for an $11 billion market in California over 10 years:

Management and Operations - Obtain greatest operational efficiency of existing systems. Gather and process system use and condition information, forecasting conditions that will hamper travel, optimizing traffic signal and ramp meter timing to actual conditions to minimize stop and go traffic, identifying and clearing accidents/incidents, coordinating traffic operations with commercial and transit fleet managers for efficient routing and for oversized or hazardous shipping; providing data for performance measurements, planning, traveler information.
proposed public investment: **$1,100 million** in urban areas and **$350 million** in rural areas:

- technologies to detect real-time traffic, road, weather and other system conditions;
- wireless and hardwire communications between centers, field elements, and vehicles;
- operations centers to process data for incident response and system management;
- computerized signal systems, ramp meters, rail grade crossing, other control systems;
- freeway service patrols, and motorist assistance patrols for incident management;
- parking management systems.

Traveler Information - Provide highest level of traveler information to greatest number of travelers at lowest possible cost, using data from management and operations systems, to help motorists manage trips and make personal decisions of most appropriate routes, modes, and/or travel times. Available through phone, internet, cable TV, personal digital assistants and in-vehicle devices, for pre-trip planning, en-route information and route guidance, travel services information, and direct reservations for travels, shippers, and fleet operators for route and mode selection, including information on destinations and accommodations.
proposed public investment: **$50 million** in urban areas and **$15 million** in rural areas;

- integrate data, provide quality control and disseminate data to private sector;
- traveler information delivered to individuals via accessible telecommunications systems;
- traveler information centers in diverse locations throughout California;
- highway advisory radio systems at strategic decision points;
- changeable message signs at strategic decision points.

Public Transportation - Increase average vehicle occupancy through modal shift from single occupant vehicles to public transit. Real-time location information for every bus, shuttle and train to improve traveler information and enhance transit services and use; such information could support new types of transit such as smart shuttles for nearby shopping, offices, medical care, and rail stations, for reverse commutes and welfare-to-work, coordinated with fixed-route systems.

proposed public investment: **$350 million** in urban areas and **$115 million** in rural areas;

- bus radio and communication systems;
- computer-aided dispatch systems;
- automatic vehicle location systems for all transit vehicles;
- real-time bus arrival information;
- fleet management systems;
- transit priority systems;
- rideshare operations;
- smart shuttle systems.

Goods Movement - Efficient, safe, and legal movements of trade goods, in, out and through the State. Increased goods movement, as well as production and consumption will out-pace population growth, 23-25% vs. 18%, over the next 10 years. To improve efficiency and safety of goods movements through automated regulatory compliance and electronic clearance for permits, licenses, record keeping, inspection, weighing, hazardous material incident notification and response, sea/air port access guidance and operations, vehicle safety monitoring. Improved communication among drivers, dispatchers, intermodal providers. Monitoring driver, vehicle and cargo safety. Bypass compliance at weigh stations, border crossings, other inspection sites.

proposed public investment: **$25 million** in urban areas and **$8 million** in rural areas:

- Satellite Transportation Management Centers for specialized goods movement applications;
- specialized information for goods movement;
- electronic credentialling and clearance systems;
- transportation permitting systems;
- goods movement tracking and identification systems;
- terminal access improvements;
- weigh-in motion systems.

Electronic Payment - Increase revenues and decrease average transaction times, reducing delays and related congestion and pollution. Integrated statewide electronic payment system providing users with broadly deployed, interorperable mobile payment system for tolls, parking, transit and private commercial transactions. Goal is open payment systems that handle diverse payments from single account, integrating into existing larger private electronic payments infrastructure.

proposed public investment: **$34 million** for automatic fare and parking payment systems.

Vehicle Safety and Control - Reduce driver-caused vehicle crashes, significantly increasing driver safety, comfort and convenience, highway capacity; reduce non-recurrent congestion from accidents. 70,000+ people will die in vehicle crashes in California over next 10 years. Coordinated public/private sector efforts to deploy products for automated driver warning and assistance for impending collisions, off-highway drifting, visibility problems from fog and dust.

proposed public investment: **$25 m** for procurement/incentives (e.g., reduced registration fees).

- Mayday systems;
- collision warning systems;
- visions enhancement;
- driver, vehicle and cargo condition monitoring;
- commercial vehicle safety systems.

State Highways:
Storm Drainage Retrofit

STATE HIGHWAYS: STORM DRAINAGE RETROFIT

Caltrans reports a need for up to $6 billion for drainage system improvements and water treatment facilities to ensure that runoff from state highway storm drains complies with federal and state water quality standards in urban areas. The cost in rural areas remains undefined. Caltrans does not know yet what may be appropriate in rural areas, and has no estimate of the eventual cost. Caltrans also reports that local agencies would need to spend a much larger sum, estimated between $11 billion and $48 billion statewide, for local street and road storm water runoff, part of an even-larger $114 billion statewide problem of polluted storm water.

Caltrans collects stormwater runoff from state highways in its drainage systems; in urban areas the runoff generally empties into local storm drains and in rural areas it generally empties directly into waterways. The most recent federal Clean Water Act requires agencies that dump water into storms drains to ensure that runoff water meets federal water quality standards. Enforcement comes through permits obtained from regional water quality boards. Federal permits currently apply only in urban areas greater than 100,000 population, but federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is extending these requirements gradually to smaller urban areas, and perhaps eventually to rural areas. New state regulations will also soon apply to storm water discharges, under coastal zone management and toxic control programs.

A 1994 U.S. Court decision required Caltrans to bring its stormwater discharge in Los Angeles County up to water quality standards expeditiously. In 1997, Caltrans settled a similar lawsuit in San Diego by consent decree. Caltrans has since taken steps to bring its storm water drain facilities in compliance in Los Angeles and San Diego, including experimental water treatment facilities.

Seven of Caltrans' nine current storm water discharge permits expire soon and must be renegotiated. In 1996, Caltrans applied to the State Water Quality Control Board for a single statewide permit. That permit has not been issued, but Caltrans expects it to require new plans and programs to bring all stormwater discharges within federal and state water quality limits. Generally, state highway stormwater runoff exceeds water quality standards, in some places and for some kinds of pollutants, by tenfold and occasionally by as much as a hundredfold. Storm water runoff from local streets and roads and other public properties typically fails to meet water quality standards too. Responsibility is further complicated by two factors: while storm drains typically run under the roadways, much of the water and pollutants they carry comes from elsewhere; and in the worst air basins, rainfall often fails to meet water quality standards even as it hits the ground, due to dissolved air pollutants.

Caltrans is currently studying the degree of stormwater pollution passing through its drainage systems and examining maintenance practices (e.g., road sweeping and litter pickup), roadside soil erosion (e.g., planting and weed control), and improved storm drains, settlement basins, and treatment facilities, to determine the most effective and appropriate measures. The problem and potential solutions are less well-defined in rural areas, where soil erosion is a bigger factor. Caltrans is seeking a total of $250 million through 2001 for capital investments, as well as $20 million per year for water pollution control in its operating budget; both amounts could increase significantly in the future.

In summary, water quality requirements indicate the following 10-year storm drainage retrofit needs for the state:

- Caltrans storm drain retrofit and experimental treatment programs $250 million (funded)
- Caltrans annual operating costs for water pollution management $200 million (funded)
- Expanded urban state highway storm drain and treatment retrofit $6 billion (unfunded)

As noted, rural state highway and local roads and street storm drain retrofit likely will require an even greater amount.

State Highways:
Retrofit Soundwalls

STATE HIGHWAYS: RETROFIT SOUNDWALLS

Beyond the retrofit soundwall projects already programmed in the 1998 STIP, Caltrans reports a need for about $600 million for unfunded retrofit soundwalls along state highways with 75% of those needs in Los Angeles County. Independently, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority estimated a need for almost $1.4 billion in retrofit soundwalls in that county alone, which presumably would add $900 million or more to the Caltrans estimate.

Streets & Highways Code Section 215.5, dating from 1974, calls for a state program to add retrofit soundwalls alongside state highways where highway noise exceeds federal noise standards, the highway or freeway was built before 1974, and adjacent development pre-dates route adoption and construction of the freeway or highway. Since 1974, federal regulations require soundwalls to be included in all highway construction projects where subsequent noise levels will exceed the federal standard, if feasible and effective. The state's program sets up criteria to identify locations where retrofit soundwalls would be warranted. Theoretically, the list of locations is finite, but increases in traffic and deteriorated (thus noisier) pavement surfaces have yielded an expanding list of eligible locations, typically where the spread of suburban development has increased traffic and belatedly raised freeway traffic noise to levels high enough to warrant soundwalls. The state's statute allows the program to proceed as funding becomes available and sets no hard deadlines.

Caltrans, in May 1989, identified a retrofit soundwall list for the Transportation Blueprint legislation, and $150 million was included in the funding package to retire the 215 projects on the list by year 2000. However, costs were seriously underestimated and other priorities compromised part of the Blueprint's funding. With no funding available in the 1994 or 1996 STIPs, progress toward completing the retrofit soundwall program halted. As of 1999, 58 soundwall projects from the May 1989 list remain unprogrammed, at an estimated cost of $205 million. Since 1989, Caltrans has identified 158 more locations as now eligible for retrofit soundwalls, at an estimated cost of about $420 million. Ironically, although locations on the May 1989 list have statutory priority, some of the more recently identified locations have worse noise levels. Los Angeles, with many older freeways dating back to the 1950s, passing through even older neighborhoods, and high traffic and noise levels, presents a particular challenge.

STIP reform legislation (SB 45, Kopp, 1997) changed the programming of retrofit soundwalls. Under SB 45, retrofit soundwalls may be programmed from regional share funds but are not eligible for Caltrans' interregional program. Thus, regional priorities currently control further progress on retrofit soundwalls through the STIP, and no retrofit soundwall projects beyond those already in the STIP can be described as funded. The Legislature is currently considering legislation (AB102, Wildman) that would set aside funding for the 58 remaining May 1989 soundwalls off the top within the next STIP.

In summary, the retrofit soundwall program shows the following ten-year needs:

- 16 projects from May 1989 list in 1998 STIP — $ 44 million (funded)
- 58 projects from May 1989 list not yet program — $205 million (unfunded)
- 158 projects identified since 1989, not programmed — $420 million (unfunded)
- Additional projects in Los Angeles estimated by LACMTA — $900 million (unfunded)

The following chart summarizes current identified retrofit soundwall needs along state highways:

	May 1989 List		Post-May 1989		County Total	
County	**Projects**	**Cost**	**Projects**	**Cost**	**Projects**	**Total Cost**
Alameda	1	$3 m	3	$6 m	4	$9 million
Fresno	2	$13 m			2	$13 million
Los Angeles	40	$164 m	96	$330 m	136	$494 million
Los Angeles MTA					(X)	($890 million)
Marin	1	$1 m	2	$3 m	3	$4 million
Napa			2	$2 m	2	$2 million
Orange	3	$7 m			3	$7 million
Placer			1	$1 m	1	$1 million
Riverside			4	$5 m	4	$5 million
Sacramento	3	$2 m			3	$2 million
San Bernardino			3	$4 m	3	$4 million
San Diego			13	$16 m	13	$16 million
San Francisco			2	$2 m	2	$2 million
San Joaquin	2	$4 m			2	$4 million
San Luis Obispo	1	$1 m			1	$1 million
San Mateo			4	$3 m	4	$3 million
Santa Barbara	1	$1 m	1	$1 m	2	$2 million
Santa Clara	2	$3 m	7	$8 m	9	$11 million
Santa Cruz	1	$3 m	1	$3 m	2	$6 million
Sonoma			3	$2 m	3	$2 million
Ventura	1	$2 m	16	$34 m	17	$36 million
Yuba	1	$1 m			1	$1 million
TOTAL	**58**	**$205 m**	**158**	**$420 m**	**216** + X	**$625 million** +($890 million)

Airports:
Ground Access Improvements

AIRPORTS: GROUND ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS

Air passenger and air cargo traffic is expected to double or even triple of over the next 20 years. International airports throughout the State are well positioned to take advantage of the economic growth around the Pacific Rim, provided adequate air and ground access capacity is developed. However, California's ability to capitalize on the growing demand in international business services and goods movement is being constrained by inadequate airport capacity and crippling ground access congestion to our major commercial airports. While large commercial airports are able to raise significant revenue to expand ground-side and air-side operating capacity of the airports, they are limited by the federal government in their ability to use airport revenues to address ground access needs beyond airport property.

Caltrans requested information on airport ground access needs in the 1999 update of the Aeronautics Capital Improvement Plan, and in addition, the Commission surveyed 17 large commercial airports in the state. . In total, 41 airports have reported 103 unfunded ground access projects with a total cost of **$3.0 billion. The reported projects include 13 State Highway improvements for $0.4 billion, 88 local road projects for $2.0 billion, and 2 passenger rail projects for $3.0 billion**.

The largest need is at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) which is in the process of updating the airport Master Plan to accommodate a projected increase in air passengers from 54 million annual passengers (MAP) in 1996 to 98 MAP in 2015, and an expected 140% increase in air cargo from 1.8 million metric tons per year in 1996 to 4.2 million metric tons per year in 2015. The anticipated need for ground access improvements at LAX is **$2.351 billion**. Another 8 commercial airports report a total ground access funding need of **$0.6 billion**. San Francisco International Airport (SFO) did not report any unfunded ground access needs over the next 10 years because they are currently implementing a fully funded $2.5 billion expansion program. The SFO program includes an additional $1.1 billion of state, federal, local and airport funds to extend the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system into the airport. The reported ground access funding needs are listed in the table below.

AIRPORT	State Highway		Local Roads		Rail		Total Cost
	Projects	Cost	Projects	Cost	Projects	Cost	
Byron			2	$2,000,000			$2,000,000
Chiriaco Summit			1	$30,000			$30,000
Colusa County			1	$425,000			$425,000
Corcoran			1	$50,000			$50,000
Desert Center			1	$400,000			$400,000
Firebaugh			1	$190,000			$190,000
French Valley			2	$367,000			$367,000
Fresno Yosemite International			4	$11,000,000			$11,000,000
Gillespie Field	2	?					?
Hemet-Ryan			3	$846,500			$846,500
Jack McNamara Field			3	$207,000			$207,000
Lake Tahoe			6	$1,515,000			$1,515,000
Livermore Municipal			1	$2,000,000			$2,000,000
Los Angeles International	5	$297,000,000	11	$1,479,450,000	1	$575,000,000	$2,351,450,000
Los Banos Municipal			1	$50,000			$50,000
Marina Municipal			1	$1,000,000			$1,000,000
McClellan-Palomar			4	$11,550,000			$11,550,000
Meadows Field			1	$1,000,000			$1,000,000
Metropolitan Oakland International			5	$56,999,000	1	$130,000,000	$186,999,000
Monterey Peninsula			1	$2,663,000			$2,663,000
Napa County			1	$740,000			$740,000
Nevada County Airport			2	$25,000			$25,000
Oceano County			2	$30,000			$30,000
Ontario International			2	$27,100,000			$27,100,000
Oxnard			4	$2,300,000			$2,300,000
Palmdale Regional			1	$150,000,000			$150,000,000
Paso Robles Municipal	2	$600,000	2	$175,000			$775,000
Petaluma Municipal			1	$80,000			$80,000
Placerville			1	$302,657			$302,657
Rio Vista			1	$100,000			$100,000
Salinas Municipal			1	$350,000			$350,000
Sacramento International			2	$150,000			$150,000
San Diego International			1	$160,000,000			$160,000,000
San Jose International	2	$30,000,000	1	$1,000,000			$31,000,000
San Luis Obispo County - McChesney Field			4	$1,710,000			$1,710,000
Santa Maria Public			1	$450,000			$450,000
Stockton Metropolitan	2	$29,000,000	1	$34,530,000			$63,530,000
Tehachapi Municipal Airport			1				?
Thermal			5	$614,000			$614,000
Truckee-Tahoe			2	$1,461,000			$1,461,000
Ukiah Municipal - Mendocino County			2	$175,000			$175,000
TOTAL	13	$356,600,000	88	$1,953,035,157	2	$705,000,000	$3,014,635,157

Seaports:
Ground Access Improvements

SEAPORTS: GROUND ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS

California's commercial deep water ports are critically important to the vitality of California's economy. In 1997, California ports accounted for $138 billion of waterborne imports, $47.5 billion of waterborne exports, and supported 1.5 million California jobs. California must have an efficient intermodal goods movement system, including improved highway and rail access to and from seaports, to improve its competitive position in the national and international economy.

The Commission surveyed the 11 commercial seaports in California to determine their unfunded ground access needs over the next 10 years. Seven seaports responded to the survey. They have identified **$1.1 billion** in needed ground access improvements, including **$395 million** in local road improvements, **$124 million** of rail improvements, and **$547 million** in State Highway routes serving the ports. The most expensive single project is improving I-710, the Long Beach Freeway, which is the primary ground access constraint to the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach for approximately $455 million.

REPORTED SEAPORTS GROUND ACCESS PROJECTS

SEAPORT	STATE HIGHWAYS		LOCAL ROADS		RAIL		TOTAL COST
	Projects	Cost ($mil.)	Projects	Cost ($mil.)	Projects	Cost ($mil.)	$ Million
Humboldt Bay Harbor	0		0		0		
Port Hueneme	0		0		0		
Port of Long Beach	3	$ 475.00	6	$ 117.00	1	$ 77.00	$ 669.00
Port of Los Angeles	1	$ 22.00	4	$ 73.60	2	$ 37.50	$ 133.10
Port of Oakland	0		1	$ 80.00	0		$ 80.00
Port of Rdwood City	0		0		0		
Port of Richmand	0		0		0		
Port of Sacramento	0		0		1	$ 4.50	$ 4.50
Port of San Diego	2	$ 50.00	2	$ 40.00	0		$ 90.00
Port of San Francisco	0		5	$ 76.50	1	$ 5.00	$ 81.50
Port of Stockton	0		1	$ 8.00	0		$ 8.00
TOTAL	6	$ 547.00	19	$ 395.10	5	$ 124.00	$ 1,066.10

North American Free Trade Agreement
Transportation Infrastructure

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT (NAFTA) TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

When the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was ratified, California identified over $1.5 billion of transportation infrastructure improvements needed by 2010 to adequately serve commercial vehicle traffic crossing the California/Mexico border as a result of the approval of NAFTA. To date, $879 million of public funds have been provided for these projects. There is also a private sector investment of $324 million committed to the State Route 125 Toll Road.

The cost of unfunded NAFTA transportation infrastructure improvements needed to serve the short-term growth in NAFTA traffic over the next 10 years, as identified by Caltrans, totals **$389 million**, **$254 million** for State Highways and **$135 million** for freight rail investments. The rail funds are for investments in the San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railway between Calexico and the Port of San Diego. Other improvements, such as those serving the Port of Entry at Tecate, will be needed after 2010. The specific projects identified for the next 10 years are:

San Diego County

State Route 905	Six-lane Freeway I-805 to Otay Mesa Border Crossing	$109 million
State Route 11 **Tijuana 2000 Corridor**	Purchase Right of Way for Corridor Protection SR 905/SR125 Interchange to Port of Entry	$ 30 million
Interstate 5	Reroute I-5 SB to Virginia Avenue Crossing North of San Ysidro Port of Entry	$ 35 million
	(San Diego Subtotal	**$174 million)**

Imperial County

State Route 98	Widen to Four-lane Highway SR 7 to SR 111	$ 25 million
State Route 111	Widen to Six-lane Expressway SR 98 to I-8	$ 35 million
State Route 186	Widen to Four-lane Highway Andrade Port of Entry to I-8	$ 20 million
	(Imperial Subtotal	**$174 million)**

SAN DIEGO AND IMPERIAL COUNTIES HIGHWAY TOTAL **$254 million**

San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railway

Funds sought for Public/Private Partnership or loan guarantees.

Repairs to reopen Desert Line	$ 10 million
Reopen and Complete Modernization Carrizo Gorge, East of Tecate, California	$125 million
RAIL TOTAL	**$135 million**

Los Angeles Basin
Rail Consolidation
and Grade Separation Needs

LOS ANGELES BASIN RAIL CONSOLIDATION AND GRADE SEPARATION NEEDS

The development and implementation of a regional strategy to improve rail freight movement from downtown Los Angeles eastward to San Bernardino requires the definition and prioritization of track improvements, grade separation projects, and consolidation of interstate freight rail traffic, modeled after the Alameda Corridor Project. Grade-separating rail and highway intersections along these freight rail corridors will produce safety benefits by limiting the possibility of collisions, air quality benefits by limiting automobile and truck delays and emissions at railroad crossings, and private sector economic benefits for the railroads by increasing the speed and reliability of goods movement through the region.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), has developed a grade separation and crossing needs analysis for the three rail lines passing through the Counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino. The estimated cost of grade separating all three lines is **$2.255 billion**. The successful implementation of this program will require a cooperative regional approach to prioritize and coordinate programming and funding of these projects among the counties, Caltrans, SCAG, and private sector railroads. The costs identified in the SCAG analysis reflect programs to grade separate three separate rail corridors. The cost of the grade separation program could be significantly reduced by consolidating interstate freight rail traffic along a single corridor, as was done in the Alameda Corridor Project. None of the studies analyzed by SCAG propose rail consolidation. The specifics of the SCAG analysis are:

Los Angeles County (San Gabriel Valley)

Grade separation projects	$821 million
Road widening projects	$ 68 million
Safety and signaling projects	$ 61 million
Los Angeles County Subtotal	**$950 million**

San Bernardino County (Union Pacific & BN/Santa Fe)

75 total crossings at $1.1 million each for safety & signaling	$ 82.5 million
27 grade separations at $28.83 million each	$778.4 million
23 grade crossing widening projects at $4 million each	$ 92.0 million
Colton Crossing - Grade separation of two freight rail lines	$150.0 million
San Bernardino County Subtotal	**$1,103 million**

Orange County (Orangethorpe Corridor)

6 grade separation projects at $32.7 million each	$196.2 million
Low cost projects and operational improvements	$ 6.0 million
Orange County Subtotal	**$202 million**

TOTAL COST $2,255 million

Short Line Railroads

SHORT LINE RAILROADS

Caltrans reports a 10-year need of $225 million for capital improvements on short line railroads in California. Beyond this, the California PUC reports an unspecified need, to fund the short line railroads' shares of 20 grade crossing improvements, to match a committed public funding share.

About 30 short line railroads operate in California, most private but two publicly-owned: the Northwestern Pacific (NWP) and the San Diego & Arizona Eastern (SD&AE). Most are small, with 10-50 miles of track, but five own larger systems from 128 to 316 miles long, and a couple own only equipment and operate on track owned by other railroads. Many of these short lines succeeded earlier railroads, inheriting track and facilities with various amounts of deferred maintenance. Most serve some kind of a niche or localized market, which the two large trunk railroads would rather not serve. All haul freight, but a few offer passenger or excursion service or contract with the movie industry. Some serve a captive market of some kind, while others have successfully developed discretionary markets. Most serve large customers with bulk products, such as food plants, lumber mills, mining operations, ports, or warehouses and distribution centers, with every boxcar hauled representing on average four truckloads off the highways, more for the heaviest bulk products. Some systems are in good shape, others need varying degrees of damage repair, modernization, or track rehabilitation. Some of these short lines earn enough to cover operations, fund capital needs, and make a healthy profit, while others can barely support operations alone. Most have trouble getting loans, because banks discount the value of their particular assets. In short, each represents an individual special case.

Caltrans surveyed all the short line railroads about 10-year unfunded needs. Eight railroads responded, listing a wide variety of needs that total $225 million. Each can make a case for public funding, because of public benefit, such as saving highway pavements from truck damage or reducing truck congestion at the ports, or impact from other public activities, such as grade crossing traffic or rerouting of floodwaters. The needs reported by short line railroads serving port access, and by the SD&AE which serves NAFTA border trade, are probably duplicated in other sections of this report.

The future for the two publicly-owned short lines remains problematic. Both the NWP and SD&AE sit with more than 100 miles of track closed by storm damage, running through extreme terrain, hampered by serious deferred maintenance inherited from prior owners, with no clear way to fund repairs and resume service. Rail-Ways Inc., which operates the NWP, reports an immediate unfunded need for $102 million (a part of which the Commission has been struggling to fund for the last 7 years), for storm damage, railbed, bridge, and tunnel work to put the railroad in operating shape, and a contingency reserve to insure it can be reopened expeditiously when the inevitable next storm damage occurs. San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board, which owns the SD&AE, reports a 10-year unfunded need for $28 million for storm damage, railbed, bridge, and tunnel work to put the railroad in operating shape, and a further need for $86 million for more permanent rehabilitation, which could come beyond 10 years.

In summary, short line railroads indicate the following 10-year needs:

- Publicly-owned short lines: NWP and SD&AE $130 million (unfunded)
- Private short lines: 6 others $95 million (unfunded)

The chart on this page shows the 10-year needs identified by short line railroads:

Short Line Railroad	**Miles**	**Purpose(s)**	**Unfunded Need**
Northwestern Pacific	316	storm damage, railbed, trestles, etc	$102 million
San Diego & Arizona Eastern	165	storm damage, railbed, trestles	$28 million
San Joaquin Valley	230	storm damage, deferred maintenance	$17 million
McCloud Railway	128	railbed rehabilitation	$4 million
Sierra Railroad	49	ties, rail, drains, passing tracks	$10 million
California Western	40	storm damage, railbed, bridge, other	$3 million
Yolo Shortline	28	long trestle, bulk terminal facilities	$60 million
Pacific Harbor Line	17	rail upgrade, enviro. cleanup	$2 million
TOTAL			**$226 million**

Intercity Passenger Rail Service

INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE

The Caltrans Rail Program, in conjunction with Amtrak and local agencies, has developed the following proposal for the expansion of intercity rail passenger services for consideration in the SR 8 process. It outlines what might be required to implement the proposed Caltrans Intercity Rail Program Vision (IRPV). This vision still under development from both policy and technical perspectives, calls for providing a full rail transportation alternative to other travel modes. The system concept embodied in this vision is an intercity rail system that provides frequent and reliable service, and serves the major intercity destinations with travel times competitive with the auto. If adopted and fully implemented, the IRPV foresees roughly a tripling of rail passenger miles over the next decade, so that rail can achieve a five percent modal share of intercity and regional commuter travel. It would provide relief to highway and airport congestion, and would lead to several environmental benefits, including improved air quality, fuel conservation, and in the long-run, more efficient land use.

The achievement of this vision, however, requires a major expansion of the existing program, so that service is available in relevant travel corridors statewide. This includes new Coast Route, Monterey, Redding, Reno, Las Vegas, and Coachella Valley extensions. This expansion includes projects to increase capacity in order to add frequencies, projects to improve on-time performance to improve train reliability, and projects to reduce running times to attract riders and provide an efficient service, with rail travel times directly competitive with auto travel.

The specific items proposed include rolling stock acquisition, track and signal work, station improvements, maintenance facilities, and grade crossing improvements. Funding required for the expanded operations is also identified. Cumulatively, Caltrans identified $4.2 billion for capital and operations: $3.4 billion for existing corridors and $0.8 billion for 6 new corridors.

Increased capacity is the primary goal of $506 million for added rolling stock, as well as $1.1 billion for expanded operations. Track/signal and grade crossing improvements totaling almost $2 billion on existing routes, and $382 million on proposed extensions, would improve system capacity and train reliability and reduce running times:

- On the San Diegan Corridor, $969 million of track and signal work would provide double track throughout the corridor, speeding service and eliminating most capacity-related delays. $15 million of grade crossing work would complete active protection at all grade crossings.
- On the San Joaquin Corridor, $480 million of track and signal work would substantially improve track standards and produce the highest speeds in California, while $71 million of grade crossing work would provide active protection at about 350 private grade crossings.
- On the Capitol Corridor, $451 million of track and signal work would modernize the entire corridor, allowing speeds competitive with the automobile and capacity for a dozen daily trains.
- Under the evolving vision, new corridors would receive major track upgrades, including the Coast Route ($157 million), the Monterey Route ($40 million), extension to Reno ($35 million), Las Vegas-Los Angeles ($50 million) and the Los Angeles-Coachella Valley Route ($100 million).

Additionally, station and maintenance facility improvements totaling $188 million would add to the efficiency of operations and protect the state's investment in rolling stock.

($ in Millions)

Route	Rolling Stock	Track & Signal	Stations	Maintenance Facilities	Grade Crossing Improvements	Operations	Total
EXISTING ROUTES							
San Diegan	$ 130.0	$ 968.7	$ 47.2	$ 25.0	$ 15.2	$ 313.4	$ 1,499.5
San Joaquin		$ 480.3	$ 20.0	$ -	$ 71.4	$ 378.9	$ 950.6
San Joaquin/ Capitol	$ 206.7						$ 206.7
Capitol		$ 451.0	$ 49.4	$ -	$ 4.8	$ 260.6	$ 765.8
Statewide			$ 11.0				$ 11.0
Subtotal	**$ 336.7**	**$ 1,900.0**	**$ 127.6**	**$ 25.0**	**$ 91.4**	**$ 952.9**	**$ 3,433.6**
PROPOSED ROUTES							
Coast	$ 72.1	$ 156.7	$ 3.5	$ 15.0	$ -	$ 97.1	$ 344.4
Monterey	$ -	$ 40.0	$ 7.3	$ -	$ -	$ 16.5	$ 63.8
Redding	$ 14.6	$ -	$ 4.0	$ 2.0	$ -	$ 12.7	$ 33.3
Reno	$ 15.0	$ 35.0	$ -	$ 2.0	$ -	$ 7.6	$ 59.6
Las Vegas	$ 36.0	$ 50.0	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 17.4	$ 103.4
Coachella Valley	$ 31.7	$ 100.0	$ -	$ 1.5	$ -	$ 22.2	$ 155.4
Subtotal	**$ 169.4**	**$ 381.7**	**$ 14.8**	**$ 20.5**	**$ -**	**$ 173.5**	**$ 759.9**
TOTAL	**$ 506.1**	**$ 2,281.7**	**$ 142.4**	**$ 45.5**	**$ 91.4**	**$ 1,126.4**	**$ 4,193.5**

Bus and Rail Transit:

Operating Shortfall
Rolling
Capital Improvements
ADA Operations
ADA Capital Improvements

BUS AND RAIL TRANSIT OVERVIEW

Travelers board California public transit vehicles 1.2 billion times annually--some 4 million times each day. They use 8,000 buses, 4,000 demand response vehicles, and 2,000 passenger rail vehicles operating on some 830 miles of rail corridor. Some 270 public transit operators provide service in California with the 30 largest (or 11%) providing about 85% of the total service. These 30 operators are located in established metropolitan areas, such as Los Angeles and San Francisco, and in rapidly urbanizing areas, such as the Central Valley and the Inland Empire.

In all, annual operating costs for bus and rail transit total $2.9 billion: approximately $2.0 billion for bus and $0.9 billion for rail. Annual "Americans with Disabilities Act" (ADA) operational costs are reported as $44 million. The State provides $0.9 billion annually for transit operating assistance from two principal sources: Local Transportation Development Account (TDA) funds and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds. Operators also receive just over $0.1 billion in federal operating funds, although federal funds have been diminishing as the federal government is moving toward elimination of operating support. Local funds provide some $1.0 billion, derived from local dedicated sales tax, property tax and other general fund revenues. Farebox revenues make up the remainder of the $2.9 billion, providing $0.9 billion toward these operational costs.

The Commission, in collaboration with the California Transit Association, regional and local agencies, surveyed California's 270 public transit bus, urban and commuter rail operators, inquiring into 10-year funding shortfalls for 3 levels of service:

- ***Existing* service** - unfunded costs of operations and capital projects needed to sustain existing service over the next 10 years;
- ***Enhanced* service** – unfunded costs of operations and capital projects needed to meet existing unmet demand, over and above current levels of service, also over the next 10 years;
- ***Expanded* service** – unfunded costs of operations and capital projects needed to increase ridership by 50% over the next 10 years.

Of the 270 operators surveyed, only 63 responded to the survey; however these respondents included: the 12 largest operators, 14 of the 18 medium-sized operators, and 37 small operators, and, as noted, they represent 85% or more of the state's transit service. (Intercity passenger rail and private non-profit paratransit operators are reported on elsewhere in this report.)

Based on these responses, the overall 10-year shortfall for capital and operational purposes for bus and rail, for *existing*, *enhanced*, and *expanded* levels of service totals $15 billion:

- $3.7 billion for continuing *existing* levels of service;
- another $2.9 billion for *enhanced* levels of service; and
- still another $8.3 billion for *expanded* levels of service.

The 12 largest operators account for $12.5 billion, or 84%, of the projected $15 billion shortfall. The 18 mid-sized operators account for $1.8 billion, or 12%, of that shortfall, with the 240 smallest operators accounting for less than $1 billion, or 4%.

BUS AND RAIL TRANSIT: OPERATING SHORTFALL

Respondents reported 10-year **total costs** of operating bus and rail transit for *existing*, *enhanced*, and *expanded* levels of service as totaling $23.7 billion, $27.7 billion, and $32.5 billion, respectively. The reported 10-year costs of operating at:

- *existing* levels of service totaled $17 billion for bus and $6.7 billion for rail;
- *enhanced* levels of service added $3 billion for bus and $1 billion for rail; and
- *expanded* levels of service added another $3.5 billion for bus and $1.3 billion for rail.

The 10-year costs to operate *expanded* service totaled $23.5 billion for bus and $9 billion for rail.

Respondents also projected **shortfalls** in State funds for operating at *existing*, *enhanced*, and *expanded* levels of service totaling $0.7 billion, $2.3 billion and $3.7 billion, respectively. They reported 10-year shortfalls for:

- *existing* levels totaling $0.6 billion for bus and $0.1 billion for rail;
- *enhanced* levels of service totaling an added $1.5 billion for bus and $0.1 billion for rail; and
- *expanded* levels of service totaled yet another $1.1 billion for bus and $0.3 billion for rail.

The cumulative shortfall in State funds for *expanded* service totaled $3.2 billion for bus and $0.5 billion for rail.

BUS AND RAIL TRANSIT: ROLLING STOCK

Respondents identified a projected 10-year need for bus and rail rolling stock of $4.3 billion, just to maintain *existing* levels of service; another $1.2 billion to provide *enhanced* service in response to existing unserved demand; and yet another $1.7 billion to *expand* current service by 50% over 10 years—or an aggregate cost of up to $7.2 billion. (The survey did not differentiate between new equipment, rehabilitation of existing equipment and spare parts.) In all, operators project shortfalls in State funding for rolling stock of $0.7 billion, $0.6 billion, and $1.1 billion, respectively, for *existing*, *enhanced* and *expanded* levels of service—or an aggregate shortfall of up to $2.4 billion. (Shortfalls in non-State funding were not reported in thus survey.)

BUS AND RAIL TRANSIT: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Operators report 10-year cumulative shortfalls in funding of between $0.8 billion and $2.1 billion for *existing*, *enhanced*, and *expanded* service, for a variety of capital improvements, including:

- maintenance facilities and equipment (up to $645 million),
- rail station improvements (up to $610 million),
- alternative fuel conversion (up to $125 million), and
- power and signaling systems (up to $870 million).

