ESTIMATED TIMED AGENDA
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
http://www.catc.ca.gov
January 30-31, 2019
Rocklin, California

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

1:00 PM  Commission Meeting
Rocklin Event Center
Ballroom
2650 Sunset Blvd
Rocklin, CA 95677

7:00 PM  WTS Sacramento Annual Awards and Scholarship Dinner
Sheraton Grand Sacramento
1230 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Thursday, January 31, 2019

9:00 AM  Commission Meeting
Rocklin Event Center
Ballroom
2650 Sunset Blvd
Rocklin, CA 95677

To view the live webcast of this meeting, please visit: http://ctc.dot.ca.gov/webcast

NOTICE: Times identified on the following agenda are estimates only. The Commission has the discretion to take up agenda items out of sequence and on either day of the two-day meeting, except for those agenda items bearing the notation “TIMED ITEM.” TIMED ITEMS which may not be heard prior to the time scheduled but may be heard at, or any time after the time scheduled. The Commission may adjourn earlier than estimated on either day.

Unless otherwise noticed in the specified book item, a copy of this meeting notice, agenda, and related book items will be posted 10 calendar days prior to the meeting on the California Transportation Commission (Commission) Website: www.catc.ca.gov. Questions or inquiries about this meeting may be directed to the Commission staff at (916) 654-4245, 1120 N Street (MS -52), Sacramento, CA 95814. If any special accommodations are needed for persons with disabilities, please contact Doug Remedios at (916) 654-4245. Requests for special accommodations or interpretation services should be made as soon as possible but no later than at least five working days prior to the scheduled meeting.

Persons attending the meeting who wish to address the Commission on a subject to be considered at this meeting are asked to complete a Speaker Request Card and provide it to the Commission Clerk prior to the discussion of the item. If you would like to present any written materials, including handouts, photos, and maps to the Commission at the meeting, please provide a minimum of 25 copies labeled with the agenda item number no later than 30 minutes prior to the start of the meeting. Video clips and other electronic media cannot be accommodated. Speakers cannot use their own computer or projection equipment for displaying presentation material.

Improper comments and disorderly conduct are not permitted. In the event that the meeting conducted by the Commission is willfully interrupted or disrupted by a person or by a group so as to render the orderly conduct of the meeting unfeasible, the Chair may order the removal of those individuals who are willfully disrupting the meeting.

* “A” denotes an “Action” item; “I” denotes an “Information” item; “C” denotes a “Commission” item; “D” denotes a “Department” item; “F” denotes a “U.S. Department of Transportation” item; “R” denotes a Regional or other Agency item; and “T” denotes a California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) item.

FREQUENTLY USED TERMS: California Transportation Commission (Commission or CTC), California Department of Transportation (Department or Caltrans), Regional Improvement Program (RIP), Interregional Improvement Program (IIP), State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP), Public Transportation Account (PTA), Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act of 1990 (Proposition 116), High Speed Passenger Train Bond Program (Proposition 1A), Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1B), State Route 99 Bond Program (RTF or SR 99), Local Bridge Seismic Retrofit Account (LBSRA), Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF), Highway-Railroad Crossing Safety Account (HRCSA), State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP), Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLS), Letter of No Prejudice (LONP), Environmental Phase (PA&ED), Design Phase (PS&E), Right of Way (RW), Fiscal Year (FY), Active Transportation Program (ATP), Intercity Rail (ICR), California Aid to Airports Program (CAAP), Acquisition & Development (A&D), Transit and Inter-City Rail Capital Program (TIRCP), Transportation Facilities Account (TFA), Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP), Local Partnership Program (LPP), Local Streets and Roads Program (LSRP), Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roll Call</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Fran Inman</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Election of Commission Chair and Vice Chair</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Fran Inman</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Welcome to the Region</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Mike Luken / Ken Broadway / Wes Heathcock</td>
<td>I R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Approval of Minutes for December 5-6, 2018</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Fran Inman</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Approval of Minutes for the December 4, 2018 Joint Meeting with the California Air Resources Board</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Fran Inman</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Commissioner Meetings for Compensation</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Fran Inman</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Commission Executive Director</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Susan Bransen</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Commissioner Reports</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Fran Inman</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CalSTA Secretary and/or Undersecretary</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Brian Annis</td>
<td>I T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Caltrans Director and/or Deputy Director</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>I D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FHWA California Division Administrator</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Vincent Mammano</td>
<td>I F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Regional Agencies Moderator</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Luke McNeel-Caird</td>
<td>I R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rural Counties Task Force Chair</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Maura Twomey</td>
<td>I R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Self-Help Counties Coalition Executive Director</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Keith Dunn</td>
<td>I R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>State and Federal Legislative Matters</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Paul Golaszewski</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Overview of Upcoming Round Table Discussions Sponsored by the University of California Institute of Transportation Studies</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Garth Hopkins / Dan Sperling</td>
<td>I C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Workshops to Develop Policy Recommendations to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Transportation Sector</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Paul Golaszewski</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Budget and Allocation Capacity</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Paul Golaszewski / Clark Paulsen</td>
<td>I D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Overview of the Development Process for the 2020 STIP Fund Estimate</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Paul Golaszewski / Clark Paulsen</td>
<td>I D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>California Conservation Corps - Active Transportation Program</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Meghan Pedroncelli / Bruce Saito</td>
<td>I C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hearing on the 2019 Active Transportation Program – Statewide and Small Urban &amp; Rural Components Staff Recommendations</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Laurie Waters</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Adoption of 2019 Active Transportation Program – Statewide and Small Urban &amp; Rural Components Resolution G-19-01</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Laurie Waters</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Amendment to the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program Resolution G-19-02, Amending Resolution G-18-44</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Christine Gordon</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Caltrans Advanced Mitigation Program Guidelines Update</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Garth Hopkins / Amy Bailey</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Presentation and Comments on the Proposed Amendments to the Procedures for Discharges of Dredged or Fill Material to Waters of the State</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>Laura Pennebaker / Jeremy Ketchum / Karen Mogus</td>
<td>A C/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Caltrans and California Trucking Association Pusher Truck Partnership Program</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Laura Pennebaker / Eric Sauer</td>
<td>I C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Informational Reports on Allocations Under Delegated Authority</td>
<td>2.5f.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Informational Reports on Allocations Under Delegated Authority**
- Emergency G-11 Allocations (2.5f.(1)): $26,168,000 for 12 projects.
- SHOPP Safety Sub-Allocations (2.5f.(3)): $4,219,000 for four projects.
- Minor G-05-16 Allocations (2.5f.(4)): $758,000 for two projects.

**Monthly Reports on the Status of Contract Award for:**
- State Highway Projects, per Resolution G-06-08 | 3.2a. | I D |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Local Assistance STIP Projects, per Resolution G-13-07</td>
<td>3.2b.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Local Assistance ATP Projects, per Resolution G-15-04</td>
<td>3.2c.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pre-Construction SHOPP Support Allocations, per Resolution G-06-08</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Monthly Report on Local and Regional Agency Notices of Intent to Expend Funds on Programmed STIP Projects Prior to Commission Allocation per SB 184</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Commission Comment Letters on Notices of Preparation and Draft Environmental Impact Reports</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quarterly Reports – Fiscal Year 2018-19 – First Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Caltrans' Rail Operations Report</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Reports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Final Expenditures for STIP Projects</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Traffic Congestion Relief Program Annual Report</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BEGIN CONSENT CALENDAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Traina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Approval of Project for Future Consideration of Funding:</td>
<td>2.2c(2)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01 – Humboldt County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annie and Mary Trail: Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a Class 1 multi-use trail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(MND) (PPNO 2505) (ATP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Related Item under Ref. 2.5w.(1).)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Approval of Project for Future Consideration of Funding:</td>
<td>2.2c(3)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03 – El Dorado County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Dorado Trail: Missouri Flat Road to El Dorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a Class 1 multi-use trail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(MND) (PPNO 1224A – 1224B) (ATP, CMAQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Related Item under Ref. 2.5w.(1).)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Approval of Project for Future Consideration of Funding:</td>
<td>2.2c(4)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03 – Sacramento County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folsom Boulevard Complete Streets: Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure on Folsom Boulevard. (MND) (PPNO 1695) (ATP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Related Item under Ref. 2.5w.(1).)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Approval of Project for Future Consideration of Funding:</td>
<td>2.2c(5)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03 – Sacramento and Yolo Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a 4.4-mile streetcar alignment from West Sacramento to Midtown Sacramento. (MND) (PPNO 1695) (Proposition 1A, CMAQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Related Item under Ref. 4.21.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab #</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Ref. #</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Status*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Approval of Projects for Future Consideration of Funding:</td>
<td>2.2c.(1)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01-Lak-20, PM 5.8 Bachelor Creek Bridge Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replace existing culverts on State Route 20 in Lake County. (ND) (PPNO 3107) (SHOPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-01 (Related Item under Ref. 2.5b.(2).)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02-Tri-3, PM 58.7/60.7 Swift Creek Bridge Replacement Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replace existing bridge on State Route 3 in Trinity County. (MND) (PPNO 3485) (SHOPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-02 (Related Item under Ref. 2.5b.(2).)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03-Sac/SJ-5, PM Various State Route 160 and I-5 Bridge Seismic Retrofit Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seismic retrofit of four bridges on I-5 in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties. (MND) (PPNO 5832) (SHOPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-03 (Related Item under Ref. 2.5b.(1).)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-Mon-1, PM 20.4 Replace Culvert at Limekiln Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct safety improvements on a portion of State Route 70 in Monterey County. (MND) (PPNO 2230) (SHOPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-04 (Related Item under Ref. 2.5b.(2).)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06-Fre-99, R5.7/11.1 Selma to Fowler Rehab Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitate a portion of State Route 99 in Fresno County. (ND) (PPNO 6800) (SHOPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-05 (Related Item under Ref. 2.5b.(2).)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08-SBd/Riv - Various, PM Various Rehabilitation Activities on Six Bridges Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitate six bridges on State Route 91 and Interstates 10 and 15 in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. (ND)(PPNO 3002G) (SHOPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-06 (Related Item under Ref. 2.5b.(1).)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-SJ-4, PM 4.1/4.9 Middle River Bridge Roadway Realignment Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curve correction on the east end of Middle River Bridge on State Route 4 in San Joaquin County. (MND) (PPNO 3177) (SHOPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-07 (Related Item under Ref. 2.5b.(2).)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-SJ-88, PM 13.70/14.0, 10-Alp-88, PM 0.20/2.60 State Route 88 Drainage System Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replace existing and construct new culverts along State Route 88 in San Joaquin and Alpine Counties. (MND) (PPNO 3141) (SHOPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-08 (Related Item under Ref. 2.5b.(2).)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-Ora-605, PM 1.1/1.6 Interstate 605/Katella Avenue Interchange Improvements Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct roadway and interchange improvements on I-605 and Katella Ave in Orange County. (MND) (EA 0K870) (Local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution E-19-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab #</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Ref. #</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Status*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Four Relinquishment Resolutions:</td>
<td>2.3c.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04-Ala-185-PM 0.9/3.2 Right of way on State Route 185 (E. 14th Street and Mission Boulevard) from the San Leandro city boundary to the Hayward city boundary, in the county of Alameda. Resolution R-4018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06-Tul-216-PM 1.97/2.46 Right of way along State Route 216 (Houston Avenue) on North Lovers Lane, McAuliff Street, and McAuliff Court, in the city of Visalia. Resolution R-4019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06-Kin-198-PM R9.47 Right of way along State Route 198 on 19th Avenue and Iona Avenue, in the city of Lemoore. Resolution R-4020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09-Ker-14-PM 59.0/61.2 Right of way along Route 14 from 1.4 miles south of and 0.5 miles north of the junction with State Route 178, in the county of Kern. Resolution R-4021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>One Vacation Resolution:</td>
<td>2.3d.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03-Sut-70-PM R2.8/R3.3, SSH Vacation Right of Way along State Route 70 from 0.15 mile south of and 0.30 mile north of Marcum Road, in the county of Sutter. Resolution A-911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Two Rescinding Resolutions of Necessity:</td>
<td>2.4e.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06-Tul-137-PM 16.5/16.6 Cynthia C. Gregory, Trustee of The Collen Gregory Revocable Trust, dated January 9, 2003, and Donald D. Gregory, as to an undivided one-half interest, and Paul C. Richter, III and Clara O. Richter, husband and wife as community property, as to an undivided one-half interest. Resolution CR-161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06-Tul-137-PM 16.5/16.6 Donald D. Gregory, Trustee of the Donald D. Gregory Revocable Trust dated October 2, 2000, as to an undivided one-half interest, and Paul C. Richter, III and Clara O. Richter, husband and wife, as community property, as to an undivided one-half interest. Resolution CR-162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>23 Resolutions of Necessity Resolutions C-21673 through C-21695</td>
<td>2.4b.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Director’s Deeds Items 1 through 10 Excess Lands - Return to State: $1,405,207 Return to Others: $0</td>
<td>2.4d.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab #</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Ref. #</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Status*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 47   | Allocation Amendments- Proposition 1B Traffic Light Synchronization Program Projects:  
      Request to reallocate a combined total of $1,297,110 from the following projects, due to savings at project close out:  
      • $16,000 from TLSP Project California Boulevard in Los Angeles County. (Project 07-6784) 2.5g.(7b) Resolution TLS1B-AA-1819-15 Amending Resolution TLS1B-A-1112-003  
      • $10,000 from TLSP Project Hill Avenue in Los Angeles County. (Project 07-6787) 2.5g.(7c) Resolution TLS1B-AA-1819-16 Amending Resolution TLS1B-A-1112-003  
      • $8,000 from TLSP Project Los Robles Avenue in Los Angeles County. (Project 07-6788) 2.5g.(7d) Resolution TLS1B-AA-1819-17 Amending Resolution TLS1B-A-1112-003  
      • $291,913 from TLSP Project Smart Corridor Projects in San Mateo County. (Project 04-6805) 2.5g.(7e) Resolution TLS1B-AA-1819-18 Amending Resolution TLS1B-AA-1112-010 Resolution STIP1B-AA-1819-01, Amending Resolution STIP1B-A-1112-004  
      • $960,764 from TLSP Project Smart Corridor Projects in San Mateo County. (Project 04-6805) 2.5g.(7f) Resolution TLS1B-AA-1819-19 Amending Resolution TLS1B-AA-1213-01  
      • $10,433 from TLSP Project Smart Corridor Projects in San Mateo County. (Project 04-6805) 2.5g.(7g) Resolution TLS1B-AA-1819-20 Amending Resolution TLS1B-A-1112-004                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 2.5g.(7b) – 2.5g.(7g) |          | A       |
| 48   | Allocation Amendments - Proposition 1B Intercity Rail Improvement Program Projects:  
      Request to reallocate a combined total of $617,000, from the following projects, due to savings from completion of the project:  
      • $198,000 in PS&E from the Van Nuys North Platform Project (PPNO 75-2113) 2.5g.(8a) Resolution ICR1B-AA-1819-01, Amending Resolution ICR1B-AA-1314-01  
      • $419,000 in PS&E from Raymer to Benson Double Track Project. (PPNO 75-2098) 2.5g.(8b) Resolution ICR1B-AA-1819-02, Amending Resolution ICR1B-A-1314-02 (Related Items under Ref. 4.24 & 2.5g.(8c))                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 2.5g.(8a) – 2.5g.(8b) |          | A       |
| 49   | Amendment – Local Partnership Program (Formulaic):  
      Amend Resolution LPP-A-1819-07 to revise the project description for the LPP Program Amendment approved in October 2018 under Resolution G-18-44. There is no change to the originally approved allocation amount. Resolution LPP-A-1819-19, Amending Resolution LPP-A-1819-07                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 2.6s.(1) |          | A       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 50    | Allocation Amendment for Proposition 116 Rail Bond Program Projects: Request to deallocate a combined total of $2,250,344, from the following projects, due to savings at project close out:  
- $429,778 from the Sand Canyon Avenue Grade Separation project in Orange County. (PPNO 9651) (2.6b.(1)) Resolution BFA-18-01, Amending Resolution BFP-09-07  
- $1,820,566 from the Orange County Metrolink Fiber Optics Installation project in Orange County. (PPNO 9523) (2.6b.(2)) Resolution BFA-18-02, Amending Resolution BFP-09-03 (Related Items under Refs 2.1d & 2.6b.(3)) | 2.6b.(1) – 2.6b.(2) | A                      | D       |
|       | **END OF CONSENT CALENDAR**                                                                                                                                                                                        |              |                        |         |
|       | **ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS**                                                                                                                                                                                          |              |                        |         |
| 51    | Approval of Project for Future Consideration of Funding: 05-SCr-1, R7.24/16.13 Santa Cruz State Route 1 Project Roadway improvements on a portion of State Route 1 in Santa Cruz County. (FEIR) (PPNO 0073A) (STIP) Resolution E-19-14 (Related Item under Ref. 2.5c.(2)) | 2.2c.(6)     | Jose Oseguera Jeremy Ketchum | A       | D       |
| 53    | Caltrans’ Project Delivery Update  
- Project Delivery Quarterly Report – FY 18-19 – First Quarter                                                                                                                                                  | 3.5          | Chris Traina Mike Keever | I       | D       |
<p>|       | <strong>PROGRAM STATUS</strong>                                                                                                                                                                                                 |              |                        |         |
| 54    | Request for an allocation of $27,800,000 (29 percent increase) in Construction Capital, and $2,990,000 (8 percent increase) in Construction Support for a SHOPP Pavement Rehabilitation project on State Route 20 in Sutter County. (PPNO 8132) Resolution FP-18-43 | 2.5d.(1)     | Chris Traina Amarjeet Benipal | A       | D       |
| 55    | Request for an allocation of $1,817,000 (31 percent increase) in Construction Capital, and the originally programmed amount of $970,000 in Construction Support, for a SHOPP drainage culvert replacement project on Interstate 5 in Los Angeles County. (PPNO 4847) Resolution FP-18-44 | 2.5d.(2)     | Chris Traina John Bulinski | A       | D       |
| 56    | Supplemental Funds Request - Award                                                                                                                                                                                  |              |                        |         |
| 57    | Request for an additional $952,000 in Construction Capital (25 percent increase) for a SHOPP Collision Severity Reduction project on State Route 68 in Monterey County. (PPNO 2378) Resolution FA-18-35 | 2.5e.(1)     | Chris Traina Tim Gubbins | A       | D       |
| 58    | Request for an additional $2,985,000 in Construction Capital (46 percent increase) for a SHOPP Collision Severity Reduction project on United States Highway 395 in Mono County, to re-advertise and award. (PPNO 0615) Resolution FA-18-36 | 2.5e.(2)     | Chris Traina Brent Green | A       | D       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Supplemental Funds Request - Complete Construction</td>
<td>2.5e.(3)</td>
<td>Chris Traina Derek Willis</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY MATTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Use of Senate Bill 1 Funds for Workforce Development</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Garth Hopkins Tim Rainey</td>
<td>I R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Draft State Highway Systems Management Plan</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Chris Traina Michael Johnson</td>
<td>I D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM UPDATES**