Rail operators also report rail extensions totaling up to $10.4 billion for *expanded* service, with projected shortfalls in State funds of up to $4.1 billion; the nature of these extensions, their projected ridership, and outlook for other "outside" funding sources (e.g., federal new rail start funds) were not reported in the survey.

BUS AND RAIL TRANSIT: ADA OPERATIONS

Maintaining *existing* levels of ADA operations by public transit operators are projected to cost $605 million over 10 years, with State funds expected to provide $195 million of that amount, with an estimated shortfall in State funding of $72 million. *Enhanced* and *expanded* levels of ADA operations over 10 years are projected to carry added costs of $195 million and $243 million respectively—for an aggregated cost of just over $1 billion. Respondents projects shortfalls in State funding of $26 million for *enhanced* service and another $114 million for *expanded* service. The aggregate shortfall in State funds for all three levels of service is identified as $212 million. (As noted, any shortfalls in non-State funds were not reported in this survey.)

BUS AND RAIL TRANSIT: ADA CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Existing levels of ADA operations by public operators are expected to require capital investments of $176 million over 10 years, with a shortfall in projected State funding of $24 million. *Enhanced* and *expanded* levels of ADA operations will require $57 million and $56 million in capital investments, respectively, of which a shortfall in State funds is projected at $29 million and $9 million, respectively. The aggregate shortfall in State funds for all three levels of service totals $62 million. (As noted, any shortfalls in non-State funds were not reported in this survey.)

Twelve Largest Transit Operators

- Alameda Contra Costa (AC) Transit
- Bay Area Rapid Transit District
- Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA)
- Orange County Transportation Authority
- Sacramento Regional Transit District
- SamTrans and Caltrain
- San Diego, Metropolitan Transportation Development Board
- San Diego, North County Transit District
- San Francisco Muni
- Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
- Southern California Regional Rail Authority -- Metrolink

Eighteen Medium Sized Operators

- Bakersfield -- Golden Empire Transit
- Central Costa Costa Transit Authority
- Culver City Transportation Department
- Fresno Area Express
- Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority
- Long Beach Transit
- Los Angeles City Municipal*
- Montebello Bus Lines
- Monterey Transit District*
- Omnitrans
- San Joaquin Regional Transit District*
- San Luis Obispo Transit
- Santa Cruz Metropolitan District
- Santa Monica Municipal Bus Lines
- South Coast Area Transit
- Sunline Transit Agency
- Torrance Transit*
- Vallejo Transit

* As of April 26, 1999, these agencies have not responded to the Commission's survey request.

Bus and Rail Public Transit
Existing Service
Current Unfunded Capital Projects
or Current Unfunded Operations

			2010	2010	2010
Baseline Revenues	**Current Revenues**		**Projected Baseline Revenues**		
Capital	$364,131,226		$2,193,914,175	$345,435,000	$320,880,000
Operations	$905,487,170		$5,842,958,559	$66,945,000	$115,170,000
Project	Current Annual Expenditure for Existing Service	Current Shortfall in Annual Expenditure for Existing Service	Estimated Total Cost 10 years	Estimated State Share of Total Cost 10 years	Estimated Shortfall in State Funding10 years
Rail Capital TTL	$447,136,000	$215,416,000	$4,724,717,000	$2,649,820,000	$2,235,920,000
rolling stock	$119,839,000	$40,900,000	$1,304,594,000	$630,100,000	$499,000,000
rail line	$83,288,000	$21,480,000	$909,832,000	$326,930,000	$220,430,000
maintenance facility and related equipment	$24,861,000	$12,476,000	$209,114,000	$116,960,000	$91,760,000
station-related improvements	$57,709,000	$31,707,000	$584,218,000	$322,600,000	$300,700,000
power &/or signaling systems	$58,696,000	$22,487,000	$699,662,000	$367,470,000	$250,670,000
other	$102,743,000	$86,366,000	$1,017,297,000	$885,760,000	$873,360,000
Rail Operations TTL	$610,190,000	$7,500,000	$6,650,290,000	$199,500,000	$140,900,000
Bus Capital TTL	$379,806,371	$255,905,384	$4,273,598,758	$800,876,965	$651,013,842
rolling stock	$262,636,371	$25,670,992	$3,019,688,095	$287,222,436	$220,834,922
alternate fuel conversion	$14,100,000	$23,710,000	$143,340,000	$75,800,000	$51,800,000
maintenance facility	$74,634,500	$11,337,500	$715,072,000	$180,160,000	$138,140,000
other	$28,435,500	$195,186,892	$395,498,663	$257,694,529	$240,238,920
Bus Operations TTL	$1,374,113,816	$32,646,776	$17,025,102,252	$2,063,628,412	$565,910,662
ADA Capital TTL	$14,730,000	$719,187	$176,172,133	$36,510,751	$23,941,874
ADA Operations TTL	$46,085,592	$532,491	$604,656,705	$197,796,912	$72,344,912
Other TTL	$8,870,000	$1,064,000	$102,558,000	$23,761,000	$23,650,000
Other Operations TTL	$17,493,000	$0	$180,184,000	$4,498,250	$17,250,000
GRAND TOTAL	$2,898,424,779	$513,783,838	$33,737,278,848	$5,976,392,290	$3,730,931,290

Bus and Rail Public Transit
Enhanced Service
Unfunded Capital Projects
or Unfunded Operations

			2010	2010	2010
Project	Current Annual Expenditure for Existing Service	Estimated Shortfall in Annual Expenditure for Enhanced Service	Estimated Total Cost 10 years	Estimated State Share of Total Cost 10 years	Estimated Shortfall in State Funding10 years
Rail Capital TTL	$124,783,000	$33,495,000	$1,236,620,500	$620,489,375	$582,171,375
rolling stock	$26,500,000	$4,000,000	$324,140,000	$214,472,000	$193,400,000
rail line	$37,600,000	$8,000,000	$455,939,000	$181,739,750	$181,693,750
maintenance facility and related equipment	$13,405,000	$7,505,000	$64,546,000	$39,050,000	$39,050,000
station-related improvements	$23,290,000	$6,400,000	$247,801,000	$100,900,000	$86,200,000
power &/or signaling systems	$11,300,000	$4,000,000	$103,700,000	$65,700,000	$64,500,000
other	$12,688,000	$3,590,000	$40,494,500	$18,627,625	$17,327,625
Rail Operations TTL	$105,990,000	$2,000,000	$1,000,000,000	$52,000,000	$52,000,000
Bus Capital TTL	$98,720,871	$44,826,160	$1,181,194,291	$606,289,381	$591,552,558
rolling stock	$53,193,371	$31,706,702	$839,944,311	$467,809,311	$415,764,311
alternate fuel conversion	$1,600,000	$270,000	$35,600,000	$26,587,000	$28,500,000
maintenance facility	$26,714,000	$9,671,000	$248,183,000	$103,527,000	$66,073,000
other	$17,213,500	$3,178,458	$57,466,980	$8,366,070	$81,215,247
Bus Operations TTL	$977,126,316	$86,189,013	$2,950,234,719	$2,330,849,719	$1,514,334,719
ADA Capital TTL	$9,660,000	$1,844,653	$57,249,531	$24,330,281	$28,730,281
ADA Ops TTL	$21,452,592	$63,330,069	$195,378,013	$154,060,688	$26,340,688
Other TTL	$880,000	$340,000	$77,470,000	$76,480,000	$76,340,000
Other Ops TTL	$150,000	$2,180,000	$22,790,000	$4,640,000	$4,540,000
GRAND TOTAL	$1,338,762,779	$234,204,895	$6,720,937,054	$3,869,139,444	$2,876,009,621

Bus and Rail Public Transit
Expanded Service
Unfunded High Priority Projects:
Congestion Relief, Economic Support, Environmental Benefit or other

			2010	2010	2010
Project	Current Annual Expenditure for Existing Service	Estimated Shortfall in Annual Expenditure for Expanded Service	Estimated Total Cost 10 years	Estimated State Share of Total Cost 10 years	Estimated Shortfall in State Funding10 years
Rail Capital TTL	$773,461,000	$451,921,000	$12,855,589,000	$6,922,880,000	$6,254,130,000
rolling stock	$35,500,000	$48,512,000	$1,190,305,000	$940,721,000	$865,721,000
rail line	$479,684,000	$248,043,000	$8,680,778,000	$4,077,960,000	$3,677,710,000
maintenance facility and related equipment	$8,700,000	$12,635,000	$258,090,000	$187,245,000	$179,745,000
station-related improvements	$12,937,000	$24,353,000	$297,599,000	$241,884,000	$224,234,000
power &/or signaling systems	$49,150,000	$72,276,000	$954,167,000	$575,704,000	$552,704,000
other	$187,490,000	$46,102,000	$1,474,650,000	$899,366,000	$754,016,000
Rail Ops TTL	$105,990,000	$71,700,000	$1,335,100,000	$328,900,000	$328,900,000
Bus Capital TTL	$181,103,600	$155,296,786	$1,661,126,828	$622,701,828	$493,252,828
rolling stock	$91,025,100	$69,250,328	$501,832,248	$277,867,248	$202,818,248
alternate fuel conversion	$10,100,000	$3,220,000	$77,530,000	$61,130,000	$44,430,000
maintenance facility	$38,135,000	$58,930,000	$320,390,000	$164,840,000	$129,980,000
other	$41,843,500	$23,896,458	$761,374,580	$118,864,580	$116,024,580
Bus Ops TTL	$417,464,566	$344,668,213	$3,499,789,671	$1,732,857,671	$1,138,092,671
ADA Capital TTL	$13,310,000	$3,524,653	$56,182,531	$19,006,531	$8,596,531
ADA Ops TTL	$15,102,592	$11,586,900	$242,718,013	$199,688,688	$114,400,688
Other TTL	$421,000	$71,000	$1,520,000	$490,000	$300,000
Other Ops TTL	$100,000	$0	$1,100,000	$0	$100,000
GRAND TOTAL	$1,506,952,758	$1,038,768,552	$19,653,126,043	$9,826,524,718	$8,337,772,718

Elderly and Disabled Paratransit Non-Profit Providers

ELDERLY AND DISABLED PARATRANSIT NON-PROFIT PROVIDERS

California's population, along with the rest of the nation's, is rapidly growing older and, as the baby boom generation becomes senior citizens, we can expect this trend to accelerate. This will inevitably create increased demand for elderly and disabled transit services. Given the rapidly expanding accessibility of publicly run transit systems brought about by ADA requirements, a sizable segment of the elderly and disabled population will be able to utilize public mass transit. The funding necessary for public transit systems to address ADA requirements is discussed in the section of this report that deals with public transit needs. However in less densely populated areas, utilizing public transit is frequently not possible for the elderly and disabled, and for many of them, public mass transportation services will be insufficient, or inappropriate regardless of geographic location. As a result, elderly and disabled transit, as is currently provided primarily by nonprofit agencies (some public agencies also provide this service), is expected to remain the primary means of transport for much of the elderly and disabled population. Today more than 200 such agencies are engaged in providing this service.

The current existing fleet of vehicles used to transport this special group of elderly and disabled individuals stands at about 1500 vehicles statewide. Current annual ridership is estimated at about 435,000 individuals, including 210,000 elderly and 225,000 disabled. Of those that are disabled, almost 50,000 utilize wheelchairs.

Federal law (Title 49 U.S.C. Section 5310) provides for capital grants for the purpose of assisting private nonprofit corporations, and, under certain circumstances, public agencies in providing transportation services to meet the needs of elderly persons and persons with disabilities for whom public mass transportation services are otherwise *unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate.* Of the agencies currently active in the 5310 program, 192 are nonprofit agencies and 17 are public agencies. While the Section 5310 program is a major source of funding for most agencies providing transportation services to the elderly and disabled, many agencies also receive funding from sources other than the Section 5310 program such as, local public funds and donations of cash and vehicles from private individuals and corporations.

The Federal law establishes Caltrans as the administrator of the 5310 program, while state law (Government Code Section 14055) requires oversight of the program by the California Transportation Commission. The program is relatively small. Total Section 5310 funding requests for state fiscal year 1998-99 were for $13,552,247 (80% federal funds, 20% local funds). However, after factoring in historical growth patterns for the program, growth in the elderly population and increasing vehicle costs, Commission staff estimates that total 5310 capital costs for vehicles over a ten-year period will be about $170 million, with just over 2,800 vehicles being requested from the program. Staff further estimates that an additional 2,100 vehicles at a cost of approximately $130 million will need to be funded from other sources. In addition to vehicle costs, staff expects that funding needs for computer and communications equipment could run as high as $9 or $10 million, bringing the total capital needs from all sources, over the ten year period, to about $310 million. During that same ten year period, operating costs could exceed $900 million (100% local funds). Current capital funding sources would appear to be capable of generating close to $170 million over ten years, leaving an overall capital funding shortfall for elderly and disabled transit of about $140 million.

V. WORKLOAD PROJECTIONS, STAFFING ESTIMATES, AND DELIVERY MEASURES

"A workload projection and staffing estimate necessary for the Department of Transportation to perform the project support work required to complete the projects contained in the assessment"

Senate Resolution 8 Workload Projection and Staffing Estimate

Upon a commitment of funding to projects identified in the assessment, the Department will build into its budget process the resources needed to deliver State Highway projects.

Budget Process:

Resources (design, preparation of environmental documents and construction inspection) for projects that have committed funding in a transportation program are provided through an annual capital outlay support budget. Resources are developed for each project through a project workplan. The workplan identifies the total planned resources for a project for the entire duration of the project over several years. All workplans are combined to determine the total resources needed to deliver a planned program. The multi-year program is consolidated into annual fiscal year budgets to match the State's budgeting process. A budget includes personal services dollars (staff salaries, benefits) and operating expenses (equipment, buildings, materials, vehicles utilities, and many others).

Workload Projection:

Normally Project Study Reports (PSRs), or in lieu documents for local off system projects, are required by statute. These are used to project specific workload and capital outlay costs. However, because of timing of budget process requirements, workload projections are sometimes needed before the PSRs are completed. In these cases (and for this estimate) for preliminary planning purposes, workload is projected at 35 percent of the estimated project costs for projects in urban areas, and 30 percent for projects in non-urban areas and for intercity rail. These support factors are to be applied to all identified projects on a program basis. As the numbers of projects in the proposed programs are increased or decreased, there would be a similar increase or decrease in the planned support needed for each of the programs.

Preliminary workload projections (expressed in dollars) are identified in the table on the next page for the different programs identified in the assessment.

Staffing Estimate:

A staffing estimate cannot be developed until the funding programs are better defined. Staffing levels depend on several factors including the time duration, dollar value of the program, and a determination of what agencies will perform what portions of the work identified. The staffing level of the Department is determined on an annual basis as part of the State's budgeting process. In practice, any increase that would be required to implement a program described in the SR 8 assessment would challenge the staffing and delivery capabilities of both state and local agencies.

Program Workload:

Program Category	$$ Capital Outlay	Support Factor	Program Support Estimate
(1) Interregional State Highway Improvements (non-Urban)	Support estimate provided in project by project assessment data provided.		
(2) Interregional State Highway (Urban) – 4/20/99 summary	$20,285 M (RTPA) - $4,260 M (Note 1) $16,015 M	X 35%	(Note 2) $5,605 M
(3) Intercity Rail	Support estimate provided in project by project assessment data provided.		
(4) Maintenance (SHOPP)	$17,024 M	X 35%	$5,958 M
(5) Traffic Operations			
• SHOPP	$ 5,021 M	X 35%	$1,757 M
• STIP (not included above)	$ 7,200 M	X 35%	$2,520 M
(6) Soundwalls	$ 472 M	X 35%	$ 165 M
(7) Storm Water Treatment	$ 6,000 M	X 35%	$2,100 M
(8) Indian Reservation Roads	Project delivery to be done by agencies other than Caltrans.		
(9) State TEA Projects (not included above)	$ 140 M	X 35%	$ 49 M
(10) ITS Intelligent Transportation System	Preliminary data does not define capital projects		
(11) Aeronautics	Project delivery to be done by agencies other than Caltrans.		
(12) State Owned Office Space	$ 510 M	X 35%	$ 179 M
Total			**$18,333 M**

Note 1: A deduction was made for duplication of projects on the urban and non-urban project lists.
Note 2: The 4/20/99 RTPA Survey Summary did not identify whether support had been included in the capital cost estimates. Therefore, it was assumed it was not included and has been included here.

"Measures to be instituted by the Department of Transportation to ensure that projects contained in the assessment can be delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner."

Senate Resolution 8 Delivery Measures

Upon a commitment of funding to projects identified in the assessment, the Department will develop plans for delivery of State Highway projects. The Department will provide project workplans for each project which will establish the delivery timeframe and an estimate of support resources needed for each of the projects identified. The Department will use the principles of Project Management to manage the projects to ensure delivery of the projects in a timely and cost-effective manner.

Project Workplans:

Workplans provide an estimate of all resources (staff hours) and the time durations (schedule) needed to perform all activities to complete a project. The workplans are developed using staff's expertise of similar projects. The workplan provides a basis to monitor and evaluate actual progress of the project against the initial planned schedule and resource estimate.

Project Management:

Each project will have an assigned Project Manager that will be responsible for managing delivery of the project in a timely and cost-effective manner in accordance with the project workplan. The Project Manager will manage changes to the workplan to keep the schedule as close to the original schedule as possible. The Project Manager will also be responsible for managing the project's budget.

Measures To Be Undertaken:

(a) Provide for resources in budgeting process.
(b) Assign a Project Manager to each project.
(c) Prepare a project workplan for each project.
(d) Prepare a program delivery plan.
(e) Use Project Management principles to manage delivery of the overall program. Manage changes to delivery within the program. Establish program performance measures and report on accomplishments.
(f) Continue efforts to improve project delivery.

Project Delivery Background Information

Project delivery can best be demonstrated in two ways. (1) Delivery of the budgeted dollar value of projects, and (2) Delivery of projects in a timely manner. The budgeted dollar value measurement is a measure of the ability to deliver a sufficient value of projects compared to the amount of funds that have been planned and budgeted for expenditure. This measurement allows some flexibility in delivery by including the delivery of projects delivered early to offset delivery of projects that have been delayed due to a project related delivery issue.

Timely delivery is a measurement of all projects planned for delivery in a given fiscal year compared to those that were actually delivered. This measurement is confined to delivery of planned projects only, and does not allow for counting of additional projects or projects delivered early. This is a measure of the ability to deliver on time. One caution about the measurement for timely delivery is that to achieve 100% delivery of projects "on time" may not be cost-effective. Some of the factors which have led to projects being delayed is continued negotiations with external parties over the project scope, mitigation measures for permit approvals, or right-of-way acquisition. These factors can lead to significant cost increases if settled too early.

Department's Delivery Performance:

The Department has been measuring it's project delivery performance since 1992. The Department reports the status of project delivery to the California Transportation Commission.

The Department over the past three years has delivered 118 percent, 111 percent, and 113 percent of the budgeted value of projects programmed in the STIP[1] and SHOPP[2]. For the current year, the Department expects to exceed 100 percent delivery of programmed dollars. The Department's performance measure is to deliver more than 100 percent of the value of programmed projects for a given year.

The Department over the past three years has delivered 96 percent, 93 percent, and 89 percent of the planned projects programmed in the STIP and SHOPP on time. For the current year, the Department expects to exceed 90 percent delivery of projects on time. The Department's performance measure is to deliver more than 90 percent of the number of programmed projects for a given year on time.

Local Agency Delivery Performance:

There are no specific delivery performance measures in place to demonstrate the delivery of projects produced by local agencies that receive grants and subventions for money processed through the department.

There is a performance indicator of local delivery in the amount of federal-aid funds that are budgeted and planned for expenditure. As part of the budget process, local agency funds are identified for various programs and the amount of expenditures are calculated. Last year (in 1997-98), local agencies obligated 42 percent of the budgeted federal dollars of projects planned. In the current year, the Department expects local agencies to deliver fewer than 50 percent of the budgeted federal dollars.

Local Agency project funds accumulate for undelivered projects as each year passes. With the current trend for local delivery, it appears that the accumulation of undelivered local funds (approximately $700 million) at the end of this year will be equivalent to a typical fiscal year's budget allocation of grants and subventions to local agencies.

[1] STIP – State Transportation Improvement Program
[2] SHOPP – State Highway Operation and Protection Program

Issues Affecting Delivery:

There can be any of a number of reasons why a specific project may not be delivered as planned. The reason will vary from project to project, reflecting a specific project's unique characteristic. Common reasons given on previous projects included the ability to get Coastal Commission Permits, Right of Way issues, Environmental issues, project scope/staging issues, or to combine one project with another planned project to be delivered later. For local agencies, the issues are significantly more diverse because the issues will vary significantly from one agency to another.

Efforts to Improve Project Delivery:

Caltrans has initiated efforts to transform project delivery. This effort revolves around changing business practices, staffing mix, organizational structure, and management approaches.

Project Management:

Reforms to the Department's project management practices are under way. Caltrans has fully committed to project management throughout the Department. A Project Management strong matrix organization structure has been fully instituted. Project Management Division Chief positions were established in the District offices. Implementation of project management is a Department continuous improvement effort. Emphasis now is on training and staff development.

- Project Manager assigned to all major projects. Serves as point of contact.
- Single Focal Point for Project Management established in each district.
- Developed electronic information processing tools needed to provide flexible management control and an ability to respond to literally thousands of projects and hundreds of managers. Development of these initial tools is complete and in use. {Data Warehouse, Work Breakdown Structure (WBS), Resource Breakdown Structure (RBS), Expert Project Manager (XPM) system, Workload Estimating Norms (WEN)}

Streamlining Project Delivery:

Caltrans has initiated Continuous Quality Improvement teams and Reengineering teams to simplify and improve the Project Development procedures, guidelines and standards.

- A SHOPP Reengineering Team was formed to reengineer the project delivery process for projects programmed in the SHOPP. The initial effort consisted of three self-managed teams with cross-functional skills utilizing the reengineered process to deliver approximately $25 million of safety, operational and rehabilitation projects.
- The grant procedures to administer grant programs and the pass-through of funds have been reviewed and changes have been implemented.

Manage Resources Efficiently:

Administrative changes are being implemented to improve organization structure and cost accounting practices in an effort to improve efficiency. Organizational issues are also being addressed.

- Existing accounting and budgeting procedures are being changed to better define costs and relate them to products and services.
- District boundaries have been changed to ensure that each county is entirely within a transportation district and that all counties within one Metropolitan Planning Organization are within the same transportation district.
- Model District organization has been implemented.
- Actions resulting in tailored small districts, regional support districts, standardized districts and service centers were taken. District regionalization is now structurally complete. A Regional Right of Way Service Unit is now in operation in Southern California.

VI. APPENDIX: DETAILED PROJECT LISTINGS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Regional Agencies: Highways

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
STATE HIGHWAY EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
MTC	Alameda	I-680 Sunol Grade NB HOV lane, aux lane, Rt 84 to SCl/Ala Co line	74.1
MTC	Alameda	I-580 eastbound auxiliary lane between Santa Rita Road and Airway Blvd.	14.5
MTC	Alameda	Soundwalls for existing freeways	5.0
MTC	Alameda	Route 84 Expressway	120.0
MTC	Alameda	Isabel Route 84/I-580 interchange	60.0
MTC	Alameda/CC	Caldecott Tunnel 4th Bore	120.0
MTC	Contra Costa	I-80 southbound HOV lane extension, Cummings Skyway to State Route 4	31.5
MTC	Contra Costa	I-680 auxiliary lane, Diablo Blvd to Bollinger Canyon Rd in San Ramon Valley	72.9
MTC	Contra Costa	Route 4 improvements from Railroad Ave. to Route 160	174.4
MTC	Contra Costa	I-80 northbound HOV lane extension from State Route 4 to the Carquinez Bridge	25.6
MTC	Contra Costa	Route 4 Bypass widening to 4 lanes from Route 160 to Lone Tree Way	11.6
MTC	Contra Costa	Route 4 Bypass widening to 4 lanes from Lone Tree Way to Balfour Road	19.3
MTC	Contra Costa	Route 4 Bypass/Route 160 freeway to freeway connectors	19.7
MTC	Contra Costa	Further widening of Route 4, Somersville Rd to Rt 160 with median for BART	128.0
MTC	Contra Costa	I-680/Rt. 4 interchange improvements	357.5
MTC	Marin	US 101 reversible HOV lane with movable barrier, N San Pedro to Lucky Drive	82.8
MTC	Marin	US 101 widening to 6 lanes, incl 2 HOV lanes, Atherton Av to Sonoma Co Line	91.3
MTC	Marin	US 101 widening to 8 lanes, incl 2 HOV lanes, Rt 37 to Atherton Av in Novato	69.2
MTC	Marin	US 101/Greenbrae interchange improvements	59.8
MTC	Marin	US 101/Tiburon interchange improvements	7.9
MTC	Napa	Maxwell Bridge widening, Rt 121 over Napa River, to 4 lanes in City of Napa	10.8
MTC	Napa	Route 221/29 interchange	39.4
MTC	Napa	Route 12 widening from the Solano Co. line to Route 29 (from 2 to 4 lanes)	54.4
MTC	Napa	Route 29 intersection improvements at Route 12 and Routes 12/121	7.7
MTC	Napa	Signal improvements on Routes 12/121	0.3
MTC	San Francisco	Doyle Drive replacement	220.0
MTC	San Francisco	Treasure Island Ramps	50.0
MTC	San Francisco	Central Freeway Replacement (cost contingency)	50.0
MTC	San Mateo	US 101 auxiliary lanes from 3rd Ave. to Grand Ave.	101.2
MTC	San Mateo	Route 1 widening from 2 to 4 lanes within the Half Moon Bay city limits	10.0
MTC	San Mateo	Route 84 Bayfront Expressway extension from Marsh Rd. to Woodside Rd.	111.1
MTC	San Mateo	Devil's Slide Tunnel	120.0
MTC	Santa Clara	I-680 Sunol Grade northbound HOV lane, Montague Expwy to Co Line	19.7
MTC	Santa Clara	I-880/Route 237 HOV interchange connectors (freeway to freeway HOV lanes)	33.5
MTC	Solano	Route 37 park-and-ride lot at Route 29	2.0
MTC	Solano	I-80 HOV lanes between I-680 and I-505 through Fairfield and Vacaville	158.3
MTC	Solano	I-80 interchange improvements	100.0
MTC	Solano	Additional Route 12 safety projects	54.0
MTC	Sonoma	US 101 HOV lanes, Lakeville Hwy to Old Redwood Hwy North, Petaluma	117.9
MTC	Sonoma	US 101 widening from Petaluma to the Marin County line with 2 HOV lanes	157.7
MTC	Sonoma	US 101 HOV lanes, Steele Lane to River Road (Santa Rosa to Windsor)	51.7
MTC	Sonoma	Routes 37/121 intersection improvements	0.7
MTC	Sonoma	Additional safety/operational projects on Routes 12/116/121	29.6
MTC	Sonoma	US 101 HOV lane gap closures, Santa Rosa Av to Old Redwood Hwy	230.1
MTC	Sonoma	Route 116 improvements in Sonoma Co.	9.4
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	3,284.6
SACOG	Sacramento	HOV on US 50 from 15th/16th Sts to Mayhew	38.8
SACOG	Sacramento	HOV on US 50 from Mayhew to Sunrise	42.0
SACOG	Sacramento	HOV on I-5 from Laguna to J St	38.0
SACOG	Sacramento	HOV on I-5 from I-80 to Sacramento International Airport	15.0
SACOG	Sacramento	Auxiliary lanes on I-5 from Richards Blvd to Garden Hwy	10.0
SACOG	Sacramento	HOV on Rt 99 from Elk Grove Blvd to Grant Line Rd	7.0
SACOG	Sutter	Route 70: 4-lane expresswy, Cornelius Rd to north of Bear River	53.3

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
STATE HIGHWAY EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
SACOG	Sutter	Rt 20: urban interchange at Rt 99	16.3
SACOG	Sutter	Rt 99: widen to 4 lanes, south of Feather River Bridge to Sacramento Av	37.2
SACOG	Sutter	Rt 99: widen to 4 lanes, Ashford to Rt 113	19.1
SACOG	Sutter	Rt 99: widen to 4 lanes, Oswald Rd to south of Lincoln Rd	7.7
SACOG	Yolo	I-5: Rt 113 interchange, construction only	30.0
SACOG	Yolo	I-80: HOV lane, Davis to West Sacramento	37.0
SACOG	Yolo	US 50: widen from Jefferson Blvd to Pioneer Bridge	10.0
SACOG	Yuba	Construct interchange at Rt 70 and Algodon Rd	6.0
SACOG	Yuba	Construct Marysville Bypass	300.0
SACOG	Yuba	Rt 65: 2 lane Third Feather River Bridge, Rt 70-Rt 99	118.0
SACOG	Yuba	Rt 65: additional 2 lanes, Third River Bridge	87.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	872.4
ACTC	Amador	Route 88 passing lanes, 4 locations (RTP candidates)	26.4
ACTC	Amador	Rt 4, North Angels Bypass	8.7
ACTC	Amador	Rt 104, West Bypass of Ione	7.2
ACTC	Amador	Other rural State highway expansion, Amador	14.2
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	56.5
BCAG	Butte	Rt 70, Yuba Co Line to Rt 162, Marysville Bypass (unfunded portion)	70.0
BCAG	Butte	Rt 99, Skyway to Eaton Rd, widen to 6 lanes	40.0
BCAG	Butte	Rt 32, Eaton Rd Bypass, Muir Av to Eaton Rd	33.0
BCAG	Butte	Rt 32, Muir Av to W 1st St, widen to 4 lanes	24.3
BCAG	Butte	Rt 32, Grade separations, 8th & 9th Sts at UPRR crossing	11.1
BCAG	Butte	11 other State highway projects	40.7
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	219.1
CCCOG	Calaveras	Calaveras: State highway expansion	64.2
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	64.2
CLTC	Colusa	Colusa: State highway expansion	104.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	104.0
DNLTC	Del Norte	Rt 199: route concept	130.0
DNLTC	Del Norte	Rt 197: route concept	3.0
DNLTC	Del Norte	Rt 101: Wilson Creek betterments	45.0
DNLTC	Del Norte	Rt 101: Crescent City Flats Expressway	5.7
DNLTC	Del Norte	Rt 101: Wilson Creek Bypass	41.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	224.7
EDCTC	El Dorado	Rt 50 widening, South Shingle Rd to El Dorado Hills Blvd	26.5
EDCTC	El Dorado	Rt 50 through Placerville, ultimate improvements	100.0
EDCTC	El Dorado	Rt 50 widening, Missouri Flat Rd to Forni Rd	6.0
EDCTC	El Dorado	Rt 50, El Dorado Hills Blvd interchange	25.0
EDCTC	El Dorado	Rt 50, Missouri Flat Rd interchange	25.0
EDCTC	El Dorado	Rt 50, Forni Rd/ Ray Lawyer Rd interchange(s)	25.0
EDCTC	El Dorado	Rt 50, convert expressway to freeway through Camino	25.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	232.5
COFCG	Fresno	SR 41 from Divisidero Ave. to Shaw Ave. 6F - 8F	39.0
COFCG	Fresno	SR 41 from Herndon Ave. to Friant Road 4F - 6F	11.0
COFCG	Fresno	SR 41 from Elkhord Ave. to Central Ave. 2C - 4E	11.0
COFCG	Fresno	SR 99 from Kingsburg to Floral Ave. 4F - 6F	49.0
COFCG	Fresno	SR 99 from Jensen Ave. toSR 41- Construct Aux. Lanes	20.0

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
STATE HIGHWAY EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
COFCG	Fresno	SR 99 New I/C at Shaw Ave.	41.0
COFCG	Fresno	SR 99 New I/C at Grantland Ave.	33.0
COFCG	Fresno	SR 99 N/R Biola JCT-Ave. 7	24.0
COFCG	Fresno	Other State highway expansion	38.6
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	266.6
Kern COG	Kern	Rt 5, Rt 99 to Rt 233, widen fwy to 6 lanes	74.0
Kern COG	Kern	Rt 5, Ft Tejon to Rt 99, widen fwy to 10 lanes	71.0
Kern COG	Kern	Rt 14, Rt 58 to near median x-over, 4 ln expwy	68.0
Kern COG	Kern	Rt 46, Co Line to Rt 5, 4 ln expwy	85.0
Kern COG	Kern	Rt 46, Rt 43 to Rt 99, 4 lane expressway	26.0
Kern COG	Kern	Rt 58, Cameron Rd to near Randsburg, upgrade to fwy	18.0
Kern COG	Kern	Rt 58, Mojave Bypass	84.0
Kern COG	Kern	Rt 58, Rd Appr to Calif City, upgrade to fwy	43.0
Kern COG	Kern	Rt 58, Heath Rd to Mohawk Rd, 4 lane freeway	175.0
Kern COG	Kern	Rt 395, Johannesburg to Randsburg Rd, 4 lane expressway	47.0
Kern COG	Kern	Other State higway expansion projects	28.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	719.0
Kings	Kings	Kings: State highway expansion	140.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	140.0
LCCAPC	Lake	Route 29, post miles 23.9/27.9	15.0
LCCAPC	Lake	Route 53, post miles 1.4/3.5	11.0
LCCAPC	Lake	Route 20, post miles 38.6/39.8	1.0
LCCAPC	Lake	Route 29, post miles 27.9/31.1 (above programmed amount)	8.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	35.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	133 soundwall projects	1,386.3
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rt 5 HOV lanes, Rte. 118 to Rt 14	37.1
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rt 5 HOV lanes, Rte. 134 to Rt 170	169.8
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rt 5 HOV lanes, Rte. 170 to Rt 118	77.5
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rt 10 HOV lanes, Rte. 605 to Rte 57	191.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rt 5 HOV connectors at Rte. 14 (N. to/from S.)	80.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rt 5 HOV connectors at Rte. 170 (N. to/from S.)	68.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rt 5 HOV connectors at Rte. 405 (N. to/from S.)	158.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rt 60 HOV connectors at Rte. 605 (N. to/from E.)	126.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rt 60 HOV connectors at Rte. 605 (S. to/from E.)	126.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rt 10 HOV connectors at Rte. 605 (S. to/from E.)	126.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rt 10 HOV connectors at Rte. 605 (S. to/from W.)	126.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Santa Ana Fwy Corridor Capacity Enhancement (MIS completed)	1,600.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	405/101 Interchange Improvement Widening	800.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Intelligent Transportation System - Project IMAJINE Phase II	6.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Intelligent Transportation System - LA/Ventura ATIS Phase II	10.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Intelligent Transportation System - Regional System to System Integration	35.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rte 134/5 Interchange Completion (Caltrans estimate)	100.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rte 170/134 Interchange Transportation Operations System Completion	100.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rte 47 Extension to Rte. 405 Gap Closure	200.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rte 710 Gap Closure (ROD of EIR/EIS)	840.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	6,362.7
MCOG	Mendocino	Route 20 passing lanes	8.0
MCOG	Mendocino	Route 101 Hopland Bypass	125.0
MCOG	Mendocino	Route 101 North Hopland	24.0