**Senate Bill 1 Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Caltrans' Senate Bill 1 Quarterly Report – FY 18-19 – First Quarter</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Robert Nelson Jim Davis</td>
<td>I D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Active Transportation Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Caltrans’ Active Transportation Program Report</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Laurie Waters Rihui Zhang</td>
<td>I D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>ATP Amendment for Approval: The County of San Bernardino proposes to amend Active Transportation Program Project Santa Ana River Trail Reaches B &amp; C to revise the project scope. (PPNO 1202) Resolution ATP-A18-07</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>Laurie Waters</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Baseline Agreements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>SB 1 Baseline Agreements: State Highway Operation and Protection Program - (SHOPP) 6 Baseline Agreements for Approval. Resolution SHOPP-P-1819-10B (Related Item under Ref. 2.5b.(2).)</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>Teri Anderson</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Status of Baseline Agreements for the Active Transportation, Local Partnership, Solutions for Congested Corridors, and Trade Corridor Enhancement Programs.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Dawn Cheser</td>
<td>I C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Proposition 1B Baseline Agreement: State Route 99 Bond Program Baseline Agreement – Northbound Livingston Widening Project Resolution R99-P-1819-03</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Matthew Yosgott</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposition 1A High Speed Passenger Train Bond Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Proposition 1A High Speed Passenger Train Bond Program (Urban/Commuter) Amendment: The Sacramento Regional Transit District proposes to reprogram the existing Sacramento Intermodal Facility Project as two separate projects, the Downtown/Riverfront Sac-West Sac Streetcar System project and the Sacramento Valley Station project. Resolution HST1A-P-1819-01, Amending Resolution HST1A-P-1718-01 (Related Item under 2.2c.(5).)</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>Teresa Favila</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposition 116 Rail Bond Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Proposition 116 Program Amendment; Request to deprogram the savings from Sand Canyon Avenue Grade Separation Project and the Metrolink Fiber Optics Installation Project and increase program funds to the Laguna Niguel to San Juan Capistrano Passing and Siding Project in the Orange County Commuter/Intercity Rail Program of Projects. Resolution PA-19-01, Amending Resolution PA-14-01. (Related Items under Ref. 2.6b.(1) &amp; 2.6b.(3)</td>
<td>2.1d.</td>
<td>Teresa Favila</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab #</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Ref. #</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Status*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Allocation Amendment – Proposition 116 Program:</td>
<td>2.6b.(3)</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Ron Sheppard</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request to increase the original allocation of Proposition 116 funding by $2,250,344, from $2,483,00 to $4,733,344, for the Laguna Niguel to San Juan Capistrano Passing and Siding project in Orange County. (PPNO 2107) Resolution BFA-18-03, Amending Resolution BFP-18-01 (Related Items under Ref. 2.1d. &amp; 2.6b.(1).)</td>
<td>2.6b.(3)</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Ron Sheppard</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Proposition 1B Intercity Rail Improvement Program Amendment:</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Ron Sheppard</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request to reprogram a combined total in $617,000 in PS&amp;E to construction on the Van Nuys North Platform Project. Resolution ICR1B-P-1819-03 Amending Resolution ICR1B-P-1819-02 (Related Item under 2.5g.(8a), 2.5g.(8b) &amp; 2.5g.(8c)</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Ron Sheppard</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Allocation Amendment – Proposition 1B Intercity Rail Improvement Program Project:</td>
<td>2.5g.(8c)</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Ron Sheppard</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request to increase the original allocation amount by $617,000, from $30,500,00 to $31,117,000, for Construction on the Van Nuys North Platform Project. (PPNO 2113) Resolution ICR1B-AA-1819-03 Amending Resolution ICR1B-AA-1516-02 (Related Item under 2.5g.(8a), 2.5g.(8b) &amp; 4.24</td>
<td>2.5g.(8c)</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Ron Sheppard</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>SHOPP PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHOPP Program Amendments for Approval</td>
<td>2.1a.(1)</td>
<td>Teri Anderson Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Add 14 new projects into the 2018 SHOPP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Revise 20 projects currently programmed in the 2018 SHOPP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHOPP Amendment 18H-007 (Related Item under Ref. 2.5b.(2).)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Amendment to the Major Damage Restoration Reserve for Fiscal Year 2018-19</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Chris Traina Dennis Agar</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request of $200,000,000, from $340,000,000 to $540,000,000 for the FY 18-19 Major Damage Restoration Reserve. Resolution G-19-03, Amending Resolution G-18-46</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Chris Traina Dennis Agar</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>STIP PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STIP Program Amendments for Approval</td>
<td>2.1a.(2)</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Department and San Mateo City/County Association of Governments, in concurrence with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, propose to amend the San Mateo and Santa Clara US 101 Managed Lanes Project, programmed in the STIP, LPP and SCCP, to reassign a portion of the scope of work into a new segment for early delivery in FY 2018-19. (PPNO 0658D) STIP Amendment 18S-11</td>
<td>2.1a.(2)</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>STIP Amendments for Notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Riverside County Transportation Commission and the City of Lake Elsinore propose to amend the 2018 STIP to program an AB 3090 replacement project (PPNO 3009Y) to advance the start of the Project Approval and Environmental Document (Environmental) phase of the I-15 Express Lanes – Southern Extension (PPNO 3009X) by using local measure funds. STIP Amendment 18S-15</td>
<td>2.1b.(2)</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>I D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab #</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Ref. #</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Status*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALLOCATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHOPP Allocations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Request of $5,211,000 for four District Minor projects. Resolution FP-18-45</td>
<td>2.5a.</td>
<td>Teri Anderson Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Request of $241,513,000 for 22 SHOPP projects. Resolution FP-18-46 (Related Item under Ref. 2.2c.(1).)</td>
<td>2.5b.(1)</td>
<td>Teri Anderson Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHOPP Capital Outlay Support Allocations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Request of $54,800,000 for 70 2018 SHOPP preconstruction project phases for environmental, design and R/W support: 2.5b.(2a) - $23,700,000 for 34 2018 SHOPP phases 2.5b.(2b) - $31,100,000 for 36 2018 SHOPP-SB1 phases Resolution FP-18-47 (Related Item under Ref. 2.1a.(1) &amp; 4.19.)</td>
<td>2.5b(2)</td>
<td>Teri Anderson Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seismic Retrofit Program – Phase II - Proposition 192</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Request of $1,163,000 for mitigation on three Seismic Retrofit Program – Phase II – Proposition 192 projects, on the State Highway System. Resolution FP-18-50</td>
<td>2.5g.(15)</td>
<td>Chris Traina Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STIP Allocations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Request of $4,051,000 for two locally-administered STIP projects, on the State Highway System. Resolution FP-18-48 (Related Item under Ref. 2.2c(6).)</td>
<td>2.5c.(2)</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Request of $3,502,000 for four locally-administered STIP projects, off the State Highway System. 2.5c. (3a) -- $3,378,000 for two STIP projects. 2.5c. (3b) -- $124,000 for two STIP Planning, Programming, and Monitoring projects. Resolution FP-18-49</td>
<td>2.5c.(3)</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Rihui Zhang</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senate Bill 1 Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Partnership Program (LPP) Project Allocations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Request of $2,027,000 for the State-Administered US 101 Managed Lanes Project – Northern Segment SB1 LPP-Formulaic project, on the State Highway System, in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. (PPNO 0658D) Resolution LPP-A-1819-15</td>
<td>2.5s.(1)</td>
<td>Christine Gordon Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Request of $5,510,000 for the locally-administered State Route 99/Fulkerth Road Interchange Improvements SB1 LPP-Formulaic and Competitive project, on the State Highway System, in Stanislaus County. (PPNO 3414) Resolution LPP-A-1819-16</td>
<td>2.5s.(2)</td>
<td>Christine Gordon Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Request of $4,142,000 for two locally-administered LPP (Formulaic) projects, off the State Highway System. 2.5s.(3a) - $4,142,000 for two LPP – Formulaic projects. Resolution LPP-A-1819-17</td>
<td>2.5s.(3)</td>
<td>Christine Gordon Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advance - LPP Project Allocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Request of $4,597,000 for two locally-administered LPP (Formulaic) projects, off the State Highway System, programmed in FY 19-20. 2.5s.(4a) - $4,597,000 for two LPP – Formulaic projects. Resolution LPP-A-1819-18 (Related Item under Ref. 4.8)</td>
<td>2.5s(4)</td>
<td>Christine Gordon Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program Project Allocations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Request of $1,815,000 for three TIRCP projects. 2.6g.(1b) – $1,815,000 for three TIRCP SB1 Augmentation for PTA projects. Resolution TIRCP-1819-06</td>
<td>2.6g.(1)</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Ron Sheppard</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab #</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Ref. #</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Status*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Active Transportation Program (ATP) Project Allocations</td>
<td>2.5w.(1)</td>
<td>Anja Aulenbacher Rihui Zhang</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request of $13,720,000 for 21 locally-administered ATP projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5w.(1a) -- $7,046,000 for eight ATP projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5w.(1b) -- $6,674,000 for 13 ATP SB1 Augmentation projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution FATP-1819-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Related Item under Ref. 2.2c.(2), 2.2c.(3), &amp; 2.2c.(4).)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Contract Award Time Extension</td>
<td>2.8b.(1)</td>
<td>Teri Anderson Bruce De Terra</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request to extend the period of contract award for 9 SHOPP projects, on the State Highway System, per Interim SHOPP Guidelines. Waiver 19-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Contract Award Time Extension</td>
<td>2.8b.(2)</td>
<td>Anja Aulenbacher Rihui Zhang</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request to extend the period of contract award for eight ATP projects, per ATP Guidelines. Waiver 19-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Contract Award Time Extension</td>
<td>2.8b.(4)</td>
<td>Teresa Favila Ron Sheppard</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request to extend the period of contract award for the Metrolink High Speed Readiness Program project (PPNO CP002) in Los Angeles County, per High Speed Passenger Train Bond Program Guidelines. Waiver 19-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Project Completion Time Extension</td>
<td>2.8c.</td>
<td>Anja Aulenbacher Rihui Zhang</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request to extend the period of project completion for three ATP projects, per ATP Guidelines. Waiver 19-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER MATTERS / PUBLIC COMMENT

6. ADJOURN

### HIGHWAY FINANCIAL MATTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$335,101,000</td>
<td>Total SHOPP/Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$  7,553,000</td>
<td>Total STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$  7,046,000</td>
<td>Total Active Transportation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 22,950,000</td>
<td>Total Senate Bill 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$  1,163,000</td>
<td>Proposition 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 38,037,000</td>
<td>Total Supplementals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$411,850,000</td>
<td>Sub-Total Highway Allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 31,145,000</td>
<td>Delegated Allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$442,995,000</td>
<td>TOTAL VALUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7,974 TOTAL JOBS CREATED

$1,297,110 Total De-allocations/Project savings

### MASS TRANS FINANCIAL MATTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,815,000</td>
<td>Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (SB1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,815,000</td>
<td>TOTAL VALUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 TOTAL JOBS CREATED
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Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 1.2

Action

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Prepared By: Douglas Remedios
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Subject: MEETING MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 5-6, 2018

ISSUE:
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the meeting minutes for the December 5-6, 2018 Commission meeting?

RECOMMENDATION:
Commission staff recommends that the Commission approve the meeting minutes for the December 5-6, 2018 Commission meeting.

BACKGROUND:
California Code of Regulations, Title 21 CA ADC §8012, requires that:

The commission shall keep accurate minutes of all meetings and make them available to the public. The original copy of the minutes is that signed by the executive secretary and is the evidence of taking any action at a meeting. All resolutions adopted at a meeting shall be entered in the text of the minutes by reference.

In compliance with Title 21 CA ADC §8012, the Commission’s Operating Procedures (May 11, 2011) require that as an order of business, at each regular meeting of the Commission, the minutes from the last meeting shall be approved by the Commission.

Attachment:
Attachment A: December 5-6, 2018 Meeting Minutes
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Reference No.: 1.13

Published Date: January 18, 2019

Subject: APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE DECEMBER 4, 2018 JOINT MEETING OF THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND THE CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Prepared By: Douglas Remedios
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the meeting minutes for the December 4, 2018 Joint Meeting of the Commission and the California Air Resources Board (Board)?

RECOMMENDATION:

Commission staff recommends that the Commission approve the meeting minutes for the December 4, 2018 Joint Meeting of the Commission and the Board.

BACKGROUND:

California Code of Regulations, Title 21 CA ADC §8012, requires that:

The commission shall keep accurate minutes of all meetings and make them available to the public. The original copy of the minutes is that signed by the executive secretary and is the evidence of taking any action at a meeting. All resolutions adopted at a meeting shall be entered in the text of the minutes by reference.

In compliance with Title 21 CA ADC §8012, the Commission’s Operating Procedures (May 11, 2011) require that as an order of business, at each regular meeting of the Commission, the minutes from the last meeting shall be approved by the Commission.

Attachment A: December 4, 2018 Joint Meeting Minutes of the California Transportation Commission and the California Air Resources Board
Assembly Bill 179 (Cervantes, Chapter 737, Statutes 2017) directs the California Transportation Commission and the California Air Resources Board to meet at least twice a year to coordinate implementation of transportation programs and policies. This was the second joint meeting of 2018.

For a detailed review of this meeting please view the archived video recording at: http://ctc.dot.ca.gov/webcast/ctc/vod_ctc.asp

The presiding officer for this meeting was the Chair of the California Transportation Commission, except for those items pertaining exclusively to the California Air Resources Board Chair’s oversight, such as the roll call of California Air Resources Board members.

*A" denotes an “Action” item; “I” denotes an “Information” item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>Roll Call and Opening Remarks</td>
<td>Fran Inman, Chair California Transportation Commission</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Nichols, Chair California Air Resources Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Transportation Commissioners and Air Resources Board Members led those attending in the Pledge of Allegiance Commission Chair Fran Inman, Board Chair Nichols, and Assemblymember Sabrina Cervantes provided welcome remarks for this informational item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair Fran Inman</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Commissioner Carl Guardino</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Bob Alvarado</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Commissioner Christine Kehoe</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Yvonne Burke</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Commission Jim Madaffer</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Lucetta Dunn</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Commissioner Joe Tavaglione</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Jim Earp</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Commissioner Paul Van Konynenburg</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Jim Ghielmetti</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly member Jim Frazier, Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Senator Jim Beall, Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>Present: 12</td>
<td>Absent: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Mary Nichols</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Vice-Chair Sandra Berg</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Hector De La Torre</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Member Barbara Riordan</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member John Eisenhut</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Supervisor Phil Serna</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Dean Florez</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Member Dr. Alex Sherriffs</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor John Gioia</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Member Professor Dan Sperling</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Judy Mitchell</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Supervisor Ron Roberts</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician Member John Balmes</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Member Diane Takvorian</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly member Eduardo Garcia, Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Senator Ricardo Lara, Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Present: 8 Absent: 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 10:10 AM  Welcome to the Region  Phillip A. Washington
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

3 10:25 AM  Senate Bill 150 Report Findings  Carey Knecht
California Air Resources Board

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Chief Executive Officer Phil Washington presented this informational item.

Air Resources Board Air Pollution Specialist Carey Knecht presented this informational item.

Comments provided by:
- ARB Member – Professor Dan Sperling
- CTC Ex-Officio Commissioner – Assemblymember Jim Frazier
- CTC Commissioner – Jim Madaffer
- ARB Member – Judy Mitchell
- CTC Commissioner – Lucy Dunn
- ARB Chair – Mary Nichols
- CTC Commissioner – Paul Van Konynenburg
- CTC Commissioner – Yvonne Burke
- ARB Member Diane Takvorian
- CTC Vice Chair – Jim Earp
- CTC Chair – Fran Inman
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments Executive Director Maura Twomey presented this informational item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>Overview of Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Development</td>
<td>Maura Twomey Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Comments provided by:
- CTC Commissioner – Christine Kehoe
- ARB Member – Professor Dan Sperling
- CTC Commissioner – Jim Madaffer
- CTC Chair – Fran Inman
- CTC Commissioner – Bob Alvarado
- CTC Commissioner – Paul Van Konyenburg
- CTC Vice Chair – Jim Earp
- CTC Ex-Officio Commissioner– Assemblymember Jim Frazier
- CTC Commissioner – Jim Ghielmetti
- California Secretary for Transportation – Brian Annis
Speakers:

Ted Smalley – Tulare County Association of Governments
Duane Baker – San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
Ahron Hakimi – Kern Council of Governments
Rosa Park – Stanislaus Council of Governments
Sarkes Khachek – Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
Darrell Clarke – Sierra Club
Tony Boren – Fresno Council of Governments
David Grubb – Sierra Club of San Diego
Will Barrett – American Lung Association
Ana Castro Reynoso – Environmental Health Coalition
Duane Baker – San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
Nancy Pfeffer – Gateway Cities Council of Governments
Jack Shu – Cleveland National Forest Foundation
Kendal Asuncion – Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Bryn Linblad – Climate Resolve
Jonathan Matz – Safe Routes to School National Partnership
Cody Rosenfield – Coalition for Clean Air
Ericka Rincon – Policy Link
Ella Wise – Climate Plan
Esther Rivera – California Walks
Jennifer Hernandez – The 200
Richard Lyon – California Building Industry Association
Keith Dunn – Self Help Counties Coalition
John Gamboa – The 200
Richard Lambros – Southern California Leadership Council
Stacie Dabbs – Merced County Association of Governments
Wes Reutiman – Active SGV
Kurt Brotcke – Orange County Transportation Authority
Andrew Henderson – Building Industry Association of Southern California
Marisela Carabello DiRuggiero – The Port of Los Angeles
Jared Sanchez – CalBike
John Barna – Private Citizen
Karissa Willette – Building Industry Association of Southern California
Wes May – Engineering Contractor’s Association
Sarah Wiltfong – Los Angeles County Business Federation
Shirley Medina – Riverside County Transportation Commission
Grecia Elenas – Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability

Comments provided by:
ARB Member Judy Mitchell
ARB Member – Professor Dan Sperling
Meeting adjourned at 4:24 pm.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 1.5
Action

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Prepared By: Douglas Remedios
Associate Governmental
Program Analyst

Subject: COMMISSIONER MEETINGS FOR COMPENSATION

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the following Commissioner meetings for compensation as provided below?

1) Meetings for Compensation for November 2018 (Attachment A)
2) Meetings for Compensation for December 2018 (Attachment B)
3) Amended Meetings for Compensation for August 2018 (Attachment C)
4) Amended Meetings for Compensation for September 2018 (Attachment D)
5) Amended Meetings for Compensation for October 2018 (Attachment E)

RECOMMENDATION:

Commission staff recommends that the Commission approve the Commissioner meetings for compensation as provided above.

BACKGROUND:

Per Government Code Section 14509, each member of the Commission shall receive compensation of one hundred dollars ($100) per day, but not to exceed eight hundred dollars ($800) for any Commission business authorized by the Commission during any month, plus the necessary expenses incurred by the member in the performance of the member’s duties when a majority of the Commission approves the compensation by a recorded vote. The need for up to eight days per diem per month is unique to the Commission in that its members must evaluate projects and issues throughout the state in order to carry out its responsibilities.
Attachments:

Attachment A: Meetings for Compensation for November 2018
Attachment B: Meetings for Compensation for December 2018
Attachment C: Amended Meetings for Compensation for August 2018
Attachment D: Amended Meetings for Compensation for September 2018
Attachment E: Amended Meetings for Compensation for October 2018
Bob Alvarado

- No meetings reported at this time.

Yvonne Burke

- November 29 – Teleconference with Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Staff Re: December Commission Agenda Items. Los Angeles.

Lucetta Dunn

- November 5 – Teleconference with Susan Bransen Re: Commission Matters. Irvine
- November 19 – Teleconference with Susan Bransen Re: Commission Matters. Irvine
- November 21 – Meeting with Roy Kim and Rick Alexander Re: Cost and Schedule Savings on Bridge Development. Irvine
- November 26 – Teleconference with Susan Bransen Re: Commission Matters. Irvine
- November 27 – Teleconference with the City of Laguna Beach Re: State Route 133/El Toro. Irvine
- November 29 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Project Delivery Briefing. Irvine
- November 30 – Meeting with Staff from the Orange County Transportation Authority Re: Orange County Street Car Project. Santa Ana

Jim Earp

- November 27 – Meeting with Amarjeet Benipal and John Ballantyne Re: Supplemental Funds Request. Rocklin
- November 29 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Project Delivery Briefing. Sacramento

James Ghielmetti

- November 19 – Meeting with Tony Tavares Re: Supplemental Funds Request. Pleasanton
- November 20 – Teleconference with Debbie Hale Re: Proposition 116 Spending. Pleasanton
- November 29 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Project Delivery Briefing. San Francisco
Carl Guardino

- November 1 – Meeting with staff from the California Water Service Company and Sam Liccardo Re: Transportation and Housing. San Jose
- November 13 – Meeting with Tony Tavares Re: Bay Area Transportation Priorities. San Jose
- November 14 – Meeting with Carolyn Gonot RE: Funding for BART Phase II. San Jose

Fran Inman

- November 1 – Attended the California Freight Advisory Committee Freight Scenario Planning Call. City of Industry
- November 7 – Attended a tour of the CR&R Biomass Fleet Solution Facility. Perris
- November 8 – Attended the City of Los Angeles Micromobility Workshop. Los Angeles
- November 14 – Meeting with Robert Weisenmiller Re: Transportation and Energy Commissions Collaboration. Los Angeles
- November 20 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Joint Meeting with the Air Resources Board and Project Delivery Workshop Planning. Los Angeles
- November 26 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Joint Meeting with the Air Resources Board Logistics. Los Angeles
- November 29 – Meeting with Robert Naylor Re: December Commission Meeting Agenda. Sacramento
- November 30 – Teleconference with Mary Nichols Re: Joint Meeting with the Air Resources Board Agenda. City of Industry.

Christine Kehoe

- No meetings reported at this time.

Jim Madaffer

- November 5 – Meeting with the Southern California Association of Governments Re: Transportation Committee Presentation. Palm Desert
- November 13 – Presenter at the Leonard Transportation Institute Re: Future of Transportation Funding. San Bernardino
- November 16 – Attended the Road Charge Technical Advisory Committee Meeting. Sacramento
- November 27 – Panel Moderator for the California State Association of Counties Annual Conference. San Diego
- November 29 – Meeting with San Diego Association of Governments Staff Re: December Commission Meeting and Joint Meeting Agendas. San Diego
Joseph Tavaglione

- No meetings reported at this time.

Paul Van Konynenburg

- November 1 – Attended the State Route 269 Ground Breaking Event. Huron
- November 5 – Attended the California Intercity Passenger Rail Service Briefing. Modesto
- November 8 – Attended the State Route 12 Bouldin Island Ribbon Cutting Event. Lodi
- November 29 – Teleconference with Susan Bransen Re: Turlock Local Partnership Program Project. Modesto
- November 30 – Meeting with the Rural Counties Task Force, Capital Southeast Connector and the Air Resources Board. Sacramento
MEETINGS FOR COMPENSATION
DECEMBER 2018

Regular Commission Meeting Activities:

- December 4 – Joint Commission and California Air Resources Board Meeting in Los Angeles (All Commissioners attended all or part of the meeting)
- December 5 – Commission Project Delivery Workshop in Riverside (All Commissioners attended all or part of the meeting)
- December 5 – Commission Meeting in Riverside (All Commissioners attended all or part of the meeting)
- December 6 – Commission Meeting in Riverside (Commissioners Burke and Madaffer were Absent. All other Commissioners attended all or part of the meeting)

Additional Meetings:

Bob Alvarado

- December 3 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Chair Briefing. Oakland
- December 20 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Active Transportation Program Cycle 4 Staff Recommendations. Oakland.

Yvonne Burke

- December 3 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Agenda Briefing. Los Angeles

Lucetta Dunn

- December 3 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Agenda Briefing. Irvine
- December 3 – Teleconference with Sheila DeBlonk and Jim Wunderman Re: Public Private Partnership Program Steering Committee. Irvine
- December 3 – Teleconference with Orange County Transportation Authority Re: December Commission Meeting Agenda. Irvine
- December 6 – Attended the Women in Transportation Seminar Orange County Event. Tustin
- December 13 – Meeting with the Southern California Partnership for Jobs Re: Senate Bill 1 Project Applications. Irvine
- December 14 – Meeting with Ryan Chamberlain Re: Caltrans Update. Irvine
- December 14 – Teleconference with Mobility 21 Re: Board Meeting. Irvine
- December 14 – Meeting with Metrolink Staff Re: Just One Trip a Week Program. Irvine
- December 17 - Teleconference with Sheila DeBlonk and Jim Wunderman Re: Public Private Partnership Program Steering Committee. Irvine
- December 19 – Meeting with Les Card and Tony Petros Re: Just One Trip a Week Program. Irvine
Jim Earp

- December 3 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Agenda Briefing. Sacramento
- December 14 – Meeting with Caltrans Staff Re: Presidio Parkway Project. San Francisco
- December 20 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Active Transportation Program Cycle 4 Staff Recommendations. Sacramento

James Ghielmetti

- December 3 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Agenda Briefing. Pleasanton
- December 14 – Meeting with Caltrans Staff Re: Presidio Parkway Project. San Francisco

Carl Guardino

- December 3 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Agenda Briefing. San Jose

Fran Inman

- December 3 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Chair Briefing. City of Industry
- December 3 – Meeting with John Bulinski Re: December Commission Meeting Agenda Briefing. City of Industry
- December 7 – Speaker at the Coalition for Responsible Transportation Annual Meeting. Long Beach
- December 18 – Attended the Electric Bus Infrastructure Workshop. West Covina
- December 19 – Teleconference with Doran Barnes Re: Foothill Transit Update for the Commission. City of Industry
- December 20 – Meeting with Tom Skancke Re: Infrastructure and Alternative Transportation. Tustin

Christine Kehoe

- No additional meetings reported at this time.

Jim Madaffer

- December 7 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Road Charge Technical Advisory Committee. San Diego

Joseph Tavaglione

- No additional meetings reported at this time.
Paul Van Konynenburg

- December 3 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Agenda Briefing. Modesto
- December 7 – Attended the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley Board Meeting. Stockton
- December 13 – Meeting with the Tulare County Association of Governments. Sacramento
- December 14 – Meeting with Caltrans Staff Re: Presidio Parkway Project. San Francisco
AMENDED MEETINGS FOR COMPENSATION
OCTOBER 2018

Additional Meetings:

Joseph Tavaglione

- August 3 – Attended the California Highway Patrol Graduation. Sacramento
- August 8 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Project Delivery Briefing. Riverside
- August 10 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Agenda Briefing. Riverside
- August 12 – Meeting with Anne Mayer, Ray Wolfe and John Bulinski Re: Regional Transportation Projects. Riverside
- August 24 – Meeting with Al Zelinka and Cindy Roth Re: Columbia Entrance Grade Separation. Riverside
AMENDED MEETINGS FOR COMPENSATION
SEPTEMBER 2018

Additional Meetings:

Joseph Tavaglione

- September 11 – Meeting with the California Highway Patrol. Riverside
- September 12 – Teleconference with Caltrans Re: Pine Street Project. Riverside
- September 14 – Teleconference with Susan Bransen Re: Commission Matters. Riverside
- September 18 – Attended the Senate Bill 1 Meeting. Riverside
- September 25 – Meeting with Senator Richard Roth Re: State Route 60. Riverside
- September 26 – Meeting with Anne Mayer Re: State Route 71 Interchange. Riverside
AMENDED MEETINGS FOR COMPENSATION
OCTOBER 2018

Additional Meetings:

James Earp

- October 9 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Project Delivery Briefing. Sacramento
- October 15 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Agenda Briefing. Sacramento
- October 16 – Meeting with Amarjeet Benipal Re: Supplemental Funds Requests. Rocklin
- October 24 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Annual Report to the Legislature. Sacramento

Joseph Tavaglione

- October 3 – Meeting with John Hagel Re: Southern California Partnership for Jobs. Riverside
- October 9 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Project Delivery Briefing. Riverside
- October 11 – Meeting with Mike Buchamp Re: Caltrans. Riverside
- October 19 – Attended the Mobility 21 Annual Summit. Los Angeles
- October 19 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee Briefing. Riverside
- October 29 – Meeting with Al Zelinka Re: Grade Separation and State Route 91. Riverside

Paul Van Konynenburg

- October 4 – Teleconference with Dennis Agar Re: Supplemental Funds Request. Modesto
- October 9 – Meeting with Derek Kan Re: Alameda Corridor Express Train Service. Modesto
- October 10 – Teleconference with Susan Bransen Re: Annual Report to the Legislature. Modesto
- October 11 – Teleconferences with Laurie Berman and Shari Bender-Ehlert Re: Supplemental Funds Request. Modesto
- October 15 – Teleconference with Commission Staff Re: Agenda Briefing. Modesto
- October 23 – Meeting with the City of Tracy, Caltrans and Commission Staff Re: Trade Corridor Enhancement Program Projects. Stockton
- October 28 – Attended the Focus on the Future Conference. Indian Wells
- October 29 – Attended the Focus on the Future Conference. Indian Wells
- October 30 – Attended the Focus on the Future Conference. Indian Wells
2019 MEETING SCHEDULE
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Proposed January 30, 2019

JANUARY 30(W) – JANUARY 31(TH), 2019 – ROCKLIN
January 29 – Project Delivery Workshop
January 30 - Commission Retreat

FEBRUARY 2019 – NO REGULARLY SCHEDULED COMMISSION MEETING

MARCH 13(W) – 14(TH), 2019 – LOS ANGELES

APRIL 2019 – NO REGULARLY SCHEDULED COMMISSION MEETING
April 9 – Joint CTC/CARB Meeting – Sacramento
April 10 & 11 – Town Hall Meeting – North State Super Region – Chico

MAY 15(W) – 16(TH), 2019 – SAN DIEGO

JUNE 26(W) – 27(TH), 2019 – SACRAMENTO

JULY 2019 – NO REGULARLY SCHEDULED COMMISSION MEETING

AUGUST 14(W) – 15(TH), 2019 – SAN JOSE

SEPTEMBER 2019 – NO REGULARLY SCHEDULED COMMISSION MEETING
September 16 & 17 – Tri-State Commission Meeting – Stevenson, WA

OCTOBER 9(W) – 10(TH), 2019 – MODESTO
October 10 – Joint CTC/CARB Meeting – Modesto

NOVEMBER 2019 – NO REGULARLY SCHEDULED COMMISSION MEETING
November 6 – Town Hall Meeting – Del Norte County

DECEMBER 4(W) – 5(TH), 2019 – RIVERSIDE
COMMISSION REPORTS

A VERBAL PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM WILL BE MADE AT THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING.
REPORT BY THE STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY SECRETARY AND/OR UNDERSECRETARY

A VERBAL PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM WILL BE MADE AT THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING.
REPORT BY CALTRANS’ DIRECTOR AND/OR DEPUTY DIRECTOR

A VERBAL PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM WILL BE MADE AT THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING.
REPORT BY UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

A VERBAL PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM WILL BE MADE AT THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING.
REPORT BY REGIONAL AGENCIES MODERATOR

A VERBAL PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM WILL BE MADE AT THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING.
REPORT BY RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE CHAIR

A VERBAL PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM WILL BE MADE AT THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING.
REPORT BY SELF-HELP COUNTIES
COALITION MODERATOR

A VERBAL PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM
WILL BE MADE AT THE CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING.
To:      CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS  
CTC Meeting:      January 30-31, 2019  
Reference No.:  4.1  
Action  
Published Date:      January 18, 2019  
Prepared By:  Paul Golaszewski  
Deputy Director  

From:  SUSAN BRANSEN  
Executive Director  

Subject:  STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE MATTERS  

ISSUE:  
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission):  
1. Accept the staff report on the proposed state legislation identified and monitored by staff as presented in Attachment A?  
2. Adopt a position of support and submit a letter (Attachment C) to Assembly Member Grayson on Assembly Bill (AB) 185? This bill would require the Department of Housing and Community Development to participate in the joint meetings held between the Commission and the California Air Resources Board.  

RECOMMENDATION:  
Staff recommends that the Commission:  
1. Accept the staff report and provide direction on state legislation of interest in Attachment A.  
2. Adopt a position of support and approve the transmission of the letter to Assembly Member Grayson supporting AB 185, included as Attachment C.  

STATE LEGISLATION:  
The Legislature reconvened on January 7, 2019 to begin its work in the new two-year session.  
As of January 16, Members have introduced seven new bills that staff have identified to monitor based on the Commission’s legislative tracking policy. Attachment A is a list of the bills monitored at this time.  

Of the bills monitored at this time, staff recommends the Commission adopt a position of support for AB 185 (Grayson). This bill would require the Department of Housing and Community Development to participate in the joint meetings held between the Commission and the California Air Resources Board pursuant to Chapter 737 of 2017 (AB 197, Cervantes). A copy of the bill is
included as Attachment B. AB 185 would implement the first part of a recommendation the Commission made to the Legislature in its 2018 Annual Report. Staff has drafted a letter to Assembly Member Grayson that expresses the Commission’s support for AB 185, included as Attachment C. The letter also respectfully requests that Assembly Member Grayson consider amending the bill to include the second part of the Commission’s recommendation, which is to require the California Energy Commission to also participate in the joint meetings.

Staff anticipates more transportation-related bills will be introduced in the coming weeks. The last day for Members to introduce bills is February 22. After bills are introduced and read on the floor, they are referred to the policy committees in each house for consideration. Attachment D contains a list of the membership of the Assembly Transportation Committee and the Senate Committee on Transportation.

STATE BUDGET:
On January 10, the Governor submitted his proposed 2019-20 budget to the Legislature. The budget includes $4.8 billion in SB 1 funding. The proposed budget also says the state will encourage jurisdictions to contribute their share of the state’s housing supply by linking housing production to certain transportation funds. The details of this proposal are to be worked out in the coming months through stakeholder discussions. Attachment E contains the Department of Finance’s summary of the Governor’s proposals for transportation and for linking housing production with transportation funds.

After the Governor introduces his proposed budget, legislative budget subcommittees in each house consider the proposals in their respective areas. Attachment F contains a list of the membership of the two budget subcommittees that consider transportation.

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE MATTERS:
On January 3rd, the new 116th Congress convened. Attachment G contains a list of the membership of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. As of January 16, membership on the House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee is still being finalized but Representative Peter DeFazio of Oregon has been named the Chair.

Attachments:
- Attachment A: Legislative bills Commission staff is monitoring this session
- Attachment B: AB 185, as introduced
- Attachment C: Letter of support for AB 185
- Attachment D: Members of legislative transportation policy committees
- Attachment E: Summary of Governor’s proposed budget for transportation
- Attachment F: Members of legislative transportation budget subcommittees
- Attachment G: Members of U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
### Legislative bills Commission staff is monitoring

**Wednesday, January 16, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB 146</th>
<th>(Quirk-Silva D)</th>
<th>State highways: property leases: County of Orange.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Text:</strong></td>
<td>Introduced: 12/14/2018</td>
<td><a href="#">html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Would authorize the Department of Transportation to lease airspace under a freeway, or real property acquired for highway purposes, in the County of Orange, that is not excess property, to a city located in the County of Orange, the County of Orange, a political subdivision of the state whose jurisdiction is located in the County of Orange, or another state agency for purposes of an emergency shelter or feeding program, subject to certain conditions. The bill would specifically authorize the Orange County Housing Finance Trust to enter into these leases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB 185</th>
<th>(Grayson D)</th>
<th>California Transportation Commission: transportation policies: joint meetings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Text:</strong></td>
<td>Introduced: 1/10/2019</td>
<td><a href="#">html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Current law creates the California Transportation Commission, with various powers and duties relative to the programming of transportation capital projects and allocation of funds to those projects pursuant to the state transportation improvement program and various other transportation funding programs. Existing law requires the commission and the State Air Resources Board to hold at least 2 joint meetings per calendar year to coordinate their implementation of transportation policies. This bill would require the Department of Housing and Community Development to participate in those joint meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 7</th>
<th>(Portantino D)</th>
<th>State Highway Route 710.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Text:</strong></td>
<td>Introduced: 12/3/2018</td>
<td><a href="#">html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Would require for surplus nonresidential properties for State Route 710 in the County of Los Angeles that purchases of those properties by tenants in good standing be offered at fair market value as determined relative to the current use of the property if the tenant is a nonprofit organization or a city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 59</th>
<th>(Allen D)</th>
<th>Automated vehicle technology: Statewide policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Text:</strong></td>
<td>Introduced: 12/19/2018</td>
<td><a href="#">html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Would establish the policy of the state relating to automated vehicles in order to ensure that these vehicles support the state’s efforts to, among other things, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and encourage efficient land use. The bill would require the Office of Planning and Research in the Governor's office, in coordination with the State Air Resources Board, to convene an automated vehicle interagency working group of specified state agencies, including, among others, the California Environmental Protection Agency, the Transportation Agency, and the Department of Motor Vehicles, to guide policy development for automated vehicle technology consistent with statewide policies as specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 127</th>
<th>(Wien D)</th>
<th>Transportation funding: active transportation: complete streets.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Text:</strong></td>
<td>Introduced: 1/10/2019</td>
<td><a href="#">html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Would establish a Division of Active Transportation within the Department of Transportation and require that an underseretary of the Transportation Agency be assigned to give attention to active transportation program matters to guide progress toward meeting the department’s active transportation program goals and objectives. The bill would require the California Transportation Commission to give high priority to increasing safety for pedestrians and bicyclists and to the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 128</th>
<th>(Beall D)</th>
<th>Enhanced infrastructure financing districts: bonds: issuance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Text:</strong></td>
<td>Introduced: 1/10/2019</td>
<td><a href="#">html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Summary:** | Current law authorizes the legislative body of a city or a county to establish an enhanced infrastructure financing district, with a governing body referred to as a public financing authority, to
finance public capital facilities or other specified projects of communitywide significance. Current law authorizes the public financing authority to issue bonds for these purposes upon approval by 55% of the voters voting on a proposal to issue the bonds. Current law requires the proposal submitted to the voters by the public financing authority and the resolution for the issuance of bonds following approval by the voters to include specified information regarding the bond issuance. This bill would instead authorize the public financing authority to issue bonds for these purposes without submitting a proposal to the voters.

**SB 137**

*(Dodd D)*  **Federal transportation funds: state exchange programs.**

**Current Text:** Introduced: 1/15/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Fiscal</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Desk</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Fiscal</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Conf.</th>
<th>Conc.</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Vetoed</th>
<th>Chaptered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st House</td>
<td>2nd House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Current federal law apportions transportation funds to the states under various programs, including the Surface Transportation Program and the Highway Safety Improvement Program, subject to certain conditions on the use of those funds. Current law establishes the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program to address deferred maintenance on the state highway system and the local street and road system, and funds that program from fuel taxes and an annual transportation improvement fee imposed on vehicles. This bill would authorize the Department of Transportation to allow the above-described federal transportation funds that are allocated as local assistance to be exchanged for Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program funds appropriated to the department.

**Total Measures:** 7

**Total Tracking Forms:** 7
ASSEMBLY BILL No. 185

Introduced by Assembly Members Grayson and Cervantes

January 10, 2019

An act to amend Section 14516 of the Government Code, relating to transportation.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 185, as introduced, Grayson. California Transportation Commission: transportation policies: joint meetings.

Existing law creates the California Transportation Commission, with various powers and duties relative to the programming of transportation capital projects and allocation of funds to those projects pursuant to the state transportation improvement program and various other transportation funding programs. Existing law requires the commission and the State Air Resources Board to hold at least 2 joint meetings per calendar year to coordinate their implementation of transportation policies.

This bill would require the Department of Housing and Community Development to participate in those joint meetings.


The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. Section 14516 of the Government Code is amended to read:
2
3 14516. (a) The commission and the State Air Resources Board shall hold at least two joint meetings per calendar year to
coordinate their implementation of transportation policies, including interagency efforts, which shall include, but not be limited to, implementation of the sustainable freight action plan developed pursuant to Executive Order B-32-15, development of the California Transportation Plan update pursuant to Section 65071, and the setting of targets pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 65080.

(b) The Department of Housing and Community Development shall participate in joint meetings of the commission and the State Air Resources Board held pursuant to subdivision (a).
January 30, 2019

The Honorable Timothy Grayson
Member of the Assembly
State Capitol, Room 4164
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support for Assembly Bill 185

Dear Assembly Member Grayson:

As part of its statutory charge, the California Transportation Commission (Commission) advises the Administration and the Legislature on state transportation policies and makes recommendations for legislation to improve the transportation system.

The Commission adopted a position to support Assembly Bill (AB) 185 at its meeting on January 30, 2019. This bill requires the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) to participate in joint meetings held by the Commission and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to coordinate their implementation of transportation policies. These joint meetings are required under Chapter 737 of 2017 (AB 197, Cervantes).

At the inaugural joint meeting between the Commission and CARB held in June 2018, it was evident from Commissioner, Board Member, and public comment that key state agencies and policy areas were missing from the discussion. Given the connection between transportation and housing, DHCD’s participation in these joint meetings is critical for transportation policy discussions on issues such as land use decisions, growth patterns, and facility siting and permitting. For this reason, the Commission, in its 2018 Annual Report to the Legislature, recommended legislation to include DHCD in the joint meetings.
In its 2018 Annual Report, the Commission also recommended including the California Energy Commission (CEC) in the joint meetings, given CEC’s role in promoting advanced transportation technologies to achieve state environmental goals. For example, CEC currently is leading an effort to complete a statewide network of electric vehicle charging stations along key interregional highway corridors. Because CEC administers this and other transportation-related programs, the Commission respectfully requests that you consider amending AB 185 to require CEC to participate in the joint meetings as well.

The Commission commends your leadership on further coordinating the implementation of transportation policy across key state agencies. Commissioners and staff are available to provide information that may assist you in moving this legislation forward. If we can be of assistance, please contact the Commission’s Executive Director, Ms. Susan Bransen, at 916-654-4245.

Sincerely,

FRAN INMAN
Chair

c: Commissioners, California Transportation Commission
Susan Bransen, California Transportation Commission, Executive Director
The Honorable Jim Beall, Senate Transportation Committee, Chair
The Honorable Shannon Grove, Senate Transportation Committee, Vice Chair
The Honorable Jim Frazier, Assembly Transportation Committee, Chair
The Honorable Vince Fong, Assembly Transportation Committee, Vice Chair
The Honorable Sabrina Cervantes, Assembly Member
Brian Annis, California State Transportation Agency, Secretary
MEMBERS OF THE ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE:
Assemblymember Jim Frazier, Chair
Assemblymember Vince Fong, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Cecilia Aguiar-Curry
Assemblymember Marc Berman
Assemblymember Frank Bigelow
Assemblymember Kansen Chu
Assemblymember Jordan Cunningham
Assemblymember Tom Daly
Assemblymember Tyler Diep
Assemblymember Laura Friedman
Assemblymember Mike Gipson
Assemblymember Timothy Grayson
Assemblymember Jose Medina
Assemblymember Adrin Nazarian
Assemblymember Patrick O’Donnell

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION:
Senator Jim Beall, Chair
Senator Shannon Grove, Vice Chair
Senator Bill Dodd
Senator Cathleen Galgiani
Senator Mike McGuire
Senator Mike Morrell
Senator Richard D. Roth
Senator Susan Rubio
Senator Nancy Skinner
Senator Jeff Stone
Senator Thomas J. Umberg
Senator Bob Wieckowski
Vacancy
2020 Census

The upcoming 2020 Census is critical to California because the data collected by the decennial census is used to determine the number of seats California will have in the U.S. House of Representatives and federal funding levels for local communities. This will be the first census conducted online, and this and other aspects of the federal census design may adversely impact resident participation. California has the largest number of hard-to-count residents—putting its population at risk of being underreported. Launched in 2017-18, California's Complete Count effort will be an extensive statewide outreach and awareness campaign designed to encourage and support full participation by all Californians in the upcoming 2020 Census.