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
STATE HIGHWAY EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	157.0
MCAG	Merced	Rt 152, Los Banos Bypass	112.0
MCAG	Merced	Rt 59 expressway projects	89.0
MCAG	Merced	Rt 140, Bradley overhead	11.0
MCAG	Merced	Rt 165, Hilmar Bypass	50.0
MCAG	Merced	Rt 99 through Merced, 6-lane	31.0
MCAG	Merced	Rt 99, Merced-Atwater, 8 lane	52.5
MCAG	Merced	Rt 99 through Atwater, 6 lane	27.4
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	372.9
TAMC	Monterey	Rt 1, Pacific Grove to Marina, widen to 6 lanes, op improvements	40.0
TAMC	Monterey	Rt 101, Airport to Russell-Espinoza, aux lanes, modify interchanges	25.0
TAMC	Monterey	Rt 101, Airport Blvd interchange	12.0
TAMC	Monterey	Rt 68, Rt 1 to Toro Park, widen to 4 lanes (bypass)	170.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	247.0
NCTC	Nevada	Rt 20, Rt 49 to Rt 80, 40 ft standard + passing lanes	70.0
NCTC	Nevada	Rt 49, Placer Co Line to Grass Valley, 5 lane expressway	75.0
NCTC	Nevada	Rt 49, Rt 20 to Yuba County Line, 40 ft standard	18.0
NCTC	Nevada	Rt 89, Truckee, reconstruct undercrossing	20.0
NCTC	Nevada	Rt 89, Truckee, reconfigure I-80 interchange	14.0
NCTC	Nevada	Rt 89, Rt 80 to Rt 49, 40 ft standard + passing lanes	40.0
NCTC	Nevada	Rt 174, Rt 80 to Grass Valley, 40 ft standard	42.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	279.0
OCTA	Orange	Interstate 5: Rt 91 to LA County, mixed flow lanes	113.5
OCTA	Orange	Rt 22: Rt 55 to I-405, HOV lanes	180.0
OCTA	Orange	Rt 57: I-5/Rt 22 to LA County, mixed flow or HOT lanes	200.0
OCTA	Orange	Rt 241 (Foothill Trans Corridor): Oso Pkwy to I-5, new toll road	50.0
OCTA	Orange	Various routes: freeway choke points	125.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	668.5
PCTPA	Placer	Rt 65, Lincoln Bypass	60.0
PCTPA	Placer	Rt 49, Auburn Bypass	22.0
PCTPA	Placer	Placer: other State highway expansion	108.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	190.0
PCTC	Plumas	Rt 70/89, Lee Summit passing lanes	2.8
PCTC	Plumas	Rt 70, within Feather River Canyon, passing lanes & turnouts	5.0
PCTC	Plumas	Rt 89, north of Greenville, passing lane	0.9
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	8.7
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 60: Route 15 to Valley Way - HOV Lanes	72.7
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 215: East junction of Route 60 to University Ave. Mixed Flow	27.9
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 71: San Bernardino County Line to Route 91 - Mixed Flow/HOV	95.6
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 91: Mary St. to Route 60/215 Interchange - HOV Lanes	86.9
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 215/60: El Cerrito to Day Street - Truck Lanes	80.5
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 10: San Bernardino Co. Line to SR-60, Add 2 MF Lanes and 2 HOV Lanes	65.1
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 60: I-15 to Jct I-10, Add 2 HOV Lanes	145.8
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 74: Grand Ave. to 10th St. - Add one lane in each direction	20.9
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 74: I-15 to I-215 - Add one lane in each direction	50.1
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 79: E. Jct SR-74 to Ramona Expressway - Add 1 lane in each direction	20.4
RCTC	Riverside	NEAR WINCHESTER ROAD, interchange, Rt 15	25.0

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
STATE HIGHWAY EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
RCTC	Riverside	NEAR MAGNOLIA AVENUE, interchange, Rt 15	25.0
RCTC	Riverside	CLINTON-KEITH ROAD interchange, Rt 215	25.0
RCTC	Riverside	I-10/SR60 (FWY. TO FWY) SEP.	100.0
RCTC	Riverside	SOUTH JCT. SR79/ FRONT ST. interchange, Rt 15	25.0
RCTC	Riverside	LOS ALAMOS ROAD interchange, Rt 215	25.0
RCTC	Riverside	ELLIS AVE & EVANS ROAD interchange, Rt 215	25.0
RCTC	Riverside	THEODORE STREET interchange, Rt 60	25.0
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 10: SR-60 to Monterey Ave., Add 2 HOV Lanes	183.2
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 79: San Diego County Line to Butterfield Stage Rd - Add 1 lane each direction	77.8
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 79: N. Jct I-15 to W. Jct SR-74 - Add 2 lanes in each direction	164.3
RCTC	Riverside	JEFFERSON STREET interchange, Rt 10	25.0
RCTC	Riverside	NEAR DILLON ROAD, interchange, Rt 10	25.0
RCTC	Riverside	RAMON RD interchange, Rt 10	8.1
RCTC	Riverside	DATE PALM DRIVE interchange, Rt 10	25.0
RCTC	Riverside	PALM DRIVE/GENE AUTRY TRAIL interchange, Rt 10	25.0
RCTC	Riverside	INDIAN AVENUE interchange, Rt 10	25.0
RCTC	Riverside	Rt 71/91 (FWY. TO FWY) interchange	81.7
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	1,580.9
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 15, E Main St & Calico Ghost Town Rd, SB Truck Climbing Lane	4.4
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 15, 4.4 Mi n/o Afton Rd to 1.6 Mi s/o Basin Rd, SB Truck Climbing Lane	4.3
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 58, Kern Co. Line to 7.5 Mi e/o Jct 395 - Construct 4-lane Expressway	101.3
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 58, Near Hinkley, Valley View Rd. to Agate Rd,4-lane Expwy (stage 1)	97.4
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 58, Lenwood Rd to Agate Rd. - Construct 2 EB lanes and structure	4.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 138: LA County Line to I-15 - widen.	110.8
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 138: SR-173, 4.5 miles east of I-15, add one lane in each direction	20.9
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 395: I-15 to SR-58	158.2
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 15: OLD ROUTE 58	20.5
SANBAG	San Bernardino	SR-395/SR-58 INTERCHANGE (interim)	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 60: LA County Line to Riverside County Line - Truck Lanes	583.6
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: I-15 to SR-38, Add 2 HOV Lanes	102.1
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: SR-38 to Yucaipa Blvd, Add 2 MF Lanes and 2 HOV Lanes	44.7
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: Yucaipa Blvd. To Riverside Co. Line, Add 2 MF Lanes and 2 HOV Lanes	36.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 215: San Bernardino Co Line to Jct I-10 - Add 2 MF and 2 HOV lanes	163.9
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 215: Rte 10 to Rte 30 Interchange - Add 2 HOV, Modify Interchange	215.3
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 215: Rte 30 to N Jct I-15 - Add 2 MF and 2 HOV Lanes	74.8
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: ETIWANDA AVENUE interchange	13.2
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: CHERRY AVENUE interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: CITRUS AVENUE interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: ALDER ROAD interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: RIVERSIDE AVENUE interchange	15.8
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: MT. VERNON interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: TIPPECANOE interchange	17.2
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: MOUNTAIN VIEW interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: CALIFORNIA interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: ORANGE interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: UNIVERSITY interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: WABASH interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: LIVE OAK CANYON interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: COUNTY LINE ROAD interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 10: 4TH STREET interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 15: DEVORE ROAD interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 15: RANCHERO ROAD interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 15: JOSHUA STREET interchange	25.0

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
STATE HIGHWAY EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 15: MOJAVE ST. (HESPERIA) interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 15: BASELINE ROAD interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 15: SIERRA AVENUE interchange	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rt 15: BEAR VALLEY interchagne	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	I-215/SR-30 interchange, Phase II	100.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	2,388.3
SANDAG	San Diego	I-5 @ SR56: WB-NB & SB-EB Connectors	55.0
SANDAG	San Diego	I-5: Del Mar Heights Rd to Birmingham Ave, HOV/ML/GP lanes	200.0
SANDAG	San Diego	I-5: Birmingham Dr. to SR76. HOV/ML/GP Lanes	300.0
SANDAG	San Diego	I-5 @ SR78. Revise Interchange	100.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR11: SR125/905 to New POE. 4F	30.0
SANDAG	San Diego	I-15 @ SR56. EB-NB & SB-WB Connector Ramps	35.0
SANDAG	San Diego	I-15: SR56 to Centre City Pkwy. ML/HOV Lanes	160.0
SANDAG	San Diego	I-15: Centre City Pkwy. To SR78. ML/HOV Lanes	100.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR52: I-5 to I-805. 4F:6F	30.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR52: I-15 to SR125. 4F:6F	60.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR52: SR125 to SR67. Initial 4F & 4F:6F	180.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR54: I-805 to SR125. 4F & 2-HOV:6F & 2-HOV	40.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR56: I-5 to Carmel Country Rd. 4F:6F	10.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR67: Prospect St. to Mapleview Ave. 4F:6F	60.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR67 @ Mapleview Ave. Interchange	10.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR67: S.D. River to Pala St. (Ramona). 2C:4C	80.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR76: Jeffries Ranch Rd. to I-15. 2C:4C	140.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR78: Widen El Camino Real Overcrossing	6.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR94 @ SR125. Missing Connectors & Widen to 8F	70.0
SANDAG	San Diego	SR125: SR54 to SR94. 4F & 2-HOV:6F & 2-HOV	40.0
SANDAG	San Diego	I-5: Various Locations. Auxiliary Lanes	50.0
SANDAG	San Diego	I-8: Various Locations. Auxiliary Lanes	30.0
SANDAG	San Diego	I-15: Various Locations. Auxiliary Lanes	60.0
SANDAG	San Diego	I-805: Various Locations. Auxiliary Lanes	30.0
SANDAG	San Diego	Various Locations. Interchange Improvements	100.0
SANDAG	San Diego	S.D. Centre City, Downtown Access Improvements	20.0
SANDAG	San Diego	S.D. International Airport, Access Improvements	100.0
SANDAG	San Diego	S.D. Bay, Port Access Improvements	50.0
SANDAG	San Diego	I-5 @ San Ysidro, Port of Entry Improvements	30.0
SANDAG	San Diego	Various Locations. Environmental Banking	10.0
SANDAG	San Diego	Various Locations. Clean Water Improvements	75.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	2,261.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-4, Road and shoulder improvements, Jack Tone Rd to Stanislaus Co Line	11.2
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-5, Widen to 5 lanes, I-205 to Rt 120	20.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-4, New 2 lane alignment, SR-99 to Jack Tone Road	2.2
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-12/88, Lockeford Bypass	50.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-12, Widen to 4 lanes, Mokelumne River Bridge to I-5	60.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-12, Widening to 4 lanes, I-5 to Lower Sacramento Rd	11.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-12, Widen to 4 lanes, add turn lanes, from SR-99 to SR-88.	4.1
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-26, Passing lanes, shoulder & rd improvts, Jack Tone Rd to Calaveras Co	20.9
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-88, Passing Lanes, SR-99 to Amador Co.Line	6.2
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-99, Widen to 8 lanes, Ripon to Manteca	39.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-99, Widen to 8 lanes, Arch to Crosstown	26.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-99, Widen to 8 lanes, Crosstown to Hammer	26.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-99, Widen to 8 lanes , Hammer to Eight Mile	18.2
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-99, New capacity from north of Harney to Jct. 12 East	11.7

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
STATE HIGHWAY EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-99, New capacity from Jct. 12 East to County line.	23.4
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-120, New alignment and Interchange, SR-99 to Sexton	57.2
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-120, New alignment, Harrold to Stanislaus County Line	14.3
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-120, New capacity, I-5 to SR-99, 6 lanes	16.9
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-5 S/B, Widen to 7 lanes (auxilliary lane), From SR-120 to I-205	13.1
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-5, Widen to 8 lanes, Eight Mile to SR-12	15.6
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-5, Widen to 8 lanes, SR 120 to French Camp Road	29.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-5, Widen to 8 lanes, French Camp Road to Charter Way	21.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-5, Widen to 6 lanes, SR-12 to County Line	28.6
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-5, Widen to 10 lanes, Charter Way to Mt. Diablo	39.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-205, Widen to 8 lanes , I-580 to I-5	55.9
SJCOG	San Joaquin	E/W Expressway, Middle Road, north side of I-205 to Paradise/Chrisman	26.7
SJCOG	San Joaquin	E/W Expressway, Golden Valley Blvd, northwest side of I-5 from Lathrop Road	59.3
SJCOG	San Joaquin	E/W Expressway, Golden Valley Blvd, Lathrop Road to El Dorado	23.5
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-580, Widen to 6 lanes, SR-132 to Patterson Pass Road	29.7
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-5, From Hammer Lane to Eight Mile Road. Widen to 8	19.6
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Sr-99, Widen to 6 lanes, Hwy 120 to Arch Road	25.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	SR-120, Escalon Bypass, from Sexton to Harrold	27.9
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-580, Widen to 6 lanes from Patterson Pass to Alameda Co. Line.	4.1
SJCOG	San Joaquin	I-5 Widen to 8 lanes from Monte Diablo to Hammer Lane	34.1
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Route 88, Widen, Collier Rd to NE of Buena Vista Rd, add EB climbing lane	3.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Comanche Parkway to 1.0 mile west, add passing lane. Hwy 50 Reliever route	3.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Rt. 132, Close gap in 4 lane expressway;	1.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Rt. 132, 2C to 4E Koster to SR 33	9.5
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	886.7
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 101, El Campo Rd to Cuesta Grade, aux lanes, interchange improvs	36.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 101, Los Osos Valley Rd, reconstruct interchange	10.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 101, Prado Rd (SLO), construct full interchange	10.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 101, Cuesta Grade to North County Line, aux lanes, interchanges	15.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 166, improve with turnouts, passing lanes, shoulders	15.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 41, Rt 46 to Kern Co Line, passing lanes, shoulder widening	10.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 46, Shandon Rest Area to Rt 41 E Jct, widen to 4 lanes, interchange	67.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 46, Rt 41 E Jct, to Kern Co Line, passing lanes, shoulder widening	10.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 101, Brisco Rd interchange (Arroyo Grande)	15.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 101/46 West interchange (Paso Robles)	15.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 101 Willow Rd interchange & frontage rd	15.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	Rt 227, Price Cyn Rd to Orcutt Rd, widen(4-6 lanes)	15.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	4 other State highway expansion projects	15.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	248.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Rt 101, Fairview to Storke, widen to 6 lanes	12.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Rt 135, UVP to Betteravia, widen to 6 lanes	17.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Rt 101, Santa Maria River Bridge, increase capacity	40.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Rt 166, Santa Maria to Kern Co Line, passing lanes & safety improvs	15.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Rt 166, Guadalupe to Santa Maria, widen to 4 lanes	10.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Rt 246, Buellton to Lompoc, widen to 4 lanes	24.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Rt 101, San Ysidro to Carpenteria, 6 lane widening and modify interchanges	87.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara: other State highway expansion projects	52.5
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	257.5
SCCRTC	Santa Cruz	Rt 1/9 intersection, improvements	10.0
SCCRTC	Santa Cruz	Granite Creek Rd interchange, realign Rt 17 SB off ramp	12.4
SCCRTC	Santa Cruz	Rt 129, Main St to Lakeview Rd, widen to 4 lanes, add left turn pockets	11.4

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
STATE HIGHWAY EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
SCCRTC	Santa Cruz	2 other State highway expansion projects	6.1
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	39.9
SRTPA	Shasta	Rt 5, auxiliary lanes, Cottonwood Hills	16.0
SRTPA	Shasta	Rt 5, add lanes, 4 to 6, S Bonneyview to Rt 299	17.0
SRTPA	Shasta	Rt 44, 4-lane freeway, Stillwater Rd to Palo Cedro	30.0
SRTPA	Shasta	Rt 44, realign and widen at "the dips"	5.0
SRTPA	Shasta	Rt 299, realign and widen 2 lane, Buckhorn completion	81.0
SRTPA	Shasta	Rt 299, widen across Sacramento River to Hilltop	30.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	179.0
SAAG	Stanislaus	Rt 132, Morse/Nebraska Av to San Joaquin Co Line, 4-ln expressway	72.0
SAAG	Stanislaus	Rt 120, Lancaster Rd east of Oakdale to Tuolumne Co Line, 4-ln expwy	61.9
SAAG	Stanislaus	Rt 120, San Joaquin Co Line to Oakdale Bypass	9.2
SAAG	Stanislaus	Stanislaus: other State highway expansion projects	48.8
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	191.9
TCAG	Tulare	SH 65: (Kern Co.-SH 190), widen to 4 lane expwy	84.7
TCAG	Tulare	SH 190: (SH 99-SH 65), widen to 4 lane expwy	48.4
TCAG	Tulare	SH 65: Ave 56-SH 190/65, widen to 4 lane expwy	49.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 65:Tul 137-MAD 152 Route Study	3.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 99: County Line-Ave 72, widen to 6 lanes	19.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 99: SH 190 to Airport O/C, widen to 6 lanes	18.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 99: Airport O/C to Prosperity, widen to 6 lanes	10.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 99: Prosperity to N/O Ave 280, widen to 6 lanes	29.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 99: N/O Ave 280-N/O BR 46-55, widen to 6 lanes	66.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 99: N/O Ave 72 to SH 190, widen to 6 lanes	19.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 137: SH 63 to SH 65, widen to 4 lane expwy	45.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 198:NR Boat Ramp Rd-NR Beach Rd, passing lanes	2.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 198: SH 63 to Lovers Lane, operational improvement	30.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 99: N/O Bridge to 55-Kingsburg, widen to 6 lanes	23.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	446.1
VCTC	Ventura	Rt 118, Rt 232 to Moorpark, widen	125.0
VCTC	Ventura	Route 33 Casitas Bypass	60.0
VCTC	Ventura	Route 101, various T.O.-Ven, widen	100.0
VCTC	Ventura	Route 101, La Conchita, widen/convert to freeway	50.0
VCTC	Ventura	Route 118 Bypass near Moorpark	80.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	415.0
		STATEWIDE TOTAL:	**23,398.7**

Regional Agencies: Arterials

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
LOCAL ARTERIAL EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
MTC	Alameda	Arterial improvements and traffic signalization projects	14.7
MTC	Alameda	Construction of arterial improvements: 4 projects	7.0
MTC	Alameda	Port of Oakland joint intermodal terminal (future phase)	20.0
MTC	Alameda	I-880/42nd/High Street interchange improvements	14.5
MTC	Alameda	Various interchange improvements in Oakland, Hayward and San Leandro	175.0
MTC	Contra Costa	Rt 4 improvements to interchanges and parallel arterials	10.0
MTC	Contra Costa	I-80 improvements to interchanges and parallel arterials	10.0
MTC	Contra Costa	Widen Ygnacio Valley/Kirker Pass to 6 lanes, Cowell to Clearbrook Dr.	17.8
MTC	Contra Costa	I-680 improvements to interchanges and parallel arterials	10.0
MTC	Contra Costa	I-680/Alcosta interchange improvements	22.3
MTC	Contra Costa	Widen Alhambra Ave. from Route 4 to McAlvey Dr (Phases II and III)	17.0
MTC	Contra Costa	Widen Pacheco Blvd. to 4 lanes from Blum to Arthur	11.9
MTC	Contra Costa	Widen Appian Way from 3 to 4 lanes from San Pablo Dam Road to I-80	5.8
MTC	Marin	Arterial improvements and traffic signalization projects	2.6
MTC	Marin	Sir Francis Drake Blvd, widening to std width, Redhill Av to Olema Rd	5.0
MTC	Napa	Arterial improvements and traffic signalization projects	1.3
MTC	Napa	Widening of First St overcrossing on Route 29 from 2 to 4 lanes in Napa	4.7
MTC	San Francisco	Arterial improvements and traffic signalization projects	7.5
MTC	San Mateo	Arterial improvements and traffic signalization projects	7.5
MTC	San Mateo	US 101 improvements to 5 interchanges	144.0
MTC	Santa Clara	Arterial improvements and traffic signalization projects	49.7
MTC	Santa Clara	Montague Expressway widening from I-680 to US 101 from 6 to 8 lanes	54.2
MTC	Santa Clara	Central Expwy widening to 8 lanes, Shoreline Bl to US 101 (2 HOV lanes)	26.1
MTC	Santa Clara	Montague Expwy interchanges (PE and environmental only)	30.0
MTC	Solano	Arterial improvements and traffic signalization projects	4.0
MTC	Solano	Improvements to intersections and local arterials	10.0
MTC	Sonoma	Arterial improvements and traffic signalization projects	4.6
MTC	Sonoma	Llano Road extension from Route 12 to Occidental Road	19.7
MTC	Sonoma	Modify US 101/Steele Lane interchange	20.6
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	727.6
SACOG	Sacramento	Folsom, Oak Av interchange at US 50	11.5
SACOG	Sacramento	Folsom, Russell Range Rd at US 50	11.5
SACOG	Sacramento	Galt, overpass and ramp improvements	9.3
SACOG	Sacramento	City of Sacramento, 29 projects to widen arterials and interchanges	111.1
SACOG	Sacramento	City of Sacramento, extend 7th St, North B to Richards	14.6
SACOG	Sacramento	City of Sacramento, widen Elk Grove Blvd to 6 lanes	19.4
SACOG	Sacramento	City of Sacramento, split-diamond interchange at Rt 160 and Expo Blvd	22.0
SACOG	Sacramento	City of Sacramento, widen Florin-Perkins Rd to 6 lanes, Folsom-Florin	24.3
SACOG	Sacramento	Widen Garden Hwy to 4 lanes, Natomas Park Dr to Northgate Blvd	32.0
SACOG	Sacramento	Rebuild interchange at Bannon/Richards	14.6
SACOG	Sacramento	Modify I-5 interchange at I-80, create EB to NB ramp	13.0
SACOG	Sacramento	Widen Power Inn Rd to 6 lanes, Fruitridge Rd to Florin Rd	22.0
SACOG	Sacramento	Extend Richards Blvd from Rt 160 to Business 80	45.0
SACOG	Sacramento	Add WB off-ramp, EB on-ramp at Northgate Blvd and Rt 160	17.6
SACOG	Sacramento	Braided ramps and auxiliary lane at Business 80/Rt 160 interchange	12.0
SACOG	Sacramento	County of Sacramento, 16 projects	53.2
SACOG	Sacramento	Widen Watt Av/US 50 overcrossing	15.1
SACOG	Sutter	Yuba City: widen Rt 20 to 6 lanes, Walton to Rocca	2.0
SACOG	Sutter	County of Sutter: 7 projects to widen arterials	9.8
SACOG	Yolo	West Sac: one arterial widening, one bridge widening, one new bridge	10.0
SACOG	Yuba	Marysville: Widen 2 portions of Rt 70	10.0

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
LOCAL ARTERIAL EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
SACOG	Yuba	County of Yuba: Interchange at Rt 70 and Feather River Blvd	8.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	488.0
ACTC	Amador	Amador: 6 local arterial expansion projects	13.1
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	13.1
BCAG	Butte	Butte: local arterial expansion, various	31.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	31.0
CLTC	Calaveras	Calaveras: local arterial expansion	37.1
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	37.1
DNLTC	Del Norte	Elk Valley Rd Corridor improvements	3.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	3.0
EDCTC	El Dorado	Ray Lawyer Dr extension	8.0
EDCTC	El Dorado	Main St (Placerville) realignment	2.0
EDCTC	El Dorado	City of Placerville local circulation improvements	10.0
EDCTC	El Dorado	Green Valley Rd improvements	10.0
EDCTC	El Dorado	Latrobe Rd improvements	10.0
EDCTC	El Dorado	Missouri Flat Rd improvements	10.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	50.0
COFCG	Fresno	Widen Clovis Ave to 4 lanes	10.0
COFCG	Fresno	Widen Belmont Ave to 4 lanes at Intersection with UPRR	10.0
COFCG	Fresno	Fresno Street grade separation at BNSF RR	10.0
COFCG	Fresno	Rehabilitate Golden State Blvd. Underpass at North Ave. and BNSF	15.0
COFCG	Fresno	Construct Grantland Ave 6 lane super arterial from Shields to Herndon Ave.	75.0
COFCG	Fresno	Widen Herndon Ave. to 6 lanes from West ave. to SR 99	34.0
COFCG	Fresno	Widen Jensen Ave. to 6 lanes from Golden State Blvd. to Clovis Ave.	22.0
COFCG	Fresno	Widen Kings Canyon Road from R Street to Fowler Ave.	30.0
COFCG	Fresno	Widen McKinley Ave. from Marks Ave. to Motel Drive	20.0
COFCG	Fresno	Modify Interchange of North Ave. and SR 99	15.0
COFCG	Fresno	Modify Interchange of Shaw Ave. and SR 99	34.0
COFCG	Fresno	Construct New Grade Separation Structure at Shaw Ave. and UPRR	15.0
COFCG	Fresno	New Grade Separation, Intersection of Shields Ave with UPRR & SR 99	80.0
COFCG	Fresno	Widen SR 99 to 8 lanes divided from SR 180 to Clinton	20.0
COFCG	Fresno	Traffic Signal Syncronization	15.0
COFCG	Fresno	Tulare Street Grade Separation at BNSF RR	10.0
COFCG	Fresno	Widen Willow Ave. to 6 lanes from Alluvial Ave. to Copper Ave.	10.0
COFCG	Fresno	Other arterial improvement projects	562.4
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	987.4
SCAG	Imperial	Forrester Rd, I-8 to Rt 86, 4-lane conventional local arterial	25.0
SCAG	Imperial	Imperial: other local arterial expansion	25.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	50.0
Kern COG	Kern	Kern: local arterial expansion	38.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	38.0
LCCAPC	Lake	Lake: local arterial expansion	16.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	16.0

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
LOCAL ARTERIAL EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
SCAG	Los Angeles	Local arterial HOV projects (6)	44.1
SCAG	Los Angeles	Cahuenga Blvd, Barham Bld to Hollywood Blvd	20.6
SCAG	Los Angeles	Sepulveda Blvd, Santa Monica Blvd to Mulholland Dr	24.0
SCAG	Los Angeles	Sepulveda Blvd, Ventura Blvd to Rinaldi Av	29.5
SCAG	Los Angeles	Av G, 50th St W to Rt 14	29.1
SCAG	Los Angeles	Av H, 50th St W to 20th St E	30.2
SCAG	Los Angeles	Av I, 50th St W to 30th St E	21.5
SCAG	Los Angeles	Av L, 50th St W to Rt 14	25.9
SCAG	Los Angeles	50th St W, Av G to Av L	51.7
SCAG	Los Angeles	20th St E, Av H to Av L	42.0
SCAG	Los Angeles	Av P/Rancho Vista Blvd, Av N to 50th St E	39.8
SCAG	Los Angeles	Sierra Hwy, Av P to Av M	21.9
SCAG	Los Angeles	Sierra Hwy, Pearblossom Hwy to Av P	20.5
SCAG	Los Angeles	Fernando, Rt 118 to Rt 14	24.7
SCAG	Los Angeles	High Desert Corridor Arterial, Rt 138 Fwy (near Av P-8) to I-15	377.3
SCAG	Los Angeles	Av O, Sierra Hwy to Rancho Vista Blvd	32.5
SCAG	Los Angeles	Av S/Ritter Ranch Rd, Tierra Subsida to Elizabeth Lake Rd	73.4
SCAG	Los Angeles	Aviation Blvd, Manhattan Beach Blvd to Arbor Vitae St	21.0
SCAG	Los Angeles	Arbor Vitae St, Walnut to I-405	32.3
SCAG	Los Angeles	Av P-8, Rt 14 to 50th St E	35.1
SCAG	Los Angeles	Atlantic Blvd, Ocean Blvd to I-10	76.7
SCAG	Los Angeles	Long Beach Blvd/Pacific Av, Ocean Blvd to Vernon Av/Santa Fe	55.3
SCAG	Los Angeles	Long Beach Traffic Circle, Pacific Coast Hwy/Lakewood Blvd	21.1
SCAG	Los Angeles	Iron Triangle intersection, PCH/Lakewood/Bellflower Blvd	35.2
SCAG	Los Angeles	Hawthorne Blvd at Artesia Blvd	250.0
SCAG	Los Angeles	Hawthorne Blvd at Pacific Coast Hwy	250.0
SCAG	Los Angeles	35 other local arterial projects	238.8
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	1,924.3
MCOG	Mendocino	Local arterial expansion, Mendocino	75.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	75.0
MCAG	Merced	Castle Parkway	50.0
MCAG	Merced	UC-related arterials	32.1
MCAG	Merced	Mission Expressway, Rt 59 to Rt 99	3.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	85.1
MLTC	Mono	Alternate Access to Bodie State Park	6.0
MLTC	Mono	Mammoth Lakes arterial improvements	17.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	23.0
TAMC	Monterey	Davis Rd, Rt 101 to Rossi, widen from 4 to 6 lanes	10.0
TAMC	Monterey	Blanco Rd, Reservation to Alisal, widen from 2 to 4 lanes	12.4
TAMC	Monterey	Reservation Rd, Rt 1 to Del Monte, widening	12.7
TAMC	Monterey	Gateway improvements, Fort Ord	20.0
TAMC	Monterey	Other County arterial improvements (6 projects)	26.1
TAMC	Monterey	Marina: 9 projects	32.4
TAMC	Monterey	Seaside: 3 projects	18.9
TAMC	Monterey	Del Rey Oaks, North-South Rd	6.2
TAMC	Monterey	King City: 2 projects	3.3
TAMC	Monterey	Salinas: 3 projects	10.5

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
LOCAL ARTERIAL EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
TAMC	Monterey	Carmel: 3 projects	0.7
TAMC	Monterey	Monterey: Del Monte widening	12.6
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	165.6
NCTC	Nevada	Dorsey Dr at Rt 20, interchange	15.8
NCTC	Nevada	26 other local arterial expansion projects in Nevada County	9.1
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	24.9
OCTA	Orange	Various: build out of master plan of arterial highways	650.0
OCTA	Orange	Smart street improvements: widening, signal coord, turnouts, intersecs	50.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	700.0
PCTPA	Placer	Sierra College Blvd, throughout Placer County, improve	21.0
PCTPA	Placer	I-80 @ Sierra College, interchange improvements	20.0
PCTPA	Placer	I-80 interchange improvements	13.0
PCTPA	Placer	Grade separation, UP/Sierra College	11.0
PCTPA	Placer	Placer Parkway, Rt 65 to Rt 70/99, new facility	80.0
PCTPA	Placer	Other arterial improvements	159.2
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	304.2
PCTC	Plumas	Route A-15, Portola-McClears Road	2.9
PCTC	Plumas	Route A-13	2.4
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	5.3
SCAG	Riverside	Alessandro Blvd, Arlington Av to Day St	36.6
SCAG	Riverside	Goetz Rd, Ellis Av to McLaughlin St	23.0
SCAG	Riverside	Jurupa Rd, Etiwanda Av to Van Buren Blvd	31.6
SCAG	Riverside	Ethanac Rd, Goetz Rd to Matthews Rd	21.5
SCAG	Riverside	Clinton Keith Rd, Grand Av to Winchester Rd	58.9
SCAG	Riverside	Limonite Ave, I-15 to Pacific Av	53.2
SCAG	Riverside	Magnolia Av, I-15 to Central Av	34.1
SCAG	Riverside	Ramon Expressway, I-215 to Florida Av	174.6
SCAG	Riverside	Perris Blvd, Iris Av to Ellis Ave	56.0
SCAG	Riverside	Gilman Springs Rd, Jack Rabbit Trail to Lamb Canyon	23.3
SCAG	Riverside	Murrieta Hot Springs Rd, Jefferson Av to Winchester Rd	32.3
SCAG	Riverside	Van Buren Blvd, Jurupa Av to Trautwein Rd	52.4
SCAG	Riverside	Alessandro Blvd, Lasselles St to Gilman Springs Rd	41.7
SCAG	Riverside	Hamner Av, Limonite Av to 5th St	20.8
SCAG	Riverside	Van Buren Blvd, Limonite Av to Jurupa Av to Trautwein Rd	68.2
SCAG	Riverside	Valley Blvd, McLaughlin St to Murrieta Rd	23.7
SCAG	Riverside	Newport Rd, Menifee Rd to State St	119.6
SCAG	Riverside	Simpson Rd, Menifee Rd to Warren Rd	25.1
SCAG	Riverside	Stetson Av, Menifee Rd to Warren Rd	50.3
SCAG	Riverside	Bundy Canyon Rd, Mission Trail to Murrieta Rd	38.8
SCAG	Riverside	Palomar St, Mission Trail to Murrieta City Limits	27.3
SCAG	Riverside	Menifee Rd, Nuevo Rd to Florida Av	44.2
SCAG	Riverside	Evans Rd, Nuevo Rd to EllisAv	21.5
SCAG	Riverside	Mission Trail, Railroad Canyon Rd to Palomar St	24.4
SCAG	Riverside	Murrieta Rd/Evans Rd, Ramonoa Expwy to Nuevo Rd	23.7
SCAG	Riverside	Perris Blvd, Reche Vista Dr to Iris Av	22.6
SCAG	Riverside	Reche Canyon Rd, Reche Vista Dr to Moreno Beach Dr	29.5
SCAG	Riverside	San Timoteo Canyon Rd, Redlands Blvd to I-10	35.6

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
LOCAL ARTERIAL EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
SCAG	Riverside	Etiwanda Av, Rt 60 to Limonite Av	21.5
SCAG	Riverside	Jack Rabbit Trail, Rt 60 to Gilman Springs Rd	28.7
SCAG	Riverside	Gilman Springs Rd, Rt 60 to Jack Rabbit Trail	32.3
SCAG	Riverside	Ethanac Rd, Rt 72 to Goetz Rd	31.2
SCAG	Riverside	Ellis Av, Rt 74 to I-215	21.5
SCAG	Riverside	Tenaja Rd, San Diego County Line to Clinton Keith Rd	58.2
SCAG	Riverside	Van Buren Blvd, Trautwein Rd to I-215	23.0
SCAG	Riverside	Stetson Av, Warren Rd to Fairview Av	57.5
SCAG	Riverside	Murrieta Hot Springs Rd, Winchester Rd to Washington St	45.3
SCAG	Riverside	Washington St, Winchester Rd to Murrieta Hot Springs Rd	21.5
SCAG	Riverside	Jurupa Av, Etiwanda Av to Rt 60	20.3
SCAG	Riverside	Varner, Madison to Monroe	113.8
SCAG	Riverside	83 other local arterial mixed flow projects	735.8
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	2,425.4
COSBCG	San Benito	San Benito: local arterial expansion	16.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	16.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	SANBAG: Arterial grade separations, widening and safety-draft	265.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Adelanto: 5 CTP baseline projects	3.6
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Apple Valley: 7 projects	29.3
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Big Bear Lake: 3 projects	18.8
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Chino: 48 projects	47.1
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Chino Hills: 4 projects	22.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Colton: 11 projects	11.3
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Fontana: 31 CTP baseline projects	87.9
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Grand Terrace: 13 projects	12.6
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Hesperia: 40 projects	69.7
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Highland: 12 projects	29.6
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Loma Linda: 4 projects	15.5
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Montclair: 9 projects	41.3
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Needles: citywide expansion and improvements	25.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Ontario: 5 projects	18.6
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rancho Cucamonga: 13 projects	50.9
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Redlands: 9 projects	17.9
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Rialto: 4 CTP baseline projects	17.7
SANBAG	San Bernardino	San Bernardino: 18 projects	32.6
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Twentynine Palms: 2 projects	2.5
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Upland: 5 projects	6.3
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Yucaipa: 11 projects	12.0
SANBAG	San Bernardino	Yucca Valley: 16 projects	26.2
SANBAG	San Bernardino	San Bernardino County: 6 projects	34.3
SANBAG	San Bernardino	SBIAA: 4 projects	11.3
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	909.1
SANDAG	San Diego	Regional Arterial Improvements, 76 Projects	410.0
SANDAG	San Diego	Local Street & Road, New Construction	1,550.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	1,960.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	County: SR-132 at Koster	10.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	County: SR-99 at SR-26	19.5
SJCOG	San Joaquin	County: SR-99 at SR-88	19.5