The Budget includes an additional $50 million for statewide outreach efforts related to increasing the participation rate of Californians in the decennial census, bringing the total funding available to $140.3 million. This effort will span multiple years, be conducted in multiple languages, and implement specific strategies to obtain a complete and accurate count of all California residents. The Budget also includes $4 million for the California Housing and Population Sample Enumeration, which is a survey that will identify barriers to a complete count and successful approaches taken by the various outreach efforts and help develop recommendations for the 2030 Census.

Transportation and Infrastructure

The Administration is continuing to implement the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017, SB 1), which provides stable, long-term funding for both state and local transportation infrastructure. SB 1 provides an average of $5.4 billion per year over the next ten years for a strategic mix of state and local transportation projects. The sustained investment over the course of the next decade and beyond will support hundreds of thousands of jobs in California.

The Budget provides $4.8 billion in new SB 1 funding. Of this amount, $1.2 billion is available to all 479 cities and 58 counties for local road repairs, with another $1.2 billion for the repair and maintenance of the state highway system. On top of this, $400 million is available to repair and maintain the state's bridges and culverts, $307 million is available to improve trade corridors, and $250 million is available to increase throughput on congested commute corridors. The Budget also reflects $458 million for local transit operations and $386 million for capital improvements for transit, commuter, and intercity rail. SB 1 also provides annual funding for other local transportation
priorities, including $200 million for Local Partnership projects, $100 million for projects in the Active Transportation Program, $25 million for expansion of freeway service patrols, and $25 million in local planning grants.

The Administration will release a Five-Year Infrastructure Plan that will identify priorities for investments in the state’s infrastructure later this year.

The Budget includes one-time resources of $315.8 million ($287.2 million General Fund and $28.6 million Proposition 68 bond funds) to address the most critical statewide deferred maintenance projects. At present, the reported statewide deferred maintenance need is more than $70 billion. These one-time resources will continue to address the statewide backlog of deferred maintenance and help departments reduce the need to build costlier new infrastructure. This funding will be provided to the entities listed below:

- Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation: $112,200,000
- Department of Parks and Recreation: $45,600,000 ($34,000,000 General Fund and $11,600,000 Proposition 68 bond funds)
- Judicial Branch: $40,000,000
- Department of State Hospitals: $35,000,000
- Department of General Services: $16,000,000
- Department of Fish and Wildlife: $10,000,000 (Proposition 68 bond funds)
- Network of California Fairs: $7,000,000 (Proposition 68 bond funds)
- Department of Forestry and Fire Protection: $6,000,000
- Department of Developmental Services: $5,000,000
- California Military Department: $5,000,000
- California Highway Patrol: $5,000,000
- Department of Veterans Affairs: $5,000,000
- State Special Schools: $5,000,000
- Department of Motor Vehicles: $3,000,000
- Exposition Park: $3,000,000
- Department of Food and Agriculture: $3,000,000
• Housing and Community Development: $3,000,000
• Employment Development Department: $2,000,000
• Office of Emergency Services: $2,000,000
• California Conservation Corps: $1,000,000
• Hastings College of the Law: $1,000,000
• Tahoe Conservancy: $1,000,000
LONG-TERM STATEWIDE HOUSING PRODUCTION STRATEGY

The Administration will develop a strategy to revamp the current Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process, which determines the amount and type of housing regions and local jurisdictions must produce to meet their need. Under Chapter 370, Statutes of 2017 (AB 72) and Chapter 958, Statutes of 2018 (AB 686), HCD will be taking a more active role in housing element reviews. Moving from an advisory role, HCD will now oversee and enforce regional housing goals and production. HCD will determine a methodology for allocating housing needs to regions and local jurisdictions, with local input.

These long-term housing production targets will be more ambitious than the short-term housing goals mentioned above. As HCD develops these targets, local jurisdictions will have lead time to begin reformulating their housing plans, using the grants above to leverage other sources of funding, such as their general funds and private dollars, to meet their targets.

Going forward, the state will strongly encourage jurisdictions to contribute to their fair share of the state’s housing supply by linking housing production to certain transportation funds and other applicable sources, if any. The Administration will convene discussions with stakeholders, including local governments, to assess the most equitable path forward in linking transportation funding and other potential local government economic development tools to make progress toward required production goals.

MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING PRODUCTION

The Budget makes a sizable investment of $500 million General Fund one-time in the development of housing for moderate-income households. The California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA) will expand its Mixed-Income Loan Program, which provides loans to developers for mixed-income developments that include housing for moderate-income households at a lower subsidy level than traditional state programs. This additional investment will jump-start the estimated $43 million in annual Chapter 364, Statutes of 2017 (SB 2) revenues dedicated for this purpose, and pair with the proposed tax credit program targeting households with incomes between 60 to 80 percent of Area Median Income (see below).

EXPANDED STATE HOUSING TAX CREDIT PROGRAM

Tax credits garner private investment in affordable housing by offering a dollar-for-dollar credit against an investor’s state or federal taxes owed. Two federal credits are
STREAMLINING CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

The Administration will propose legislation to accelerate the construction of homeless shelters, navigation centers and new supportive housing units by allowing for a streamlined CEQA process with accelerated judicial review of challenges to an Environmental Impact Report. This is similar to the process outlined in Chapter 354, Statutes of 2011 (AB 900), and recent bills providing streamlined environmental reviews for sports stadiums.

AIRSPACE

The Administration will also develop a statewide policy for use of Department of Transportation (Caltrans) airspace for emergency shelters. Airspace is land located within the state’s highway right-of-way limits used for non-transportation purposes. This expands on 2018 legislation allowing for up to 30 parcels to be used for emergency shelters in Oakland, San Jose, and Los Angeles, and additional parcels in San Diego and Stockton.

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME (SSI) ADVOCACY

Providing safe shelter for homeless populations coupled with housing supports generally leads to more positive outcomes than either on its own. Studies have shown that affordable housing combined with health and social services supports result in declines in the use of medical and other local services as well as in incarceration.

Many of the chronically homeless are eligible for federal SSI due to their disabling conditions, but the process for applying can be lengthy and difficult to complete. The Housing and Disability Advocacy Program (HDAP) was established as a county match program to assist homeless, disabled individuals with applying for disability benefit programs, while also providing housing supports. The program includes outreach, case management, benefits advocacy, and housing supports to all program participants. Participating counties are required to match any state funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis. The 2017 Budget Act included one-time funding of $45 million General Fund, available over three years, for this program. The Budget proposes an annual appropriation of $25 million General Fund beginning in 2019-20 to continue this program.

WHOLE PERSON CARE PILOT PROGRAMS

The Budget invests $100 million General Fund (one-time with multi-year spending authority) for Whole Person Care Pilot programs that provide housing services.
MEMBERS OF ASSEMBLY BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 ON RESOURCES AND TRANSPORTATION:
Assemblymember Richard Bloom, Chair
Assemblymember Vince Fong
Assemblymember Cristina Garcia
Assemblymember Kevin Mullin
Assemblymember Jim Patterson
Assemblymember Eloise Reyes
Assemblymember Luz Rivas
Assemblymember Phil Ting, Democratic Alternate
Assemblymember Jay Obernolte, Republican Alternate

MEMBERS OF SENATE BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 ON RESOURCES, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, ENERGY AND TRANSPORTATION:
Senator Bob Wieckowski, Chair
Senator Brian W. Jones
Senator Mike McGuire
Senator Bill Monning
Senator Henry I. Stern
MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Majority Members
Senator Roger Wicker, Mississippi, Chairman
Senator Marsha Blackburn, Tennessee
Senator Roy Blunt, Missouri
Senator Shelley Moore Capito, West Virginia
Senator Ted Cruz, Texas
Senator Deb Fischer, Nebraska
Senator Cory Gardner, Colorado
Senator Ron Johnson, Wisconsin
Senator Mike Lee, Utah
Senator Jerry Moran, Kansas
Senator Rick Scott, Florida
Senator Dan Sullivan, Alaska
Senator John Thune, South Dakota
Senator Todd Young, Indiana

Minority Members
Senator Maria Cantwell, Washington, Ranking Member
Senator Tammy Baldwin, Wisconsin
Senator Richard Blumenthal, Connecticut
Senator Tammy Duckworth, Illinois
Senator Amy Klobuchar, Minnesota
Senator Ed Markey, Massachusetts
Senator Gary Peters, Michigan
Senator Jacky Rosen, Nevada
Senator Brian Schatz, Hawaii
Senator Kyrsten Sinema, Arizona
Senator Jon Tester, Montana
Tom Udall, New Mexico
MEMORANDUM

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 4.3

Information

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN

Executive Director

Prepared By: Garth Hopkins

Deputy Director

Subject: OVERVIEW OF UPCOMING ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS SPONSORED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TRANSPORTATION STUDIES

SUMMARY:
Daniel Sperling, Professor of Civil Engineering and Environmental Science and Policy, founding Director of the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California, Davis, and California Air Resources Board Member, will provide an overview of a series of upcoming roundtable discussions sponsored by the University of California Institute of Transportation Studies (UC ITS).

BACKGROUND:
UC ITS is a multi-campus research unit with branches on four UC campuses. It teams UC researchers from more than 30 disciplines on six UC campuses to address critical state goals in high priority areas such as climate change, urban sustainability and air quality, infrastructure and energy, transportation system performance/optimization, taxation and finance.

As part of its outreach efforts, UC ITS is in the process of developing a plan to identify priority policy and research needs related to the transition to shared, automated, connected and zero-emission mobility. UC ITS, in consultation with the California Transportation Commission and the California Air Resources Board, is scheduling a series of five roundtable discussions with select stakeholders to identify the most pressing areas for research and policy development. The five roundtable discussions will take place in various areas throughout California during February 2019.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS  
CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 4.11
Action

Published Date: January 18, 2019

Prepared By: Paul Golaszewski

From: SUSAN BRANSEN  
Executive Director

Subject: WORKSHOPS TO DEVELOP POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM THE TRANSPORTATION SECTOR

ISSUE:

At the December 5, 2018 California Transportation Commission (Commission) meeting, staff received direction to prepare a plan for a series of workshops to develop policy recommendations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector. Should the Commission approve the plan prepared by staff?

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Commission approve the plan prepared by staff for a series of workshops to develop policy recommendations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector.

BACKGROUND:

According to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector account for almost 40 percent of all such emissions—more than any other sector. In 2008, the Legislature enacted SB 375 (Steinberg) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the transportation planning process. Specifically, SB 375 requires each of California’s 18 metropolitan planning organizations, as part of their long-range regional transportation plans, to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy to reduce emissions from passenger vehicles. SB 375 also provides CEQA streamlining incentives for projects consistent with a Sustainable Communities Strategy, to encourage their implementation.

SB 150 of 2017 (Allen) requires CARB to prepare a report every four years to assess the progress made toward reducing greenhouse gas emissions through SB 375 and discuss best practices and challenges, including the effect of state policies and funding. CARB completed its first progress report in November 2018. In its report, CARB found that, on a statewide basis, SB 375-targeted
per capita greenhouse gas emissions decreased by only 2 percent from 2005 to 2016. CARB staff presented the findings from the report at the joint meeting of the Commission and CARB held on December 4, 2018. The presentation generated many comments from CARB members, Commissioners, partner agencies, stakeholders, and members of the public. Among the many issues raised were comments related to the need to balance environmental goals with other transportation goals (such as safety, mobility, economic growth, and goods movement), the importance of housing and land use policy in transportation planning, and the potential impact of advanced transportation technologies under development.

**PLAN FOR WORKSHOPS TO DEVELOP POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS:**
At the December 5, 2018 Commission meeting, Commission staff received direction to prepare a plan for a series of workshops to develop policy recommendations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. Pursuant to this directive, Commission staff has prepared the plan outlined below.

**Kick Off Workshop**
- In the spring, Commission staff will convene an initial workshop to identify a limited number of key policy issues for the workshop series to focus on. For example, key issues might include transportation funding, land use, or advanced transportation technology development.
- Commission staff will solicit input on the selection of the key issues from workshop participants. Staff will encourage broad participation in this workshop, including from all agencies that affect greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector, as well as stakeholder groups.

**Policy Issue Workshops**
- After the key issues have been identified through the initial workshop process, Commission staff will hold workshops throughout the state devoted to specific issues identified.
- The purpose of these workshops will be for Commission staff to receive input on the development of specific, action-oriented policy recommendations for the Commission to inform its 2019 Annual Report to the Legislature.
- Staff will encourage broad participation in these workshops, including from all agencies that affect greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector, as well as stakeholder groups.
- Staff anticipates concluding the workshops by the end of the summer to inform the Commission’s 2019 Annual Report to the Legislature.
To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: BUDGET AND ALLOCATION CAPACITY UPDATE

SUMMARY:

Outlined below is an update for the California Transportation Commission (Commission) concerning topics related to transportation funding in the State of California (State). This information is intended to supplement portions of the verbal presentation on this item.

BACKGROUND:

As of December 31, 2018, the Commission has allocated approximately $3.7 billion toward 436 projects in Fiscal Year 2018-19. Adjustments totaled approximately negative $52 million, leaving approximately $3.3 billion (48 percent) in remaining allocation capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation Capacity</th>
<th>SHOPP</th>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>AERO</th>
<th>LPP</th>
<th>SCCP</th>
<th>TCEP</th>
<th>ATP</th>
<th>TIRCP</th>
<th>BONDS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,149</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>$486</td>
<td>$729</td>
<td>$316</td>
<td>$1,160</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>$6,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Capacity</td>
<td>$1,245</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>$157</td>
<td>$438</td>
<td>$294</td>
<td>$757</td>
<td>$191</td>
<td>$3,323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Amounts may not sum to totals due to independent rounding.

1 Authorized changes include project increases and decreases through December 31, 2018, pursuant to the Commission's G-12 process and project rescissions.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability.”
PROJECT SAVINGS REPORT (G-12):

Through December 31, 2018, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has processed changes to capital construction budgets for both the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). The STIP and SHOPP experienced a decrease of approximately $52.4 million of the programmed amounts. This is the result of increases to 91 projects and decreases to 143 projects.

Savings is added to, or subtracted from, current year capacity in order to make funding immediately available for advancements and project cost increases. These amounts appear under “Authorized Changes,” in the Capital Allocation vs. Capacity Summary on the preceding page.
M e m o r a n d u m

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
       Chief Financial Officer

Subject: OVERVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS FOR THE 2020 STIP FUND ESTIMATE

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No: 4.14
Prepared by: Clark Paulsen, Chief
             Division of Budgets

ISSUE:

Over the next several months, the Department of Transportation (Department) will work closely with California Transportation Commission (Commission) staff to identify key issues and assumptions to prepare the 2020 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate for adoption on August 14, 2019.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve key milestone dates for the development of the 2020 STIP Fund Estimate as follows:

- January 2019 – Overview
- March 2019 – Present Draft Assumptions and Key Issues
- May 2019 – Approve Assumptions (pending 2019-20 May Revise changes)
- June 2019 – Present Draft 2020 STIP Fund Estimate
- August 2019 – Adopt 2020 STIP Fund Estimate

BACKGROUND:

The purpose of the Fund Estimate is to provide both an estimate of all federal and state resources expected to be available for programming in the subsequent STIP and a plan to manage these funds over the Fund Estimate period. The 2020 STIP Fund Estimate will include a five-year forecast from fiscal years 2020-21 through 2024-25 for the State Highway Account, the Federal Trust Fund, the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account, the Public Transportation Account, Proposition 1A bond funds, and Proposition 1B bond funds. In addition to the STIP Fund Estimate, the Department will concurrently prepare a Fund Estimate for the Aeronautics Account.

Section 14525(a) of the California Government Code (GC) requires the Commission to adopt the STIP Fund Estimate by August 15 of each odd-numbered year. Section 14525(d) of the GC allows the Commission to postpone the issuance of the Fund Estimate for up to 90 days.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 4.9

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN

Executive Director

Prepared By: Meghan Pedroncelli

Staff Services Analyst

Subject: CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS

SUMMARY:

Bruce Saito, Director of the California Conservation Corps, will provide an overview of the California Conservation Corps and their role in the Active Transportation Program.

BACKGROUND:

The California Conservation Corps, the oldest and largest conservation corps in the nation, is a state agency that hires young men and women, ages 18 to 25, for a year of natural resource work and emergency response. The California Conservation Corps puts youth and the environment together to benefit both. The young women and men of the California Conservation Corps work hard protecting and restoring California’s environment, responding to disasters becoming stronger workers, citizens and individuals through their service.

As required by Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013), the Active Transportation Program has always included in its application the requirement for every applicant to contact the California Conservation Corps and their Local Community Conservation Corps to offer participation in their project. If an applicant fails to contact either the California Conservation Corps or their Local Community Conservation Corps, the project application’s total score is reduced by five points.

Senate Bill 1 (Beall, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), signed by Governor Brown on April 28, 2017, directs $100 million annually from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account to the Active Transportation Program beginning in the 2017-18 fiscal year. In addition, Assembly Bill 97 (Ting, Chapter 14, Statutes of 2017) directs $4 million of the $100 million annually, beginning in the 2017-18 fiscal year for the next five years, to the California Conservation Corps for active transportation projects to be developed and implemented by the California Conservation Corps and certified Local Community Conservation Corps. The availability of these funds is subject to annual appropriation by the Legislature. Not less than 50 percent of these funds shall be in the form of grants to certified Local Community Conservation Corps. In addition, in accordance with Active Transportation Guidelines, a minimum of 25 percent of all California
Conservation Corps and certified Local Community Conservation Corps proposals that are approved benefit a Disadvantaged Community.

The California Conservation Corps runs a project selection process outside of the Statewide competition that adheres to and conforms to the California Transportation Commission schedule for each Active Transportation Program funding cycle. Projects are selected by the California Conservation Corps on a competitive basis and scored and ranked on the applicant’s ability to commence construction within six months of an award and be completed within two years from the project start date. A minimum of 25 percent of all proposals approved will benefit a disadvantaged community as defined by median household income, CalEnviroScreen, or Free or Reduced Priced School Meals, outlined in the Active Transportation Program Guidelines. In addition, projects must also show the ability to further the goals of Active Transportation Program and leverage other funds.

In 2017-18 and 2018-19, the California Conservation Corps programmed $8 million for 37 projects. Twenty-four projects totaling $5,233,325 (65 percent) will benefit disadvantaged communities and nineteen projects totaling $4,377,772 (54 percent) will go to certified Local Community Conservation Corps.

In September 2015 Bruce Saito was appointed as Director of the California Conservation Corps by Governor Brown. In 1977 Bruce worked for the California Conservation Corps as a training instructor and became Center Director and Conservation Supervisor in the Los Angeles area. In 1986, Bruce helped create the Los Angeles Conservation Corp and later served as the Director for 30 years. He has served as board president for the California Conservation Corps Network and president of the California Association of Local Conservation Corps. Bruce grew up in Los Angeles, graduated from San Francisco State University and resides in Long Beach, CA.
M e m o r a n d u m

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 4.6

Information

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN

Executive Director

Prepared By: Anja Aulenbacher

Assistant Deputy Director

Subject: HEARING ON THE 2019 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM–STATEWIDE AND SMALL URBAN & RURAL COMPONENTS STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY:

The Commission adopted the 2019 Active Transportation Program guidelines and the program fund estimate at the May 2018 Commission meeting. Per legislation, the 2019 Active Transportation Program must benefit a minimum of 25 percent disadvantaged communities.

The 2019 Active Transportation Program includes four years of programming, 2019-20 through 2022-23, with $445,560,000 in funding capacity for the following program components:

- Statewide (50 percent or $218,780,000)
- Small Urban & Rural (10 percent or $43,756,000)
- Ten large Metropolitan Planning Organizations (40 percent or $175,024,000)
- California Conservation Corps ($8,000,000 for 2019-20 and 2020-21)

The call for projects was released May 2018. Project applications were due on or before July 31, 2018. An extension was granted to applicants affected by wildfires. Applications were received for 554 projects, requesting over $2.2 billion of Active Transportation Program funds. Fifty-one teams of volunteer evaluators reviewed applications and provided consensus scores for each application. The evaluators represent the northern and southern parts of the state equally. Evaluators are city/county transportation planners and engineers, advocates, California Transportation Commission and Department of Transportation employees. All evaluators attended a mandatory three-hour training session conducted by Commission staff that involves reviewing the evaluation process and scoring rubrics. Commission staff also reviewed every application to check the evaluator scores.