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
LOCAL ARTERIAL EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
SJCOG	San Joaquin	County: I-5 at Otto Drive	10.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Caltrans: I-5 Roth Road	10.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	County: 3 other projects	10.5
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Lathrop: I-5 at Lathrop Road	34.4
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Lathrop: I-5 at Louise	15.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Lathrop: 5 other projects	20.3
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Lodi: SR-99 at Cherokee	19.5
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Lodi: 4 other projects	12.1
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Manteca: I-5 /SR 120	30.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Manteca: SR-99 at Austin	18.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Manteca: 2 other projects	3.5
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Stockton: SR-99 at Arch Sperry Road, reconstruct interchange	10.8
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Stockton: SR-99 at Eight Mile Road, reconstruct interchange	22.1
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Stockton: SR99 at March Lane & Wilson, reconstruct interchange	22.5
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Stockton: SR-99 at Main	10.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Stockton: Arch-Sperry Rd, extend to I-5	11.9
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Stockton: 10 other projects	49.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Tracy: I-205 at Patterson Pass	12.4
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Tracy: I-580 at Lammers	15.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Tracy & Lathrop: I-205, Paradise Road/Chrisman	19.2
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Tracy & County: I-205 at Lammers	15.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Tracy: 5 other projects	19.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	Various: I-580/I-205 Interchange	10.0
SJCOG	San Joaquin	9 railroad grade crossing projects	39.8
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	489.0
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo: local arterial expansion	20.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	20.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Hollister Av, Auhay to State Street, widen to 4 lanes	10.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Lompoc, Central Av extension, bridge Santa Ynez River, connect to Rt 246	10.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Kelloge Av overcrossing	10.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Other local arterial expansion projects	72.5
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	102.5
SCCRTC	Santa Cruz	Local street expansion, 41 projects	57.1
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	57.1
SRTPA	Shasta	Shasta Couny: various rural arterials & collectors	44.0
SRTPA	Shasta	Shasta Lake: Ashby Rd, Cascade Av, Hardenbrook, New Rd S	11.5
SRTPA	Shasta	Anderson: widening, 6 roads	6.3
SRTPA	Shasta	Anderson: North St Bridge and Dodson Lane Bridge	8.3
SRTPA	Shasta	I-5 at Oasis Rd (Redding), interchange improvements	17.1
SRTPA	Shasta	I-5 at Rt 299/44, interchange improvements	18.0
SRTPA	Shasta	13 other freeway interchange improvements	53.9
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	159.1
SAAG	Stanislaus	Rt 5 interchange improvements: Fink, Sperry	16.5
SAAG	Stanislaus	Rt 99 interchange improvements (7 interchanges)	51.1
SAAG	Stanislaus	Briggsmore widening from 54 to 6 lanes, Sisk to Claus	39.6
SAAG	Stanislaus	Carpenter widening to 4 lanes, Maze to Hatch	28.3
SAAG	Stanislaus	Christoffersen Parkway -construct 4 lane arterial, Golden State to Berkeley	13.3

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
LOCAL ARTERIAL EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
SAAG	Stanislaus	Claribel widening to 4 lanes, McHenry to Claus	34.1
SAAG	Stanislaus	Claus widening to 4 lanes, Yosemite to Kiernan	24.1
SAAG	Stanislaus	Geers-Albers widening to 4 lanes, portions, Oakdale to Turlock	14.6
SAAG	Stanislaus	Hatch widening to 4 lanes, Rt 99 to Faith Home, Faith Home to Geer	15.1
SAAG	Stanislaus	McHenry widening to 4 lanes, Modesto to Rt 219, Rt 108 to Co Line	11.6
SAAG	Stanislaus	Other local arterial major projects in Stanislaus County	17.9
SAAG	Stanislaus	Local road safety improvements	20.9
SAAG	Stanislaus	Local road operational improvements	10.4
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	297.4
TCAG	Tulare	Road 108: (Leland-Caldwell),widen to 4 lane expressway	11.1
TCAG	Tulare	Ave 280: (SH 99-Rd 188), widen to 4 lane expressway	65.4
TCAG	Tulare	Road 204: (SH 65-SH 198), widen to 4 lane expressway	27.7
TCAG	Tulare	Ave 416: (Fresno Co.- Rd 72), widen to 4 lane expressway	15.6
TCAG	Tulare	Tulare: Cartmill Interchange (SH 99)	22.3
TCAG	Tulare	Tulare: Paige Interchange (SH 99)	22.3
TCAG	Tulare	Tulare: Commercial Interchange (SH 99)	22.0
TCAG	Tulare	Porterville: North Grand Interchange (SH 65)	13.0
TCAG	Tulare	SH 137: (Lindsay to Tulare), widen to 4 ln expressway	41.5
TCAG	Tulare	Visalia, Plaza Dr.: (SH 198 -Ave 304), widen to 4 ln expressway	5.0
TCAG	Tulare	Visalia, SH 216: (Houston): Lovers Lane-Limits, widen to 4 ln expressway	7.5
TCAG	Tulare	Visalia, SH 198 Improve Interchanges	20.0
TCAG	Tulare	Porterville, SH 190: 2 Ramps at Main St	3.0
TCAG	Tulare	Porterville, Bridge at Hocum and Main St.	5.0
TCAG	Tulare	Porterville, SH 190 Hocum Interchange	16.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	297.3
VCTC	Ventura	Various: local arterial expansion	578.0
		REGIONAL SUBTOTAL:	578.0
		STATEWIDE TOTAL:	13,059.4

Regional Agencies: Urban and Commuter Rail

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
URBAN AND COMMUTER RAIL EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
MTC	Alameda	West Dublin BART Station	40
MTC	Alameda	BART to Oakland Airport connector	130
MTC	Alameda	Extend BART service from Dublin/Pleasanton to East Livermore	900
MTC	Alameda	Extend BART service from Fremont to Warm Springs	546
MTC	Contra Costa	Extend BART to Railroad Ave.	350
MTC	Contra Costa	Extend BART service from Richmond BART Station to Hilltop Mall	345
MTC	San Francisco	Extend Third Street LRT service to San Francisco Chinatown	520
MTC	San Mateo	Caltrain-SFO Airport Light Rail	60
MTC	Santa Clara	Guadalupe LRT to San Jose Airport and Santa Clara Caltrain	250
MTC	Santa Clara	Extend LRT from Tasman LRT to Downtown Sunnyvale	200
MTC	Santa Clara	Evergreen Corridor LRT between East Valley and Downtown San Jose	400
MTC	Alameda	Upgraded Commuter Rail to Union City BART	156
MTC	Alameda	Upgraded Altamont Commuter Rail Service	40
MTC	Alameda	Capitol Corridor/West Oakland BART connection	100
MTC	Marin	Marin/Sonoma Commuter Rail	144
MTC	San Francisco	Extend Caltrain service to vicinity of Transbay Terminal	700
MTC	San Mateo	Caltrain electrification	360
MTC	Santa Clara	Altamont Commuter Express (ACE)/Capitol Corridor rail improvements	34
MTC	Santa Clara	Extend Caltrain to Newark/Fremont via the Dumbarton Rail Bridge	185
		SUBTOTAL, MTC:	**5,460**
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Metro Blue Line Pasadena- Capital Requirements	315
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Eastside Fixed Guideway (MOS 3), unfunded remaining cost	381
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Mid-City Fixed Guideway (MOS 3), unfunded remaining cost	244
LACMTA	Los Angeles	San Fernando Valley Fixed Guideway, busway alternative	144
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Exposition R/W, Phase I busway from USC to Santa Monica	231
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Crenshaw Corridor, Phase I Busway from Exposition Blvd to LAX	162
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Downtown Connector- 4-mile bus lane, Transitway Feasibility Study	49
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Red Line Western Extension to I-405	3,111
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Red Line Eastern Extension to Whittier/Atlantic	1,242
LACMTA	Los Angeles	San Fernando Valley East/West Corridor, Phase 2 Red Line Ext to I-405	828
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Exposition Right-of-Way Phase 2 Light Rail	843
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Crenshaw Corridor Fixed Guideway Project - Phase 2 LRT	900
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Green Line Extension to LAX	TBD
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Burbank-Glendale LRT	544
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Green Line LRT Easterly Extension to Norwalk Transportation Center	253
LACMTA	Los Angeles	MTA Rail Transit Incident Management System	2
LACMTA	Los Angeles	12 CNG Locomotives, 9 cab cars, 69 coach cars	183
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rolling Stock/Facilities/Equipment	29
LACMTA	Los Angeles	2nd Main, E Chatsworth to CP Raymer/platform at Northridge (VC Line)	24
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Expand Central & Inland Empire Maintenance Facilities	24
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Rehabilitation of Tunnels 25 (AV Line)and 26 (VC Line)	22
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Other Line Changes (AV Line)	20
LACMTA	Los Angeles	New sidings: W of Pomona, Mira Loma, Upland, Sun Valley, Fontana	19
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Station/Parking Expansions	18
LACMTA	Los Angeles	3rd Main MP 157.9 to 163.1	15
LACMTA	Los Angeles	2nd Main MP 32.5 to 38.4 (R Line)	13
LACMTA	Los Angeles	2nd Main MP 55.5 to 56.3 with bridge over State Route 91 (R Line)	13
LACMTA	Los Angeles	2nd Main, Pico to Bartolo with bridge over San Gabriel River	13
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Upgrade 2nd Main, Soto Street to Garfield	13

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
URBAN AND COMMUTER RAIL EXPANSION

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Purchase 4th Street Yard	10
LACMTA	Los Angeles	3rd Main, Burbank Junction to CP Allen, platform at Burbank	8
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Overpass at Blackbird Dr.	8
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Commuter Platforms at Van Nuys Station (VC Line)	7
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Additional Track: L.A. Union Station to Fullerton (OC Line)	7
LACMTA	Los Angeles	2nd Main Track Pomona -Montclair; Extend Platforms (SB Line)	7
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Other Metrolink improvements, 10 projects	14
		SUBTOTAL, LOS ANGELES:	**9,717**
OCTA	Orange	Centerline System (lower cost alternative)	800
OCTA	Orange	Metrolink rolling stock, facilities, equipment	12
OCTA	Orange	Capital	161
OCTA	Orange	Metrolink track improvement (OC line)	23
OCTA	Orange	Commuter rail stations and parking expansion	24
OCTA	Orange	Grade separations along Orange-Olive and Orangethorpe Corridors	530
		SUBTOTAL, ORANGE:	**1,550**
SACOG	Sacramento	Phase 2: extension of the North line to 7th and North B Sts	10
SACOG	Sacramento	Extend light rail from 7th & North B to Sacramento International Airport	400
SACOG	Sacramento	Additional LRT vehicle acquisition for South Sac Corridor extension	17
SACOG	Sacramento	Mid life rebuild of original LRT fleet of 26 trains, 2001-2007	18
SACOG	Sacramento	Extend light rail from Watt/I-80 to Antelope	126
SACOG	Sacramento	Extend South Line from Meadowview Rd to Calvine/Auberry	200
SACOG	Sacramento	Further extend South Line to Elk Grove Blvd	NA
SACOG	Sacramento	Extend Sunrise/Folsom light rail, Gold River to Fair Oaks	50
SACOG	Sacramento	Misc rail-related improvements	16
		SUBTOTAL, SACRAMENTO	**837**
SANDAG	San Diego	Mission Valley East LRT	372
SANDAG	San Diego	Mid Coast LRT (to Balboa)	103
SANDAG	San Diego	Airport/Point Loma Guideway	120
SANDAG	San Diego	12th Avenue LRT Improvements	18
SANDAG	San Diego	LRT Vehicle Replacement/Rehabilitation	65
SANDAG	San Diego	I-15 Bus Rapid Transit	100
SANDAG	San Diego	Coaster C.R./AMTRAK: UTC Tunnel Section	283
SANDAG	San Diego	Coaster C.R./AMTRAK: Del Mar Tunnel Section	141
SANDAG	San Diego	Coaster C.R./AMTRAK: Bridge Replace/Enhance	102
SANDAG	San Diego	Coaster C.R./AMTRAK: Other Track Improvements	76
SANDAG	San Diego	Oceanside-Escondido Rail Line: to Escondido T.C.	205
SANDAG	San Diego	Rail Rolling Stock, Vehicle Overhaul	55
SANDAG	San Diego	Misc. Capital (Bus Facilities, Expand Rail Parking, Etc.)	61
		SUBTOTAL, SAN DIEGO:	**1,701**
VCTC	Ventura	Upgrade/extend Santa Paula Branch Line	150
VCTC	Ventura	Metrolink improvements	9
		SUBTOTAL, VENTURA:	**159**
		STATEWIDE TOTAL:	**19,424**

Regional Agencies: Bicycle and Pedestrian

SR 8 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
INVENTORY OF HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY REGIONAL AGENCIES
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

($ millions)

Agency	County	Project/Program	Cost
MTC	Regional	Bay Trail Completion	300.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	Coast R/W Bike Path, Porter Ranch to Glendale, Class I, 11 miles	11.0
LACMTA	Los Angeles	UCLA Veloway, 1.5 miles, Class I	10.0
SANDAG	San Diego	State Route 78 Rail Trail	10.0
SANDAG	San Diego	Coastal Rail Trail	14.0
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	Rt 101, 3 new bike/ped overcrossings, South Coast & Buellton	20.0
VCTC	Ventura	Santa Paula Branch Line Trail	30.0
		Sum of major projects above	395.0
		Other bicycle and pedestrian projects statewide	874.8
		Statewide total	**1,269.8**

Local Streets and Roads: Pavement Rehabilitation

County Name	City Name	Key	1997 Population	Maintained Mileage centerline	Maintained Mileage lane-miles	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Rehabilitation	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Maintenance	Total Annual Exp. Need from local agcy.	Deferred Mntce. Backlog from local agcy.
Alameda	(County)	1	127,300	477	1,000	$3,500,000	$285,000	$7,000,000	$20,000,000
Alameda	Alameda	118	78,000	115	276	$470,000	$30,000	$500,000	$4,500,000
Alameda	Albany	NR	17,300	27	57	$0	$639,000	$1,278,000	$3,918,361
Alameda	Berkeley	131	105,000	216	453	$2,400,000	$232,000	$3,000,000	$38,000,000
Alameda	Dublin	348	26,000	56	118	$500,000	$20,000	$700,000	$1,000,000
Alameda	Emeryville	172	7,025	19	44	$200,000	$15,000	$250,000	$3,000,000
Alameda	Fremont	181	195,000	460	1,100	$5,000,000	$1,000,000	$2,500,000	$22,000,000
Alameda	Hayward	188	124,469	251	577	$1,225,000	$200,000	$2,500,000	$11,734,791
Alameda	Livermore	205	66,000	246	600	$1,750,000	$300,000	$2,800,000	$25,000,000
Alameda	Newark	449	40,000	98	220	$260,000	$10,000	$855,000	$2,540,000
Alameda	Oakland	386	388,100	843	1,916	$2,797,409	$1,272,228	$6,700,000	$77,000,000
Alameda	Piedmont	NR	11,300	43	86	$119,000	$308,000	$238,000	$5,943,193
Alameda	Pleasanton	NR	59,800	178	409	$1,969,000	$937,000	$3,938,000	$28,292,364
Alameda	San Leandro	75	71,000	175	400	$985,400	$1,526,700	$8,219,000	$4,534,000
Alameda	Union City	270	60,000	250	550	$500,000	$150,000	$1,000,000	$500,000
Alpine	(County)	NR	1,180	133	266	$0	$40,000	$120,000	$19,407,143
Amador	(County)	2	20,000	409	818	$435,000	$17,500	$2,300,000	$24,000,000
Amador	Amador	307	210	2	4	$0	$1,464	$5,900	$157,000
Amador	Ione	308	6,925	13	26	$0	$238,000	$63,000	$525,000
Amador	Jackson	277	3,800	23	46	$62,000	$25,000	$189,937	$1,910,000
Amador	Plymouth	309	810	6	12	$0	$29,600	$46,000	$300,000
Amador	Sutter Creek	310	2,060	15	31	$35,000	$68,000	$123,000	$846,000
Butte	(County)	3	103,900	1,362	2,751	$1,860,000	$500,000	$3,100,000	$30,000,000
Butte	Biggs	400	1,800	11	24	$300,000	$50,000	$50,000	$3,000,000
Butte	Chico	147	52,000	146	321	$7,373,000	$125,000	$700,000	$20,000,000
Butte	Gridley	NR	4,870	23	46	$0	$100,000	$200,000	$2,303,102
Butte	Oroville	234	12,000	85	192	$150,000	$50,000	$150,000	$657,000
Butte	Paradise	45	26,100	102	215	$150,000	$20,000	$733,000	$10,764,498
Calaveras	(County)	4	33,650	680	1,360	$483,000	$261,700	$5,642,700	$37,461,755
Calaveras	Angels Camp	123	2,700	20	39	$0	$15,000	$30,000	$1,502,500
Colusa	(County)	5	9,825	724	1,448	$318,000	$458,000	$800,000	$31,000,000
Colusa	Colusa	154	5,500	28	56	$127,978	$10,000	$300,000	$1,000,000
Colusa	Williams	288	3,052	22	44	$80,000	$25,000	$200,000	$2,500,000
Contra Costa	(County)	6	172,200	738	1,483	$4,200,000	$2,400,000	$9,400,000	$12,000,000
Contra Costa	Antioch	258	79,289	284	624	$820,000	$153,000	$973,000	$38,303,112
Contra Costa	Brentwood	NR	14,500	59	118	$58,000	$0	$116,000	$7,246,701
Contra Costa	Clayton	431	9,500	33	77	$0	$4,000	$8,000	$4,728,779
Contra Costa	Concord	155	113,400	330	685	$2,800,000	$606,000	$2,700,000	$10,000,000
Contra Costa	Danville	163	39,168	142	314	$487,600	$15,000	$1,255,184	$2,513,057
Contra Costa	El Cerrito	369	23,000	67	141	$250,000	$50,000	$110,000	$5,000,000
Contra Costa	Hercules	323	19,400	58	126	$256,000	$39,000	$800,000	$11,000,000
Contra Costa	Lafayette	NR	23,600	93	195	$229,000	$1,150,000	$458,000	$11,993,904
Contra Costa	Martinez	290	35,000	115	253	$190,000	$300,000	$600,000	$10,000,000
Contra Costa	Moraga	NR	16,350	53	109	$20,000	$0	$40,000	$6,672,492
Contra Costa	Orinda	232	17,150	95	195	$919,756	$80,000	$750,000	$2,485,000
Contra Costa	Pinole	49	18,000	52	115	$285,000	$30,000	$650,000	$950,000
Contra Costa	Pittsburg	NR	50,800	134	295	$2,795,000	$92,000	$5,590,000	$18,104,469
Contra Costa	Pleasant Hill	51	32,250	105	315	$370,000	$80,000	$740,000	$13,042,000
Contra Costa	Richmond	432	92,000	265	630	$2,000,000	$1,000,000	$6,000,000	$50,000,000
Contra Costa	San Pablo	77	26,400	45	100	$1,500,000	$52,600	$100,000	$2,500,000
Contra Costa	San Ramon	NR	41,950	131	288	$3,261,000	$0	$6,522,000	$17,699,145
Contra Costa	Walnut Creek	246	63,000	174	400	$2,500,000	$1,000,000	$1,700,000	$24,577,370
Del Norte	(County)	352	19,900	303	610	$1,670,000	$1,250,000	$1,800,000	$70,000,000
Del Norte	Crescent City	349	8,800	18	35	$23,000	$12,000	$50,000	$200,000
El Dorado	(County)	7	111,000	1,043	2,160	$385,000	$880,000	$3,000,000	$69,000,000
El Dorado	Placerville	NR	8,825	41	82	$203,000	$0	$406,000	$5,249,691
El Dorado	South Lake Tahoe	92	22,838	128	259	$397,200	$438,000	$1,500,000	$5,000,000
Fresno	(County)	8	176,407	3,625	7,594	$19,500,000	$5,700,000	$50,600,000	$204,400,000
Fresno	Clovis	387	67,716	212	474	$3,000,000	$440,000	$2,000,000	$8,729,121
Fresno	Coalinga	333	10,250	38	75	$225,000	$20,000	$500,000	$20,000,000
Fresno	Firebaugh	413	6,000	17	34	$0	$157,158	$158,000	$10,000,000
Fresno	Fowler	NR	3,790	32	64	$0	$20,000	$40,000	$1,600,424
Fresno	Fresno	152	406,900	1,527	3,436	$225,000	$20,000	$500,000	$2,000,000
Fresno	Huron	318	6,000	29	57	$75,000	$56,000	$300,000	$1,500,000
Fresno	Kerman	324	7,400	26	60	$100,000	$30,000	$250,000	$750,000
Fresno	Kingsburg	NR	8,750	38	76	$0	$182,000	$364,000	$1,900,503
Fresno	Mendota	NR	7,450	30	60	$0	$126,000	$252,000	$1,500,397
Fresno	Orange Cove	231	7,749	28	56	$900,000	$75,000	$336,000	$5,300,000
Fresno	Parlier	46	10,800	29	58	$350,000	$50,000	$88,000	$1,320,000
Fresno	Reedley	328	19,500	63	129	$180,000	$20,000	$180,000	$3,500,000
Fresno	San Joaquin	362	2,975	15	30	$0	$75,000	$150,000	$750,199
Fresno	Sanger	414	18,600	65	140	$300,000	$50,000	$200,000	$10,000,000
Fresno	Selma	85	18,050	75	160	$754,000	$57,000	$120,000	$4,481,957
Glenn	(County)	9	14,750	861	1,722	$1,200,000	$450,000	$3,200,000	$42,000,000
Glenn	Orland	233	5,700	30	60	$175,000	$35,000	$45,000	$400,000
Glenn	Willows	NR	6,400	28	56	$320,000	$23,000	$640,000	$3,844,615

County Name	City Name	Key	1997 Population	Maintained Mileage centerline	Maintained Mileage lane-miles	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Rehabilitation	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Maintenance	Total Annual Exp. Need from local agcy.	Deferred Mntce. Backlog from local agcy.
Humboldt	(County)	10	66,800	1,610	3,252	$250,000	$250,000	$1,800,000	$120,000,000
Humboldt	Arcata	126	15,600	68	135	$600,000	$80,000	$900,000	$6,600,000
Humboldt	Blue Lake	134	1,303	10	20	$0	$750	$65,000	$250,000
Humboldt	Eureka	174	28,576	125	253	$664,700	$26,100	$450,000	$3,430,000
Humboldt	Ferndale	176	1,408	8	16	$10,000	$2,500	$175,000	$2,450,000
Humboldt	Fortuna	107	10,200	61	122	$150,000	$70,000	$280,000	$6,100,000
Humboldt	Rio Dell	59	3,000	14	27	$9,100	$24,100	$30,000	$1,713,400
Humboldt	Trinidad	321	367	5	10	$0	$30,000	$120,000	$800,000
Imperial	(County)	376	34,500	2,561	5,135	$2,000,000	$200,000	$4,500,000	$20,000,000
Imperial	Brawley	350	22,500	65	135	$500,000	$100,000	$1,000,000	$2,000,000
Imperial	Calexico	NR	25,150	64	134	$70,000	$120,000	$140,000	$5,612,122
Imperial	Calipatria	NR	7,450	23	46	$0	$194,000	$388,000	$1,920,816
Imperial	El Centro	169	37,506	98	196	$1,700,000	$30,000	$3,400,000	$8,187,685
Imperial	Holtville	111	5,500	20	40	$300,000	$5,000	$225,000	$400,000
Imperial	Imperial	NR	7,175	33	66	$0	$16,000	$32,000	$2,755,953
Imperial	Westmorland	354	1,700	11	22	$290,000	$20,000	$350,000	$3,000,000
Inyo	(County)	11	14,850	1,124	2,248	$490,000	$700,000	$1,000,000	$50,000,000
Inyo	Bishop	133	3,470	15	31	$148,000	$132,000	$350,000	$8,000,000
Kern	(County)	12	280,600	3,285	6,900	$16,000,000	$6,000,000	$27,120,000	$100,000,000
Kern	Arvin	331	11,250	27	54	$135,000	$25,000	$150,000	$56,000,000
Kern	Bakersfield	102	213,000	920	2,020	$3,400,000	$150,000	$7,000,000	$15,000,000
Kern	California City	140	8,800	773	1,550	$0	$253,000	$3,000,000	$30,000,000
Kern	Delano	330	34,150	95	195	$500,000	$25,000	$350,000	$18,000,000
Kern	Maricopa	NR	1,230	11	22	$1,000	$0	$2,000	$950,598
Kern	Mcfarland	NR	8,025	22	44	$0	$90,000	$180,000	$1,901,196
Kern	Ridgecrest	58	28,000	121	259	$1,000,000	$864,000	$1,200,000	$9,800,000
Kern	Shafter	327	11,250	54	108	$230,000	$10,000	$100,000	$1,000,000
Kern	Taft	326	6,900	42	84	$229,000	$25,000	$240,000	$7,957,800
Kern	Tehachapi	96	6,780	32	72	$175,000	$80,000	$250,000	$4,500,000
Kern	Wasco	247	20,147	49	99	$255,500	$10,000	$250,000	$14,800
Kings	(County)	13	35,850	957	1,914	$900,000	$890,000	$5,500,000	$45,000,000
Kings	Avenal	NR	12,350	32	66	$95,000	$346,000	$190,000	$3,156,763
Kings	Corcoran	156	14,350	62	131	$16,000	$20,000	$120,000	$4,800,000
Kings	Hanford	303	38,900	165	370	$1,500,000	$45,000	$2,500,000	$16,000,000
Kings	Lemoore	204	17,100	72	157	$600,000	$10,000	$800,000	$2,500,000
Lake	(County)	14	38,350	615	1,232	$350,000	$550,000	$5,300,000	$144,000,000
Lake	Clearlake	151	11,900	120	240	$80,000	$30,000	$100,000	$10,000,000
Lake	Lakeport	200	4,650	31	62	$0	$300,000	$2,000,000	$20,000,000
Lassen	(County)	15	17,350	912	1,824	$493,300	$341,800	$3,000,000	$15,800,000
Lassen	Susanville	398	17,500	33	66	$585,000	$239,000	$900,000	$3,000,000
Los Angeles	(County)	16	992,900	3,100	7,660	$16,900,000	$5,345,000	$36,000,000	$135,000,000
Los Angeles	Agoura Hills	117	22,000	64	134	$880,000	$120,000	$450,000	$3,000,000
Los Angeles	Alhambra	101	88,000	150	330	$70,000	$15,000	$300,000	$150,000
Los Angeles	Arcadia	125	49,000	146	500	$500,000	$20,000	$1,000,000	$37,269,365
Los Angeles	Artesia	NR	16,600	30	62	$0	$10,000	$20,000	$4,584,132
Los Angeles	Avalon	NR	3,450	6	12	$0	$57,000	$114,000	$894,465
Los Angeles	Azusa	361	45,000	84	192	$600,000	$200,000	$1,400,000	$12,000,000
Los Angeles	Baldwin Park	103	73,000	104	229	$4,257,000	$595,000	$1,500,000	$7,000,000
Los Angeles	Bell	378	37,166	39	86	$5,100,000	$20,000	$10,200,000	$6,440,146
Los Angeles	Bell Gardens	313	44,700	44	101	$500,000	$50,000	$350,000	$3,100,000
Los Angeles	Bellflower	129	67,000	100	246	$373,500	$44,000	$406,000	$18,336,527
Los Angeles	Beverly Hills	132	34,000	102	214	$2,500,000	$200,000	$2,500,000	$10,000,000
Los Angeles	Bradbury	315	938	3	6	$0	$2,000	$18,000	$200,000
Los Angeles	Burbank	137	104,048	228	546	$2,000,000	$265,000	$4,000,000	$22,000,000
Los Angeles	Calabasas	139	19,150	55	164	$600,000	$50,000	$745,000	$745,000
Los Angeles	Carson	145	94,497	210	420	$2,600,000	$450,000	$5,200,000	$17,000,000
Los Angeles	Cerritos	415	56,200	136	364	$3,400,000	$100,000	$3,100,000	$15,600,000
Los Angeles	Claremont	360	34,000	110	231	$250,000	$35,000	$413,000	$970,000
Los Angeles	Commerce	106	16,187	60	153	$430,000	$105,000	$430,000	$3,000,000
Los Angeles	Compton	379	96,000	173	415	$2,000,000	$100,000	$4,300,000	$90,000,000
Los Angeles	Covina	159	46,360	109	274	$700,000	$15,000	$1,000,000	$12,500,000
Los Angeles	Cudahy	160	28,110	13	62	$100,000	$50,000	$800,000	$5,000,000
Los Angeles	Culver City	389	40,000	86	216	$2,000,000	$200,000	$1,500,000	$12,000,000
Los Angeles	Diamond Bar	370	57,000	133	293	$650,000	$330,000	$2,000,000	$13,930,000
Los Angeles	Downey	402	99,700	209	503	$990,000	$452,000	$1,031,000	$9,900,000
Los Angeles	Duarte	165	21,000	52	110	$621,307	$5,000	$150,000	$800,000
Los Angeles	El Monte	170	115,100	151	363	$1,500,000	$200,000	$443,000	$4,000,000
Los Angeles	El Segundo	171	15,000	53	130	$350,000	$466,000	$535,000	$2,661,000
Los Angeles	Gardena	276	53,000	100	220	$1,238,000	$30,000	$1,820,000	$3,075,000
Los Angeles	Glendale	433	195,623	356	790	$3,570,000	$0	$6,000,000	$5,000,000
Los Angeles	Glendora	183	51,208	152	350	$718,000	$51,400	$2,784,475	$18,313,222
Los Angeles	Hawaiian Gardens	316	14,500	17	38	$200,000	$10,000	$135,000	$1,200,000
Los Angeles	Hawthorne	187	78,000	100	390	$1,100,000	$300,000	$3,000,000	$15,000,000
Los Angeles	Hermosa Beach	189	20,000	42	88	$89,000	$30,000	$929,000	$6,574,316
Los Angeles	Hidden Hills	NR	1,920	1	2	$0	$1,000	$2,000	$149,077
Los Angeles	Huntington Park	192	60,824	66	171	$970,000	$25,000	$1,004,000	$1,057,000
Los Angeles	Industry	434	700	62	175	$2,100,000	$100,000	$150,000	$8,074,000
Los Angeles	Inglewood	193	118,000	185	444	$4,000,000	$150,000	$500,000	$2,000,000
Los Angeles	Irwindale	195	1,150	29	58	$0	$120,000	$2,000,000	$10,200,000
Los Angeles	La Canada Flintridge	197	20,576	86	180	$220,481	$439,600	$750,000	$1,750,000
Los Angeles	La Habra Heights	416	6,625	40	82	$1,250,000	$15,527	$256,500	$5,170,000
Los Angeles	La Mirada	112	48,005	117	260	$400,000	$53,700	$300,000	$400,000
Los Angeles	La Puente	NR	40,800	66	145	$348,000	$0	$696,000	$10,823,024
Los Angeles	La Verne	203	32,300	99	235	$380,000	$42,000	$800,000	$1,800,000
Los Angeles	Lakewood	295	79,100	190	425	$1,400,000	$150,000	$2,100,000	$20,000,000