The Commission encouraged applicants to apply for larger projects in the 2019 Active Transportation Program because these projects have the potential to generate a more transformative change to a community’s transportation environment. Applicants heeded this encouragement by applying for much larger projects than in past cycles. Eight percent of projects submitted in Cycle 4 requested $10,000,000 or more, with the largest request amount being...
$39,600,000. The average fund request was over $4,000,000 per project which is double the average fund request from the 2017 Active Transportation Program. Because of these large requests, the available funds were consolidated into fewer projects than in past cycles. Additionally, the funding cut-off score (a score of 89) was higher than in past cycles.

The geographic funding distribution has been varied over the years, in some cycles the majority of funds were distributed to the northern part of the state, and in others the majority of funds was distributed to the southern part of the state. Considering all four cycles together, the funding distribution generally breaks down to 59 percent south and 41 percent north.

Parallel to the application review process, Caltrans reviewed each project for eligibility and deliverability. Caltrans worked with project sponsors for projects recommended for funding in the 2019 Active Transportation Program to resolve any project component eligibility and deliverability issues. Through the Caltrans review and the Commission evaluation process, ten projects were determined to be ineligible and were not scored.

The staff recommendations are based on:
- Funding levels identified in the 2019 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate;
- Eligibility for the program;
- Evaluation team project scores;
- Statutory requirements; and
- Commission policies as expressed in the Active Transportation Program guidelines.

In summary, the recommendations include:

**Statewide Component – Active Transportation Program funds of $237,566,000 for 51 projects valued at $290,273,000 including:**
- $154,186,000 (65 percent) for 35 Safe-Routes-to-School projects
- $232,936,000 (98 percent) for 50 projects that provide benefits to disadvantaged communities.

An additional $18,786,000 in savings from lapsed funds or canceled projects from the last three cycles was added to the Statewide component, for an increased funding capacity of $237,566,000.

**Small Urban & Rural Component – Active Transportation Program funds of $43,756,000 for 9 projects valued at $53,270,000, including:**
- $24,239,000 (55 percent) for 6 Safe-Routes-to-School projects
- $43,756,000 (100 percent) for 9 projects that provide benefits to disadvantaged communities.

Commission staff recommendations were revised on January 18, 2019 and differ from the recommendations initially released on December 28, 2018. The December recommendations conditionally awarded $22,572,000 to the project submitted by the City of Compton, Blue Line First/Last Mile Improvements: Compton and Artesia Station Areas. The City of Compton did not meet the programming conditions to designate a replacement project implementor by January 16, 2019. As a result, the City of Compton will forego the award, and their requested amount of $22,572,000 will be distributed to the next highest scoring applicants.
For those projects receiving the same score at the cut-off for funding, Commission staff applied a secondary ranking system to recommend projects. This secondary ranking system was adopted by the Commission in the 2019 Active Transportation Program Guidelines and consists of prioritizing project funding based on the following sequence: 1) infrastructure projects, 2) construction readiness, and 3) which applicant received the highest score on question 2, then question 3, then question 4.

The revised cut-off score for funding in the Statewide Component is 89. Programming capacity at the cut-off score is available to fully fund five of twelve projects that scored 89 and fund $3,217,000 of the $4,756,000 requested by the City of Santa Barbara for the U.S. 101 State Street Undercrossing Active Transportation Improvements project. Since the City of Santa Barbara also qualifies for the Small Urban and Rural Component, the remaining $1,539,000 will be funded from that component to fully fund the project.

Many projects which are not recommended for the Statewide Component remain eligible for the metropolitan planning organization component. The metropolitan planning organizations will bring their programming recommendations forward at the June 26-27, 2019 Commission meeting for Commission adoption.

In the Small Urban & Rural Component, the cut-off score for funding was an 85. Four projects eligible for the Small Urban & Rural Component scored an 85 and were subject to the secondary ranking system described above. Enough programming capacity at the cut-off score was available to fund $14,583,000 of the $17,959,000 requested by the City of Goleta for the San Jose Multi-Purpose project in the City of Goleta. Commission staff will work with the City of Goleta to determine if the project can be delivered with the funding available.

BACKGROUND:

On September 26, 2013, the Governor signed legislation creating the Active Transportation Program (Senate Bill 99, Chapter 359 and Assembly Bill 101, Chapter 354). Senate Bill 1, signed by the Governor on April 28, 2017, directs an additional $100 million annually from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account to the Active Transportation Program beginning in Fiscal Year 2017-18.

Commission staff recommendations include active transportation projects that will provide significant benefits throughout the state. Examples include, but are not limited to, the following:

Statewide Component Projects

- Doran Street Grade Separation Active Transportation Access Project, Los Angeles County – $16,319,000. This Project will construct two bridges for shared use by pedestrians and bicyclists in the cities of Glendale and Los Angeles. The bridges will improve safety and increase non-motorized access between employment, residences, and recreational opportunities. The project area is currently blocked off by a river and a freeway and marred.
by a railroad corridor with up to 90 train trips per day and a history of bicycle and pedestrian collisions. Train volumes in this corridor are expected to increase with improvements to commuter rail service and the introduction of high speed rail service. The proposed bridges are being designed to remove a major barrier to connectivity and build a safer, less intimidating railroad crossing, creating an environment that encourages more residents, employees, and visitors to choose non-motorized modes of transportation.

- **California Street Separated Bikeway Project, Stockton, San Joaquin County - $4,390,000.** This project will be the “spine” of a proposed north/south bicycle travel network that will also support multiple east/west connections. The project will install 1.2 miles of Class IV protected bike lanes and 3.8 miles of Class II bike lanes that connect North and Central Stockton through downtown to South Stockton connecting multiple disadvantaged neighborhoods. The project will also include associated signal modifications, improvements to traffic control devices, street lighting, and ADA improvements. The project is expected to decrease Average Daily Traffic throughout Stockton while also decreasing bicyclist involved motor vehicle collisions and improving mobility for the City's most economically vulnerable residents.

- **Central Community Mobility Enhancements, National City, San Diego County - $1,286,000.** The project will include the design and construction of a continuous 1.7 mile, low-stress bicycle boulevard, close a sidewalk gap, and provide pedestrian enhancements in National City between 4th Street and 30th Street. The proposed north/south alignment connects several dense neighborhoods (Central, Las Palmas, and Olivewood) to a major commercial and transit corridor, Plaza Boulevard. The commercial area has the highest employment density in the City and contains several super markets. The local streets are ideal for active transportation due to their low vehicular volumes and speeds and their connection to three east/west bicycle corridors. However, no bicycle infrastructure currently exists along the route and there is a large gap north of the commercial/transit area. Residents from the neighborhood north of Plaza Boulevard currently traverse a steep dirt hill to access public transit, shopping centers, and employment.

- **Humboldt Bay Trail South, Humboldt County - $13,296,000.** The project will close the four-mile gap in the Humboldt Bay Trail between Eureka and Arcata by constructing a multi-use trail (Class I bike path) along the Humboldt Bay shoreline parallel to Highway 101. The project will provide the interconnecting link between recently completed trail projects and culminate the decades-long effort to connect the two largest cities in Humboldt County with a continuous, non-motorized transportation facility. Under existing conditions, people must travel in the shoulder along a four-lane expressway. The lack of bicycle and pedestrian facilities severely limits the number of non-motorized trips along the highway corridor due to safety concerns. This project is Humboldt County’s top priority for investing in active transportation and presents the greatest opportunity to enable a major mode shift in transportation within the county. The project will significantly increase the number of non-motorized trips, improve safety, enhance public health, and promote community vitality.
- South Chester Avenue Pedestrian Safety Project, Kern County - $1,976,000. This project will improve an approximately 0.8-mile length of South Chester Avenue in a primarily unincorporated metropolitan Bakersfield area by bridging sidewalk gaps, completing ADA-accessibility upgrades, creating safer pedestrian paths across the railroad tracks (presently dirt shoulders), and increasing visibility of non-motorized users by installing rapid flashing beacons, signs, and lights at two uncontrolled crossing locations. The project will provide safer routes to school for hundreds of students attending South High, Sequoia Middle and Wayside Elementary schools. Additionally, the improvements will benefit the severely disadvantaged community residents living near the project location.

- Highway 49 Sidewalk Gap Closure, Placer County - $14,403,000. The project will construct approximately 2.8 miles of sidewalks and ADA curb ramps in the 4.4-mile corridor of State Route 49. The project will close four significant gaps and create four new routes, which will provide direct connections for approximately 11,000 disadvantaged community residents who are otherwise forced to walk along the highway shoulder or dirt paths to six schools, local government services, seven bus routes, a hospital and supporting health clinics, social service agencies, multiple retail centers, two parks, and numerous neighborhoods. In addition to the sidewalk improvements, the Placer County Public Health Division will develop a multi-year Safe Routes to School program targeting the six area schools focusing on safety, education, encouragement, equity, enforcement, and evaluation.

Small Urban & Rural Component Projects

- Fort Ord Regional Trail & Greenway: Highway 218 Segment, Monterey County - $10,379,000. This project is a 1.5-mile pedestrian and bicycle trail connection for the Southern Loop of the proposed 32-mile Fort Ord Regional Trail & Greenway in Monterey County. The proposed segment provides independent utility, connecting eleven project area destinations. The future connection to the Fort Ord Regional Trail & Greenway network will link residents to regional healthcare, employment and shopping centers, California State University Monterey and Monterey Peninsula College campuses, Fort Ord National Monument, and the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail. This project will construct the most difficult segment of the Fort Ord Regional Trail & Greenway network, separating students, residents, and visitors from the biggest barrier to mobility in the network – Highway 218.

- U.S. 101 State Street Undercrossing Active Transportation Improvements, Santa Barbara County - $4,756,000. This project addresses a barrier to mobility and safety issues. Consistent with Vision Zero, the project improves the State Street Undercrossing by removing unnecessary vehicle travel lanes to widen sidewalks, upgrade the narrow Class II bike lanes to Class IV lanes with separation from vehicle traffic, and shorten the pedestrian crossing distance at State Street and Gutierrez Street. The project also provides a context-sensitive design that strengthens the visual active transportation connection between Santa Barbara’s downtown and waterfront.
Bikeway 99 Phase 5 - 20th Street Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing, Chico, Butte County - $12,356,000. Bikeway 99 is a 7-mile Class I and Class II/III regional bicycle/pedestrian facility paralleling State Route 99 from the City’s northern to southern limits. Phase 5 construction will close the final gap in Bikeway 99 with a 2,800-linear foot Class I path, including a bicycle/pedestrian bridge over 20th Street and short connection to Business Lane, between the Class I portion of Bikeway 99 that terminates at the Chico Mall parking lot and the Phase 4 Class I facility along the State Route 99 frontage. The benefits of constructing Phase 5, located within a disadvantaged community, include: increase proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking by addressing safety and mobility needs of nonmotorized users; implement Chico General Plan “Complete Streets” and sustainability goals/policies, including greenhouse gas reductions; enhance public health with active transportation, and reduce vehicle miles traveled.

The following tables provide a summary of proposed programming recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Programming Recommendations (Amount in $1000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Urban &amp; Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Requirements (Amount in $1000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities (Statewide)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities (Small Urban &amp; Rural)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule

The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the 2019 Active Transportation Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission adopts 2019 Active Transportation Program Guidelines</td>
<td>May 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call for projects</td>
<td>May 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications due to Caltrans</td>
<td>July 31, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Approves / Rejects MPO Optional Guidelines</td>
<td>August 15-16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Staff posts recommendations for Statewide and Small Urban &amp; Rural Components</td>
<td>December 31, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission adopts Statewide and Small Urban &amp; Rural Components</td>
<td>January 30-31, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO final programming recommendations to CTC</td>
<td>April 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission adopts MPO selected projects</td>
<td>June 26-27, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:

- Attachment A: 2019 Active Transportation Program – Statewide Component Revised
- Attachment B: 2019 Active Transportation Program – Small Urban & Rural Component Revised
- Attachment C: Correspondence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Recommended ATP Funding</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>22-23</th>
<th>PABED</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>CON NI</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>DAC</th>
<th>SRTS</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Humboldt-1</td>
<td>Humboldt Humblet Bay Trail South</td>
<td>$22,600</td>
<td>$13,296</td>
<td>13,296</td>
<td>13,296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LA Department of Transportation (LA T.O.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LA Department of Transportation (LA T.O.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gustin-1</td>
<td>Gustin Active Transportation Plan</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gustin-1</td>
<td>Gustin Active Transportation Plan</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gustin-1</td>
<td>Gustin Active Transportation Plan</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stanislaus County-1</td>
<td>Stanislaus Airport Neighborhood Active Transportation Connectivety and Safety Project</td>
<td>$6,163</td>
<td>$4,926</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4,907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pomona-2</td>
<td>Pomona Multi-Neighborhood Pedastrian and Bicycle Improvements</td>
<td>$9,864</td>
<td>$9,269</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>8,534</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,334</td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Duarte-1</td>
<td>Duarte Active Transportation Safety Project</td>
<td>$2,293</td>
<td>$2,270</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,23</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA Department of Transportation-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stockton-3</td>
<td>Stockton SRTS Safety and Connectivity Improvements</td>
<td>$3,225</td>
<td>$2,838</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>2,33</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Santa Barbara-2</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Downtown De LaVina Street Safe Crosswalks and Buffered Bike Lanes</td>
<td>$1,494</td>
<td>$1,494</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA Department of Transportation-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inyo County-2</td>
<td>Inyo Lone Pine Sidewalk Construction and ADA Improvements</td>
<td>$1,939</td>
<td>$1,939</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Riverside County Transportation Department-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stockton-1</td>
<td>Stockton California Street Separated Bikeway Project</td>
<td>$6,390</td>
<td>$4,390</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Long Beach-2</td>
<td>Los Angeles Orange Avenue Backbone Bikeway and Complete Streets Improvements</td>
<td>$15,526</td>
<td>$13,363</td>
<td>13,363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Temecula-1</td>
<td>Riverside Santa Gertrudis Creek Trail, Phase 2</td>
<td>$2,085</td>
<td>$1,502</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure + NI - M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application ID</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Recommended ATP Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Alemany Interchange Improvements, Phase 2</td>
<td>$2,727</td>
<td>$1,971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Every Child Community-Supported SRTS</td>
<td>$2,225</td>
<td>$1,214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>High School G Street Bike/Pedestrian Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>$703</td>
<td>$45 658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Pedestrian Plans for Disadvantaged Communities in Unincorporated Los Angeles County</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Doran Street Grade Separation Active Transportation Access Project</td>
<td>$22,219</td>
<td>$16,319 16,319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Kennedy Elementary and Villa Fundamental Intermediate SRTS</td>
<td>$1,482</td>
<td>191 1,291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Avenue R Complete Streets and Safe Routes Project – Construction Phase</td>
<td>$9,630</td>
<td>$5,150 5,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>Highway 49 Sidewalk Gap Closure</td>
<td>$16,403</td>
<td>$14,403 1,083 13,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Fremont Elementary and Spurgeon Intermediate SRTS</td>
<td>$5,776</td>
<td>927 4,849 84 484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>National City Bike Wayfinding</td>
<td>$592</td>
<td>15 95 383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Townsite Complete Street Improvements</td>
<td>$4,177</td>
<td>100 400 3,468 100 400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Jurupa Valley Sunnyslope Area SRTS Sidewalk Gap Closure</td>
<td>$3,173</td>
<td>1 388 2,466 1 388 2,466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>SR 41 Pedestrian Crossing and Pathway Improvements</td>
<td>$366</td>
<td>8 40 312 8 40 312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>North/South Bike Network Gap Closure &amp; Connectivity to North Eastvale</td>
<td>$8,091</td>
<td>414 457 5,600 114 457 5,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Tweedy Boulevard Complete Streets Project</td>
<td>$5,776</td>
<td>4,620 4,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Citywide SRTS Sidewalk Gap Closure</td>
<td>$4,199</td>
<td>104 974 50 3,021 104 550 424 3,021 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Jelhue Corridor and Eucalyptus Avenue Class I Bike Paths</td>
<td>$2,820</td>
<td>195 417 2,108 195 292 125 2,079 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>Walk Isabella</td>
<td>$6,086</td>
<td>854 4,286 854 4,286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Alexandria Avenue Elementary School Neighborhood Safety Improvements Project</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>549 183 382 3,366 549 183 382 3366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Rancho Cordova School Zone Improvement Project</td>
<td>$1,282</td>
<td>$1,122 1,122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Juan Bautista de Anza Multi-Use Trail Project</td>
<td>$8,653</td>
<td>$8,403 1,010 7,393 350 660 7,393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application ID</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Recommended ATP Funding</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>P&amp;AED</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>CON NI</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-San Jose-2</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Better BikewaySJ - San Fernando Corridor</td>
<td>$11,919</td>
<td>$9,992</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>8,208</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>8,208</td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Monterey Park-1</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Monterey Park School and Crosswalk Safety Enhancement Project</td>
<td>$1,367</td>
<td>$1,367</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Transportation Agency for Monterey County-1</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Fort Ord Regional Trail &amp; Greenway: Highway 218 Segment (Monterey County)</td>
<td>$12,397</td>
<td>$10,379</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>9,181</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>9,181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Santa Barbara-1</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>U.S. 101 State Street Undercrossing Active Transportation Improvements</td>
<td>$5,961</td>
<td>$3,217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$290,273</td>
<td>$237,566</td>
<td>$22,569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$78,894</td>
<td></td>
<td>$77,152</td>
<td>$58,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Prior to programming Caltrans will contact applicant for project clarifications.

† Recommended funding year(s) programming differs from proposed for deliverability purposes.

§ This project requested $4,756,000, however only $3,217,000 of programming capacity remains. Since this project would be fully funded in the Small Urban and Rural Component, the remaining $1,539,000 will be used from the SUR component to fully fund this project.
## 2019 Active Transportation Program - Small Urban and Rural Component
### Revised Staff Recommendations

($1,000's)

| Application ID | County | Project Title                                                                 | Total Project Cost | Recommended ATP Funding | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | PA&ED | PS&E | ROW | CON | CON | Project Type | DAC | SRTS | Final Score |
|----------------|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|-----|------|-------------|
| 5-Santa Barbara County-1 | Santa Barbara | Modoc Road Multimodal Path Gap Closure | $6,990 | $5,351 | 388 | 621 | 4,342 | 388 | 543 | 78 | 4,342 | Infrastructure - M | X | X | 89 |
| 5-Santa Barbara-1‡ | Santa Barbara | U.S. 101 State Street Undercrossing Active Transportation Improvements | $5,961 | $1,539 | 412 | 596 | 531 | 412 | 551 | 45 | 531 | Infrastructure - M | X | X | 89 |
| 3-Chico-1 | Butte | Bikeway 99 Phase 5 - 20th Street Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing | $15,464 | $12,356 | 2,252 | 10,104 | 2,252 | 10,104 | Infrastructure - L | X | 89 |
| 3-Willits-1 | Mendocino | City of Willits Rail with Trail Project | $6,362 | $6,362 | 350 | 400 | 5,612 | 350 | 400 | 5,423 | 189 | Infrastructure + NI - M | X | 87 |
| 2-Corning-2 | Tehama | Olive View School Connectivity Project | $1,123 | $1,118 | 30 | 130 | 80 | 858 | 30 | 150 | 80 | 858 | Infrastructure + NI - S | X | X | 86 |
| 5-UC Santa Cruz-1* | Santa Cruz | UCSB Bike Path Safety Improvement Phase 2/Bike Safety Education | $1,499 | $799 | 799 | 65 | 369 | 365 | Infrastructure + NI - S | X | 86 |
| 5-Santa Barbara-4 | Santa Barbara | Lower Eastside Community Connectivity Active Transportation Plan | $344 | $344 | 344 | 344 | Plan | X | X | 86 |
| 2-Corning-1 | Tehama | West Street School Connectivity Project | $1,309 | $1,304 | 30 | 185 | 80 | 1,009 | 30 | 185 | 80 | 1,009 | Infrastructure + NI - S | X | X | 86 |
| 5-Goleta-1‡ | Santa Barbara | San Jose Multi-Purpose Path | $20,179 | $14,583 | 2,669 | 11,914 | 1,800 | 869 | 11,914 | Infrastructure - L | X | X | 85 |

**Prior to programming Caltrans will contact applicant for project clarifications.**

**Recommended programming funding year(s) differs from proposed for deliverability purposes.**

**This project requested $17,959,000, however only $14,583,000 of programming capacity remains. Staff will work with the agency to ensure a fully funded project.**

**This project requested $4,756,000, however only $3,217,000 of programming capacity remains in the Statewide Component. Since this project would be fully funded in the Small Urban and Rural Component, the remaining $1,539,000 will be used from the SUR component to fully fund this project.**

---

**CON: Construction Phase**  **RW: Right-of-Way Phase**

**DAC: Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities**  **SRTS: Safe Routes to School**

**NI: Non-Infrastructure**  **S: Small**

**PA&ED: Environmental Phase**  **M: Medium**

**Plan: Active Transportation Plan**  **L: Large**

**PS&E: Plans, Specifications & Estimate Phase**
Attachment C:
Correspondence
January 4, 2019

Laurie Waters
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, MS-52
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 4 Scoring for the City of Big Bear Lake

Dear Ms. Waters,

This joint letter is being submitted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) to request rescission of the ineligibility decision made on the City of Big Bear Lake – Lake Loop Non-Motorized Pathway ATP application. We would respectfully request that the CTC score the submitted application so that we can determine its rankings in the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) portion of the ATP.

We fully understand that the main reason for the application receiving an ineligibility status was due to submittal of a small infrastructure application instead of a large infrastructure application. Since this is the first time different forms were introduced in the ATP process, mistakes were made by multiple applicants including the application from Big Bear Lake. However, the application did state its full project cost in the engineering estimate section of the application.

In addition, this is a project identified in the Big Bear Lake Active Transportation Plan as a priority, and thus the City has worked hard to come up with its implementation strategy, involving multiple strategy sessions with various stakeholders such as SBCTA, SCAG, and Caltrans District 8. Due to the geographical location of the City, there were multiple environmental and right-of-way issues identified that needed to be resolved before construction could occur. The only logical conclusion as a group was to have the City submit a pre-construction only application.

From the regional and countywide perspective, the City did everything right when it comes to preparing for an ATP application. SCAG and SBCTA have been involved in the development of the ATP grant process from the beginning, and the City should be commended for the quality of the ATP application they prepared. It is truly unfortunate to see such an exemplary application not even be considered for scoring based on a technicality.

For these reasons, both SCAG and SBCTA believe that the project application should at least be considered as a “project” and receive a score that mirrors the merits of the application.

Sincerely,

Kome Ajise
Planning Director, SCAG

Steve Smith, Director of Planning, SBCTA
January 18, 2019

California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Active Transportation Program (Cycle 4) Staff Recommendations for Awards

Dear Commissioners,

On behalf of the Avenal City Council and the residents of Avenal, please accept this letter for your consideration with regard to the 2019 Active Transportation Program (Cycle 4) Staff Recommendations. The City of Avenal respectfully challenges the CTC Staff’s recommendations, specifically pertaining to the Small Urban and Rural Component (SUR) on the basis of a technical scoring error as explained below.

The City of Avenal submitted two project applications: 1) 6-AVENAL-1: Avenal SRTS SR269 Improvement Project ($537,000), and 2) 6-AVENAL-2: Avenal Safe Routes to School and Bicycle Improvement Project ($1.725m), which each scored 84 and 69, respectively. 6-AVENAL-1 contained an apparent technical error in the scoring which more than likely would have placed it among the awarded projects in the SUR.

The Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric (attached as Exhibit A), against which 6-AVENAL-1 was evaluated, includes Question #1: Disadvantaged Communities. This question is broken down into five parts, each with their own maximum amount of attainable points:

- A) Map of Project Boundaries, Access and Destination (0 points)
- B) Identification of Disadvantaged Community (0 points)
- C) Direct Benefit (0-4 Points)
- D) Project Location (0-2 Points)
- E) Severity (0-4 Points)
  
  Total: 10 maximum points

According to the Score Sheet for 6-AVENAL-1 (attached as “Exhibit B”), it received a total of 6 points for Question 1. The score sheet provided by CTC Staff does not indicate how those points are broken down but based on the information in the application and the rubric guidelines, it should have received the maximum points for Parts D - Project Location (2 points) and E-Severity (4 points). Our project is located fully (100%) within a DAC and >90% of students receive free or reduced lunches, as indicated in the application.

"Oasis in the Sun - Gateway to the Coast."
Based on the assumption that we received full points for parts D and E, which we cannot confirm with the information provided by CTC Staff, we can deduce that the application received 0 points for Part C (Direct Benefit). The scoring guidelines for Part C provided in the Rubric are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the project will result in a direct benefit to the Disadvantaged Community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 Points | The application **clearly and convincingly**:  
- Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network and/or meets an important disadvantaged community need. |
| 3 Points | The application **convincingly**:  
- Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important disadvantaged community need. |
| 2 Points | The application **somewhat**:  
- Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, and/or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important disadvantaged community need. |
| 1 Point | The application **minimally**:  
- Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important disadvantaged community need. |
| 0 Points | Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe the application does not adequately make a convincing argument that the project will directly benefit a disadvantaged community. |

As is apparent from the table above, the score appears to indicate that our application failed to "adequately make a convincing argument that the project will directly benefit a disadvantaged community", which presumably resulted in 0 points. However, our application scored highly in every other question, including:

**Question 2:** Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and bicycling routes to and from schools, transit facilities, community centers, employment centers, and other destinations; and including increasing and improving connectivity and mobility of nonmotorized users. **Total: 48** of 53 points

**Question 3:** Potential for reducing the number and/or rate or the risk of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries, including the identification of safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists. **Total: 22** of 25 points
Question 4: Public Participation and Planning. **Total: 6** of 10 points

Question 5: Scope and Plan Consistency. **Total: 2** of 2 points

The scores in all of the other questions clearly indicate that the application was successful in establishing a clear need in the disadvantaged community of Avenal and proposing a feasible and effective solution that would benefit the community in alignment with the goals of the ATP. It is thus puzzling that a score of "0" was given for Part C of Question 1, which if our assumption is correct, is inconsistent with the scoring of the rest of the application and leads us to conclude that there was a technical error in the scoring for this section.

It should also be noted that our decision to challenge CTC Staff's recommendations was further reinforced by the fact that the awards for the Small Urban and Rural Component (SUR) were extremely skewed to specific geographical areas of the state, with 60% of the Small Urban & Rural Component recommended to be awarded to applicants from only two counties, totaling 48% of the total funding for this component. No San Joaquin Valley communities were awarded in the SUR, though clearly not due to lack of merit.

With the above information in mind, we respectfully request that the Commission take the appropriate course of action, including rejecting Staff's Recommendations for the Small Urban and Rural Component, and ensure that the scoring of our application 6-AVENAL-1 is correct, fair, and consistent with the guidelines and spirit of the Program, and that the awards are subsequently distributed accordingly.

Sincerely,

Dagoberto Ovalle, Mayor
City of Avenal

Attachments:  Exhibit A: Small Infrastructure Scoring Rubric
Exhibit B: Score Sheet for 6-AVENAL-1
Exhibit C: 2019 ATP – Small Urban and Rural Component, Staff Recommendations

CC: Susan Bransen, Executive Director, California Transportation Commission
    Laurie Waters, Associate Deputy Director, California Transportation Commission
    Melissa Hurtado, CA State Senate, 14th District
    Rudy Salas, CA State Assembly, 32nd District
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The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has prepared these Scoring Rubrics in coordination with Caltrans to provide additional guidance on the evaluation process. This document is principally intended as a guide for the evaluators when scoring the 2019 ATP applications. Applicants may also find this a useful resource when developing applications. This document, however, is not intended as the definitive formula for how applications will be scored. Evaluators may take other factors into consideration when scoring applications, such as the overall application quality, project context and project deliverability.

Note: For combined projects the term “project” refers to both the infrastructure and non-infrastructure elements.

Index:

QUESTION #1: Disadvantaged Communities  Page 2
QUESTION #2: Potential to Increase Users  Page 5
QUESTION #3: Potential to Reduce Collisions  Page 10
QUESTION #4: Public Participation & Planning  Page 16
QUESTION #5: Scope & Plan Consistency  Page 18
2019 Active Transportation Program
Small Infrastructure
Scoring Rubric

QUESTION #1: DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (0-10 POINTS)

This project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community.
If this project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community, applicant will skip the question and move onto question 2.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluator:
If the applicant checked the box for “This project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community” the evaluator will not evaluate sub-questions C, D and E. The score for Question #1 will be zero “0” if the box is checked.

A. Map of Project Boundaries, Access and Destination (0 points): Required
Provide a scaled map showing the boundaries of the proposed project, the geographic boundaries of the disadvantaged community, and disadvantaged community access point(s) and destinations that the project is benefiting.

B. Identification of Disadvantaged Community: (0 points)
Select one of the following 4 options. Must provide information for all Census Tract/Block Group/Place # that the project affects.
- Median Household Income
- CalEnviroScreen
- Free or Reduced Priced School Meals - Applications using this measure must demonstrate how the project benefits the school students in the project area.
- Other

C. Direct Benefit: (0 - 4 points)
Explain how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, and/or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network and how the improvements meet an important need of the disadvantaged community.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluator:
Sub-questions A & B do not receive any points.
- If the applicant does not check the box “This project does not qualify as a Disadvantaged Community” they are required to provide the required project map(s) and provide the DAC information as required in both A & B.
- The evaluator should verify that the required information in both A & B is provided and complete. If the evaluator determines the information is incomplete, inconsistent, or has been manipulated to maximize the DAC criteria they should note this in their evaluation comments and score Question 1 accordingly.

When evaluating sub-question C the evaluator should consider:
- Does the project provide reasonable improvements to close missing gaps; increase needed routes or connections (such as access to and/or community safety for disadvantaged community residents to parks, greenways, open space, health care centers, transit stops, and other community assets) or address the poor conditions of an existing route?
- If developing a new route/connection, will the project result in a convenient and logical route that residents will want to use because it offers improved access to destinations the community commonly utilizes.
- Will the project address the lack of or need for active transportation planning? And/or does the project address the community concerns about the lack of pedestrian or bicycle safety education in their community?
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- Will the project address an identified “need” that was identified by the local community and is it supported by backup documentation/attachments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the project will result in a direct benefit to the Disadvantaged Community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 Points | The application **clearly and convincingly:**  
  - Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network and/or meets an important disadvantaged community need. |
| 3 Points | The application **convincingly:**  
  - Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important disadvantaged community need. |
| 2 Points | The application **somewhat:**  
  - Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, and/or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important disadvantaged community need. |
| 1 Point | The application **minimally:**  
  - Explains how the project closes a gap, provides connections to, or addresses a deficiency in an active transportation network or meets an important disadvantaged community need. |
| 0 Points | Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe the application does not adequately make a convincing argument that the project will directly benefit a disadvantaged community. |

D. **Project Location: (0 - 2 points)**  
*Is your project located within a disadvantaged community?*

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**  
Evaluators should review the project location maps that are required with the application to determine the accuracy of the applicant’s response to the project location question.

- If the applicant failed to provide project location maps that clearly define and show all of the proposed projects locations, and the corresponding census track/block/place data that verifies the DAC community location status, the evaluator should not give full points for this sub-question and should use their best judgment to choose the least score they feel best represents the information given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the project is located within a DAC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Points</td>
<td>Project location(s) are/is fully (100%) located within a DAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Point</td>
<td>Project location(s) are/is partially (less than 100%) within a DAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Points</td>
<td>None of the project location(s) are/is within a DAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2019 Active Transportation Program
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**E. Severity: (0-4 points)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Median Household Income (MHI) Criteria – MHI = $51,026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>Greater than 80% of the MHI greater than $51,025.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Point</td>
<td>75% through &lt;80% of MHI $47,836.50 through $51,025.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Points</td>
<td>70% through &lt;75% of MHI $44,646.49 through $47,835.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Points</td>
<td>65% through &lt;70% of MHI $41,458.30 through $44,646.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Points</td>
<td>&lt; 65% of MHI less than $41,458.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>CalEnviroScreen Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>Above 25% most disadvantaged less than 39.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Point</td>
<td>20% through 25% most disadvantaged 39.34 through 42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Points</td>
<td>15% through &lt; 20% most disadvantaged 42.87 through 46.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Points</td>
<td>10% through &lt; 15% most disadvantaged 46.64 through 51.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Points</td>
<td>&lt; 10% most disadvantaged 51.19 through 94.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Free or Reduced Lunches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>Less than 75% of students receive free or reduced lunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Point</td>
<td>≥ 75% through 80% of students receive free or reduced lunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Points</td>
<td>&gt; 80% through 85% of students receive free or reduced lunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Points</td>
<td>&gt; 85% through 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Points</td>
<td>&gt; 90% of students receive free or reduced lunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Other DAC Criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use MHI Criteria</td>
<td>If a project applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria due to a lack of accurate Census data or CalEnviroScreen data that represents a small neighborhood or unincorporated area, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment, to demonstrate that the community’s median household income is at or below 80% of that state median household income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Will Score</td>
<td>If the applicant used a Regional Definition, please do not score this Severity section. CTC staff will give the application the appropriate severity score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Points</td>
<td>Projects located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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QUESTION #2: POTENTIAL FOR INCREASED WALKING AND BICYCLING, ESPECIALLY AMONG STUDENTS, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF WALKING AND BICYCLING ROUTES TO AND FROM SCHOOLS, TRANSIT FACILITIES, COMMUNITY CENTERS, EMPLOYMENT CENTERS, AND OTHER DESTINATIONS; AND INCLUDING INCREASING AND IMPROVING CONNECTIVITY AND MOBILITY OF NONMOTORIZED USERS. (0-53 POINTS)

A. Statement of Project need. Describe the issue(s) that this project will address. How will the proposed project benefit the non-motorized users? What is the project’s desired outcome and how will the project best deliver that outcome? (0-26 points)

Discuss:
- Destinations and key connectivity the project will achieve
- How the project will increase walking and or biking
- The lack of mobility if applicable- Does the population have limited access to cars? Bikes? And transit?
  - Does the project have an unserved or underserved demand?
- The local health concerns responses should focus on:
  - Specific local public health concerns, health disparity, and/or conditions in the built and social environment that affect the project community and can be addressed through the proposed project. Please provide detailed and locally relevant answers instead of general descriptions of the health benefits of walking and biking (i.e. “walking and biking increase physical activity”).
  - Local public health data demonstrating the above public health concern or health disparity. Data should be at the smallest geography available (state or national data is not sufficient). One potential source is the Healthy Places Index (HPI) (http://healthyplacesindex.org).
- For combined I/NI: discuss the need for an encouragement, education, and/or enforcement program.

Breakdown of points:
- “Need” must be considered in the context of the “Potential for increased walking and bicycling”
- “Need” must be considered in the context of one or more of the following:
  - Connectivity to key destinations
  - Mobility to access everyday destinations and services
  - Local public health concerns
- To receive the maximum points, applicants must demonstrate all of the above aspects of “need”.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:
The following checks and analysis must be done by the evaluator prior to awarding points:
- Review the data provided for reasonableness from the proposed project.
  - The evaluator should consult the attached photos, Google Maps, and any other information available to make an informed decision.
  - A project does not need to have, or create large numbers in order to cause great change to a community’s active transportation increases, and this can be reflected in the scores given to a project.
- Evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated the need for improvements in the project area.
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- Did the applicant identify specific local public health concerns, health disparity, and/or conditions in the built and social environment affecting the project community that can be addressed by increasing walking and biking, including:
  - Thorough and nuanced discussion of existing health condition(s) amongst targeted users AND
  - Responses should be more sophisticated than simply stating, "Walking and biking is good for health because it increases physical activity." AND
  - The physical or social conditions (known as the social determinants of health) in the target community that contribute to the current health conditions (beyond other elements already addressed in the application including bike/ped infrastructure gaps and barriers, collision rates, etc.) AND
  - Description and supporting data of the social determinants of health including, but not limited to, access to safe places to recreate, access to essential destinations (like childcare and work), tree canopy, and social cohesion AND

- Provides local public health data demonstrating the above public health concern or health disparity, including:
  - Inclusion of health data at the smallest geography available (i.e., census track or possibly county level if census track is not available) AND
  - Health status of targeted users given as percentages or rates using relevant and local health indicators AND stated as ranks or comparisons to non-targeted user data (e.g., the community has a higher/lesser obesity rate compared to both the state and other rural communities of similar size) AND
  - Citation of sources used for all health status information given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Applicant’s ability to demonstrate a specific active transportation need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 19-24 Points | The application clearly and convincingly demonstrates “need” in the project area, and documents all of the following:  
  - the lack of connectivity,  
  - the lack of mobility for non-motorized users,  
  - local health concerns,  
  **AND if applicable**  
  - For NI components- education, encouragement and/or enforcement |
| 13-18 Points | The application convincingly demonstrates “need” in the project area, and documents: (at least 2 of the following)  
  - the lack of connectivity,  
  - the lack of mobility for non-motorized users,  
  - local health concerns,  
  **AND if applicable**  
  - For NI components- education, encouragement and/or enforcement |
| 7-12 Points | The application somewhat demonstrates “need” in the project area, and documents: (at least 1 of the following)  
  - the lack of connectivity,  
  - the lack of mobility for non-motorized users,  
  - local health concerns  
  **AND if applicable**  
  - For NI components- education, encouragement and/or enforcement |
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| 1-6 Points | The application *minimally demonstrates “need” in the project area*, and documents: (partially 1 or more of the following)  
|            | • the lack of connectivity,  
|            | • the lack of mobility for non-motorized users,  
|            | • local health concerns  
|            | **AND if applicable**  
|            | • For NI components- education, encouragement and/or enforcement  
| 0 Points   | The application **does not demonstrate “need” in the project area**  

PLUS:

| Points  | Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the active transportation needs of STUDENTS.  
|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------  
| 2 Points | The application demonstrates the active transportation needs of students  
| 0 Points | The application **does not** demonstrate the active transportation needs of students  

B. *Describe how the proposed project will address the active transportation need: (0-27 points)*

1. **Proposed project addresses:**  
   • Close a gap?  
   • Creation of new routes?  
   • Removal of barrier to mobility?  
   • Other Improvements to existing routes?  

2. **Must provide a map of each gap closure identifying the gap and connections, and/or of the new route location, and/or the barrier location and improvement.**

3. **Referencing this map, describe the existing route(s) that currently connect the affected transportation related and community identified destinations and why the route(s) are not adequate.**

4. **Referencing this map, describe how the project links or connects, or encourages use of existing routes to transportation-related and community identified destinations where an increase in active transportation modes can be realized, including but not limited to: schools, school facilities, transit facilities, community, social service or medical centers, employment centers, high density or affordable housing, regional, State or national trail system, recreational and visitor destinations or other community identified destinations. Specific destination must be identified.**  
   • For combined I/NI projects: discuss how the encouragement, education, and/or enforcement program will help address the needs.

**Breakdown of points:**

- “**Need**” must be considered in the context of the “Potential for increased walking and bicycling”  
- “**Will address**” must be considered in the context of one or more of the following “needs”:
  o the lack of connectivity,  
  o the lack of mobility for non-motorized users,  
  o local health concerns
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To receive the maximum points, applicants must demonstrate all of the above aspects of "need". The amount of points an applicant/project receives on this sub-questions is not impacted by the number of categories documented for addressing the active transportation need.

- Applications only documenting one category has the potential of receiving full points as long as it can fully meet the scoring criteria. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that additional categories are not appropriate for the project to better or more fully address the need.
- Applications documenting numerous categories should not automatically receive additional points. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that the project scope connected to each category is relevant to the non-motorized users’ needs in the project limits.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:
A "very important destination", includes those that offer access to goods, services and activities that society considers particularly important i.e. a hospital, a grocery store, a transit station, or an employment center (where the community can reasonably expect to find employment). The applicant may be able to make a case for other very important destinations, with adequate documentation.

The following checks and analysis must be done by the evaluator prior to awarding points:

- Evaluate if the proposed improvements are the best solution to address the need described in sub-question A.
- Evaluate if the destinations shown in the application are reasonably accessible by non-motorized users.
- Determine if an increase in active transportation modes can be realized by the project.
- Determine if the local public health department and/or local non-profit that provides support for health equity/addressing health disparities
  o was involved in aspects of the application such as supporting public engagement, developing project scope, supporting data and statistics to highlight the public health need, etc. AND
  o will continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project/program
- Evaluators should award fewer points if the local public health department and/or local non-profit that provides support for health equity/addressing health disparities was just contacted for data or information, but not involved in a meaningful way in project development otherwise, or if the applicant did not contact the local public health department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Applicant’s ability to make a case that the project will address need for active transportation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20-26 Points | The application clearly and convincingly demonstrates that the project will best result in meaningful increases in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users in the project area by:  
  • creating or improving links or connections,  
  • encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations. |
| 13-19 Points | The application convincingly demonstrates that the project will likely result in meaningful increases in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users in the project area by:  
  • creating or improving links or connections,  
  • encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations. |
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| 7-12 Points | The application *somewhat demonstrates* that the project will likely result in minor *meaningful increases* in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users in the project area by: (at least 1 of the following)
|             | • creating or improving links or connections,
|             | • encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations. |

| 1-6 Points | The application *minimally demonstrates* that the project may result in *some minor increases* in the number (and/or percentage for rural/small communities) of walking and bicycling users by: (partially 1 or more of the following)
|           | • creating or improving links or connections,
|           | • encouraging use of routes to very important destinations and community identified destinations. |

| 0 Points | The application did not demonstrate the project would address the need. |

**PLUS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Applicant's ability to make a case that the proposal that will increase the number of active transportation trips accomplished by STUDENTS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Point</td>
<td>The project will increase the proportion of active transportation trips accomplished by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Points</td>
<td>The project will not increase the proportion of active transportation trips accomplished by students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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QUESTION #3: POTENTIAL FOR REDUCING THE NUMBER AND/OR RATE OR THE RISK OF PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLIST FATALITIES AND INJURIES, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF SAFETY HAZARDS FOR PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLISTS. (0-25 POINTS)

A. Describe the project location’s history of pedestrian and bicycle collisions resulting in fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users, which this project will mitigate. (0-12 points)

8 points: Based on applicant’s ability to make a compelling case that the history of crash data (or Safety Data for projects without documented crash data) within project location represents one of the agency’s top priorities for addressing ongoing safety and demonstrates the need for safety improvements.