County Name	City Name	Key	1997 Population	Maintained Mileage centerline	Maintained Mileage lane-miles	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Rehabilitation	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Maintenance	Total Annual Exp. Need from local agcy.	Deferred Mntce. Backlog from local agcy.
Los Angeles	Lancaster	363	127,136	386	1,137	$1,980,000	$600,000	$1,750,000	$6,500,000
Los Angeles	Lawndale	390	30,200	41	85	$39,000	$45,000	$350,000	$2,468,306
Los Angeles	Lomita	208	20,000	9	21	$250,000	$308,059	$250,000	$400,000
Los Angeles	Long Beach	210	424,000	810	1,900	$4,800,000	$800,000	$6,000,000	$12,000,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles	417	3,451,900	6,478	23,014	$39,500,000	$15,250,000	$100,000,000	$1,500,000,000
Los Angeles	Lynwood	213	67,000	96	215	$2,600,000	$60,000	$5,200,000	$16,025,827
Los Angeles	Malibu	377	15,000	47	94	$750,000	$30,000	$500,000	$5,000,000
Los Angeles	Manhattan Beach	114	32,063	120	264	$1,200,000	$150,000	$550,000	$5,000,000
Los Angeles	Maywood	217	30,000	25	160	$54,000	$9,000	$800,000	$12,000,000
Los Angeles	Monrovia	297	39,400	90	189	$1,000,000	$50,000	$800,000	$14,087,820
Los Angeles	Montebello	222	60,000	125	300	$280,000	$5,000	$560,000	$22,361,619
Los Angeles	Monterey Park	435	65,000	115	275	$295,000	$375,000	$500,000	$3,125,000
Los Angeles	Norwalk	227	101,988	180	580	$1,400,000	$640,000	$1,000,000	$43,000,000
Los Angeles	Palmdale	266	114,900	384	803	$1,500,000	$350,000	$1,300,000	$12,600,000
Los Angeles	Palos Verdes Estates	44	14,155	70	150	$428,500	$17,955	$417,000	$2,979,000
Los Angeles	Paramount	314	55,200	73	167	$934,000	$60,000	$600,000	$5,100,000
Los Angeles	Pasadena	47	139,000	321	775	$1,535,000	$477,000	$2,748,000	$17,800,000
Los Angeles	Pico Rivera	356	61,800	140	320	$2,100,000	$300,000	$1,000,000	$5,700,000
Los Angeles	Pomona	52	143,152	297	725	$1,163,965	$40,000	$5,470,693	$5,354,693
Los Angeles	Rancho Palos Verdes	357	42,000	289	607	$2,000,000	$150,000	$400,000	$8,000,000
Los Angeles	Redondo Beach	418	67,000	127	291	$1,200,000	$998,000	$650,000	$14,100,000
Los Angeles	Rolling Hills	341	2,000	1	2	$0	$380,000	$760,000	$149,077
Los Angeles	Rolling Hills Estates	365	7,789	30	95	$350,000	$45,000	$350,000	$1,400,000
Los Angeles	Rosemead	64	55,760	80	212	$2,000,000	$110,000	$500,000	$1,280,000
Los Angeles	San Dimas	72	35,756	119	250	$497,037	$48,500	$550,000	$2,700,000
Los Angeles	San Fernando	73	24,000	50	106	$850,000	$40,000	$400,000	$7,800,000
Los Angeles	San Gabriel	263	40,053	71	183	$500,000	$150,000	$1,000,000	$13,640,588
Los Angeles	San Marino	393	13,700	62	132	$660,000	$30,000	$1,320,000	$9,839,112
Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	81	140,000	321	760	$2,500,000	$300,000	$7,250,000	$99,000,000
Los Angeles	Santa Fe Springs	436	16,100	109	286	$895,000	$150,000	$2,750,000	$30,000,000
Los Angeles	Santa Monica	82	91,400	144	360	$4,000,000	$2,141,000	$2,641,632	$14,800,000
Los Angeles	Sierra Madre	355	11,000	39	78	$148,000	$25,000	$48,000	$1,319,937
Los Angeles	Signal Hill	88	8,500	37	120	$650,000	$30,000	$2,500,000	$180,000
Los Angeles	South El Monte	419	22,150	76	304	$750,000	$51,000	$1,500,000	$12,000,000
Los Angeles	South Gate	91	90,000	127	267	$1,046,000	$1,322,459	$1,250,000	$5,500,000
Los Angeles	South Pasadena	395	25,150	52	130	$200,000	$375,000	$500,000	$12,700,000
Los Angeles	Temple City	407	33,900	70	147	$370,000	$79,000	$200,000	$400,000
Los Angeles	Torrance	99	142,000	330	726	$320,000	$1,300,000	$16,000,000	$120,000,000
Los Angeles	Vernon	243	90	49	146	$545,000	$0	$400,000	$800,000
Los Angeles	Walnut	409	30,000	101	245	$895,000	$75,000	$1,790,000	$1,056,607
Los Angeles	West Covina	249	101,000	225	566	$1,369,000	$87,000	$1,330,000	$14,040,000
Los Angeles	West Hollywood	399	37,950	41	97	$54,709	$20,663	$688,500	$11,086,000
Los Angeles	Westlake Village	250	7,931	29	73	$356,000	$70,000	$500,000	$500,000
Los Angeles	Whittier	252	89,000	192	600	$500,000	$100,000	$1,206,000	$8,234,300
Madera	(County)	329	63,400	1,550	3,131	$1,126,835	$2,681,375	$10,000,000	$310,000,000
Madera	Chowchilla	149	12,700	38	76	$300,000	$50,000	$100,000	$1,500,000
Madera	Madera	113	36,291	128	262	$2,556,532	$341,408	$5,113,064	$40,000,000
Marin	(County)	17	68,100	420	850	$4,500,000	$1,500,000	$11,000,000	$52,000,000
Marin	Belvedere	260	2,300	12	24	$50,000	$10,000	$50,000	$40,000
Marin	Corte Madera	275	8,900	27	54	$280,000	$22,000	$500,000	$1,500,000
Marin	Fairfax	NR	71,000	29	58	$0	$16,000	$32,000	$1,676,007
Marin	Larkspur	NR	11,750	39	78	$293,000	$0	$586,000	$2,253,940
Marin	Mill Valley	343	13,000	67	150	$1,500,000	$20,000	$1,000,000	$16,000,000
Marin	Novato	228	47,500	143	315	$2,500,000	$70,000	$1,000,000	$6,000,000
Marin	Ross	66	2,169	15	30	$50,000	$15,000	$150,000	$1,280,000
Marin	San Anselmo	68	12,000	43	88	$800,000	$75,000	$700,000	$10,000,000
Marin	San Rafael	364	54,000	165	350	$1,200,000	$112,000	$1,200,000	$12,000,000
Marin	Sausalito	NR	7,725	26	52	$197,000	$42,000	$394,000	$1,502,627
Marin	Tiburon	NR	8,550	30	60	$50,000	$0	$100,000	$1,733,800
Mariposa	(County)	311	16,100	559	1,119	$561,000	$348,000	$1,500,000	$18,000,000
Mendocino	(County)	18	60,000	1,018	2,056	$1,700,000	$2,700,000	$5,400,000	$65,000,000
Mendocino	Fort Bragg	179	6,300	26	53	$5,000	$15,000	$350,000	$9,654,000
Mendocino	Point Arena	NR	430	3	6	$0	$7,000	$14,000	$784,741
Mendocino	Ukiah	240	15,030	52	108	$714,646	$82,500	$531,500	$9,400,000
Mendocino	Willits	292	5,200	27	53	$22,000	$5,000	$44,000	$5,200,000
Merced	(County)	19	78,500	1,730	3,806	$2,500,000	$2,470,000	$5,200,000	$52,000,000
Merced	Atwater	NR	21,350	73	150	$40,000	$0	$80,000	$5,094,071
Merced	Dos Palos	334	4,450	22	44	$127,000	$32,000	$175,000	$4,500,000
Merced	Gustine	186	4,214	23	46	$122,000	$40,000	$250,000	$450,000
Merced	Livingston	206	10,500	20	40	$450,000	$50,000	$50,000	$250,000
Merced	Los Banos	212	21,000	91	187	$190,000	$341,000	$350,000	$5,000,000
Merced	Merced	218	65,000	160	330	$0	$141,855	$4,270,931	$33,422,103
Modoc	(County)	20	7,050	1,000	2,000	$500,000	$1,500,000	$2,500,000	$55,000,000
Modoc	Alturas	119	3,100	34	67	$60,000	$220,000	$815,000	$14,500,000
Mono	(County)	304	5,200	684	1,368	$507,000	$60,000	$1,240,000	$6,200,000
Mono	Mammoth Lakes	214	5,214	53	156	$345,000	$65,000	$1,000,000	$20,000,000

County Name	City Name	Key	1997 Population	Maintained Mileage centerline	Maintained Mileage lane-miles	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Rehabilitation	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Maintenance	Total Annual Exp. Need from local agcy.	Deferred Mntce. Backlog from local agcy.
Monterey	(County)	21	99,800	1,260	2,600	$900,000	$2,000,000	$2,500,000	$3,500,000
Monterey	Carmel-By-The-Sea	300	4,500	30	60	$150,000	$50,000	$250,000	$750,000
Monterey	Del Rey Oaks	359	1,700	6	12	$50,000	$5,000	$55,000	$250,000
Monterey	Gonzales	337	6,648	3	6	$60,000	$25,000	$120,000	$395,432
Monterey	Greenfield	110	10,185	22	43	$400,000	$28,000	$500,000	$5,800,000
Monterey	King City	196	9,975	30	74	$2,900,100	$10,000	$3,000,000	$40,000,000
Monterey	Marina	216	17,700	30	62	$10,000	$5,000	$10,000	$100,000
Monterey	Monterey	223	32,190	108	227	$1,053,000	$615,000	$1,250,000	$2,600,000
Monterey	Pacific Grove	235	17,300	55	110	$0	$15,000	$575,000	$1,650,000
Monterey	Salinas	285	123,329	247	573	$480,000	$25,000	$1,500,000	$9,400,000
Monterey	Sand City	406	200	5	10	$150,000	$15,000	$20,000	$800,000
Monterey	Seaside	437	28,300	94	188	$2,746,000	$75,000	$800,000	$50,000,000
Monterey	Soledad	NR	20,050	19	38	$25,000	$0	$50,000	$2,504,402
Napa	(County)	22	29,800	444	916	$17,025	$2,782,635	$4,300,000	$37,000,000
Napa	American Canyon	120	9,000	27	54	$0	$80,000	$10,978	$1,886,836
Napa	Calistoga	105	4,800	14	28	$81,000	$5,000	$162,000	$2,810,145
Napa	Napa	438	69,316	208	458	$500,000	$110,000	$1,000,000	$45,925,797
Napa	St Helena	NR	5,725	23	46	$286,000	$119,000	$572,000	$4,616,667
Napa	Yountville	NR	3,490	7	14	$0	$12,000	$24,000	$1,405,072
Nevada	(County)	396	89,500	565	1,138	$2,772,547	$1,444,740	$3,000,000	$40,000,000
Nevada	Grass Valley	184	9,700	40	80	$800,000	$100,000	$400,000	$3,000,000
Nevada	Nevada City	294	2,855	18	36	$136,950	$51,739	$52,000	$2,817,750
Nevada	Truckee	237	11,750	141	282	$2,200,000	$1,214,000	$1,700,000	$5,000,000
Orange	(County)	23	185,900	447	1,050	$1,300,000	$700,000	$2,500,000	$7,600,000
Orange	Anaheim	121	300,000	550	1,550	$5,000,000	$500,000	$7,000,000	$70,000,000
Orange	Brea	135	35,000	94	238	$250,000	$30,000	$481,587	$3,848,764
Orange	Buena Park	136	71,000	147	425	$2,300,000	$1,785,000	$3,043,000	$21,305,000
Orange	Costa Mesa	158	104,237	189	530	$5,147,090	$50,000	$10,000,000	$33,000,000
Orange	Cypress	353	47,000	118	291	$1,600,000	$80,000	$200,000	$1,200,000
Orange	Dana Point	162	34,800	84	180	$840,000	$120,000	$250,000	$350,000
Orange	Fountain Valley	180	55,985	141	362	$2,142,500	$535,000	$4,285,000	$23,974,714
Orange	Fullerton	109	122,804	275	676	$2,483,000	$687,000	$1,850,000	$96,000,000
Orange	Garden Grove	427	154,398	286	977	$800,000	$500,000	$1,600,000	$64,730,271
Orange	Huntington Beach	262	190,000	411	1,008	$1,117,245	$498,019	$2,800,000	$24,844,374
Orange	Irvine	194	128,000	357	1,372	$2,700,000	$2,300,000	$6,000,000	$4,800,000
Orange	La Habra	439	55,000	111	242	$2,000,000	$554,000	$2,800,000	$32,000,000
Orange	La Palma	273	16,000	32	128	$150,000	$15,000	$300,000	$8,480,527
Orange	Laguna Beach	NR	24,100	75	150	$0	$468,000	$936,000	$9,938,117
Orange	Laguna Hills	346	30,000	70	154	$500,000	$525,000	$500,000	$250,000
Orange	Laguna Niguel	198	57,000	140	371	$900,000	$210,000	$800,000	$1,950,000
Orange	Lake Forest	199	57,600	117	238	$850,000	$426,000	$1,100,000	$1,800,000
Orange	Los Alamitos	272	12,580	33	72	$250,000	$150,000	$300,000	$1,713,600
Orange	Mission Viejo	219	92,000	223	555	$1,600,000	$410,000	$2,500,000	$36,771,034
Orange	Newport Beach	405	70,512	198	518	$2,044,000	$100,000	$30,300,000	$37,300,000
Orange	Orange	230	122,000	362	792	$1,544,000	$665,800	$2,500,000	$26,060,000
Orange	Placentia	NR	45,550	106	244	$446,000	$0	$892,000	$16,152,753
Orange	San Clemente	71	48,300	120	276	$4,000,000	$600,000	$2,000,000	$18,286,136
Orange	San Juan Capistrano	NR	29,650	72	151	$401,000	$161,000	$802,000	$10,017,622
Orange	Santa Ana	78	317,000	413	1,077	$12,000,000	$1,500,000	$14,000,000	$104,000,000
Orange	Seal Beach	384	28,000	43	90	$300,000	$302,000	$610,000	$12,000,000
Orange	Stanton	93	33,449	62	134	$350,000	$175,000	$300,000	$5,308,270
Orange	Tustin	239	65,207	99	289	$1,200,000	$50,000	$600,000	$1,000,000
Orange	Villa Park	244	6,400	30	63	$250,000	$20,000	$330,000	$2,365,012
Orange	Westminster	251	84,000	190	515	$1,700,000	$50,000	$3,000,000	$9,000,000
Orange	Yorba Linda	256	56,500	207	574	$750,000	$175,000	$1,725,000	$4,142,000
Placer	(County)	24	92,400	1,045	2,092	$1,500,000	$1,000,000	$6,000,000	$78,000,000
Placer	Auburn	127	11,600	60	120	$10,000	$20,000	$150,000	$5,940,000
Placer	Colfax	153	1,430	11	22	$14,412	$3,000	$62,000	$1,300,000
Placer	Lincoln	283	8,103	57	125	$300,000	$80,000	$600,000	$6,157,544
Placer	Loomis	296	6,025	32	64	$0	$25,000	$200,000	$10,500,000
Placer	Rocklin	284	27,632	153	337	$650,000	$50,000	$1,114,050	$1,500,000
Placer	Roseville	65	66,000	340	748	$700,000	$300,000	$1,300,000	$20,000,000
Plumas	(County)	25	18,250	671	1,342	$5,000	$100,000	$1,000,000	$10,000,000
Plumas	Portola	420	2,100	17	34	$0	$2,000	$200,000	$6,645,000
Riverside	(County)	26	373,300	2,604	5,324	$14,200,000	$1,200,000	$22,000,000	$58,000,000
Riverside	Banning	104	24,500	107	214	$670,000	$10,000	$400,000	$15,093,500
Riverside	Beaumont	NR	10,300	53	106	$575,000	$0	$1,150,000	$7,476,220
Riverside	Blythe	NR	20,550	44	92	$236,000	$0	$472,000	$6,517,006
Riverside	Calimesa	142	7,390	27	59	$100,000	$60,000	$680,000	$10,245,000
Riverside	Canyon Lake	410	13,500	3	12	$0	$500	$1,000	$846,364
Riverside	Cathedral City	NR	34,950	158	379	$839,000	$0	$1,678,000	$26,745,117
Riverside	Coachella	382	22,000	60	128	$40,000	$45,000	$200,000	$12,000,000
Riverside	Corona	374	102,794	335	804	$3,000,000	$670,000	$3,000,000	$18,500,000
Riverside	Desert Hot Springs	371	14,832	104	213	$100,000	$32,000	$200,000	$15,037,075
Riverside	Hemet	NR	52,300	191	420	$1,305,000	$263,000	$2,610,000	$29,636,863
Riverside	Indian Wells	347	3,140	13	31	$470,000	$6,000	$940,000	$2,158,229
Riverside	Indio	404	43,780	173	392	$1,490,000	$920,000	$10,000,000	$50,000,000
Riverside	La Quinta	372	21,000	107	320	$250,000	$25,000	$900,000	$4,600,289
Riverside	Lake Elsinore	383	28,000	182	422	$600,000	$130,000	$1,200,000	$29,763,817
Riverside	Moreno Valley	293	133,000	625	1,449	$2,000,000	$213,000	$3,200,000	$25,000,000
Riverside	Murrieta	226	37,919	131	275	$623,000	$217,000	$901,000	$7,550,000
Riverside	Norco	NR	24,350	83	174	$932,000	$71,000	$1,864,000	$12,293,444
Riverside	Palm Desert	322	34,163	134	396	$1,000,000	$25,000	$1,750,000	$2,350,000
Riverside	Palm Springs	NR	33,650	259	596	$1,413,000	$173,000	$2,826,000	$42,014,943
Riverside	Perris	366	31,000	130	275	$1,600,000	$20,000	$2,000,000	$6,000,000

County and City Survey-Pavement Rehabilitation Needs

County Name	City Name	Key	1997 Population	Maintained Mileage centerline	Maintained Mileage lane-miles	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Rehabilitation	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Maintenance	Total Annual Exp. Need from local agcy.	Deferred Mntce. Backlog from local agcy.
Riverside	Rancho Mirage	53	11,000	73	210	$750,000	$50,000	$1,000,000	$2,500,000
Riverside	Riverside	63	248,000	810	1,920	$4,000,000	$1,500,000	$7,000,000	$30,000,000
Riverside	San Jacinto	74	24,237	72	151	$1,100,000	$20,000	$2,200,000	$10,664,192
Riverside	Temecula	325	45,000	166	349	$350,000	$292,466	$1,500,000	$23,000,000
Sacramento	(County)	27	609,800	2,543	6,500	$2,500,000	$4,000,000	$20,000,000	$35,000,000
Sacramento	Citrus Heights	422	89,000	215	473	$1,250,000	$40,000	$3,809,000	$15,000,000
Sacramento	Folsom	261	43,300	158	415	$150,000	$125,000	$600,000	$4,250,000
Sacramento	Galt	182	15,950	65	130	$200,000	$25,000	$500,000	$19,000,000
Sacramento	Isleton	NR	840	6	12	$0	$8,000	$16,000	$605,506
Sacramento	Sacramento	67	392,300	1,250	2,632	$5,000,000	$2,000,000	$8,000,000	$80,000,000
San Benito	(County)	281	17,050	405	810	$0	$438,994	$1,268,994	$14,000,000
San Benito	Hollister	191	27,000	90	200	$90,000	$250,000	$2,500,000	$30,000,000
San Benito	San Juan Bautista	338	1,650	15	30	$179,000	$100	$358,000	$3,000,000
San Bernardino	(County)	28	280,400	2,919	6,714	$3,531,176	$2,184,733	$16,000,000	$137,000,000
San Bernardino	Adelanto	268	14,000	276	560	$0	$10,000	$650,000	$2,000,000
San Bernardino	Apple Valley	124	56,734	404	889	$1,800,000	$300,000	$2,000,000	$30,000,000
San Bernardino	Barstow	423	22,850	88	185	$1,000,000	$43,000	$600,000	$22,700,000
San Bernardino	Big Bear Lake	299	6,049	119	238	$454,000	$415,650	$3,300,000	$11,100,000
San Bernardino	Chino	148	62,671	193	636	$394,000	$66,000	$4,000,000	$24,000,000
San Bernardino	Chino Hills	NR	51,400	157	345	$135,000	$100,000	$270,000	$22,768,549
San Bernardino	Colton	421	48,000	125	300	$500,000	$80,000	$500,000	$5,000,000
San Bernardino	Fontana	178	103,000	400	829	$2,000,000	$1,400,000	$2,000,000	$44,000,000
San Bernardino	Grand Terrace	264	13,552	44	88	$225,000	$60,000	$590,000	$9,500,000
San Bernardino	Hesperia	274	60,000	479	1,005	$70,000	$300,000	$5,095,487	$184,000,000
San Bernardino	Highland	NR	40,650	114	251	$849,000	$160,000	$1,698,000	$16,532,577
San Bernardino	Loma Linda	NR	21,100	54	113	$0	$10,000	$20,000	$7,475,256
San Bernardino	Montclair	221	30,000	72	155	$403,000	$324,049	$806,000	$10,217,502
San Bernardino	Needles	NR	5,725	40	80	$0	$583,000	$1,166,000	$5,273,549
San Bernardino	Ontario	280	150,000	410	1,094	$3,100,000	$600,000	$4,100,000	$67,000,000
San Bernardino	Rancho Cucamonga	428	120,000	437	1,000	$2,000,000	$500,000	$5,600,000	$13,200,000
San Bernardino	Redlands	NR	65,200	270	594	$296,000	$551,000	$592,000	$39,156,103
San Bernardino	Rialto	57	84,000	246	552	$550,000	$100,000	$1,500,000	$21,000,000
San Bernardino	San Bernardino	424	184,000	620	1,334	$1,500,000	$80,000	$2,500,000	$90,000,000
San Bernardino	Twentynine Palms	NR	14,700	158	324	$293,000	$139,000	$586,000	$21,351,282
San Bernardino	Upland	241	67,000	170	360	$1,140,000	$300,000	$2,280,000	$23,730,971
San Bernardino	Victorville	375	60,577	321	705	$550,000	$60,000	$1,100,000	$46,494,246
San Bernardino	Yucaipa	257	38,000	165	346	$1,000,000	$300,000	$1,300,000	$7,327,000
San Bernardino	Yucca Valley	NR	18,500	147	301	$0	$75,000	$150,000	$19,864,801
San Diego	(County)	29	400,000	1,880	4,042	$7,300,000	$14,000,000	$61,000,000	$6,000,000
San Diego	Carlsbad	339	70,532	238	626	$1,200,000	$220,000	$2,900,000	$32,900,000
San Diego	Chula Vista	150	156,401	340	830	$1,800,000	$642,000	$8,000,000	$15,170,000
San Diego	Coronado	440	26,713	40	84	$1,300,000	$160,000	$800,000	$2,500,000
San Diego	Del Mar	317	5,211	23	46	$223,000	$25,000	$500,000	$10,000,000
San Diego	El Cajon	168	94,400	186	473	$875,000	$749,000	$815,000	$3,000,000
San Diego	Encinitas	173	58,900	163	380	$900,000	$40,000	$500,000	$4,000,000
San Diego	Escondido	425	130,000	285	656	$790,000	$172,000	$500,000	$6,000,000
San Diego	Imperial Beach	450	28,000	58	118	$0	$95,000	$425,000	$750,000
San Diego	La Mesa	201	57,973	153	600	$200,000	$100,000	$1,600,000	$6,000,000
San Diego	Lemon Grove	345	24,500	64	142	$152,000	$360,000	$2,050,000	$3,000,000
San Diego	National City	441	54,400	102	347	$830,000	$9,000	$1,500,000	$2,500,000
San Diego	Oceanside	442	160,000	400	920	$1,600,000	$300,000	$2,000,000	$3,000,000
San Diego	Poway	NR	47,400	150	345	$2,000,000	$300,000	$4,000,000	$20,000,000
San Diego	San Diego	443	1,197,100	2,974	6,669	$7,326,000	$5,645,471	$19,096,000	$197,000,000
San Diego	San Marcos	312	50,827	135	402	$460,000	$74,000	$920,000	$800,000
San Diego	Santee	NR	55,300	114	251	$517,000	$0	$1,034,000	$15,925,088
San Diego	Solana Beach	90	14,000	47	102	$150,000	$50,000	$500,000	$3,000,000
San Diego	Vista	429	82,900	176	405	$609,000	$82,000	$6,000,000	$29,940,593
San Francisco	(County)	NR							
San Francisco	San Francisco	30	760,000	953	2,160	$14,000,000	$5,000,000	$22,000,000	$142,000,000
San Joaquin	(County)	31	128,500	1,664	3,400	$7,000,000	$1,500,000	$16,500,000	$112,000,000
San Joaquin	Escalon	426	5,500	22	50	$400,000	$15,000	$500,000	$3,000,000
San Joaquin	Lathrop	202	8,941	48	108	$185,000	$25,000	$500,000	$3,271,896
San Joaquin	Lodi	207	54,700	172	378	$687,514	$641,855	$1,100,000	$20,678,590
San Joaquin	Manteca	215	46,000	140	320	$1,500,000	$50,000	$2,500,000	$2,000,000
San Joaquin	Ripon	60	9,500	37	79	$475,000	$50,000	$300,000	$2,000,000
San Joaquin	Stockton	94	258,000	683	1,537	$1,250,000	$1,400,000	$20,000,000	$18,500,000
San Joaquin	Tracy	100	46,250	150	350	$1,600,000	$200,000	$2,750,000	$11,500,000
San Luis Obispo	(County)	32	100,000	1,285	2,600	$1,400,000	$5,700,000	$3,000,000	$27,400,000
San Luis Obispo	Arroyo Grande	282	15,000	53	115	$155,000	$20,000	$200,000	$7,035,379
San Luis Obispo	Atascadero	128	24,900	155	380	$350,000	$50,000	$750,000	$23,000,000
San Luis Obispo	El Paso De Robles	380	22,000	104	218	$900,000	$25,000	$500,000	$1,300,000
San Luis Obispo	Grover Beach	185	12,200	50	125	$105,000	$60,000	$400,000	$12,000,000
San Luis Obispo	Morro Bay	225	9,860	49	97	$12,000	$22,000	$200,000	$4,000,000
San Luis Obispo	Pismo Beach	50	8,200	36	73	$230,000	$30,000	$400,000	$3,200,000
San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo	76	44,000	117	246	$2,000,000	$600,000	$1,300,000	$18,000,000

County and City Survey-Pavement Rehabilitation Needs

County Name	City Name	Key	1997 Population	Maintained Mileage centerline	Maintained Mileage lane-miles	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Rehabilitation	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Maintenance	Total Annual Exp. Need from local agcy.	Deferred Mntce. Backlog from local agcy.
San Mateo	(County)	286	63,600	317	633	$1,204,000	$964,100	$4,500,000	$55,000,000
San Mateo	Atherton	259	7,500	50	100	$500,000	$50,000	$500,000	$1,700,000
San Mateo	Belmont	269	26,000	70	150	$300,000	$60,000	$1,500,000	$4,000,000
San Mateo	Brisbane	NR	3,210	19	38	$0	$346,000	$692,000	$2,935,757
San Mateo	Burlingame	138	28,567	79	166	$400,000	$200,000	$750,000	$3,800,000
San Mateo	Colma	388	1,278	7	15	$100,000	$5,000	$200,000	$1,158,852
San Mateo	Daly City	401	103,000	113	260	$1,200,000	$39,500	$1,900,000	$9,000,000
San Mateo	East Palo Alto	167	28,000	38	79	$2,700,000	$200,000	$5,400,000	$6,083,971
San Mateo	Foster City	108	30,350	27	64	$907,000	$10,000	$1,000,000	$4,944,433
San Mateo	Half Moon Bay	358	10,334	27	55	$200,000	$303,000	$300,000	$3,500,000
San Mateo	Hillsborough	190	12,000	81	162	$295,000	$35,000	$300,000	$3,000,000
San Mateo	Menlo Park	320	30,000	92	193	$50,000	$10,000	$1,400,000	$3,800,000
San Mateo	Millbrae	NR	21,450	55	116	$53,000	$0	$106,000	$8,923,157
San Mateo	Pacifica	NR	39,650	89	196	$2,000	$434,000	$4,000	$15,126,876
San Mateo	Portola Valley	265	4,200	35	70	$220,000	$40,000	$220,000	$5,407,974
San Mateo	Redwood City	56	71,718	356	854	$1,200,000	$563,000	$1,400,000	$11,000,000
San Mateo	San Bruno	NR	40,800	79	174	$8,000	$1,090,000	$16,000	$13,427,227
San Mateo	San Carlos	70	27,000	85	200	$480,000	$245,000	$950,000	$6,000,000
San Mateo	San Mateo	NR	92,200	190	418	$6,910,000	$0	$13,820,000	$32,293,330
San Mateo	South San Francisco	NR	57,600	123	295	$315,000	$573,000	$630,000	$22,806,199
San Mateo	Woodside	NR	5,475	46	92	$0	$43,000	$86,000	$7,107,623
Santa Barbara	(County)	33	170,867	933	1,871	$2,831,894	$5,167,599	$5,800,000	$74,000,000
Santa Barbara	Buellton	NR	3,590	12	24	$30,000	$0	$60,000	$1,596,546
Santa Barbara	Carpinteria	381	14,500	29	66	$102,211	$124,000	$519,628	$3,000,000
Santa Barbara	Guadalupe	NR	6,325	14	28	$10,000	$0	$20,000	$1,862,637
Santa Barbara	Lompoc	209	42,000	106	233	$1,300,000	$75,000	$1,500,000	$300,000
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	79	91,223	250	575	$1,500,000	$500,000	$2,500,000	$11,085,000
Santa Barbara	Santa Maria	411	69,300	180	415	$1,000,000	$177,000	$896,700	$1,939,800
Santa Barbara	Solvang	NR	5,125	19	38	$22,000	$28,000	$44,000	$2,527,865
Santa Clara	(County)	267	108,200	706	1,800	$2,400,000	$1,340,000	$4,800,000	$58,751,670
Santa Clara	Campbell	141	38,000	110	231	$3,000,000	$150,000	$750,000	$15,000,000
Santa Clara	Cupertino	161	44,775	119	260	$310,000	$192,000	$1,000,000	$8,486,352
Santa Clara	Gilroy	412	37,455	101	215	$154,000	$120,000	$1,750,000	$4,850,000
Santa Clara	Los Altos	211	28,000	107	220	$600,000	$100,000	$800,000	$7,180,760
Santa Clara	Los Altos Hills	344	7,800	55	110	$500,000	$50,000	$500,000	$2,000,000
Santa Clara	Los Gatos	NR	29,700	111	233	$129,000	$444,000	$258,000	$7,608,341
Santa Clara	Milpitas	NR	61,200	125	275	$146,000	$1,986,000	$292,000	$8,975,950
Santa Clara	Monte Sereno	115	3,500	14	27	$21,000	$15,000	$160,000	$1,047,107
Santa Clara	Morgan Hill	224	28,000	89	188	$363,000	$200,000	$750,000	$9,231,000
Santa Clara	Mountain View	450	73,066	138	353	$750,000	$700,000	$1,200,000	$4,245,718
Santa Clara	Palo Alto	236	55,971	198	416	$2,500,000	$1,500,000	$2,123,000	$6,300,000
Santa Clara	San Jose	430	873,300	2,050	4,510	$17,350,000	$1,800,000	$16,800,000	$63,000,000
Santa Clara	Santa Clara	80	101,000	247	685	$1,515,000	$1,420,000	$2,141,000	$1,500,000
Santa Clara	Saratoga	445	30,000	142	285	$1,000,000	$100,000	$650,000	$1,500,000
Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	95	125,000	300	700	$2,100,000	$1,017,000	$2,000,000	$22,847,872
Santa Cruz	(County)	34	134,900	607	1,213	$565,000	$1,000,000	$3,000,000	$19,000,000
Santa Cruz	Capitola	144	11,000	24	65	$400,000	$30,000	$650,000	$2,500,000
Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	306	51,000	136	274	$750,000	$60,000	$850,000	$17,183,572
Santa Cruz	Scotts Valley	291	10,000	35	70	$425,000	$15,000	$50,000	$100,000
Santa Cruz	Watsonville	248	35,000	83	173	$1,034,000	$16,000	$400,000	$10,000,000
Shasta	(County)	86	68,400	1,250	2,500	$100,000	$5,000,000	$10,000,000	$14,000,000
Shasta	Anderson	122	8,700	73	146	$110,000	$79,000	$250,000	$1,500,000
Shasta	Redding	55	78,000	363	799	$500,000	$200,000	$4,000,000	$32,000,000
Shasta	Shasta Lake	87	9,800	53	106	$250,000	$16,000	$500,000	$5,000,000
Sierra	(County)	36	2,480	390	780	$43,432	$113,891	$1,000,000	$5,000,000
Sierra	Loyalton	368	870	5	11	$6,500	$16,000	$50,000	$500,000
Siskiyou	(County)	37	24,250	1,364	2,728	$1,000,000	$2,000,000	$10,000,000	$50,000,000
Siskiyou	Dorris	298	849	10	20	$24,000	$10,000	$48,000	$547,493
Siskiyou	Dunsmuir	166	2,300	5	15	$2,900	$1,500	$5,800	$15,000
Siskiyou	Etna	NR	770	10	20	$0	$1,000	$2,000	$536,758
Siskiyou	Fort Jones	335	615	4	8	$0	$12,000	$12,000	$380,000
Siskiyou	Montague	367	1,360	14	28	$0	$60,000	$120,000	$10,000,000
Siskiyou	Mount Shasta	391	3,645	52	104	$32,000	$165,000	$64,000	$3,000,000
Siskiyou	Tulelake	NR	910	8	16	$95,000	$0	$190,000	$429,407
Siskiyou	Weed	336	3,040	27	54	$0	$45,000	$60,000	$1,449,247
Siskiyou	Yreka	408	7,100	48	95	$35,000	$97,000	$70,000	$8,000,000
Solano	(County)	289	20,200	599	1,200	$1,000,000	$3,000,000	$5,500,000	$50,000,000
Solano	Benicia	130	28,000	90	183	$425,000	$50,000	$1,200,000	$6,000,000
Solano	Dixon	446	13,663	49	100	$514,000	$50,000	$500,000	$2,000,000
Solano	Fairfield	302	90,000	240	563	$2,000,000	$950,000	$4,500,000	$46,000,000
Solano	Rio Vista	61	3,750	28	56	$120,172	$88,500	$2,600,000	$2,500,000
Solano	Suisun City	271	26,000	71	149	$350,000	$25,000	$1,000,000	$9,000,000
Solano	Vacaville	447	87,700	212	500	$0	$793,000	$1,600,000	$3,000,000
Solano	Vallejo	242	110,519	214	526	$425,000	$90,000	$4,500,000	$27,000,000

County and City Survey-Pavement Rehabilitation Needs

County Name	City Name	Key	1997 Population	Maintained Mileage centerline	Maintained Mileage lane-miles	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Rehabilitation	Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Actual Exp. 1998 Maintenance	Total Annual Exp. Need from local agcy.	Deferred Mntce. Backlog from local agcy.
Sonoma	(County)	448	154,100	1,392	2,854	$5,996,555	$3,651,900	$6,997,000	$48,862,000
Sonoma	Cloverdale	373	5,552	19	40	$55,000	$5,000	$150,000	$4,033,000
Sonoma	Cotati	340	6,691	22	44	$129,000	$1,000	$258,000	$4,026,393
Sonoma	Healdsburg	NR	9,625	43	86	$236,000	$2,000	$472,000	$7,869,767
Sonoma	Petaluma	NR	49,000	148	326	$1,711,000	$0	$3,422,000	$29,795,306
Sonoma	Rohnert Park	NR	38,700	81	178	$228,000	$452,000	$456,000	$16,306,890
Sonoma	Santa Rosa	83	136,148	424	943	$2,252,000	$966,800	$3,700,000	$48,500,000
Sonoma	Sebastopol	84	7,800	23	46	$35,000	$106,000	$237,635	$4,209,410
Sonoma	Sonoma	NR	8,925	31	62	$0	$6,000	$12,000	$5,673,553
Sonoma	Windsor	NR	19,200	66	135	$686,000	$0	$1,372,000	$12,381,157
Stanislaus	(County)	397	430,000	1,549	3,100	$1,457,449	$5,500,000	$13,000,000	$40,000,000
Stanislaus	Ceres	146	32,241	90	191	$298,000	$4,000	$400,000	$750,000
Stanislaus	Hughson	403	3,589	20	50	$234,000	$5,000	$468,000	$3,876,050
Stanislaus	Modesto	220	180,000	545	1,700	$1,700,000	$395,000	$6,000,000	$45,000,000
Stanislaus	Newman	342	5,600	26	52	$60,000	$5,000	$50,000	$500,000
Stanislaus	Oakdale	229	14,700	50	107	$747,400	$8,500	$750,000	$1,300,000
Stanislaus	Patterson	48	9,700	33	65	$240,000	$20,000	$150,000	$1,500,000
Stanislaus	Riverbank	62	13,750	40	80	$275,000	$20,000	$550,000	$6,201,681
Stanislaus	Turlock	287	49,900	180	385	$50,000	$15,000	$1,500,000	$19,600,000
Stanislaus	Waterford	444	6,525	12	24	$250,000	$20,000	$500,000	$800,000
Sutter	(County)	38	35,250	847	1,694	$1,500,000	$700,000	$5,000,000	$31,000,000
Sutter	Live Oak	NR	5,350	17	34	$60,000	$0	$120,000	$1,449,281
Sutter	Yuba City	NR	34,050	114	234	$67,000	$191,000	$134,000	$9,961,673
Tehama	(County)	39	35,250	1,093	2,186	$560,000	$937,000	$730,000	$22,500,000
Tehama	Corning	157	6,272	33	69	$100,000	$75,000	$1,500,000	$18,000,000
Tehama	Red Bluff	54	13,000	60	130	$100,000	$40,000	$1,585,700	$5,900,000
Tehama	Tehama	97	438	6	12	$30,000	$2,000	$60,000	$437,935
Trinity	(County)	41	13,200	700	1,399	$535,000	$125,000	$1,700,000	$26,600,000
Tulare	(County)	238	141,700	3,077	6,264	$5,058,552	$1,069,848	$10,000,000	$134,000,000
Tulare	Dinuba	301	15,269	54	135	$123,000	$0	$275,000	$3,100,000
Tulare	Exeter	NR	8,200	37	74	$0	$96,000	$192,000	$2,625,806
Tulare	Farmersville	175	7,461	6	12	$0	$200,000	$400,000	$2,000,000
Tulare	Lindsay	NR	8,900	30	60	$191,000	$12,000	$382,000	$2,129,032
Tulare	Porterville	305	36,300	156	370	$125,000	$400,000	$400,000	$10,000,000
Tulare	Tulare	NR	40,350	149	328	$817,000	$285,000	$1,634,000	$11,631,613
Tulare	Visalia	245	93,145	308	620	$2,107,700	$27,000	$2,134,700	$8,240,000
Tulare	Woodlake	255	6,120	14	28	$180,000	$17,500	$350,000	$1,200,000
Tuolumne	(County)	40	47,950	604	1,208	$1,300,491	$522,248	$4,000,000	$22,000,000
Tuolumne	Sonora	394	4,500	26	56	$102,000	$5,000	$80,600	$200,000
Ventura	(County)	42	90,700	544	1,112	$1,439,000	$600,000	$2,000,000	$18,000,000
Ventura	Camarillo	143	59,000	160	400	$2,500,000	$55,000	$1,500,000	$10,000,000
Ventura	Fillmore	177	13,000	33	66	$168,000	$3,200	$461,000	$4,740,000
Ventura	Moorpark	284	28,400	75	156	$1,400,000	$244,000	$665,000	$13,107,333
Ventura	Ojai	279	7,980	37	73	$173,000	$10,608	$400,000	$3,915,500
Ventura	Oxnard	278	152,000	382	804	$21,000,000	$1,300,000	$12,100,000	$60,721,617
Ventura	Port Hueneme	385	25,000	46	104	$600,000	$140,000	$1,200,000	$3,600,000
Ventura	San Buenaventura	69	100,043	620	1,426	$2,900,000	$375,000	$5,000,000	$32,000,000
Ventura	Santa Paula	351	27,000	55	115	$675,000	$40,000	$250,000	$3,000,000
Ventura	Simi Valley	89	104,576	285	655	$3,310,000	$27,000	$4,500,000	$13,500,000
Ventura	Thousand Oaks	98	112,000	380	1,000	$2,500,000	$600,000	$3,500,000	$1,000,000
Yolo	(County)	332	21,300	803	1,606	$180,000	$400,000	$2,500,000	$17,400,000
Yolo	Davis	164	53,400	149	312	$400,000	$165,000	$800,000	$10,000,000
Yolo	West Sacramento	NR	30,400	116	255	$304,000	$381,000	$608,000	$10,361,965
Yolo	Winters	253	5,250	21	42	$0	$86,000	$172,000	$1,705,339
Yolo	Woodland	254	43,912	155	313	$609,000	$21,000	$1,100,000	$10,200,000
Yuba	(County)	43	46,450	589	1,192	$398,000	$436,000	$4,500,000	$61,000,000
Yuba	Marysville	NR	12,150	58	119	$8,000	$58,000	$16,000	$9,887,711
Yuba	Wheatland	NR	1,920	9	18	$186,000	$3,000	$372,000	$1,496,878
TOTAL:	**All counties & cities**		**32,922,921**	**136,698**	**309,558**	**$635,595,270**	**$232,102,646**	**$1,311,412,875**	**$10,473,420,396**

* The Key column shows a file reference number for each survey response. An "NR" in the Key column indicates the county or city sent "No Response." The Commission estimated the values shown on this chart for population, mileage, expenditures, and needs from other sources, for any county or city that did not respond or that omitted any of the requested information.