Breakdown of points:
The amount of points an applicant/project receives on this sub-question is based on the evaluators review of the following output files from the new UC Berkeley SafeTREC TIMS ATP tool (or if the agency prefers, they may use their own collision database data/software to produce equivalent documents).

- The “County/City Heat Map” and the “Community Heat Map” of the area surrounding the project limits: Points are based on the maps demonstrating that the relative collision history within the project limits is high when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community’s collision history, suggesting that the project limits represent one of their highest safety needs.
- Project Area Collision Map: Points are based on the map demonstrating that the past collision locations are within the “Influence area” of the proposed safety improvements. Evaluators should consider the overall project limits AND the limits of the specific improvements/scope of the project.
- Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports: Points are based on summaries, lists and reports demonstrating the overall number of collisions and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements.
  - Note: For applications that do not have the collision data OR that prefer to provide safety data in a different format are allowed to do so. If an application chooses not to provide the above output documents, then the evaluator must scrutinize why they did not provide these documents/data and then do their best to make an approximation/comparison of the data provided to the generally-expected output data.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:
Applicants are required to respond to question 1 or 2, and have the option to respond to both.

Sub-questions 1 and/or 2 and 3 do not receive any points. The evaluator should verify that the required information in 1 and/or 2 and 3 is provided and complete. If the evaluator determines the information is incomplete, inconsistent, or has been manipulated they should note this in their evaluation comments and score sub-question 4 accordingly.

The following “Minimum Requirements” must be met for the application to receive any of these points:
- Applicant must provide the output files from the new TIMS ATP tool (or if the agency prefers, they may use their own collision database data/software to produce equivalent documents)
- The output files provided by the Applicant must meet the following parameters:
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- The project’s “Influence area”, as defined by the applicant and shown in the output documents, must be consistent with the project maps/plans attached to the application AND must be reasonable per the “Influence area” guidance below.
  - Evaluators should consider additional point reductions for this question if the applicant included crash data that does not reasonably tie to the influence area of the proposed “safety” improvements.
- The collisions represent the most recent 5-11 years of available crash data. (Note: SWITRS and TIMS crash data is typically 1.5 to 2.5 years old before it is loaded into the crash database).
- If the applicant does not use the TIMS ATP tool and instead uses their own collision database data/software, then the following additional checks and analysis must be done by the evaluators prior to awarding points:
  - Crashes are from official crash reports. The full crash reports do not have to be included, but their report number and agency must be identifiable.
  - Only pedestrian and bicycle crashes are included. All crashes that do not include a non-motorized user as one of the primary victims must be excluded.
  - The number of crashes entered into the table is directly supported by both the map and the listing.
- The data entered in the application-table is accurate and reflects the documentation the applicant provides abiding to the above requirements.

A project's expected safety "Influence Area" (i.e. Where a project has the potential to mitigate) must be reasonable. The project’s “Influence area” is established by the applicant and in the TIMS ATP Tool is depicted by the “Project Area Collision Map”. The following are some general criteria to guide applicants and evaluators in determining appropriate “influence-area” and/or overall project area for their proposed safety improvements/countermeasures (These criteria are defined in the Caltrans Highway Safety Improvement Program application Instructions). Prior to scoring the Safety Question, the evaluator should assess and try to confirm that the applicant's “project area” (or Influence Area) shown in their maps is reasonable with respect to the following criteria:

- For intersection or mid-block crossing improvements, collisions that occurred within 250 feet of the intersection/mid-block crossing in all directions affected by the improvement may be used.
- Longitudinal Improvements (bike lanes, sidewalks, road diets, etc.): crashes potentially effected by and within the limits of the improvement.
- If the improvements represent a new route and there is no past crash and safety data available within the limits of the proposed improvements, the applicant should consider the potential for the project to eliminate or reduce existing conflict points on parallel routes. The crash data from parallel routes can be included where the new facility/route can be reasonably expected to reduce the likelihood of past crashes from reoccurring. The overall applicant data provided in the Narrative Questions and various attachments must support the use of parallel crash data.
2019 Active Transportation Program  
Small Infrastructure  
Scoring Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Applicant's ability to demonstrate the project location represents <strong>one of the agency's top priorities for addressing ongoing safety.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6-8 Points** | The application **clearly and convincingly shows:**  
  - Collision Heat-maps demonstrating that the relative collision history within the project limits is high when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community's collision history,  
  - Project Area Collision Map demonstrating that the past collision locations are within the "**Influence area**" of the proposed safety improvements.  
  - Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports demonstrating that the overall number of collisions is significant and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements. |
| **3-5 Points** | The application **somewhat shows:**  
  - Collision Heat-map demonstrating that the relative collision history within the project limits is high when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community's collision history,  
  - Project Area Collision Map demonstrating that the past collision locations are within the "**Influence area**" of the proposed safety improvements.  
  - Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports demonstrating that the overall number of collisions is significant and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements. |
| **1-2 Points** | The application **minimally shows:**  
  - Collision Heat-map demonstrating that the relative collision history within the project limits is high when compared to the overall jurisdiction/community's collision history,  
  - Project Area Collision Map demonstrating that the past collision locations are within the "**Influence area**" of the proposed safety improvements.  
  - Collision Summaries and collision lists/reports demonstrating that the overall number of collisions is significant and that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements. |
| **0 Points** | Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe the application does not provide verifiable data and does not provide data-driven documentation to demonstrate that the propose project represents one of the jurisdiction/community’s highest safety needs AND does not demonstrate that collision trends, collision types, and collision details will be positively impacted by the proposed safety improvements. |

---

4 points: Based on applicant’s ability to make a compelling case that they have analyzed their past Crash Data (or Safety Data for projects without documented crash data) and can demonstrate that **the proposed safety improvements correspond to the types and locations of the past collisions.**

**Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:**
The following checks and analysis must be done by the evaluator prior to awarding points:
- Evaluators are to verify that the applicant demonstrated that the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed project.
- Evaluators are to verify that the applicant demonstrated that they analyzed the past crash/safety data to identify the specific crash-type trends which will likely occur in the future if no action is taken.
- Evaluators are to verify that the applicant demonstrated there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles which can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Applicant's ability to demonstrate that they have analyzed their past Crash/Safety Data and the proposed safety improvements correspond to the types and locations of the past collisions.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application <strong>clearly and convincingly shows:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed project,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Points</strong></td>
<td>The application <strong>convincingly shows:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed project,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Points</strong></td>
<td>The application <strong>somewhat shows:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed project,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
<td>The application <strong>minimally shows:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how the past crash/safety data is within the expected influence area of the proposed project,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that the past crash/safety data was analyzed by the applicant to identify the specific crash-type trends that will likely occur in the future if no action is taken, AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• there are significant safety threats to pedestrians and/or bicycles that can be mitigated by ATP eligible improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0 Points</strong></td>
<td>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately prove the safety need of the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019 Active Transportation Program
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B. Safety Countermeasures (13 points max)

Describe how the project improvements will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards that contribute to pedestrian and/or bicyclist injuries or fatalities. Referencing the information you provided in Part A, demonstrate how the proposed countermeasures directly address the underlying factors that are contributing to the occurrence of pedestrian and/or bicyclist collisions.

Breakdown of points:

- The amount of points an applicant/project receives on this sub-questions is not impacted by the number of “Potential safety hazards” and “Countermeasures” documented in the application.
  - Applications only documenting one “Potential safety hazard” / “Countermeasure” has the potential of receiving full points as long as it can fully meet the scoring criteria and demonstrate that implementing only one countermeasure is appropriate to fully address the existing hazards.
  - Applications documenting numerous “Potential safety hazards” / “Countermeasures” should not automatically receive additional points. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate that each safety hazard is relevant to the non-motorized users in the project limits and that each countermeasure being funded by the project is necessary to mitigate the potential for future crashes.
  - Projects that appear to include elements/costs with little safety benefits should not receive as many points as projects with highly effective & efficient use of limited funding.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:

The following checks and analysis must be done by the evaluator prior to awarding points:

- Evaluators are to evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated the need for the safety improvements being proposed in the project.
- Evaluators are to evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated that they analyzed the past crash/safety data trends and appropriately selected safety countermeasure(s) with proven track record(s) for addressing the past trends.
- Evaluators are to evaluate the level to which the applicant demonstrated each proposed safety countermeasure(s) is appropriately included in the project to mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the project will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards with the project limits.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10-13 Points| The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that:  
  - there is an urgent need for the countermeasure(s) proposed – based on past crash/safety data trends,  
  - the proposed countermeasure(s) have a proven track record for addressing the past crash/safety data trends, AND  
  - the proposed application of the countermeasure(s) should fully mitigate the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>The applicant convincingly demonstrates that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>- there is a significant need for the countermeasure(s) proposed – based on past crash/safety data trends,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the proposed countermeasure(s) have a proven track record for addressing the past crash/safety data trends, <strong>AND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the proposed application of the countermeasure(s) should <strong>significantly (but not fully) mitigate</strong> the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>The applicant somewhat demonstrates that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>- there is a moderate need for the countermeasure(s) proposed – based on past crash/safety data trends,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the proposed countermeasure(s) have a track record for addressing the past crash/safety data trends, <strong>AND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the proposed application of the countermeasure(s) should <strong>somewhat mitigate</strong> the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>The applicant minimally demonstrates that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>- there could be a need for the countermeasure(s) proposed – based on past crash/safety data trends,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the proposed countermeasure(s) have a track record for addressing the past crash/safety data trends, <strong>AND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the proposed application of the countermeasure(s) should <strong>somewhat mitigate</strong> the potential for future non-motorized crashes in the area of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately prove the safety need of the proposed project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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QUESTION #4: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION and PLANNING (0-10 POINTS)

Describe the community based public participation process that has and will continue to define the proposed project.

A. Include discussions of: What was the process to prepare for existing and future needs of users of this project? Who was engaged in the public participation and planning process? How will stakeholders continue to be engaged in the implementation of the project?

General Guidance on stakeholders and their involvement in a project:

- Public stakeholders can include, but are not limited to, residents, targeted end users, and community leaders, elected officials, advocacy organizations, local businesses, and members of vulnerable or underserved populations (i.e. elderly, youth, physically and/or mentally disabled, members from disadvantaged communities).
- Governmental stakeholders can include other departments, agencies, jurisdictions, etc. impacted by the proposed project that are NOT the applicant (these can include, but are not limited to law enforcement, transportation, local health department, schools/school districts, emergency services, metropolitan planning organization, etc.)
- Meetings and/or events and how many were held to engage stakeholders is key to Public Participation. These can include, but are not limited to:
  - The type of meetings or events: open houses, community charrettes, city council meetings, planning commission meetings, etc.
  - How the meetings or events were noticed: local newspaper, county website, on the radio, at school parents group meetings, etc.
  - How the meetings or events were documented: Meeting sign-in sheets, meeting notes, letters of support, etc.
  - Where the meetings or events took place: school, community center, city council hall, etc.
  - The accessibility of the meetings or events: accessible by public transportation, transatlational services provided, and time of day the meetings or events were held, etc.
  - The stakeholders' involvement in the decision-making body: technical advisory committee, citizens' advisory committee, etc.

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:
The following checks and analysis must be done by the evaluator prior to awarding points. Evaluators are to:

- Consider whether or not the applicant appropriately used their agency’s active transportation technical planning to develop and refine the project scope.
- Consider the level to which the technical planning considered both existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system.
- Consider the level to which the planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.
- Give consideration to any attachments the agency provided in connection with this sub-question, including but not limited to: any applicable public outreach process/proposal/plan, links to websites, meeting agenda, meeting sign-in sheet, meeting minutes, public service announcements, letters of support, new alternatives or major revisions that were identified, etc.
  - Consider the level to which the letters of support emphasize that the project represents the top or one of the top active transportation priorities for the community, targeted end users, or public stakeholders.
2019 Active Transportation Program  
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- Consider the extent that the public participation and planning process was utilized to identify and improve the effectiveness of the project and ensure the project is one of the highest community/regional active transportation priorities.
  - Additional consideration can be given for outreach which has been ongoing for a longer duration.
- Consider the magnitude of the proposed project when considering the extent to which the project represents one of the highest community/regional active transportation priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Applicant’s ability to demonstrate the public participation process will be utilized as part of the development of a plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-10 Points</td>
<td>The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates that: The project scope was developed through a comprehensive technical planning process (appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) and the planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system and the planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 Points</td>
<td>The applicant demonstrates that: The project scope was developed through a comprehensive technical planning process (appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) and the planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system and the planning process was effectively integrated into the public participation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Points</td>
<td>The applicant somewhat demonstrates that: The project scope was developed through a technical planning process (appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) and/or the planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system and/or the planning process was somewhat integrated into the public participation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Points</td>
<td>The applicant minimally demonstrates that: The project scope was developed through a technical planning process (appropriate for the complexity and magnitude of the project) and/or the planning process considered the existing and future needs of the project users and transportation system and/or the planning process was minimally integrated into the public participation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Points</td>
<td>Evaluators can award a score of zero if they believe that the application does not adequately prove the project scope is a result of technical planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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QUESTION #5: SCOPE AND PLAN CONSISTENCY (0-2 POINTS)

A. The application, scope and plans are consistent with one another: (2 points max)

- The scope and plans are consistent with one another including (2 points):
  - Improvement location(s)
  - Improvement element(s)

- Either the scope and plans are not consistent with one another including (0 points):
  - Improvement location(s)
  - Improvement element(s)

Special Instructions & Expectations for Evaluators:
The following checks and analysis must be done by the evaluator prior to awnolding points:

- Give consideration to all of the information contained in the application; but extra attention
  should be given to the written scope/project description and the plans/maps included in the application.
- Do the plans/maps show the complete project as described in the application?

| 1-2 Points | All elements are consistent |
| 0 Points   | Not all elements are consistent |

For I/NI combination projects:

- Check the applicants 22-R Work Plan for 3 components:
  1. Completeness: a 22-R that includes a complete clear and organized work plan with in-depth detail that outlines
     the various tasks and costs of the program
  2. Consistency: a 22-R that is fully consistent and reflects the applicants responses throughout the application
  3. Compliance: the 22-R that complies with the eligibility and costs requirements provided in the ATP Non-Infrastructure Program Guidance

| 1 Point | Applicant submitted a 22-R Work Plan that is complete, consistent and compliant |
| 0 Points | Applicant did not submit a 22-R Work Plan that is complete, consistent and compliant |
Exhibit B

ATP 2019
Consensus Score Sheet

County: Kings County
Application ID: 6-Avenal-1
Project Name: Avenal SRTS SR269 Improvement Project
Project Applicant: City of Avenal
Evaluator Team Number: 43
Date: October 5, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>TEAM SCORE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL COMMENTS:
| Application ID | County | Project Title | Total Project Cost | Recommended ATP Funding | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | PAR&E | PS&E | ROW | CON | CON NI | Project Type | DAC | SRPs | Final Score |
|---------------|--------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-----|------|------|-------|----------------|------|------|-------------|
| 5-Santa Barbara County-1 | Santa Barbara | Molec Road Multimodal Path Gap Closure | $6,990 | $5,857 | 888 | 621 | 4,142 | 3,188 | 543 | 78 | 4,142 | Infrastructure - M | X | X | 89 |
| 5-Santa Barbara-1 | Santa Barbara | U.S. 101 State Street Undercrossing Active Transportation Improvements | $5,961 | $4,756 | 412 | 596 | 3,748 | 412 | 551 | 45 | 3,748 | Infrastructure - M | X | X | 89 |
| 5-Transp Agency for Monterey County-1 | Monterey | Fort Ord Regional Trail & Greenway: Highway 218 Segment | $12,897 | $10,179 | 1,119 | 9,181 | 2,130 | 9,181 | 9,181 | 9,181 | Infrastructure - M | X | X | 89 |
| 3-Oilba-1 | Inyo | Blidway 99 Phase 5 - 20th Street Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing | $15,440 | $12,356 | 2,252 | 3,010 | 2,225 | 10,104 | 10,104 | 10,104 | Infrastructure - L | X | X | 89 |
| 1-Wilson-1 | Mendocino | City of Willis Rail Trail Project | $6,362 | $5,362 | 350 | 400 | 5,132 | 350 | 400 | 400 | 5,423 | Infrastructure + M - M | X | X | 87 |
| 2-Corning-2 | Tehama | Olive View School Connectivity Project | $1,123 | $1,118 | 30 | 150 | 80 | 858 | 30 | 159 | 80 | 858 | Infrastructure + M - S | X | X | 87 |
| 5-UC Santa Cruz | Santa Cruz | UCSC Bike Path Safety Improvement Phase 2/Bike Safety Education | $1,497 | $1,299 | 759 | 65 | 369 | 369 | 369 | 369 | Infrastructure + M - S | X | X | 87 |
| 7-Corning-2 | Tehama | West Street School Connectivity Project | $1,309 | $1,104 | 30 | 185 | 100 | 1,009 | 10 | 185 | 100 | 1,009 | Infrastructure + M - S | X | X | 87 |
| 5-Goleta-1 | Santa Barbara | San Jose Multi-Purpose Path | $20,179 | $19,687 | 587 | 967 | 587 | 967 | 967 | Infrastructure - L | X | X | 85 |

* Prior to programming, Caltrans will contact applicants for project clarifications.
* Recommended funding year(s) differs from proposed for deliverability purposes.
* This project requested $17,055,000, however only $897,000 of programming capacity remains. Staff will work with the agency to ensure a fully funded project.

CON: Construction Phase
PAR: Right-of-Way Phase
DAC: Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities
SRPs: Safe Routes to School
NI: Non-infrastructure
S: Small
PE: Environmental Phase
M: Medium
Plan: Active Transportation Plan
L: Large
PS&E: Plans, Specifications & Estimate Phase
January 23, 2019

Ms. Susan Bransen  
Executive Director  
California Transportation Commission  
1120 N Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  

Dear Ms. Bransen & Members of the California Transportation Commission:

The Central Coast Coalition supports the California Transportation Commission (CTC) staff recommendations for Cycle 4 the Active Transportation Program. We highly value the Active Transportation Program as a valuable asset to increase safety and mobility of non-motorized users. Projects recommended for funding from the Active Transportation Program will help increase walking and bicycling and improve safety on the Central Coast. There are also transformative projects recommended for funding that will help close gaps on the California Coastal Trail. We greatly appreciate the Commission’s support in helping fund these critical projects.

The projects recommended for ATP funding from the Central Coast include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Agency by Region</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monterey County</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transportation Agency for Monterey County | Fort Ord Regional Trail & Greenway: Highway 218 Segment  
Every Child: Community-Supported SRTS |
| **Santa Barbara County** |              |
| City of Goleta           | San Jose Multi-Purpose Path |
| City of Santa Barbara    | Downtown De La Vina Street Safe Crosswalks and Buffered Bike Lanes |
The Central Coast Coalition understands the Active Transportation Program is an extremely competitive program with limited funding available for local jurisdictions. Therefore, several very high priority projects were not funded this cycle. Moving forward, the Coalition would like the Commission to consider that projects of statewide significance such as coastal access receive due attention.

The Central Coast Coalition agencies are excited to apply for projects under the Cycle 5 call for projects. Once again, we support the CTC staff recommendations for Cycle 4 and urge the Commission to consider funding for the priority projects listed above. Thank you for accepting our support for the Cycle 4 Active Transportation staff recommendations.

If you have any questions, please contact SBCAG Director of Programming, Sarkes Khachek, at (805) 961-8913.

Sincerely,

Marjie Kirn, Executive Director
Santa Barbara Association of Governments

Pete Rodgers, Executive Director
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments
Debra L. Hale, Executive Director  
Transportation Agency for Monterey County Commission

Guy Preston, Executive Director  
Santa Cruz Co. Regional Transportation

Mary Gilbert, Executive Director  
San Benito Council of Governments

Maura Twomey, Executive Director  
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments

cc:  
Mr. Brian Annis, Secretary, California State Transportation Agency  
Ms. Laurie Berman, Director, California Department of Transportation  
Mr. Mitch Weiss, Chief Deputy Director, California Transportation Commission  
Mr. Robert Nelson, Deputy Director, California Transportation Commission  
Ms. Laurie Waters, Associate Deputy Director, California Transportation Commission  
Ms. Anja Aulenbacher, Assistant Deputy Director, California Transportation Commission  
Ms. Meghan Pedroncelli, Staff Service Analyst, California Transportation Commission
January 24, 2019

Ms. Laurie Waters  
ATP Program Manager  
California Transportation Commission  
1120 N Street  
Sacramento CA 95814

RE: City of Chico’s SR 99 Bikeway Project

Ms. Waters:

Please accept this letter as confirmation of support for the City of Chico’s SR 99 Bikeway Project being considered for Active Transportation Program funding. The Mechoopda Indian Tribe of the Chico Rancheria has nearby Tribal housing located in a disadvantaged community as defined by Senate Bill 535 along 20th Street west of State Route 99. The bike crossing bridge would allow for our tribal members and the rest of the residents in the disadvantaged community to safely cross one of Chico’s busiest major streets. This bridge is essential to allow for residents, especially kids to safely cross to access goods and services including Butte Community College.