Native American Reservation Roads and Access Roads

IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS FOR CALIFORNIA INDIAN RESERVATIONS & RANCHERIAS

CENTRAL CALIFORNIA AGENCY

Reservation	County	Name of Road	Length in Miles	Cost Estimate
Benton Paiute	Mono	Yellow Jacket Road	0.35	$525,000
		Yellow Jacket Road	5.15	$2,157,700
		Cattle Drive Road	1.9	$850,000
		Cemetery Road	0.05	$27,200
Big Pine	Inyo	Bowers Street	0.21	$320,000
		Callina Street	0.2	$456,300
Big Sandy	Fresno	Hud Housing Road	0.1	$250,000
		Railroad Grade	0.5	$260,000
		Housing Road A	0.25	$148,500
		BIA Route 160	0.1	$38,300
		Billy Williams Road	0.15	$57,500
		Unnamed Tribal Road	0.1	$383,300
		Ballfield Road	0.15	$79,000
Big Valley	Lake	Rancheria Road	0.9	$625,000
Bishop	Inyo		0.6	$450,000
Colusa	Colusa	Unnamed Road	0.45	$412,000
Cortina	Colusa	Spring Valley Road	7	$6,221,000
Coyote Valley	Mendocino	Housing Road A	0.2	$305,000
Dry Creek	Sonoma	BIA	0.1	$735,000
Greenville	Plumas	Cemetary Road	0.03	$12,200
Grindstone	Glenn	Bridge Road	1.5	$750,000
Hopland	Mendocino	BIA	0.1	$325,000
Manchester Pt	Mendocino	Windy Hollow Road	1.5	$1,200,000
Middletown	Lake	Community Center Road	0.3	$325,000
		Pump house	0.2	$225,000
		Cemetary Road	0.9	$475,000
Mdpn. P.D. Allotment	BIA		0.55	$375,000
Mooretown	Butte	BIA	0.7	$450,000
North Fork PD All	Madera	Mission Dr. & Susan	1.4	$1,092,000
Laytonville	Mendocino	Loop Road	0.5	$350,000
Lone Pine	Inyo	Building - Ah Lane	0.5	$497,000
		Substation	1	$725,000
Redwood Valley	Mendocino	Community Rd. & I Rd.	0.5	$350,000
Robinson	Lake	Shee Come Road	0.1	$225,000
		Mocking Bird	0.1	$250,000
Round Valley	Mendocino	Road M	0.5	$319,800
		Rodeo Grounds Rd.	0.6	$260,400
		Short Creek Rd.	0.1	$116,700
		Pollard Rd.	0.35	$207,900
		Foothill Rd.	0.15	$692,600
Santa Rosa	Kings	Cemetary Road	0.2	$225,000
		Noami Ln./Coyote Ln.	0.05	$75,000
Sherwood Valley	Mendocino	215	1.1	$586,300
		Sherwood Rd.	5	$218,400
		Cemetary Loop Road	0.25	$17,500
Shingle Springs	El Dorado	Proposed	0.5	$500,000
Stve Mrnda. P.D. AI	Kern	225	1.2	$726,000
Stewart Point	Sonoma	Kashia Rd.	0.1	$134,200
Tule River	Tulare	Cemetary Road	0.1	$131,000
		Cemetary Road	0.1	$254,000
		Chimney Road	1.5	$1,971,100
		Route 242	1	$683,000
		HUD Rd.	0.1	$168,000
		E. Cribbans Rd.	0.6	$325,900
		Cemetary Rd.	0.3	$181,500
		Trap Rd.	0.25	$216,000
		Painted Rock Rd.	0.4	$216,800
		Lower Chololllo Rd.	10	$8,502,400
		Garfield Rd.	0.1	$171,300
Tuolumne	Tuolumne	Road A	0.05	$26,500
		Minn St.	0.5	$243,400
		Hani Dr.	0.7	$426,100
			TOTAL:	$39,523,800

IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS FOR CALIFORNIA INDIAN RESERVATIONS & RANCHERIAS

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA AGENCY

Reservation	County	Name of Road	Length in Miles	Cost Estimate
Hoopa	Humboldt	Hundred Acre Prairie	10.3	$15,600,000
Valley		Lookout Rd.	1.6	$750,000
		Mill Creek Rd.	11.9	$18,700,000
		Long Ridge Rd.	2	$1,120,000
		Bald Hill Rd.	11	$12,300,000
		Marshall Lane	1.4	$850,000
		Chase Rd.	0.7	$450,000
		Nixon Rd.	6.8	$6,497,000
		Redwood Grove Rd.	2	$850,000
		Moon Lane Rd.	1	$550,000
		Mill Creek Spur Rd.	0.7	$352,200
		Big Hill Rd.	12.5	$15,425,000
		Bair Rd.	6	$6,625,000
		Matilton Cutoff Rd.	0.5	$589,500
		Community Rd.	2.2	$2,307,800
		Loop Rd.	0.7	$731,400
		Davis Rd.	1.3	$345,000
		Senior Nutrition Center	0.2	$226,000
		Tish Tang Rd.	2.2	$1,125,000
Alturas	Modoc	Unnamed Rd.	0.1	$154,000
Cedarville	Modoc	Indian Rd.	0.1	$155,500
		Patterson St.	0.18	$182,000
Elk Valley	Del Norte	Community Center Rd.	0.05	$59,500
Karuk	Yreka	Clinic Rd.	0.2	$273,000
		Kuyraak St.	0.05	$172,000
		Big Rock Rd.	0.7	$249,100
		Panamnik St.	0.1	$158,500
		E-Note Impah Rd	1.5	$908,200
Likely	Alturas	Cemetary Rd.	0.2	$239,000
Look Out	Modoc	Lookout Dr.	0.25	$232,100
Roaring Creek	Shasta	Cove Rd.	10	$7,527,000
X-L Ranch	Modoc	Thomas Creek Rd.	1	$553,800
Quartz Valley	Siskiyou	Unnamed Rd.	0.2	$216,500
		Fruit Growers Rd.	0.5	$227,400
		Shiktaw Lane	0.1	$147,500
Resighini	Del Norte	Campground Rd.	0.35	$211,800
		Unnamed Rd.	0.3	$295,000
Susanville	Lassen	Spring Ridge Dr.	0.7	$573,300
Trinidad	Humboldt	Icay-Win Lane	0.1	$225,000
		Ter-Ker-Coo Lane	0.12	$214,500
		Archer Rd.	0.35	$223,700
Yurok	Humboldt	Tully Creek	2	$1,994,200
		Mclainnon Hill Rd.	0.8	$628,700
		Weithepec New Villa	0.3	$272,600
		Old Weithchpec Rd.	0.1	$178,500
		Mitchell Rd.	0.8	$467,700
		Weitchpec School Rd.	0.2	$232,000
			TOTAL:	$102,366,000

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AGENCY

Reservation	County	Name of Road	Length in Miles	Cost Estimate
Barona	San Diego	Wildcat Canyon Road	1.5	$4,800,000
Cabazon	Riverside	BIA Rt. 62	0.4	$281,000
Cahuilla	Riverside	Route 18	0.8	$413,000
		Route 20	4.15	$2,613,000
		Route 21	4.45	$1,846,600
		Route 22	1	$517,800
Campo	San Diego	Old Campo Rd.	2.85	$1,320,000
		Route 15	1.5	$793,000
		Route 12	0.4	$198,800
Ewiiaapaayp	San Diego	New Reservation Rd.	2	$1,237,600
		Interior Rd.	2	$1,237,600
		BIA Route 18	3	$1,858,400

IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS FOR CALIFORNIA INDIAN RESERVATIONS & RANCHERIAS

Inaja-Cosmit	San Diego	Boulder Creek Rd.	1.1	$4,801,900
Jamul	San Diego	Reservation Rd.	0.2	$180,000
		County	0.5	$650,000
La Jolla	San Diego	Route 49	0.6	$405,900
		Red Gate Rd.	0.5	$338,100
		Unnamed HUD Rd.	0.1	$167,000
		Campground Rd.	2	$1,370,000
La Posta	San Diego	BIA Route 11B	3.53	$1,677,300
		Tribal Office Rd.	0.1	$145,000
		BIA Route 11A	1.68	$930,900
		BIA Route 11	2.6	$586,000
Los Coyotes	San Diego	BIA Route 41	0.15	$172,500
		Banning Rd.	0.25	$178,900
		BIA Route 42	5.3	$3,584,500
		BIA Route 46	0.65	$281,100
		BIA Route 42	4.4	$2,125,400
		BIA Route 45	4.1	$2,125,400
Mesa Grande	San Diego	Black Canyon Rd.	5	$4,010,500
		New Access Rd.	3.5	$2,436,000
Morongo	Riverside	Access Rd.	0.6	$306,500
		Sunset Ave/Mission	2.5	$1,196,000
		Idyllwild Rd.	0.6	$1,156,600
		& Potrero Canyon Rd.	9	$4,118,400
Pechanga	Riverside	Pechanga Rd.	0.43	$176,500
		Local Rd.	0.6	$950,000
Ramona	San Diego	Hog Lake Road		
		Hog Lake Truck Trail	6.35	$2,564,900
		Table Mt. Rd.		
Rincon	San Diego	North Calac Lane	0.95	$454,600
		BIA Rt. 338	0.27	$220,000
		BIA Rt. 339	0.1	$158,000
		West Rocky Rd.	0.33	$254,000
		North Eucalyptus Ln.	0.13	$125,000
		No Name Rd.	1.1	$594,000
		Sass Rd.	0.15	$165,000
		West Arviso Lane	0.3	$231,000
San Pasqual	San Diego	North Canal Road	0.35	$265,000
		Road 2-1669	1.3	$758,800
		Kewaak Way	1	$476,000
		Litton Lane	0.1	$147,000
		Oose Place	0.5	$795,400
Santa Rosa	Riverside	BIA Rt. 23	0.4	$521,000
		BIA Rt. 24	0.3	$255,000
		Santa Rosa Springs	13.5	$7,643,800
		Old Village Rd.	2.25	$1,064,000
		Sulpher Springs Rd.	0.5	$305,000
Santa Ynez	Santa Barbara	Sanja Cota Ave.	1.5	$593,700
Santa Ysabel	San Diego	BIA Rt. 52	2.1	$1,420,300
		BIA Rt. 49	3.5	$1,739,300
		Deming Ranch Rd.	0.8	$414,200
		BIA Rt. 6	0.2	$81,800
		Canyon Rd.	1.5	$786,400
Soboba	Riverside	Poppet Flats Rd.	1	$479,000
		Castle Canyon Rd.	0.5	$238,200
		New Road A	0.25	$119,500
		Soboba Rd.	0.6	$271,800
Torres-Martinez	San Diego	Johnson St.	1.5	$766,400
	Imperial	86th Ave	1.8	$624,800
		Monroe St.	0.65	$338,100
Viejas	San Diego	BIA Rts. 56, 59, 60	1	$476,000
		Cut-off Rd.	0.3	$142,800
			TOTAL:	$76,677,000
			GRAND TOTAL	$218,566,800

State Highways:
Interregional Improvements in Rural Areas

LIST 1

SENATE RESOLUTION 8
INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM
(NONURBANIZED)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

Dist	Co	Route	Post Mile	Improvement Description and Location	PROJECT NEED Near Term 1999-2009/10	Estimated * Project Cost ($M)
PROJECTS $10 MILLION OR GREATER						
01	HUM	101	0.0/5.6	2C to 4E/F, Richardson Grove Bypass	X	$250
01	HUM	101	79.8/85.8	4E to 4F, Close Freeway gap, Eureka - Arcata	X	$28
01	LAK	29	23.9/27.9	2C to 4E, West of Lower Lake	X	$15
01	LAK	53	1.4/3.5	4E to 4F, Clearlake	X	$11
01	MEN	101	8.8/14.0	2C to 4E/F, Hopland Bypass	X	$125
01	MEN	101	14.0/17.6	4C to 4E, North Hopland	X	$24
01	MEN	101	64.7/81.4	2C to 4E/F, Laytonville Bypass	X	$150
01	MEN	101	T91.2/100.3	2C to 4E/F, Leggett to Red Mountain Creek	X	$168
02	LAS	36	27.5/29.4	2C to 4E	X	$13
02	LAS	44	14.8/37.0	Passing Lanes, Multiple Locations	X	$20
02	LAS	395	51.9/70.1	Realign / Relinquish - Co Rd A3 / US 395 at Standisit - Buntingville	X	$10
02	SHA	44	3.8/7.7	2E to 4F	X	$30
02	TRI	299	11.1/30.0	Passing Lanes, Multiple Locations	X	$20
02	TRI	299	30.0/57.7	Passing Lanes, Multiple Locations	X	$20
02	TRI/ SHA	299 299	71.8/72.2 0.0/5.3	Realign/Widen	X	$67
03	BUT	70	10.3/13.0	2C to 4F	X	$25
03	NEV / PLA	49 49	0.0/2.2 11.2/ 11.4	2E to 4E with continuous center turn lane	X	$20
03	NEV	49	2.1/6.5	2C to 5C	X	$26
03	NEV	49	6.5/10.0	2C to 5C	X	$25
03	SAC	99	35.4/35.5	4F- Close Freeway gap, I/C at Elverta Road	X	$16
03	SUT	70	5.0/8.3	2E to 4E	X*	$46
03	SUT	99	0.9/1.0	4F- Close Freeway gap, I/C at Riego Road	X	$16
03	SUT / YUB	65 65		4E - Const. Third Bridge (connects urbanized area of Yuba City and Marysville). Continuation of SR 65; statutory description from I-80 in Placer County to SR 99 in Sutter County	X*	$205
03	YUB / BUT	70 70	R8.3/25.8 0.0/13.5	4E - Marysville Bypass / Butte County Freeway	X*	$444
04	MRN/ SON	101	22.8/27.6 0.0/3.2	4E to 6F	X	$195
04	SON	101	8.3/11.7	HOV lns fr Rte 116 W in Cotati to Old Redwood Hwy No of Petaluma	X	44
04	SCL	152	7.9/23.0	2C to 4E	X	$250
05	MON	101	R91.5/98.7	Prunedale Bypass	X*	$50
05	MON	101	98.4/101.3	4E to 6F	X	$50
05	MON	101	100.0/101.3	4E to 4F, Close Freeway gap - Const. San Juan I/C	X	$15
05	MON	156	1.5/5.4	Upgrade to full freeway	X	$60
05	MON	156	1.6/5.2	2C to 4E, Castroville to Prunedale	X*	$30
05	SBT	101	0.0/7.5	4E to 6F	X	$60
05	SBT	156	3.3/7.7	2C to 4E, San Juan Bautista to Hollister	X*	$27
05	SBT	156	R14.3/R18.4	2C to 4E to SCL Co Line	X	$25
05	SLO	41	43.8/50.4	Operational Imps.	X	$10
05	SLO	46	50.2/55.1	2C to 4E and Const SR 41 / SR 46 I/C (East)	X	$67
05	SLO	46	55.1/60.8	Operational Imps.	X	$10
05	SLO	101	0.08/0.49	4F to 6F, Widen Bridge at SB/SLO County Line	X	$45
05	SLO	101	11.0/24.7	Op Imps / Aux Lanes, City of Arroyo Grande to SLO City Limits	X	$20
06	FRE/ MAD	99	27.0/31.6 0.0/R1.0	4F to 6F	X	$24
06	KER	14	16.2/26.0	4C to 4E	X	$65

*** 98 STIP Program Partial Funding (PF) / amount shown is additional amount required for full construction**

SENATE RESOLUTION 8
INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM
(NONURBANIZED)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

Dist	Co	Route	Post Mile	Improvement Description and Location	PROJECT NEED Near Term 1999-2009/10	Estimated * Project Cost ($M)
PROJECTS $10 MILLION OR GREATER CONT'D						
06	KER	46	0.0/7.3	2C to 4E	X	$10
06	KER	46	7.3/20.5	2C to 4E	X	$36
06	KER	46	20.5/32.5	2C to 4E	X	$39
06	KER	58	T31.6/T41.1	Const. 4F / 6F - New Alignment	X	$175
06	KER	58	77.0/86.5	Auxiliary and truck climbing lanes	X	$14
06	KER	58	101.5/107.0	4E to 4F, Upgrade to freeway standards	X	$18
06	KER	58	118.0/127.6	4E to 4F, Close Freeway gap	X	$43
06	KER	395	0.0/7.0	2C to 4E, North of Johannesburg	X	$15
06	KER	395	15.2/23.0	2C to 4E	X	$16
06	KIN	41	37.2/40.0	2C to 4F with I/C	X	$20
06	KIN/TUL	198	21.5/28.0 0.0/3.3	2C to 4E	X*	$30
06	MAD	99	10.5/12.8	4F to 6F	X	$20
06	MAD	99	20.1/22.5	4E to 6F, Close Freeway gap	X*	$27
06	TUL	99	0.0/9.2	4F to 6F	X	$19
06	TUL	99	9.2/18.4	4F to 6F	X	$19
06	TUL	99	18.4/26.1	4F to 6F	X	$18
06	TUL	99	26.1/30.6	4F to 6F	X	$10
06	TUL	99	30.6/36.9	4F to 6F	X	$29
06	TUL/FRE	99	41.3/53.4 0.0/1.0	4F to 6F	X	$23
08	SBD	58	0.0/12.9	2C to 4E	X*	$83
08	SBD	58	5.4/5.5	SR 395 / SR 58 I/C	X	$33
08	SBD	58	22.4/33.1	2C to 4E	X*	$80
08	SBD	395	4.0/11.2	2C to 4E, I-15 to SR 18	X	$96
08	SBD	395	11.2/15.7	2C to 4E, SR 18 to Airbase Rd	X	$60
08	SBD	395	15.7/21.6	2C to 4E, Airbase Rd to Purple Sage	X	$66
08	SBD	395	21.6/26.9	2C to 4E, Purple Sage to Shadow Mtn	X	$36
08	SBD	395	26.9/30.6	2C to 4E, Shadow Mtn to Passing Ln	X	$25
08	SBD	395	30.6/34.0	2C to 4E, Passing Ln to Macon Rd	X	$23
08	SBD	395	34.0/37.8	2C to 4E, Macon Rd to Kramer Rd	X	$26
08	SBD	395	37.8/42.1	2C to 4E, Kramer Rd to Alcudia Rd	X	$29
08	SBD	395	42.1/48.5	2C to 4E, Alcudia Rd to Farmington Rd	X	$53
09	INY	395	30.8/36.4	2C to 4E, Olancha	X	$41
09	INY	395	36.4/41.6	2C to 4E, Cartago	X	$28
09	MNO	395	65.9/70.0	2C to 4C, North Conway	X	$24
09	MNO	395	116.9/120.1	Topaz High Point Relocation	X	$15
10	MER	99	0.0/4.6	4E to 6F, Close Freeway gap	X	$75
10	MER	99	4.6/11.0	4E to 6F, Close Freeway gap	X	$132
10	MER	99	21.6/25.2	4F to 6F through Atwater with I/C at Gianni-Schaffer	X	$34
10	MER	99	25.2/27.9	4F to 6F	X	$12
10	MER	99	27.9/32.3	4F to 6F	X	$23
10	MER	99	32.3/R36.4	4F to 6F	X	$24
10	MER	152	17.0/24.0	2E - New Alignment, Bypass/Los Banos	X*	$85
10	SJ	99	6.2/12.9	4F to 6F, Manteca to Stockton	X	$59
11	IMP	86	24.3/32.5	Const. 4E (Westmorland Bypass)	X	$30
11	IMP	111	R1.2/R7.7	4E to 6E	X	$35
11	SD	905	5.7/12.0	Const. 4E (Stage 1 of 6F)	X*	$27
11	SD	905	5.7/12.0	Const. 6F (Phase 2)	X	$109

*** 98 STIP Program Partial Funding (PF) / amount shown is additional amount required for full construction**

LIST 1

SENATE RESOLUTION 8
INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM
(NONURBANIZED)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

Dist	Co	Route	Post Mile	Improvement Description	PROJECT NEED	Estimated *
				and Location	Near Term	Project Cost
					1999-2009/10	($M)
TOTAL LIST 1: TEN MILLION OR GREATER						**$4,765**
PROJECTS UNDER $10 MILLION						
Dist	**Co**			**Number of Improvements**	**PROJECT NEED**	**Estimated ***
					Near Term	**Project Cost**
					1999-2009/10	**($M)**
01	LAK			1 Project	X	$1
02	MOD			1 Project	X	$2
02	SHA			1 Project	X	$7
02	TEH			2 Project	X	$4
02	TRI			2 Projects	X	$12
04	SCL			1 Project	X	$5
06	KER			3 Projects	X	$19
06	KIN			2 Projects	X	$7
09	MNO			1 Project	X	$9
TOTAL LIST 1: UINDER TEN MILLION						**$66**
SUMMARY						
TOTAL LIST 1: TEN MILLION OR GREATER						$4,765
TOTAL LIST 1: UNDER TEN MILLION						$66
TOTAL LIST 1: ALL PROJECTS						**$4,831**

*** 98 STIP Program Partial Funding (PF) / amount shown is additional amount required for full construction**

LIST 2

SENATE RESOLUTION 8
INTERREGIONAL STATE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS
OTHER HIGH EMPHASIS ROUTES - NON-URBANIZED PORTIONS ONLY
Projects to Complete to Route Concept or Minimum Facility Standard

Dist	Co	Route	Backpm	Aheadpm	Improvement Description and Location	PROJECT NEED Near Term 1999 - 2009/10	Estimated * Project Cost $(M)
PROJECTS $10 MILLION OR GREATER							
02	SHA	5	1.1	3.6	NB/SB Auxiliary Lanes	X	$16
02	SIS	5	R51.3	R57.8	Passing Lane	X	$10
02	TEH	5	28.2	42.1	Truck Climbing Lanes (3 projects)	X	$22
03	ED	50	16.4	18.3	Ops Improvements	X	$14
03	ED	50	20.8	R25.4	2E to 4F - Close Freeway Gap - Const. I/C	X	$12
03	YOL	5	5.3	6.0	Connect I-5/ SR 113 I/C Phase 2	X	$14
04	ALA	580	0.4	8.9	Truck Climbing Lns (Phase 1 & 2)	X	$30
04	SCL	17	0.0	6.1	Climbing lns and safety improvements fr Sta Cruz Co. Line to Los Gatos begin Fwy	X	$78
04	SCL	17	5.0	5.6	Upgrade conventional to expressway	X	$16
04	SCL	17	7.1	12.3	Widen Hwy 17 fr Los Gatos Jct Rte 9 W to Hamilton Ave IC	X	$69
04	SOL	80	30.9	40.7	Meridian Rd to Pedrick Rd-widen fr 6 to 8 lns	X*	$11
05	MON	1	T91.4	95.2	2C to 4E	X	$27
05	MON	1	T92.2	T92.3	Const. SR 1 / SR 183 I/C	X	$15
05	MON	1	95.2	98.4	2C to 4E	X	$23
05	MON	1	98.4	100.5	2C to 4E	X	$15
05	MON	1	T100.4	T100.5	Const. Salins Rd I/C	X	$15
06	KER	5	4.5	15.0	8F to 10F - Fr Tejon OC-SR 99/5 SEP	X	$71
06	KER	5	R15.0	19.6	4F to 6F - SR 99/5 SEP-SR 166/5 SEP	X	$18
06	KER	5	19.6	33.5	4F to 6F - SR 166/5 SEP-SR 223/5 SEP	X	$56
06	MAD	41	3.2	6.3	2E to 4F - AVE 12 - AVE 15	X	$23
07	LA	138	60.2	69.4	2C to 4C	X*	$46
08	RIV	10	0.0	6.7	6F to 8F - I/C	X	$206
08	RIV	10	6.7	13.9	8F to 10F	X	$28
08	RIV	10	13.9	25.2	8F to 10F	X	$44
08	RIV	10	32.7	33.6	Indian Ave I/C	X	$33
08	RIV	10	36.0	36.2	Palm Drive/Gene Autry Trail I/C	X	$33
08	RIV	10	39.4	39.5	Date Palm Drive I/C	X	$33
08	RIV	215	R10.4	R10.8	Los Alamos Rd I/C	X	$33
08	SBD	15	13.0	31.0	Const. HOV Lanes	X	$38
08	SBD	15	31.8	43.5	Rte 395 to SR-18N, Add 2HOV	X	$42
08	SBD	15	74.4	75.7	4F to 6F	X	$11
08	SBD	15	75.7	R84.6	4F to 6F	X	$35
08	SBD	15	R84.6	R96.4	4F to 6F	X	$46
08	SBD	15	R96.4	R111.6	4F to 6F	X	$59
08	SBD	15	R111.6	R124.2	4F to 6F	X	$49
08	SBD	15	R124.2	R136.6	4F to 6F	X	$48
08	SBD	15	R136.6	149.6	4F to 6F	X	$51
08	SBD	15	R138.0	156.4	Baker OC to Haloran Summit OC - SB Truck Descending Lane	X	$24
08	SBD	15	149.6	162.7	4F to 6F	X	$51
08	SBD	15	162.7	171.5	4F to 6F	X	$34
08	SBD	15	171.1	182.1	Bailey Road OC to YatesWell Rd OC - NB Truck Decending Lane	X	$24

***98 STIP Program Partial Funding (PF)/ amount shown is additional amount required for full construction**

LIST 2

SENATE RESOLUTION 8
INTERREGIONAL STATE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS
OTHER HIGH EMPHASIS ROUTES - NON-URBANIZED PORTIONS ONLY
Projects to Complete to Route Concept or Minimum Facility Standard

Dist	Co	Route	Backpm	Aheadpm	Improvement Description and Location	PROJECT NEED Near Term 1999 - 2009/10	Estimated * Project Cost $(M)
PROJECTS $10 MILLION OR GREATER CONT'D							
08	SBD	15	171.5	186.2	4F to 6F	X	$57
08	SBD	138	0.0	6.7	2C to 4C	X	$20
08	SBD	138	6.7	R15.2	2C to 4C	X	$34
10	SJ	5	13.8	15.6	Widen Bridge to 5 lanes Northbound Lane	X	$14
10	SJ	120	6.2	14.8	2-lane expressway on new alignment SR 99 to Sexton. Includes 99/120 I/C	X	$57
10	SJ	205	3.4	R13.4	4F to 6F	X*	$48
10	TUO	120	11.0	12.4	Realign and construct 108/120 I/C	X	$20
TOTAL LIST 2: TEN MILLION OR GREATER							$1,772
PROJECTS UNDER $10 MILLION							
Dist	**Co**				**Number of Improvements**	**PROJECT NEED Near Term 1999 - 2009/10**	**Estimated * Project Cost $(M)**
01	DN				1 Project	X	$6
02	MOD				1 Project	X*	$3
02	PLU				2 Projects	X	$8
02	SIS				1 Project	X	$3
02	TEH				2 Projects	X	$9
03	ED				2 Projects	X*	$3
03	YOL				2 Projects	X	$8
04	ALA				1 Project	X	$2
05	MON				1 Project	X	$7
06	MAD				6 Projects	X	$21
06	TUL				1 Project	X	$2
09	MNO				1 Project	X	$7
TOTAL LIST 2: UNDER TEN MILLION							$79
SUMMARY							
TOTAL LIST 2: TEN MILLION OR GREATER							$1,772
TOTAL LIST 2: UNDER TEN MILLION							$79
TOTAL LIST 2: ALL PROJECTS							**$1,851**

***98 STIP Program Partial Funding (PF)/ amount shown is additional amount required for full construction**

List 3

SENATE RESOLUTION 8
OTHER PRIORITY STATE HIGHWAY PROJECTS
NON-URBANIZED PORTIONS ONLY

Dist	Co	Route	Backpm	Aheadpm	Improvement Description and Location	PROJECT NEED Near Term 1999 - 2009/10	Estimated * Project Cost $(M)
PROJECTS $10 MILLION OR GREATER							
03	SAC	149			Cross-Link between I-5 & SR 99 (similar to SR 149, +/- 5 mi)	X	$51
05	SB	166	0.0	6.7	2C to 4E	X	$25
05	SBT	25	51.4	60.1	2C to 4E (continue to Rte 101 in SCl County)	X	$40
05	SLO	166	0.0	70.1	operational improvements	X	$15
06	TUL	65	6.9	17.7	2C-4E: AVE 56-SR 190/65 SEP	X	$49
08	RIV	74	11.8	16.1	Grand Ave to 10th St, Add 2MF	X	$15
08	RIV	74	17.3	27.5	I-15 to I-215, Add 2MF	X	$37
08	RIV	79	0.0	16.0	San Diego Co Ln to Butt Stage Rd, Add 2MF	X	$58
08	RIV	79	R2.3	R19.2	N Jct I-15 to W. Jct SR-74, Add 2MF	X	$122
08	RIV	79	25.7	29.9	E Jct SR-74 to Ramona Expressway, Add 2MF	X	$15
08	SBD	30	R20.6	25.8	I-215/SR-30 (FWY to FWY)	X	$130
10	AMA	88	2.5	5.5	From .5 mile east of Ashlet Lane to Rte 104, widen with passing lanes (Por.)	X	$10
10	AMA	88	28.4	42.9	0.8 mile W/O Pioneer Station to 1.2 Mile E/O Cooks Sta. (Por), passing lanes	X	$11
10	CAL	4	R10.3	R13.7	Ferry Rd, construct 2 lane expressway on new alignment (Phase 1)	X	$17
10	CAL	4	R13.7	R16.4	W/O Altaville, 5.5 miles E/O Byrnes Ferry Rd to 2.0 milesW/O North Jct Rte 49, construct 2 lane expressway on new alignment (Phase 2)	X	$14
10	SJ	12	0.0	10.2	Full widening to 4 lanes from Mokelumne River Bridge to I-5 Interchange including 2nd span bridge at Potato Slough	X	$60
10	STA	132	5.7	12.3	4E on new alignment - Gates Rd to Dakota	X	$27
10	TUO	108	R4.0	R6.0	East Sonora Bypass Stage II, Standard to Via Este	X	$37
10	TUO	108	R6.0	6.9	East Sonora Bypass Stage III, Via Este to Sunshine	X	$14
11	IMP	98	34.5	39.6	2C to 4C	X	$17
11	IMP	186	0.0	2.1	2C to 4C	X	$20
11	SD	11	0.0	2.7	Acquire right of way	X	$30
11	SD	11	0.0	2.7	Const. 4F		$110
11	SD	76	12.0	R17.6	2C to 4C	X	$78
12	ORA	74	8.0	13.0	Const. shoulder & widen lane	X	$15
TOTAL LIST 3: TEN MILLION OR GREATER							$1,017

*** 98 STIP Program Partial Funding (PF) / amount shown is additional amount required for full construction**

List 3

SENATE RESOLUTION 8
OTHER PRIORITY STATE HIGHWAY PROJECTS
NON-URBANIZED PORTIONS ONLY

Dist	Co	Route	Backpm	Aheadpm	Improvement Description and Location	PROJECT NEED Near Term 1999 - 2009/10	Estimated * Project Cost $(M)
PROJECTS UNDER $10 MILLION							
Dist	**Co**				**Number of Improvements**	**PROJECT NEED Near Term 1999 - 2009/10**	**Estimated Project Cost $(M)**
02	MOD				1 Project	X	$2
02	PLU				1 Project	X	$1
02	TEH				1 Project	X	$3
06	TUL				1 Project	X	$3
10	AMA				1 Project	X	$4
10	MPA				1 Project	X	$6
10	SJ				4 Projects	X	$12
10	SJ/STA				1 Project	X	$13
TOTAL LIST 3: UNDER TEN MILLION							$44
SUMMARY							
TOTAL LIST 3: TEN MILLION OR GREATER							$1,017
TOTAL LIST 3: UNDER TEN MILLION							$44
TOTAL LIST 3: ALL PROJECTS							**$1,061**

*** 98 STIP Program Partial Funding (PF) / amount shown is additional amount required for full construction**

State Highways:

Bridge and Highway Rehabilitation
Safety Improvements
Recurrent Problems
Operational Improvements

SR8 SHOPP
10-Year Needs Assessment
($ in millions)

County	Roadway Rehabilitation	Long-Life Pavement	Bridge Rehabilitation	Roadside Rehabilitation	Lands & Buildings	Safety	Recurrent Problems	Operational Improvements	Truck Weigh Stations	SHOPP Total Need
Alameda	$ 92.4	$ 373.7	$ 235.8	$ 5.1	$ 27.9	$ 37.4	$ 25.4	$ 91.3	$ 26.8	$ 915.8
Alpine	$ 6.5	$ -	$ 1.0	$ -	$ -	$ 3.1	$ 3.0	$ 3.1	$ -	$ 16.7
Amador	$ 24.4	$ -	$ 4.4	$ -	$ 4.6	$ 15.9	$ 9.4	$ 9.2	$ -	$ 67.9
Butte	$ 20.4	$ -	$ 28.9	$ 4.7	$ -	$ 26.2	$ 239.2	$ 23.1	$ -	$ 342.5
Calaveras	$ 21.1	$ -	$ 2.9	$ -	$ 4.3	$ 16.1	$ 9.0	$ 16.7	$ 0.1	$ 70.2
Colusa	$ 18.9	$ -	$ 2.1	$ 3.4	$ -	$ 7.0	$ 5.0	$ 1.4	$ -	$ 37.8
Contra Costa	$ 29.6	$ 175.2	$ 57.4	$ 6.7	$ 9.0	$ 18.8	$ 17.1	$ 72.6	$ 0.5	$ 386.9
Del Norte	$ 5.8	$ -	$ 9.5	$ -	$ 3.0	$ 8.9	$ 9.6	$ 59.2	$ -	$ 96.0
El Dorado	$ 36.1	$ -	$ 5.1	$ 5.3	$ 6.2	$ 24.0	$ 8.9	$ 21.9	$ 0.3	$ 107.8
Fresno	$ 87.5	$ -	$ 22.7	$ 17.4	$ 3.0	$ 45.9	$ 87.2	$ 29.9	$ -	$ 293.6
Glenn	$ 37.5	$ -	$ 23.9	$ 3.2	$ -	$ 4.9	$ 7.9	$ 1.1	$ -	$ 78.5
Humboldt	$ 27.4	$ -	$ 181.7	$ -	$ 11.6	$ 16.9	$ 63.5	$ 32.4	$ 0.5	$ 334.0
Imperial	$ 19.3	$ -	$ 15.5	$ 1.2	$ 10.0	$ 34.2	$ 11.7	$ 64.5	$ 14.3	$ 170.7
Inyo	$ 25.3	$ -	$ 1.3	$ 2.0	$ 1.4	$ 25.2	$ 9.8	$ 15.1	$ -	$ 80.1
Kern	$ 179.3	$ 14.7	$ 41.3	$ 16.3	$ 5.0	$ 72.0	$ 336.8	$ 27.7	$ 1.6	$ 694.7
Kings	$ 26.5	$ -	$ 5.9	$ 3.1	$ -	$ 16.9	$ 9.0	$ 14.1	$ -	$ 75.5
Lake	$ 6.5	$ -	$ 8.1	$ -	$ -	$ 17.5	$ 8.9	$ 12.1	$ -	$ 53.1
Lassen	$ 41.4	$ -	$ 2.3	$ 2.4	$ 4.5	$ 18.7	$ 97.2	$ 4.4	$ -	$ 170.9
Los Angeles	$ 756.1	$ 2,210.3	$ 976.4	$ 57.1	$ 14.2	$ 184.5	$ 1,148.5	$ 574.2	$ 15.1	$ 5,936.4
Madera	$ 30.8	$ -	$ 14.3	$ 4.1	$ -	$ 25.8	$ 3.0	$ 10.5	$ -	$ 88.5
Marin	$ 35.4	$ 78.2	$ 81.8	$ 3.4	$ -	$ 23.2	$ 34.3	$ 19.0	$ 0.5	$ 275.8
Mariposa	$ 9.6	$ -	$ 3.8	$ -	$ -	$ 7.6	$ 3.0	$ 2.7	$ -	$ 26.7
Mendocino	$ 71.0	$ -	$ 53.1	$ -	$ 10.9	$ 34.6	$ 205.8	$ 32.2	$ 0.5	$ 408.1
Merced	$ 37.3	$ -	$ 45.3	$ 2.1	$ -	$ 49.1	$ 4.5	$ 35.6	$ 4.9	$ 178.8
Modoc	$ 45.1	$ -	$ 1.3	$ -	$ 2.7	$ 5.9	$ 11.0	$ 0.5	$ -	$ 66.5
Mono	$ 30.1	$ -	$ 0.8	$ 1.0	$ 8.0	$ 16.1	$ 15.7	$ 44.2	$ -	$ 115.9
Monterey	$ 50.6	$ -	$ 17.6	$ 17.3	$ -	$ 47.7	$ 30.2	$ 15.8	$ -	$ 179.2
Napa	$ 23.0	$ -	$ 36.2	$ 0.7	$ 2.6	$ 24.3	$ 3.0	$ 1.0	$ -	$ 90.8
Nevada	$ 33.0	$ -	$ 22.2	$ 3.8	$ 21.5	$ 19.5	$ 5.2	$ 12.6	$ 1.0	$ 118.8
Orange	$ 89.2	$ 763.0	$ 26.4	$ 63.0	$ 3.2	$ 35.9	$ 82.5	$ 198.2	$ 0.5	$ 1,261.9
Placer	$ 34.4	$ -	$ 13.5	$ 5.9	$ 8.6	$ 30.3	$ 3.3	$ 22.5	$ -	$ 118.5
Plumas	$ 13.0	$ -	$ 30.8	$ 2.7	$ 6.8	$ 11.9	$ 487.9	$ 8.6	$ 0.3	$ 562.0
Riverside	$ 226.5	$ 162.3	$ 19.9	$ 49.2	$ 1.6	$ 86.3	$ 3.0	$ 95.8	$ 13.0	$ 657.6
Sacramento	$ 38.8	$ 179.4	$ 62.3	$ 14.8	$ 7.7	$ 53.7	$ 3.0	$ 97.4	$ 0.5	$ 457.6
San Benito	$ 7.2	$ -	$ 4.2	$ -	$ -	$ 11.7	$ 3.0	$ 5.5	$ -	$ 31.6
San Bernardino	$ 287.7	$ 283.4	$ 77.6	$ 50.7	$ 4.0	$ 125.4	$ 14.1	$ 114.0	$ 34.3	$ 991.2
San Diego	$ 94.8	$ 796.0	$ 89.5	$ 53.0	$ -	$ 71.2	$ 15.8	$ 720.5	$ 3.5	$ 1,844.3
San Francisco	$ 14.7	$ 68.1	$ 250.7	$ -	$ -	$ 10.7	$ 3.0	$ 60.3	$ -	$ 407.5
San Joaquin	$ 67.0	$ 44.7	$ 65.9	$ 9.4	$ 4.9	$ 36.8	$ 3.0	$ 78.1	$ -	$ 309.8
San Luis Obispo	$ 42.8	$ -	$ 45.9	$ 10.3	$ 4.9	$ 42.7	$ 5.4	$ 21.9	$ -	$ 173.9
San Mateo	$ 53.3	$ 206.0	$ 69.7	$ 4.6	$ -	$ 41.9	$ 322.2	$ 19.3	$ -	$ 717.0
Santa Barbara	$ 50.1	$ -	$ 38.0	$ 11.4	$ -	$ 53.3	$ 3.4	$ 25.1	$ -	$ 181.3
Santa Clara	$ 66.2	$ -	$ 28.9	$ 9.6	$ 6.0	$ 71.1	$ 7.5	$ 33.3	$ 2.0	$ 224.6
Santa Cruz	$ 23.5	$ -	$ 6.6	$ -	$ 0.9	$ 20.7	$ 5.6	$ 13.6	$ -	$ 70.9
Shasta	$ 71.1	$ -	$ 29.7	$ 3.9	$ 6.5	$ 20.1	$ 216.0	$ 32.9	$ 0.3	$ 380.5
Sierra	$ 5.6	$ -	$ 1.0	$ 0.1	$ 1.2	$ 3.4	$ 20.7	$ -	$ -	$ 32.0
Siskiyou	$ 28.9	$ -	$ 22.9	$ 3.6	$ 6.0	$ 13.2	$ 258.6	$ 6.9	$ 1.1	$ 341.2
Solano	$ 66.8	$ 38.8	$ 33.1	$ 4.6	$ 2.8	$ 28.2	$ 10.5	$ 33.0	$ 14.8	$ 232.6
Sonoma	$ 61.4	$ -	$ 25.0	$ 4.6	$ 0.9	$ 40.1	$ 112.8	$ 29.0	$ -	$ 273.8
Stanislaus	$ 44.3	$ 12.5	$ 7.8	$ 5.6	$ -	$ 26.8	$ 8.5	$ 15.7	$ -	$ 121.2
Sutter	$ 1.6	$ -	$ 16.9	$ 2.4	$ -	$ 18.6	$ 5.0	$ 1.8	$ -	$ 46.3
Tehama	$ 33.0	$ -	$ 31.1	$ 4.3	$ 4.1	$ 10.4	$ 27.5	$ 13.1	$ 1.4	$ 124.9
Trinity	$ 5.4	$ -	$ 5.9	$ -	$ 4.7	$ 8.0	$ 211.9	$ 1.0	$ -	$ 236.9
Tulare	$ 66.1	$ -	$ 13.9	$ 8.0	$ 6.7	$ 29.9	$ 9.0	$ 4.5	$ -	$ 138.1
Tuolumne	$ 14.2	$ -	$ 4.0	$ 12.0	$ 0.5	$ 18.2	$ 3.0	$ 3.1	$ 0.3	$ 55.3
Ventura	$ 81.1	$ 48.5	$ 44.1	$ -	$ 2.9	$ 35.1	$ 61.2	$ 143.6	$ 1.6	$ 418.1
Yolo	$ 31.5	$ -	$ 31.9	$ 2.2	$ -	$ 12.4	$ 14.1	$ 3.8	$ -	$ 95.9
Yuba	$ 5.0	$ -	$ 30.7	$ 0.6	$ 6.3	$ 9.2	$ 3.0	$ 5.3	$ -	$ 60.1
Total Need	**$ 3,453.1**	**$ 5,454.8**	**$ 3,030.5**	**$ 496.8**	**$ 241.6**	**$ 1,825.1**	**$ 4,347.3**	**$ 3,055.9**	**$ 139.7**	**$ 22,044.8**
10-Yr. SHOPP Pla	$ 3,299.0	$ 1,051.0	$ 2,167.0	$ 410.0	$ 446.0	$ 659.0	$ -	$ 442.0	$ -	$ 8,474.0
Net Difference	**$ 154.1**	**$ 4,403.8**	**$ 863.5**	**$ 86.8**	**$ (204.4)**	**$ 1,166.1**	**$ 4,347.3**	**$ 2,613.9**	**$ 139.7**	**$ 13,570.8**

Airports:
Ground Access Improvements

AIRPORT GROUND ACCESS PROJECTS

AIRPORT	COST	YEAR
Byron		
Purchase land between Armstrong Road & Vasco Road	$1,000,000	2005
Construct/Overlay Armstrong Road to Vasco Road	$1,000,000	2006
Chiriaco Summit		
Pave access Road	$30,000	2002
Colusa County		
New Access Road from SR20 to Terminal Area	$425,000	2004
Corcoran		
Parking Lot	$50,000	2000
Desert Center		
Entrance road new 5,000 ft paving and easement	$400,000	2002
Firebaugh		
Access Street Construction	$190,000	2001
French Valley		
Slurry seal & restripe entrance rd & service rd, restripe parking	$17,000	2001
Pave north entry road	$350,000	2002
Fresno Yosemite International		
Airline Terminal Gateway Frontage Road Realignment	$5,000,000	
Aircorp Way Improvements	$2,000,000	
Airways Blvd. Improvements	$1,000,000	
On-going Infrastructure Improvements of existing airport roadways	$3,000,000	
Gillespie Field		
Widen Bradley Avenue Bridge over Hwy 67		
Route 52 extension to Hwy 67		
Hemet-Ryan		
Slurry seal, stripe: entrance road Waldon-Weaver	$6,500	2001
Rebuild parking south side hangars	$220,000	2001
Construct Whittier entrance road	$620,000	2002
Jack McNamara Field		
Construct T-hangar, TW and site development Phase I	$20,000	2000
Overlay access road	$100,000	2004
Construct T-hangar, TW and site development Phase II	$87,000	2005
Lake Tahoe		
Handicapped Access Ramp	$25,000	
On airport Return Roadway	$90,000	
Remote Parking Lot #1	$75,000	
Parking Structure	$750,000	
Covered Terminal Roadway/Transit Access	$500,000	
Remote Parking Lot #2	$75,000	

AIRPORT GROUND ACCESS PROJECTS

AIRPORT	COST	YEAR
Livermore Municipal		
Construct airport southside access road	$2,000,000	2002
Los Angeles International		
Arbor Vitae Street Widening	$4,000,000	2001
Sepulveda Blvd Tunnel Improvements	$3,000,000	2001
FlyAway Bus Terminal Expansion	$15,100,000	2001
La Tijera Blvd Widening at I-405	$3,000,000	2002
ATCS-LAX/Airport Area	$3,350,000	2002
Pershing Drive/World Way West	$193,000,000	2003
Sepulveda Blvd./North Tunnel	$109,000,000	2003
Sepulveda Blvd./Westchester Parkway Interchange	$96,000,000	2003
Lincoln Blvd./Westchester Parkway Interchange	$45,000,000	2003
I-105/Imperial Highway Extension	$70,000,000	2003
I-405/I105 HOV Connectors	$70,000,000	2003
New Remote "Flyaway" Terminals	$200,000,000	2005
I-405 Airport Connector Road	$250,000,000	2007
Arbor Vitae Major Highway I405 to Westchester Parkway	$265,000,000	2008
Aviation Blvd. Widening	$300,000,000	2008
MTA Green Line Extension	$575,000,000	2008
Airport People Mover	$150,000,000	2008
Los Banos Municipal		
Airport Road access improvements	$50,000	2000
Marina Municipal		
Construct North Perimeter Aviation Access Road	$1,000,000	2011
McClellan-Palomar		
Palomar Airport Road (City of Carlsbad)	$550,000	1999
Melrose Drive (City of Vista)	$4,500,000	1999
Melrose Drive (City of Carlsbad)	$4,500,000	2001
El Camino Real (City of Carlsbad)	$2,000,000	2004
Meadows Field		
New terminal access road and controls	$1,000,000	2004
Metropolitan Oakland International		
Construct road to parking garage	$3,305,000	2000
Construct 2 level roadway	$23,796,000	2000
Construct airport drive up roads	$17,248,000	2001
Construct John Glenn Dr. Service road	$6,000,000	2001
realign N. Armstrong & Edward white way	$6,650,000	2001
BART connector to the airport	$130,000,000	2004
Monterey Peninsula		
Terminal Road and storm drain improvements	$2,663,000	1999

AIRPORT GROUND ACCESS PROJECTS

AIRPORT	COST	YEAR
Napa County		
Fagan Bridge - Airport Access	$740,000	2000
Nevada County Airport		
Pave 500' of east entrance road	$15,000	2000
Overlay 500' pf west entrance road	$10,000	2000
Oceano County		
Fixed Route Transit access to airport	$5,000	1998
Analysis & implementation of redirecting primary access road	$25,000	1999
Ontario International		
Airport Drive-West End Improvements	$12,200,000	1999
Grove Ave Grade Separation	$14,900,000	1999
Oxnard		
Realign access road in front of terminal	$250,000	
Improve access road from Victoria Ave	$150,000	
Pave security perimeter road	$1,750,000	
Improve access road from Ventura Blvd	$150,000	
Palmdale Regional		
SR 14 Airport Access Lanes	$150,000,000	2008
Paso Robles Municipal		
Accel. Lane of Hwy 46 (WB) @ Airport Road	$400,000	2000
Accel. Lane of Hwy 46 (EB) @ Airport Road	$200,000	2000
Right turn lane on Airport @ Hwy 46	$75,000	2000
Intersection reconfiguration Airport Rd/Dry Creek	$100,000	2000
Petaluma Municipal		
Entrance land protection	$80,000	2001
Placerville		
East end Access Road, Phase I	$302,657	2002
Rio Vista		
Widen Airport Road entrance to airport	$100,000	2000
Salinas Municipal		
Airport access road improvement from Airport Blvd to Terminal Bldg	$350,000	2000
San Diego International		
Under study	$160,000,000	
San Jose International		
Highway 101/Trimble Interchange	$10,000,000	
Interstate 880/Coleman Interchange	$20,000,000	
Miscellaneous Improvements	$1,000,000	

AIRPORT GROUND ACCESS PROJECTS

AIRPORT	COST	YEAR
San Luis Obispo County - McChesney Field		
Fixed Route Transit Service	$10,000	1999
Buckley Road Intersection Reconfiguration	$1,000,000	1999
Aero Drive traffic signal	$200,000	2005
Tank Farm/Santa Fe interchange reconfiguration	$500,000	2005
Santa Maria Public		
Extend access road from Blosser Road west (1400 feet)	$450,000	2000
Stockton Metropolitan		
Arch Road/State Route 99 Interchange - Phase I	$22,000,000	2000
Arch Road/State Route 99 Interchange - Phase II	$7,000,000	2005
Arch Sperry Road	$34,530,000	2006
Tehachapi Municipal Airport		
Construct Road from Dennison Road to north side of airport		
Thermal		
Grade and pave service road	$20,000	2000
Overlay grade boundaries, service roads	$180,000	2001
Slurry seal entry road and parking	$10,000	2002
Slurry seal parking lot and entrance road	$4,000	2002
Widen entry road	$400,000	2003
Truckee-Tahoe		
Soaring Way	$961,000	2000
Airport Road	$500,000	2000
Ukiah Municipal - Mendocino County		
Reconstruct airport entrance & parking entrance	$120,000	2001
Construct ground transport facility at airport	$55,000	2001
Sacramento Area Council of Governments		
Comstruct corporate area access road	$150,000	2000
Construct new airport main entrance from new highway off-ramp		2006

Seaports:
Ground Access Improvements

SEAPORT GROUND ACCESS PROJECTS

PORT OF LONG BEACH	Cost ($Millions)
Port Project	
Terminal Island Fwy (SR 47)/Ocean Bl. Interchange	$ 22.00
Navy Way/Seaside Av. Interchange - Mole Landfill Access, and construct double mainline tracts to connect Alameda Corridor with Mole Landfill	$ 50.00
Port Area National Highway System Improvements Harbor Av./9th St. realignment, Pier B St. widening, Pier B St. Railyard overpass, Anaheim St. widen from 4 to 6 lanes between I-710 & 9th St.	$ 35.00
Widen Harbor Scenic Dr. - Widen NB from Pico Av. & Ocean Bl.	$ 2.00
Alameda Corridor Terminus - Expand Pier B St. Railyard including centralized Train Control for Port areas.	$ 77.00
Terminal Island Fwy/Pier B St. Northbound On-ramp	$ 1.00
Port Area ITS/Commercial Vehicle Operations - Grade Crossing Advance Warning System and ATIS with closed circuit television and changeable message signs adjacent to Port gates.	$ 7.00
STATE HIGHWAY PROJECTS	
I-710 Fwy Corridor Improvements - Ocean Bv. to I-10	$ 455.00
Vincent Thomas Bridge Toll Booth Removal	
Pacific Coast Highway (SR 1) - Widen, Terminal Island Fwy to I-710	
PCH/Alameda Corridor Grade Separation - Cost increase	$ 20.00
PORT OF LOS ANGELES	
PORT Projects	
Pier 400 Transportation Corridor - 4-lane highway to new Pier 400 facilities and double tracked rail connection to the Alameda Corridor	$ 45.00
Rail Grade Separation at Neptune Avenue and Harry Bridges Blv.	$ 10.10
Manual Rail Yard - new common user rail yard with direct service to both Ports, locomotive service area and support functions.	$ 9.00
Pier 400 Intermodal Rail Facility - 4 unit train capacity loading tracks (100 Double Stack Cars), 128 Double Stack storage yard.	$ 28.50
Realign Front Street	$ 15.00
STATE HIGHWAY PROJECTS	
PCH/Alameda Corridor Grade Separation (SR1) (under Long Beach)	
Elimination of Vincent Thomas Bridge Toll Plaza (SR 47)	
Terminal Island Freeway (SR 47)/Ocean Blvd. Interchange	$ 22.00
I-710 Freeway Corridor Improvements (under Long Beach)	
PORT OF OAKLAND	
PORT PROJECTS	
Joint Intermodal Terminal - Construct intermodal container transfer facility and surface access improvements.	$ 80.00

SEAPORT GROUND ACCESS PROJECTS

PORT OF SACRAMENTO	
PORT PROJECTS	
Rail Bridge Project - from the Port's easterly storage across the barge canal into the Southport Industrial Area where rail served industries will be located	$ 4.50
PORT OF SAN DIEGO	
PORT PROJECTS	
Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal Interstate on/off ramp access and road improvements	$ 25.00
National City Marine Terminal Interstate on/off ramp access and road improvements	$ 25.00
Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal Overhead ramp access from Harbor Drive	$ 20.00
Rail terminal access Tenth Avenue & National City Marine Terminals	$ 20.00
PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO	
PORT PROJECTS	
Illinois Street Rail Bridge and Amador Street Improvements - rail and truck bridge over Islais Creek and improvements to Amador Street to enable trains and trucks to efficiently traverse between Piers 94-96 terminals.	$ 5.00
Cargo Terminal Improvements - higher capacity gates, crane upgrades to accommodate taller vessels and heavier containers, terminal yard lighting and resurfacing.	$ 31.00
Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal - expansion of additional ferry berths adjacent to the Ferry Building, improved public access, breakwater, weather protection for commuters, hovercraft service via satellite terminals.	$ 30.00
Water Taxi Facilities - provide waterborne access between waterfront developments such as the Pacific Bell ballpark, Fisherman's Wharf, the planned James Herman Cruise Terminal, and Mission Bay. Potential dock locations are Pier 30-32, 16th Street, and the Northeast waterfront.	$ 10.50
Pacific Bell Ballpark Ferry - construct a two float ferry adjacent to Pacific Bell Ballpark and eventual addition of a third float to allow docking for three vessels.	$ 2.00
Fisherman's Wharf Ferry Terminal - concentrate ferry operations in central area in the heart of the Wharf, improve circulation, ticketing and queuing space for ferry passengers, acquisition of long-term leases from parking operators for development of public access improvements.	$ 3.00
PORT OF STOCKTON	
PORT PROJECTS	
Washington Street - improve to three lanes from Fresno Ave. to the San Joaquin River (1.4 miles).	$ 8.00

Short Line Railroads

Rail-Ways, Inc.
4 West Second Street, Eureka, California 707.444.8029 Fax. 707.441.1324

VIA FACSIMILE AND U. S. MAIL

Mr. Richard Nordahl,
California Department of Transportation
1120 N Street
Sacramento, California 95814

5 April, 1999

Re: Short Line Railroad Needs Assessment

Dear Mr. Nordahl:

Continuing our telephone conversation of Friday, last, following are our thoughts regarding particular needs of California short line railroads over the next 10 years. As you might imagine the focus is on the special needs associated with the unique geology of Northern California and with the deferred maintenance inherited by many short lines that were acquired from the Class I railroads. All of the following are contemplated for distant future years of the NWP within the planning processes of Rail-Ways, Inc. and the NCRA. Acceleration of the program would, however, materially reduce the associated interim costs to the NWP and substantially improve the reliability of the Northern California's transportation infrastructure.

1. **Infrastructure Support:**

   a. **The NWP needs approximately $2.5 million per year for the next five years to repair its capacity and restore its ability to deal effectively with the geologic instabilities of the Eel River canyon and the tidal marshes of Sonoma and Napa Counties. This includes replacement of drainage facilities and retaining structures and acquisition of specialized excavation and transportation equipment needed to handle slipped and/or sinking soils economically. Total: $ 12.5 million**

   b. **Revolving Contingency Reserve Fund to finance immediate repairs to storm damage incurred in State or federally, declared disasters pending recovery of funds from other agencies, if any, to be convertible to grants if all administrative reimbursement efforts and appeals should ultimately fail.**

      Total: $ 25.0 million

   c. **Funding for purchase of private catastrophic flood and earthquake insurance. $ 15.0 million**

   Total Infrastructure Support: $ 52.5 million

2. Deferred Maintenance:

a.	**Acceleration of Highway Grade Crossing Replacement:**		
	i.)	**Grade crossing signals:**	**$ 6.3 million**
b.	**Bridge Replacement:**		
	i.)	**Small bridges:**	**$ 7.5 million**
	ii.)	**Major movable bridges at Black Point and Petaluma (in form of matching funds for Truman-Hobbs funding):**	**$ 5.0 million**
c.	**Track Rehabilitation (for replacement of crossties and ballast *if* SMART commuter rail program is not funded within next five years):**		**$ 28.8 million**
d.	**Installation of Defect Detection Signals:**		**$ 1.0 million**
e.	**Communications modernization:**		**$ 0.7 million**
	Total Deferred Maintenance		**$ 49.3 million**

Related highway projects, such as grade separation projects, are not included as probably being outside the intended scope of the present request.

The foregoing are, obviously, only estimates – and some estimates are better than others. However, each of the above items can, if and when needed, be better defined and more reliable estimates developed. Please advise if further assistance is required.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Darling
President

cc: Mr. Allan Hemphill, Chairman, NCRA
Ms. Mary Hiatt, Executive Secretary, MCOG

STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS INVENTORY
SAN DIEGO REGION PROJECT LIST
(Costs in Millions of 1999 Dollars)

No.	Project Description	Length (Miles)	Source/ Benefit	FY 2000-FY 2010	FY 2011 - FY 2020
46	I-805: SR52 to I-5(N). Add 2-HOV Lanes	8.0	RTP/CR	-	$50
47	SR905: I-805 to Otay Mesa Border Crossing. 4E:6F	6.6	RTP/CR	-	$310
48	I-5: Various Locations. Auxiliary Lanes	-	Caltrans/CR	$50	$30
49	I-8: Various Locations. Auxiliary Lanes	-	Caltrans/CR	$30	$30.
50	I-15: Various Locations. Auxiliary Lanes	-	Caltrans/CR	$60	540
51	I-805: Various Locations. Auxiliary Lanes	-	Caltrans/CR	$30	$30
52	Various Locations. Interchange Improvements (Incl. SR67@Bradley Ave. & Other Fwy/Fwy & Local IC$)	-	Caltrans/CR	$1.00	$200
53	S.D. Centre City, Downtown Access Improvements	-	Caltrans/ED	$20	$100
54	SD. International Airport, Access improvements	-	Caltrans/ED	$100	-
55	SD. Bay, Port Access Improvements	-	Caltrans/ED	$50	-
56	I-5 @ San Ysidro, Port of Entry Improvements	-	Caltrans/ED	$30	-
57	Various Locations. Environmental Banking	-	Caltrans/EM	$10	-
58	Various Locations. Landscaping Enhancements	-	Caltrans/EM	-	$10
59	Various Locations. Clean Water Improvements		Caltrans/EM	$75	$75
60	SHOPP: Safety Projects	-	Caltrans/CR	$130	$170
61	SHOPP: Rehabilitation Projects	-	Caltrans/CR	$280	$365
62	SHOPP: Operational Projects	-	CaltransICR	$615	$515
63	SHOPP: Landscape Projects	-	Caltrans/EM	$76	$90
64	SHOPP: Lands & Buildings	-	Cattrans/ED	$50	$65
**	Subtotal: State Highway Projects			$3,406	$4,795
*	MTDB TRANSIT/RAILROAD PROJECTS				
65	Mission. Valley East LRT	-	RTP/CR	$372	-
66	Mid Coast LRT (to -Balboa)	--	RTP/CR	$103	
67	Mid Coast LRT (Balboa to l-805)	-	RTP/CR	-	$341
68	North Bay/Beach Guideway	-	MTDB/CR	-	$169
69	Otay Ranch LRT	-	RTP/CR	-	$349
70	Mira Mesa/Poway LRT	-	RTP/CR	-	$234
71	l-1 5 Guideway	-	RTP/ICR		$525
72	Airport/Point .Loma Guideway.	-	RTP/CR	$120	
73	Otay Mesa LRT	-	RTP/CR	-	$221
74	12th Avenue LRT Improvements	-	MTDB/CR	$18	-
75	LRT Vehicle Replacement/Rehabilitation	-	RTP/CR	$65	$65
76	I-l 5 Bus Rapid Transit	--	RTP/CR	$100	-
77	SR15 Mid-Cities Bus	-	RTP/CR	$3	-
78	Transit Centers	-	RTP/CR	$11	-
79	East County Bus Operations Center	-	MTDB/CR	$8	
80	Bus Replacement/Expansion	-	RTP/CR	$198	$241
81	Paratransit	-	RTP/CR	$6	$13
82	Intelligent Transportation Systems	-	RTP/CR	$35	$8
	SDTC, Bus Parking (Imperial Ave. Division)	-	MTDB/CR	$3	-
84	SDUAE Raikay	-	RTP/ED	$28	$88
**	Subtotal: MTDB Projects			$1,070	$2,254

Burton/Kamette Inventory Checklist
B. High-Priority Projects:
Congestion Relief, Economic Support, Environmental Benefit

Reporting Agency	Category	Source	$ Cost (a)	Benefit
San Joaquin Valley Railroad	Repair/Rehab/Upbrade (b)	Fresno RTP 40% (c) Tulare RTP 40% (c) Kings RTP 10% (c)	$16.57 M	Congestion Relief Economic Development Environmental Enhancement (See attached narrative)

Footnotes:
(a) constant dollars- FY 1999, estimates 5% year inflation rate to increase cost to $22.2 M in year 2005
(b) rejuvenate railroad from Fresno to Exeter and Exeter to Huron (total distance of project- 109 miles)crosses a
(c) crosses and 3 county jurisdicrtions

Adddional Narrative Attached

McCloud Railway Company

April 5, 1999

Mr. Thomas Messer
Department of Transportation
Freight Planning Branch
1120 N. Street PO Box 942874
Sacramento, CA 94274-001

Dear Mr. Messer:

In response to your letter dated 03/30/99, regarding Senate Resolution 8 (SR 8) we have twelve projects of rehabilitation to be scheduled in the next 10 years. None of these projects are considered "high priority".

The estimated cost of these projects will total approximately $6.2 million, of which approximately $3.6 million (7 projects) will be in Siskiyou county and approximately $2.6 million (5 projects) in Shasta County. We predict we will be able to fund between $2.1 million and $2.5 million internally for these rehabilitation projects. The balance of approximately $3.7 million would be considered unfunded infrastructure need.

Sincerely,

Jeff E. Forbis,
President

Cc: Ms. Kay Bryan, Chair
Siskiyou County Transportation Commission
305 Butte St.
Yreka, CA 96097

Mr. Daniel Kovacich, Executive Director
Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency
1855 Placer Street
Redding, CA 96001

P.O. BOX 1500 McCloud, California 96057-1500
Phone: 916-964-2141 •Fax: 916-964-2250

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
B. HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS:
CONGESTION RELIEF, ECONOMIC SUPPORT, ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT, (OTHER)

TUOLUMNE COUNTY AND CITIES AREA PLANNING COUNCIL
STANISLAUS AREA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
SIERRA RAILROAD REHABILITATION, FREIGHT AND PASSENGER PLAN

Track Project	Location (County)	#	# Ties, Tons of Rail, or Feet of New Track	Cost /Unit Installed	Total Cost Installed
FY 2000-2002: INSTALL 50,000 NEW TIES (1,000/MILE)					
Replace Ties MP 19-37	100% Tuolumne	18	18,000/a/	$100	$1,800,000
Replace Ties MP 37-49	100% Tuolumne	12	12,000/a/	$100	$1,200,000
Replace Ties 0-19	100% Stanislaus	20	20,000/a/	$100	$2,000,000
			Subtotal FY 2000-2002		*$5,000,000*
FY 2003-2005: REPLACE 31 MILES OF RAIL, INSTALL SPURS, DRAINAGE					
Increase Brush Clearances	40% Stanislaus 60% Tuolumne	50	–	$5,000	$250,000
Drainage Improvements (ditching)	40% Stanislaus 60% Tuolumne	50	–	$7,000	$350,000
Culvert Upgrade and Replacement	40% Stanislaus 60% Tuolumne	20	–	$15,000	$300,000
Upgrade Passing Sidings/Switches	40% Stanislaus 60% Tuolumne	–	10,130/b/	$95	$962,278
Warnerville Passing Track	100% Stanislaus	–	1,500/b/	$95	$142,500
Cooperstown Passing Track	100% Stanislaus	–	3,500/b/	$95	$332,500
Montezuma Industry Track	100% Tuolumne	–	3,500/b/	$95	$332,500
Standard Industry Track	100% Tuolumne	–	1,500/b/	$95	$142,500
Replace Rail MP 0-19	100% Stanislaus	13	2,621/c/	$350	$917,432
Replace Rail MP 19-37	100% Tuolumne	10	2,016/c/	$350	$705,717
Replace Rail MP 37-49	100% Tuolumne	8	1,613/c/	$350	$564,573
			Subtotal FY 2003-2005		*$5,000,000*
GRAND TOTAL HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS					$10,000,000

/a/ Ties to be Replaced w/ 7X9X9 New Ties
/b/ Tons of Rail 90# to be Replaced by #115 Rail
/c/ Feet of Track to be Built

CALIFORNIA WESTERN RAILROAD, INC.

UNFUNDED INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

TEN YEAR PERIOD ESTIMATE

Storm Damage Repair	**$300,000**
Erosion Repair	**$500,000**
Bridge Rehabilitation	**$600,000**
Tunnel Rehabilitation	**$200,000**
Tie Replacement	**$400,000**
Ballast	**$250,000**
Rail Replacement	**$200,000**
Support Facilities Rehabilitation/Repair	**$250,000**
Station, Improvements	**$200,000**
Intermodal Improvements	**$500,000**
TOTAL	**$3,400,000**

Burton/Karnette Inventory Checklist

A. Unfunded Rehabilitation, Maintenance, Operations of Existing System

Reporting Agency Lease Source Secondary Source	Category	Source, (Lest RTP or Other specific source)	10 Year $ Cost Estimate (a)	20 Year $ Cost Estimate (b)
Yolo Shortline Railroad Yolo County	FREMONT TRESTLE REPLACEMENT Freight/Passenger Inter-City Railroad Replace/Rehab	Yolo Shortline Railroad Long Range Plans	$35 million	$40 million

footnotes:

(a) 10 year estimate timeframe: FY 2000 to FY 2010; annual inflation rate: 4%

(b) 20 year estimate timeframe: FY 2000 to FY 2020; annual inflation rate: 4%

B. High Priority Projects: Congestion Relief, Economic Support, Environmental Benefit (or other)

Reporting Agency Lease Source Secondary Source	Category: list specific projects; or list by group description	Source (Lest RTP or Other specific source)	$ cost (a)	Benefit
Yolo Shortline Railroad Yolo County	BULK TRANSFER/INTERMODAL FACILITY	Yolo Shortline Railroad Long Range Plans	$25 million	Congestion Relief Environmental Economic development

footnotes:

(a) constant dollars - FY 2000

Prepared by:
Yolo Shortline Railroad Company
1965 East Main Street
Woodland, CA 95776
(530) 666-9646

PACIFIC HARBOR LINE
340 Water Street
Wilmington, CA 90744
(310) 834-8511

Burton/Karnette Inventory Checklist

A. Unfunded Rehabilitation, Maintenance, Operations of Existing System

Reporting Agency	Category	Source	10 year	20 year
Pac. Harbor Line	Replace old/worn rail	PHL	$1 million(a)	

(a) $200,000/yr FY 2000-2004 0% inflation

B. High Priority Projects

Reporting Agency	Category	Source	$ cost	(b) Benefit
Pac. Harbor Line	Replace all 75# rail	PHL	$1 million	Safety Enhancement currently have old-light rail on hazardous commidity routes
Pac. Harbor Line	Environmental Cleanup of Loco Shop Area	(C)	$250,000	Environmental Mitiagation

(b) constant dollars FY 1999

(C) Property owned by Port of Los Angeles which has responsibility for cleanup for use prior to 1998

Intercity Passenger Rail Service

San Diegan Route

Intercity Rail Infrastructure Needs For Implementation during FY's 1999-2000 through FY 2008-2009

Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	For Existing Services	For New Services	Location of Project	Description of Project	Total Amount ($ in Millions)
Rolling Stock	X			X	Corridorwide	New Rolling Stock (Faster Loading and Unloading)	$ 130.0
Track & Signal	X		X		San Diego to Oceanside	Double Track	$ 105.9
Track & Signal	X		X		Eastern Ave - Basta	Triple Track	$ 46.1
Track & Signal	X		X		Serra	Siding Extension	$ 3.2
Track & Signal	X		X		Plugas	Siding Extension	$ 4.0
Track & Signal	X			X	Fullerton to San Diego	Allow 4" unbalance between Fullerton and San Diego	$ 0.5
Track & Signal	X			X	Rose Canyon	Tunnel	$ 173.6
Track & Signal	X		X		Corridorwide	Double Tracking	$ 200.0
Track & Signal	X		X		LA Union Station	Run Through Tracks	$ 149.1
Track & Signal	X			X	Burbank Junction	Track Realignment	$ 9.9
Track & Signal	X			X	Near Ortega	New Siding	$ 5.0
Track & Signal	X			X	Raymer to Chatworth	Second Main Track	$ 10.6
Track & Signal		X	X		Tunnel #26 (between Chatworth & Simi)	Rehabilitate Tunnel	$ 17.0
Track & Signal	X		X		Moorpark to Los Angeles	Class IV Upgrade	$ 5.6
Track & Signal	X			X	Santa Barbara - SLO	Extend Siding	$ 1.3
Track & Signal	X		X		Santa Barbara - SLO	Class IV Upgrade	$ 31.1
Track & Signal	X		X		Ellwood - San Luis Obispo	Signal Improvements	$ 164.3
Track & Signal	X		X		San Dieguito Creek	Bridge Replacement and 2nd Main Track	$ 18.0
Track & Signal	X		X		San Diego County	Replace worn timber bridges	$ 11.5
Track & Signal		X	X		Del Mar	Bluffs Stabilization	$ 12.0
Stations	X			X	San Diego Station	Capacity Improvements	$ 5.6
Stations	X		X		Van Nuys Station	2nd Platform	$ 3.6
Stations	X		X		Van Nuys Station	Parking Structure	$ 3.9
Stations	X		X		Solano Beach Station	Parking Structure	$ 12.1
Stations	X		X		Oceanside	Parking Structure	$ 5.5
Stations	X		X		Oxnard	Parking Structure	$ 2.5
Stations	X		X		Irvine	Parking Structure	$ 14.0
Maintenance Facility	X		X		San Diego	Maintenance Facility	$ 25.0
Grade Crossing Improvements	X		X		LA - San Diego	Grade Crossing Imps (6 @ $200,000)	$ 1.2
Grade Crossing Improvements	X		X		LA - San Luis Obispo	Grade Crossing Imps (70 @ $200,000)	$ 14.0
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of Services shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 242.4
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of New Services beyond those shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 71.0
						TOTAL	**$ 1,428.5**

San Joaquin Route

Intercity Rail Infrastructure Needs For Implementation during FYs 1999-2000 through FY 2008-2009

Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	For Existing Services	For New Services	Location of Project	Description of Project	Total Amount ($ in Millions)
Track and Signal	X			X	Corridorwide	Double Tracking & Siding Extensions	$ 110.8
Track and Signal	X			X	Corridorwide	Class V (90mph) Speeds/Cab Signals	$ 205.1
Track and Signal	X		X		Hanford	Hanford Area Track & Signal Improvements	$ 26.5
Track and Signal	X		X		Fresno	Fresno Area Track & Signal Improvements	$ 77.7
Track and Signal	X		X		Stockton	Stockton Area Track & Signal Improvements	$ 60.2
Stations	X		X		Corridorwide	Station Improvements	$ 10.0
Stations	X		X		Stockton	New station - East of Interlocking	$ 8.0
Stations	X			X	Modesto	2nd Platform station track	$ 2.0
Grade Crossing Improvements	X		X		Corridorwide	Grade Crossing Protection (357 @ $200,000 ea)	$ 71.4
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of Services shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 289.8
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of New Services beyond those shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 89.1
						TOTAL	**$ 950.6**

San Joaquin and Capitol Routes - Joint Rolling Stock

Intercity Rail Infrastructure Needs For Implementation During FYs 1999-2000 through FY 2008-2009

Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	For Existing Services	For New Services	Location of Project	Description of Project	Total Amount ($ in Millions)
Rolling Stock		X	X		San Joaquin & Capitol Routes	Rebuild 66 California Cars and 11 Locomotives	$ 46.7
Rolling Stock	X			X	San Joaquin & Capitol Routes	Rolling Stock (10 sets including locomotives)	$ 160.0
						TOTAL	**$ 206.7**

Capitol Route

Intercity Rail Infrastructure Needs For Implementation during FYs 1999-2000 through FY 2008-2009

Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	For Existing Services	For New Services	Location of Project	Description of Project	Total Amount ($ in Millions)
Track and Signal	X		X		Corridorwide	Complete CTC Installation	$ 86.9
Track and Signal	X		X		Great America Station	Siding	$ 10.0
Track and Signal		X	X		Niles Junction	Reconstruct Niles Junction	$ 42.4
Track and Signal	X		X		Oakland JLS Station	Capacity Improvements - Third Track	$ 5.8
Track and Signal	X		X		Yolo Causeway	2nd Main Track	$ 17.5
Track and Signal	X			X	Corridorwide	Curve reduction and 3rd Main Track Capacity	$ 221.2
Track and Signal	X		X		Corridorwide	Increase unbalance to 4"	$ 0.5
Track and Signal	X		X		Corridorwide	Upgrade to Class IV (79 mph)	$ 14.5
Track and Signal	X			X	Hayward	Double Track	$ 7.5
Track and Signal	X			X	Alviso-CP Coast	2nd Track	$ 44.7
Stations	X		X		Emeryville Station	Capacity Improvements	$ 5.4
Stations	X		X		Sacramento Station	Station and track terminal improvements	$ 14.0
Stations	X		X		San Jose Diridon Station	Rehab and track reconfiguration for freight bypass and added station tracks/platform	$ 17.5
Stations	X		X		Richmond Station	New Station Building	$ 3.0
Stations	X		X		Davis Station	Depot and access/parking expansion	$ 2.5
Stations	X		X		Berkeley Station	Platform and track improvements	$ 2.5
Stations	X		X		Corridorwide	Ticket vending machines (30 @ $100,000 each)	$ 3.0
Stations	X		X		Corridorwide	Electronic passenger information signs	$ 1.5
Grade Crossing Improvements	X		X		Corridorwide	Grade Crossing Protection (24 @ $200,000 ea)	$ 4.8
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of Services shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 224.2
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of New Services beyond those shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 36.4
						TOTAL	**$ 765.8**

Statewide Service

Intercity Rail Infrastructure Needs For Implementation During FYs 1999-2000 through FY 2008-2009

Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	For Existing Services	For New Services	Location of Project	Description of Project	Total Amount ($ in Millions)
Stations	X		X		Statewide	Ticket Vending Machines (60 @ $100,000)	$ 6.0
Stations	X		X		Statewide	Passenger Information System	$ 5.0
						TOTAL	**$ 11.0**

Coast Route - Proposed

Intercity Rail Infrastructure Needs For Implementation During FYs 1999-2000 through FY 2008-2009

Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	For Existing Services	For New Services	Location of Project	Description of Project	Total Amount ($ in Millions)
Rolling Stock	X			X	Coast	4 Sets Tilt Equipment (including locomotives)	$ 72.1
Track and Signal	X			X	SLO to San Jose	CTC Improvements	$ 31.5
Track and Signal	X			X	Chorro and King City	Extend Sidings	$ 17.6
Track and Signal	X			X	San Luis Obispo - Gilroy	Class IV Upgrade	$ 59.6
Track and Signal	X			X	San Francisco - San Jose (PCS)	CTC Phase III - Cab Control and Upgrades	$ 18.0
Track and Signal	X			X	San Francisco - San Jose (PCS)	Triple Track at Two Locations	$ 30.0
Stations	X			X	Gilroy	Track realignment for main line station	$ 1.0
Stations	X			X	King City/Soledad	New station facility	$ 2.5
Maintenance Facility	X			X	San Francisco/Los Angeles	Layover & Maintenance Facility for Tilt Trains	$ 15.0
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of Services shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 59.3
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of New Services beyond those shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 37.8
						TOTAL	**$ 344.4**

Monterey Service - Proposed

Intercity Rail Infrastructure Needs For Implementation during FYs 1999-2000 through FY 2008-2009

Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	For Existing Services	For New Services	Location of Project	Description of Project	Total Amount ($ in Millions)
Track and Signal	X			X	Gilroy to Castroville	Capacity Improvements	$ 40.0
Stations	X			X	Seaside	Station Improvements	$ 4.5
Stations	X			X	Pajaro	Station Improvements	$ 2.3
Stations	X			X	Castroville	Station Improvements	$ 0.5
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of Services shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 14.7
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of New Services beyond those shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 1.8
						TOTAL	**$ 63.8**

Redding Service - Proposed

Intercity Rail Infrastructure Needs For Implementation during FYs 1999-2000 through FY 2008-2009

Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	For Existing Services	For New Services	Location of Project	Description of Project	Total Amount ($ in Millions)
Rolling Stock	X			X	Corridorwide	Rolling Stock (1 set including locomotive)	$ 14.6
Stations		X		X	Redding Station	Station Improvements	$ 1.0
Stations	X			X	Red Bluff Station	Station Construction	$ 1.0
Stations		X		X	Chico Station	Station Improvements	$ 1.0
Stations	X			X	Marysville Station	Station Construction	$ 1.0
Maintenance Facility	X			X	Redding	Layover Facility	$ 2.0
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of New Services beyond those shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 12.7
						TOTAL	**$ 33.3**

Reno Service - Proposed

Intercity Rail Infrastructure Needs For Implementation during FYs 1999-2000 through FY 2008-2009

Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	For Existing Services	For New Services	Location of Project	Description of Project	Total Amount ($ in Millions)
Rolling Stock	X			X	Corridor	Tilt Equipment (1 set including locomotive)	$ 15.0
Track and Signal	X			X	Corridor	CTC and Track Improvements	$ 35.0
Maintenance Facility	X			X	Sparks, Nevada	Layover Facility	$ 2.0
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of New Services beyond those shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 7.6
						TOTAL	**$ 59.6**

Las Vegas Service - Proposed

Intercity Rail Infrastructure Needs For Implementation during FYs 1999-2000 through FY 2008-2009

Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	For Existing Services	For New Services	Location of Project	Description of Project	Total Amount ($ in Millions)
Rolling Stock	X			X	Corridorwide	Tilt Equipment (2 sets including locomotives)	$ 36.0
Track and Signal	X			X	Corridorwide	Second and Third Frequency - Infrastructure	$ 50.0
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of New Services beyond those shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 17.4
						TOTAL	**$ 103.4**

Coachella Valley Route - Proposed

Intercity Rail Infrastructure Needs For Implementation during FYs 1999-2000 through FY 2008-2009

Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	For Existing Services	For New Services	Location of Project	Description of Project	Total Amount ($ in Millions)
Rolling Stock	X			X	Coachella Valley	2 Sets Rolling Stock (Including Locomotives)	$ 31.7
Track and Signal	X			X	Coachella Valley	Infrastructure Improvements	$ 100.0
Maintenance Facility	X			X	Coachella Valley	Layover Facility	$ 1.5
Operations	X			X	Corridorwide	10 year Operations Cost of New Services beyond those shown in 1998 Fund Estimate	$ 22.2
						TOTAL	**$ 155.4**

Questionnaires:

SR 8: BURTON/KARNETTE INVENTORY
RTPA SURVEY/CHECKLIST

DIRECTIONS/GUIDANCE

1. **Format.** Please use the attached survey as the format for your responses. You may choose to reproduce this separately on a spreadsheet, but please do not significantly deviate from the order or categories listed. This will aid in aggregating information later. If you believe more descriptive information is required to explain your data, please list the survey category first, followed by additional description. If anyone wishes to have the attached tables sent to them electronically, please e-mail Therese McMillan: tmcmillan@mtc.ca.gov

2. **Region**: Please fill out the Region covered by the survey—for multi-county areas, list counties included. List a contact name, phone number, fax number and e-mail, as appropriate.

3. **Mail**. ***On or before April 5, 1999***, send completed copies by e-mail, mail, or fax to the following:

   Robert Remen, Executive Director
   CTC
   1120 "N" Street, 2nd floor
   Sacramento CA. 95814

   FAX: 916/653-2134
   Bob_Remen@dot.ca.gov

   Therese McMillan
   MTC
   101 Eighth Street
   Oakland, CA 94607

   FAX: 510/464-7848
   tmcmillan@mtc.ca.gov

   We encourage electronic submittals if at all possible in order to facilitate data compilation. *Please be prepared to discuss progress on the survey at our next scheduled RTPA meeting on March 29, 1999.*

4. **Timeframe**. We are assuming that the information provided will be from long range plans, and the transportation needs will be projected for the period FY 1999/00 to 2009/10 for the 10 year period; and 1999/00 to 2019/20 for 20 years. The 10-year figure is most important, because that is the period of the SR 8 inventory; 20 year estimates for the rehabilitation needs are added for context, and because RTPs are developed on that timeframe. We are assuming that some regions may have very clear time series data as the basis for the RTP, that can be disaggregated for a 10 year presentation. Other regions may have to massage the 20 year RTP aggregates to present them in the10 year format.

5. **Inflation and other adjustments**. Generally, long range plans present revenues and costs in inflated dollars for the 20 year time frame. It is not at all clear that each region has used the same inflation rates. At this point, please just indicate what inflation rate *or rates* you did use **in the footnotes for the appropriate columns, as indicated in the survey**.

   Because we are doing this for the entire state, I do not believe that major adjustments need to be calculated if your information is different by only one year (e.g. FY 1998/99 to 2008/09 instead of FY 1999/00 to 2009/10). However, if your information is five years off, you would need to adjust the information for inflation, real growth, or other considerations. Use your own judgment at this point, and indicate clearly what your time frames are, **in the footnotes for the appropriate columns, as indicated in the survey**, and describe separately what if any adjustments you have

made in presenting the financial information.

Source of Data. We are assuming that most of the information in the survey will be from RTPs. However, in the case of the "high priority projects", it may well be that information is drawn from other sources. I have added a column—"Source"—for your use.

Some of the primary data will be coming from other agencies. For example, CTC is developing a streets and roads survey for cities and counties, in collaboration with CSAC and League of Cities; and a survey for transit operators in collaboration with California Transit Association (CTA). In these instances, they will compare what they get from those surveys, with the information we provide as regions, and make a decision regarding final assessment/presentation. Caltrans is the primary source of SHOPP, interreegional state system improvements, and state highway operations/ITS related data. We will make a point of working with the CTC on that reconciliation, to understand the final decision and consequences.

Where RTPAs are listed as secondary source on the survey, you should still provide information if you have it. If in any circumstance you don't have reliable information, please indicate "not available" in the appropriate column.

6. **High Priority Projects**. This is the less defined inventory, and it is not clear what the form the data will finally take. At this juncture, we are asking that you prepare a list of projects in the categories, as appropriate. A project could be an aggregate description, for example "system operational improvements on Rt. 101 in San Mateo county-$ 5.5 million". However, big capacity increasing projects should be fairly specific.

   In particular, the CTC is concerned that there not be duplication of high-priority projects coming from Caltrans and regions for the state highway system, so specificity will be important at this point. We assume that the RTPs were developed with appropriate input from Caltrans Districts. *However, you may want to coordinate state highway project listings with your District before they are submitted. For projects totaling $10 million or more, you should attach lists of projects and their costs to the checklist separately, by category. You should aggregate other, smaller priced projects by category (e.g. bike projects—$8 million; "various capacity increasing arterial improvement projects—$20 million).*

   For RTPAs covering a multi-county area, it would be helpful to indicate the county location of your high-priority projects; if the project is located in more than one county, please indicate that as well.

   Sources of high priority projects are fluid at this point. Because RTPs by statute must be financially constrained, regions may have separate sources of information for these projects. If this is the case, please specify the source (e.g. corridor or MIS studies, complementary capital priorities outside of the RTP, etc.). As a region, you may also want to consider the acceleration of projects from the outer 10 years of your RTP, to the front 10 years of the RTP. It may well be that your most critical needs are contained in the long range plan, but deferred to outer years because of funding constraints. The SR8 high priority list would present an opportunity to depict acceleration of those projects.

   COST information. We understand that high priority project cost information may not be very precise, as RTP are intended as planning, not programming documents. We would, however, like to know whether costs listed include only construction elements, or whether the additional support costs are included in the estimate. Please indicate in your projects lists whether the estimate is

construction only, or total cost. For the high priority projects, please indicate whether the costs are in constant dollars, or inflated dollars to year of construction; and if inflated, what rate was used. Indicate **in the footnotes for the appropriate column, as indicated in the survey**.

For the "benefits" column for the high priority survey, please indicate "congestion relief", "economic development"; and/or "environmental enhancement/mitigation. These are the particular improvements indicated in SR 8". List as many as are appropriate, but try to emphasize the primary benefit in order for CTC to make meaningful distinctions in reviewing the information. Should you desire to add additional benefit information, please indicate separately.

J:section\finance\mcmillan\rtpa\list2.doc

Burton/Karnette Inventory Checklist
A. Unfunded Rehabilitation, Maintenance, Operations of Existing System
(Page 1 of 2)

Region: _____
Contact: _____

Reporting Agency **LEAD source** ***SECONDARY source***	**Category**	**Source** **(List RTP or Other Specific Source)**	**10 Year $ Cost Estimate (a)**	**20 Year $ Cost Estimate (b)**
CALTRANS	State Highways: Rehab.			
CALTRANS	State Highways: Operations (e.g., TOS)			
RTPAs Cities/Counties survey (CTC coordinates)	Local Streets & Roads Rehab.: Pavement			
CITIES/COUNTIES *RTPAs*	Local Streets & Roads Rehab.: Non-pavement			
CITIES/COUNTIES *RTPAs*	Local Streets & Roads - Maint.			
RTPAs PTA Survey (CTC coordinates)	Transit: bus and urban rail: Replace/Rehab.			
RTPAs PTA Survey (CTC coordinates)	Transit: bus and urban rail: Operations			

Burton/Karnette Inventory Checklist
A. Unfunded Rehabilitation, Maintenance, Operations of Existing System
(Page 2 of 2)

Reporting Agency LEAD source *SECONDARY source*	**Category**	**Source (List RTP or Other Specific Source)**	**10 Year $ Cost Estimate (a)**	**20 Year $ Cost Estimate (b)**
CALTRANS	Transit: Intercity Rail Replace/Rehab.			
CALTRANS	Transit: Intercity Rail Operations			
OTHER (e.g., MetroRail)	Transit: Other Interreg. Rail: Replace/Rehab.			
OTHER (e.g., MetroRail)	Transit: Other Interreg. Rail: Operations			
CTC Survey: E&D non-profits RTPAs *Caltrans*	Paratransit: Replace/Rehab.			
CTC Survey: E&D non-profits RTPAs *Caltrans*	Paratransit: Operations			

Footnotes:

(a) 10 year estimate timeframe: FY_____ to FY _____; annual inflation rate: _____%

(b) 20 year estimate timeframe: FY_____ to FY _____; annual inflation rate: _____%

Burton/Karnette Inventory Checklist
B. High-Priority Projects: Congestion Relief, Economic Support Environmental Benefit (or Other…)
(Page 1 of 2)

Region: _____
Contact: _____

Reporting Agency LEAD source ***SECONDARY source***	**Category: list specific projects; or list by group descriptor (e.g., corridor/subarea)**	**Source (List RTP or Other Specific Source)**	**$ Cost (a)**	**Benefit**
CALTRANS: Interreg./ rural RTPAs: urban region	State Highway Expansion			
RTPAs *CTA*	Transit: Bus Expansion • Capital • Operations			
RTPAs *CTA*	Transit: Urban Rail Expansion • Capital • Operations			
RTPAs *CTA*	Transit: Paratransit • Capital • Operations			
CALTRANS *RTPAs*	Transit: Intercity Rail Expansion • Capital • Operations			

Burton/Karnette Inventory Checklist
B. High-Priority Projects: Congestion Relief, Economic Support Environmental Benefit (or Other…)
(Page 2 of 2)

Reporting Agency LEAD source ***SECONDARY source***	**Category: list specific projects; or list by group descriptor (e.g., corridor/subarea)**	**Source (List RTP or Other Specific Source)**	**$ Cost (a)**	**Benefit**
OTHER OPERATORS (e.g., Metrolink)	Transit: Other Rail Expansion • Capital • Operations			
CITIES/COUNTIES *RTPAs*	Local Arterial Expansion			
RTPAs	Bike/Pedestrian Enhancement/Expansion			
CAAT *RTPAs*	New Techn./System Management • Capital • Operations			
SEAPORTS	Seaports			
AIRPORTS	Airports			

Footnote:

(a) constant dollars - FY_____ **OR** inflated dollars - annual rate: ___%

Burton/Karnette
Senate Resolution 8 Survey

Please provide:

Agency name _____ Contact person _____

Phone # _____ Fax # _____ Email Address _____

Although several other surveys have been circulated, we need your immediate help. Take a few minutes to complete this survey. Many discussions have occurred regarding funding for transit. Several efforts are underway to examine this issue in the context of a comprehensive statewide transportation funding proposal. The California Transportation Commission, in conjunction with the California Transit Association, California State Association of Counties, League of California Cities, regional agencies, and Caltrans are conducting this joint analysis.

The goal is to obtain an immediate snapshot of the transit service needs in California, as it relates to:

- **Existing service needs:** defined as current unfunded operations projected over the next decade and unfunded capital projects needed to sustain service. List the amount (difference) needed to fully fund existing service.

- **Enhanced service needs:** defined as unfunded operations and capital projects needed to provide existing service needs and identified unmet demand over the next 10 years. List only the amount (difference) needed to fully fund unmet demand.

- **Expanded service needs:** assumes a 50% increase in ridership by 2010. What unfunded high priority operations and capital projects would be needed to provide congestion relief, economic support, environmental benefit or other benefit over the next 10 years. List only the amount (difference) needed over and above existing and enhanced services to fully fund expanded service.

Questions? Please **contact Robert Chung**, California Transportation Commission, at **916-653-2090** or at Robert_Chung@dot.ca.gov or **Josh Shaw**, California Transit Association, at **916-446-4656** or at jshaw@.gsy.org.

Completed surveys are due April 2, 1999 and should be:

- **faxed to Robert I. Remen, Executive Director, California Transportation Commission at 916-654-4364**

- **sent to your regional agency which is participating in identifying your region's funding needs as part of the overall effort called for in SR 8.**

Existing Service

Current Unfunded Capital Projects or Current Unfunded Operations

(Escalated $ to the nearest $100,000)

			2010	2010	2010
Baseline Revenues[1]	Current Revenues		Projected Baseline Revenues		
Capital					
Operations					
Project	Current Annual Expenditure for Existing Service	Current Shortfall in Annual Expenditure for Existing Service	Estimated Total Cost 10 years	Estimated State Share of Total Cost 10 years	Estimated Shortfall in State Funding 10 years
Rail Capital					
♦ rolling stock[2]					
♦ rail line					
♦ maintenance facility and related equipment					
♦ station-related improvements					
♦ power &/or signaling systems					
♦ other[3]					
Rail Operations					
Bus Capital					
♦ rolling stock[2] ♦ alternate fuel conversion					
♦ maintenance facility					
♦ other[3]					
Bus Operations					
ADA Capital [4]					
ADA Operations					
Other (specify ferry, trolley bus, etc.)					
Other Operations					
TOTAL					

1. Baseline revenues assumes that existing revenues continue to be received by transit operators and that no statutory changes have occurred to increase revenues.
2. Rolling stock can include, but is not limited to, new equipment, rehabilitation, or spare parts.
3. Other can include, but is not limited to, security, ticket vending machines, information kiosks, fare collecting devices, etc.
4. ADA is federally mandated and commands priority on funding, which could creates shortfalls in other areas of capital and operations (such as reduced vehicle purchases or reduced fixed route service frequency). Please estimate the amount of any potential shortfall.

Enhanced Service
Unfunded Capital Projects or Unfunded Operations

(Escalated $ to the nearest $100,000)

			2010	2010	2010
Project	Current Annual Expenditure for Existing Service	Estimated Shortfall in Annual Expenditure for Enhanced Service	Estimated Total Cost 10 years	Estimated State Share of Total Cost 10 years	Estimated Shortfall in State Funding 10 years
Rail Capital					
♦ rolling stock[2]					
♦ rail line					
♦ maintenance facility and related equipment					
♦ station-related improvements					
♦ power &/or signaling systems					
♦ other[3]					
Rail Operations					
Bus Capital					
♦ rolling stock[2] ♦ alternate fuel conversion					
♦ maintenance facility					
♦ other[3]					
Bus Operations					
ADA Capital [4]					
ADA Operations					
Other (specify ferry, trolley bus, etc.)					
Other Operations					
TOTAL					

1. Baseline revenues assumes that existing revenues continue to be received by transit operators and that no statutory changes have occurred to increase revenues.
2. Rolling stock can include, but is not limited to, new equipment, rehabilitation, or spare parts.
3. Other can include, but is not limited to, security, ticket vending machines, information kiosks, fare collecting devices, etc.
4. ADA is federally mandated and commands priority on funding, which could creates shortfalls in other areas of capital and operations (such as reduced vehicle purchases or reduced fixed route service frequency). Please estimate the amount of any potential shortfall.

Expanded Service

Unfunded High Priority Projects:
Congestion Relief, Economic Support, Environmental Benefit or Other

(Escalated $ to the nearest $100,000)

			2010	2010	2010
Project	Current Annual Expenditure for Existing Service	Estimated Shortfall in Annual Expenditure for Expanded Service	Estimated Total Cost 10 years	Estimated State Share of Total Cost 10 years	Estimated Shortfall in State Funding 10 years
Rail Capital					
♦ rolling stock[2]					
♦ rail line					
♦ maintenance facility and related equipment					
♦ station-related improvements					
♦ power &/or signaling systems					
♦ other[3]					
Rail Operations					
Bus Capital					
♦ rolling stock[2] ♦ alternate fuel conversion					
♦ maintenance facility					
♦ other[3]					
Bus Operations					
ADA Capital [4]					
ADA Operations					
Other (specify ferry, trolley bus, etc.)					
Other Operations					
TOTAL					

1. Baseline revenues assumes that existing revenues continue to be received by transit operators and that no statutory changes have occurred to increase revenues.
2. Rolling stock can include, but is not limited to, new equipment, rehabilitation, or spare parts.
3. Other can include, but is not limited to, security, ticket vending machines, information kiosks, fare collecting devices, etc.
4. ADA is federally mandated and commands priority on funding, which could creates shortfalls in other areas of capital and operations (such as reduced vehicle purchases or reduced fixed route service frequency). Please estimate the amount of any potential shortfall.

COMMERCIAL AIRPORTS
SR 8 STATE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM TEN-YEAR NEEDS ASSESSMENT
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Senate Resolution 8 (SR 8) by Senator John Burton, President Pro Tempore of the California Senate, requests that the California Transportation Commission, working with the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the state's regional transportation planning agencies, produce and submit to the Senate Committee on Transportation and to the President pro Tempore of the Senate, a 10-year needs assessment of the state transportation system's (1) Unfunded rehabilitation, maintenance, and operations needs for the state highway system, local streets and roads, and regional rail and transit systems and (2) High-priority projects, that are expected to reduce congestion and provide economic and environmental benefits to the state, which should be moved forward for completion as expeditiously as possible. The needs assessment will be used in defining the transportation uses of the $16 billion of General Obligation bond funds proposed by Senator Burton in Senate Bill 315.

Given the economic importance of California's commercial airports in the movement of passengers and cargo, it is important to include the highway and rail ground access needs of the airports in our response to SR 8. I am requesting your assistance in providing information on the ground access needs over the next 10 years for your airport. **Please complete the brief survey below and fax it, BY APRIL 7, 1999, to Charles Oldham, California Transportation Commission, (916) 653-2134**. If you have any questions regarding the SR 8 Needs Assessment, please call Mr. Oldham at (916) 653-2068.

1. NAME OF AIRPORT _____

2. CONTACT PERSON _____ TELEPHONE _____

3. AIRPORT ACTIVITY

	CURENT ACTIVITY	PROJECTED ACTIVITY IN 2010	PROJECTED ACTIVITY IN 2020
Annual Passengers	_____	_____	_____
Annual Cargo - Tons	_____	_____	_____
Annual Cargo - $ Value	_____	_____	_____
Annual passenger Vehicles	_____	_____	_____
Annual Truck Movements	_____	_____	_____
Annual Rail Passengers	_____	_____	_____

4. CURRENT GROUND ACCESS FACILITIES TO THE AIRPORT:

State Highways _____

Local Streets _____

Rail Lines _____

5. PLEASE ATTACH A LIST OF GROUND ACCESS PROJECTS, INCLUDING THE ESTIMATED PROJECT COST, NEEDED BY 2010 TO SERVE EXPECTED ACTIVITY AT THE AIRPORT.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION TO THIS REQUEST

SENATE RESOLUTION 8 - COMMERCIAL SEAPORTS
STATE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM TEN-YEAR NEEDS ASSESSMENT
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Senate Resolution 8 (SR 8) by Senator John Burton, President Pro Tempore of the California Senate, requests that the California Transportation Commission, working with the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the state's regional transportation planning agencies, produce and submit to the Senate Committee on Transportation and to the President pro Tempore of the Senate, a 10-year needs assessment of the state transportation system's (1) Unfunded rehabilitation, maintenance, and operations needs for the state highway system, local streets and roads, and regional rail and transit systems and (2) High-priority projects, that are expected to reduce congestion and provide economic and environmental benefits to the state, which should be moved forward for completion as expeditiously as possible. The needs assessment will be used in defining the transportation uses of the $16 billion of General Obligation bond funds proposed by Senator Burton in Senate Bill 315.

Given the economic importance of California's commercial seaports in the State's expanding international trade, the Commission believes it is important to include truck and rail ground access needs of the ports in our response to SR 8. I am requesting your assistance in providing the information on the ground access needs over the next 10 years for your port. **Please complete the brief survey below and fax it, BY MARCH 26, 1999, to Charles Oldham, California Transportation Commission, (916) 653-2134**. If you have any questions regarding the SR 8 Needs Assessment, please call Mr. Oldham at (916) 653-2068.

1. NAME OF PORT _____

2. CONTACT PERSON _____ TELEPHONE _____

3. PORT ACTIVITY

	CURENT ACTIVITY	PROJECTED ACTIVITY IN 2010	IN 2020
Annual Cargo - Tons	_____	_____	_____
Annual Cargo - $ Value	_____	_____	_____
Annual Truck Movements	_____	_____	_____
Annual Rail Carloads	_____	_____	_____

4. CURRENT GROUND ACCESS FACILITIES TO THE PORT:

State Highways _____

Local Streets _____

Rail Lines _____

5. PLEASE ATTACH A LIST OF GROUND ACCESS PROJECTS, INCLUDING THE ESTIMATED PROJECT COST, NEEDED BY 2010 TO SERVE EXPECTED ACTIVITY AT THE PORT.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION TO THIS REQUEST

NATIVE AMERICAN
LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS TEN-YEAR NEEDS ASSESSMENT
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Senate Resolution 8 (SR 8) requests that the California Transportation Commission, working with the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the state's regional transportation planning agencies, produce and submit a 10-year needs assessment of the state transportation system's (1) Unfunded rehabilitation, maintenance and operation needs for the state highway system, local streets and roads and regional rail and transit systems; and (2) High-priority projects, that are expected to reduce congestion and provide economic and environmental benefits to the state, which should be moved forward for completion as expeditiously as possible.

In an effort to compile a comprehensive list of roadway needs within California it is vital that Indian reservation roads be included. Please only identify projects which are maintained by the reservation or the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Projects situated on local city/county roads or state highways have in all likelihood been identified by the respective jurisdictions. However, if you have knowledge of unreported projects on local city/county roads or state highway please identify these projects separately. We ask your assistance in providing the information on roadway rehabilitation needs for the next 10-years. **Please complete the brief survey below and fax it, BY APRIL 20, 1999, to Charles Oldham, California Transportation Commission, (916) 653-2134.**

1. Tribe:_____ a) 1997 Population: _____
   a) Number of Centerline Miles Maintained: paved _____ unpaved_____
   b) Lane Miles Maintained: _____
   c) Pavement Maintenance and Rehabilitation Expenditure in 1998:
      Rehabilitation (i.e. reconstruction, overlay, seal work): $_____
      Maintenance (pothole patching, spot repairs, etc.): $_____

2. Do you have an operative Pavement Management System ____ Yes ___ No

It is very important that **only** reconstruction, overlays, and seal work be included in the following questions. **Do not** include stop gap work such as pothole and spot repairs. The survey will recognize that actual funds needed to complete all aspects of pavement maintenance could be much more than the amounts derived from this survey.

4. What is the total **annual cost** to maintain the pavement condition (reconstruction, overlays, and seal work) at its current level? $_____

5. a) What is the **current** accumulated backlog of deferred pavement maintenance and rehabilitation (e.g. total one-time cost to bring pavement condition ratings to "good"? $_____
   b) How much do you expect your backlog to increase $_____ or decrease $_____ on an annual basis given current funding levels?

Completed by:

Name: Address: Phone Number: Date:

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION TO THIS REQUEST.