As part of the application process, we provided a letter of support for the City of Chico. However, since the application was prepared, the recent Camp Fire displaced thousands of families into Chico. Increased traffic congestion and accidents throughout the urbanized area of Chico has risen drastically. We are in need of a safer bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure and the proposed project represents a significant gap closure.

We look forward to meeting you in person when you come to Chico for a Town Hall meeting in April.

Thank you,

Sandra M. Knight  
Vice Chairwoman
January 25, 2019

California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Laurie Waters

RE: ATP Funding for Monterey Park and LA County

Dear Ms. Waters:

On behalf of the City of Monterey Park, we would like to thank you, the California Transportation Commission (CTC), and the project evaluators for their time in reviewing the many applications received and expanding the recommendations list and for their consideration and recommendation of our project for ATP Funding.

The Monterey Park School and Crosswalk Safety Enhancement Project will enhance conditions at approximately 17 intersections throughout the City, adjacent to schools and city parks, where there are a high number of pedestrians and school-aged children crossing and walking. The locations receiving improvements provide direct links to seven (7) public schools, with 5,550 plus enrolled students, many of whom walk to school. This project will increase the overall safety and mobility of non-motorized users, enhance public health, and improve access for pedestrian crossings in the community.

We sincerely appreciate the CTC’s recommendation of our project in the City of Monterey Park and for their consideration of other projects in LA County. The City looks forward to working together to implement this project.

Respectfully,

Ron Bow
City Manager
January 20, 2019

Ms. Laurie Waters  
ATP Program Manager  
California Transportation Commission  
1120 N St. # 2231  
Sacramento CA 95814

Dear Ms. Waters:  

I am writing to bring your attention again to a proposal for $12.9 million bike and pedestrian bridge that has been submitted to ATP by the city of Chico CA. I have contacted Nima Kabirinissab, but have not heard back after the last letter I sent him in early December.

The proposal, in my view, represents an astonishing waste of money. The bridge is planned for the southeast corner of Chico, where very few people ride bikes now or are likely to in the foreseeable future, and will not be far from an existing safe street crossing the occasional cyclists use now. The bridge’s exceptional cost arises because it will be above the street (East 20th St.) near on and off ramps for Chico’s one freeway (CA99), over 5 lanes of traffic. The intersection is one of the city’s busiest, carrying traffic between CA99 and both the Chico Mall (north side of East 20th St.) and Target (south side). The existing bike crossing is at the next intersection to the east (East 20th St. and Forest Ave.), where traffic is far lighter and both bike lanes and a safe street crossing have existed for years.

The proposed bridge is intended as the south end of the city’s “Bikeway 99”, dating back about 20 years. The city’s bike maps show the existing route along Forest Ave. described above as the Bikeway, with the new route essentially relocating the Bikeway to follow the original concept. Until ATP funding became a possibility, no Chico maps or documents placed a bridge at the CA 99 / East 20th, St. Intersection. None would now, if our city of 90,000 was expected to pay for it. A price tag of $12.9 million plus $2.6 million in local funds translates to nearly $175 per resident, with $150 of that being the state share. How is a bridge that will replace a safe and I think better located street crossing worth that expense?

To be fair, Chico is a bike city. The reason for that is Chico State University, with about 15,000 students, located just to the northwest of downtown Chico. It gives the city many cyclists, and the amenity of challenging bike paths in Upper Bidwell Park northeast of the downtown certainly helps. Bikeway 99, unfortunately, is not a significant part of that. At its north and south ends it has few riders and no reason for there to be more. The hopes for the Bikeway read far better than the reality.

The planning process leading to the bridge proposal also left out its most important part. The critical study (the 20th Street Pedestrian / Bicycle Overcrossing Feasibility Study, Dec. 2017) that preceded the proposal managed to omit any estimates of current or prospective ridership. I am a retired demographer (Assoc. Professor, University of Texas School of Public Health 1981-2005): numbers are not something we overlook. How the Feasibility Study fell short on that is a puzzle. Their focus groups did manage to endorse a $13 million bridge over a less appealing $7 million alternative, but seem to have been flying blind on the question of the number of users the bridge would actually see.

On that score I can suggest about zero pedestrians, since there are few in that part of Chico, and they are likely to prefer the existing street crossings to a somewhat out of the way bridge with a 20 or 25’ climb by stairs or ramp to be over the street. As to cyclists, I spent 2 hours (7:30-9:30 a.m. on a summer workday) at the Forest Ave. crossing on East 20th St., and
counted 15 bikes. That is not a healthy number for a morning rush hour, even if all 15 of them were to make an extra effort to use the bridge. Because I am in the area often, my count did not greatly surprise me. I had expected a few more, but not numbers that would justify multimillion dollar costs. Chico is 90 minutes from Sacramento, so my assessment is something you can easily check.

I have not seen the Bikeway proposal itself, and don’t know if the city has managed to incorporate credible estimates for pedestrians and cyclists, or if it has acknowledged my other concerns. To do that and have a viable proposal would require some finesse. We are dealing with very small numbers, and with a bike route that was poorly thought out from its beginnings.

I hope that you will see that the proposal is analyzed carefully. Toward that end, I am attaching copies of one of the analyses I sent to Nima Kabirinassab, Regional Liaison, and Amarjeet Benipal, District Director, and am providing the url for the Feasibility Study. The document speaks directly to the review criteria for ATF funding as given in the Study, several of which (remember, I’m a demographer) cannot be scored on missing or unsupported numbers, and one of which (Benefits to disadvantaged communities) is fully met by the existing bike route along Forest Avenue. I also attach copies of two letters I sent to the Chico Enterprise Record when the city was considering whether to support the bridge proposal.

You may contact me if anything I have written requires clarification. I received an appropriate and cautious reply from Mr. Benipal after my first letter back in June, but at this point don’t know if the reviewers for the city’s proposal have or will have access to my assessment, or whether they will see its significance. I trust my own credentials, but not everyone’s, and am deeply concerned about seeing the ATP succeed. In Chico we seem to be on the wrong path. And as a Chico resident capable enough and concerned enough to offer a critical and hopefully balanced perspective, it bothers me that I don’t even know if what I have written is being read.

Thank you.

David P. Smith
321 Mesa Verde Ct.
Chico CA 95973
therealdavesmith@gmail.com

Attachments:
Two letters to Chico Enterprise Record
My notes to Nima Kabirinassab Dec. 6, 2018
The Feasibility Study url is:
http://www.chico.ca.us/capital_project_services/documents/Bikeway99Ph5FinalFSR.pdf

cc Ms. Laurie Berman
Director, California Department of Transportation
1120 N Street, Sacramento CA 95814
cc Mr. Amarjeet Benipal, District 3 Director
cc Mr. Nima Kabirinassab, Regional Liaison
Letter: $15.5 million bike bridge a waste of taxpayer money

By Chico Enterprise-Record | news@chicoer.com |
April 11, 2018 at 6:55 pm

If the City Council decides to push forward this month with plans for our (mostly state money) $15.5 million bike bridge over East 20th Street, I hope the E-R will offer a friendly editorial. Maybe addressing the $2.6 million the city will be spending as its share. Good thing we keep the occasional pile of money on hand for stuff like this. I mean, we can’t get the upper Bidwell Park road reopened even though it’s our park and it will be dirt cheap to do it, and we can’t seem to get a handle on the massive pension deficit we are facing, but a decorative bike bridge in a part of Chico where few of us ride bikes is a winner.

It’s all a little strange, starting with the whole area already has bike lanes and safe street crossings. Those are why, apart from its astronomical price tag, we wouldn’t need the bridge even if we could find riders for it somewhere.

That part might trouble the state. Its $12.9 million chunk of the cost is intended for making biking safer and work commutes easier. This bit of whimsy flunks on both counts. For Chico to even be in the running, the proposal will need to be highly creative. You know, forgetting to note the low actual ridership there, fulsome enthusiasm for the splendid future it heralds, that sort of thing. Creative.

Council needs to be smarter than that with our money. And our state’s.

— David P. Smith, Chico

Letter: No stats provided on how many will use bike bridge

By Chico Enterprise-Record | news@chicoer.com |
July 5, 2018 at 10:04 pm
If the City Council decides to push forward with plans for a $15 ½ million bike bridge over East 20th Street, I hope E-R will offer a friendly editorial. Maybe addressing the $2.6 million the city will spend as its share, with more trails and maybe a Skyway bridge still ahead. Good thing we keep the occasional pile of money on hand for stuff like this. I mean, we can’t get the upper Bidwell Park road reopened even though it’s our park and it will be dirt cheap to do it, and we’re barely addressing the large pension deficit we face, but a decorative bike bridge in a part of Chico where few of us ride bikes is a winner.

It’s a bit strange, starting with Chico’s 2017 Overcrossing Feasibility Study that omits any statistics on current bike traffic in the East 20th Street area and any estimates of the number of bikes likely to use the bridge once it opens. I’m a demographer, and I do kind of understand. It’s hard to project future numbers when the baseline is about zero.

That part might trouble the state though. Its $12.9 million chunk of the cost is intended for making biking safer, and work commutes easier. How does that play out with no numbers on riders?

Council should scrap the proposal and make Bikeway 99 an Eaton to the Mall bike route. It’s enough. We can reconsider the bridge when we find $15 ½ million worth of bike riders to use it.

— David P. Smith, Chico
PDF accompanying letter to Nima.Kabirinassab Dec. 6, 2018

Mr. Nima Kabirinassab  
District 3  
703 B Street,  
Marysville CA 95901

Dear Mr. Kabirinassab:

I learned last week that Chico sent its bike and pedestrian bridge proposal ahead of the July deadline. I assume that means the proposal is now under review.

Let me ask again: will the persons reviewing the proposal be given access to my earlier comments to you?

For the record, I am a retired demographer (University of Texas School of Public Health, 1981-2005), I believe my comments are both honest and accurate, and every point I have made about the bridge project is within your ability to check out.

Here again is my earlier review and Bikeway Maps:

First: Almost no pedestrians will likely use the bridge. They do not belong in the proposal.

The bridge is for bikes, not pedestrians, and will need to be at least 25 ft. above street level. For pedestrians that will mean stairs or ramps. In addition, the bridge location near Hwy 99 puts it a fair distance from the two street level crossings at the Mall that pedestrians use now, the main one at the Mall / Target entrance and at the other at the east end of the Mall on Forest Avenue. Both crossings are seen clearly on the second map, along with the original plan for the Bikeway crossing as a street-level crossing at the Mall entrance. There is no reason pedestrians would care to cross at the west end of the Mall and Hwy 99 even if it was at street level and not something like 25 feet up. It’s a slog, and in no way convenient for them. I have noted before that I rarely see more than an occasional pedestrian in this area, which makes their inclusion in the proposal doubly puzzling. If you have it, what pedestrian numbers does the proposal show?

Second: Where are the bikes?

The Feasibility Study doesn’t give numbers for bike use in the Mall area, but I can. In July, on a workday, I counted 15 bikes crossing East 20th on Forest between 7:30 and about 9:30 a.m. That’s the “Bikeway” now, and it’s grim. Other parts of the day when I’m there I rarely see more than a couple of bikes in the whole Mall area. The Feasibility Study version is for a brighter future for biking after the bridge is built, but few demographers would buy that: the area has few people and fewer university students, the main population Chico’s bike routes serve. That is unlikely to change in the years ahead.

On the second map, the Forest Crossing is immediately east of the Mall, on what is now the Bikeway. That is where I did my bike count.
Third: The East 20th Street bike crossing we already have is safe. It is on the quieter part of East 20th Street, away from both Hwy 99 and the Mall entrance. The intersection has bike lanes, and includes pedestrian crossing signals which some cyclists also use.

As I noted above, following the Bikeway on the 2014 Bike Map it crosses from Teichert Ponds to Springfield Drive behind Kohl's. From Springfield Drive it follows Forest Avenue to Notre Dame Blvd. and continues on Notre Dame to the Skyway. It is missing Bikeway signage, but it exists and it works. Replacing the current route with a freeway-hugging route requiring a $13 million bridge to make the East 20th Street crossing would be odd even with substantial bike traffic. With the extraordinarily low volume of bike traffic the area has, it is frankly puzzling.

Fourth: With low or missing numbers on riders and pedestrians, can the bridge even be scored under ATP criteria?

The Feasibility Study that preceded the bridge proposal offered no baseline estimates for either cyclists or pedestrians, and whatever numbers the proposal will offer will be low. With that in mind, I present below the ATP Goals and Scoring Criteria and the Response as given in the Feasibility Study (p. 54). The Comments that follow are my assessment of the scores the goals should earn.

Potential for reducing the number and/or rate or the risk of pedestrian and bicycle fatalities and injuries (0-25 points). Response: The recommended Overcrossing Alternative 2 provides a completely separated bikeway, greatly reducing the number and rate of injuries. Comment: The Feasibility Study has no numbers for traffic injuries affecting cyclists and pedestrians in the Mall area in general, or for the existing Bikeway 99 crossing at East 20th and Forest. Without those numbers, and realistic projections of bridge usage, the score for this goal must be recorded as zero.

Benefits to disadvantaged communities (0-10 points). Response: Using Phase 5 and the existing bikeway network, several low-income areas in the City of Chico will be linked to the Chico Mall and other businesses in the area. Comment: The areas in question are already linked to the Mall and other businesses in the area by the existing Bikeway 99 route along Forest Avenue. Because these are shopping areas, they are places residents at all income levels are more likely to drive to than walk or bike to. On both counts the bridge does not introduce any new benefits and should be scored as zero.

Public participation and planning (0-10 points). Response: The recommendations included in this study were based in part on input from the public during three community workshops. Comment: I believe this goal was addressed competently.

Improved public health (0-10 points). Response: The project will sponsor active transportation, promoting public health and improving air quality. Comment: The prospects for improved public health from a $13 million bridge that will be largely unused are near zero.

Cost-effectiveness (0-5 points). Response: the recommended Overcrossing Alternative 2 uses the most efficient and direct separated alignment to connect Phases 3 and 4. Comment: The Bikeway 99 route along Forest Avenue already connects Phases 3 and 4. It also already
completes Phase 5 (East 20th Street to the Skyway). The proposal is actually an alternative routing of the Bikeway, at a $13 million price tag. Its cost-effectiveness would be about zero unless it could demonstrate major effects on bicycle and pedestrian safety. With few probable users that is not a likely outcome.

*Leveraging of non-ATP funds* (0-5 points). Response: the community outreach effort and this feasibility study were funded by local funds. Additionally, CMAQ funding is anticipated to be used for the preliminary engineering phase. Comment: I believe this goal was addressed competently.

On my personal assessment, it would be hard to make a case that the Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing merits a score much above 15 points, out of 65 points possible. Chico already has a Bikeway 99 route running from Eaton Road in the north down to the Skyway, and ATP staff are I think obligated to consider its existence in assessing the need for a competing route and the reasonableness of its cost. That assessment must recognize that the bridge is proposed for a part of Chico with few pedestrians and little bike use, and not much prospect of increases in either in the foreseeable future. The reasonableness part should include that assessment, and recognize as well that no bridge was even considered for the proposed area until the prospect of state funding arose. The plan prior to that was for a street crossing at the Mall / Target entrance, as shown on the maps. If it were me, I would have kept the Bikeway on Forest. Unfortunately, in the *Feasibility Study*, which owes its existence to the opportunity for ATP money, the existing Bikeway on Forest is not even acknowledged. To me, why it needs to be relocated at all is a 13 million dollar question.

Chico has no street overcrossings for pedestrians or bicycles now, and I am not sure where one might be of some benefit. As to the Hwy 99 and East 20th Street location, all we have in the *Feasibility Study* is a $13 million funding request, for a city with something like 90,000 people, with no pedestrian or bike numbers whatsoever to back up the supposed need for it. That amounts to about $125 or $150 for every man, woman and child in Chico. It is not how we would spend that amount of local money.

**Fifth: The Bikeway itself doesn’t actually have much value for Chico.**

If you review the *Feasibility Study*, you will find it highly endorsed as a 15 or more year project to provide cyclists with a sterling north-south bikeway through Chico. A more realistic appraisal would be that the original design was badly flawed. The part above Lassen Street that hugs Hwy 99 is virtually unused. The part hugging Hwy 99 south of Hwy 32 by Teichert Ponds does modestly better, but as a link to the proposed bridge and the Bikeway continuation to the Skyway it falls dramatically short of reasonable use. The center section, running from East Avenue and Orchard Road through Lower Bidwell Park and across Hwy 32, is bike lanes along quiet side streets: 6 of them north of Bidwell Park and 2 south of it. I suspect it sees little more use than the north and south segments it connects to. The rare times I have been on it, it has been as empty of bikes as other Bikeway sections. The attached map will suggest the cobbled appearance of the Bikeway, but doesn’t hint at the poor numbers of riders I believe it sees or at the clumsiness of a design that placed eventual Bikeway crossings at 1 or perhaps 2 (East 20th Street and the Skyway) of the busiest traffic areas in Chico. The other routing, along Forest Avenue, has always been a better option. It is the route cyclists use now, and has a safe street crossing on East 20th Street.
In the end what ATP is being asked to do is to donate a $13 million bike bridge to Chico so it can continue a little used Bikeway past a congested intersection where there is no reason for the bike path to be, while quietly ignoring the existence of safe alternate bike route that more than accommodates the low bike traffic this part of Chico sees now and is likely to see in the years ahead. You are being asked to buy Chico what I think is merely a pretty bauble. That is not what the taxpayers who approved ATP had in mind.

In closing, let me add that all of the information I have given here is, I think, highly relevant for the persons carrying out the review of this proposal. If it is approved, and this bauble is built, both they and you could find yourselves in a position that is more than a little awkward. It will not be enough to argue that an almost unused bike bridge with a $13 million price tag was approved in good faith and on reasonable expectations. You have my candid and honest review of its excessive shortcomings, and I believe I have at least reasonable credentials for making the statements here. The critical issue, whether the number of cyclists and the number of pedestrians in this corner of Chico are any size at all, is one your office can easily check. It also wouldn't hurt for one of your staff to ride the length of the bikeway and consider how much more money needs to be thrown at it. This is voter-approved funding. It deserves to be spent with greater wisdom than Chico is showing.

Yours,

David P. Smith
therealdavesmith@gmail.com

cc: Amjeet S. Benipal
District Director
Department of Transportation, District 3
703 B Street
Marysville, CA 95901
www.dot.ca.gov/dist3
Chico 2914 Bike Map (part)
Chico 2014 Bike Map Mall area detail. The violet outline identifies the existing and proposed Bikeway routing as of 2014. The section I identify as "open" runs along the northwest side of Kohl's and is a parking lot shortcut used by cyclists. I don't believe it is part of the Bikeway as yet as it carries no bike lane markings or signage.
2014 Bike Map reproduced in grayscale with my highlighting of existing (green) and proposed (yellow) Bikeway routing as of 2018.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Subject: ADOPTION OF THE 2019 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM - STATEWIDE AND SMALL URBAN & RURAL COMPONENTS (RESOLUTION G-19-01)

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) adopt the 2019 Active Transportation Program Statewide and Small Urban & Rural components as recommended by staff?

RECOMMENDATION:

Commission staff recommends that the Commission adopt the 2019 Active Transportation Program, Statewide and Small Urban & Rural components, in accordance with the attached resolution and the revised staff recommendations; and authorize staff to make any specific technical changes, corrections, or exceptions to staff recommendations, with report of any substantive changes back to the Commission for approval at the March 13-14, 2019 meeting.

BACKGROUND:

Applications were received for 554 Active Transportation Program projects, requesting over $2.2 billion of Active Transportation Program funds. The 2019 Active Transportation Program includes four years of programming, Fiscal Year 2019-20 through Fiscal Year 2022-23, with $464,346,000 in funding capacity. In summary, the recommendations include:

Statewide Component – Active Transportation Program funds of $237,566,000 for 51 projects valued at $290,273,000 including:
- $154,186,000 (65 percent) for 35 Safe-Routes-to-School projects
- $232,936,000 (98 percent) for 50 projects that provide benefits to disadvantaged communities.

Small Urban & Rural Component – Active Transportation Program funds of $43,756,000 for 9 projects valued at $53,270,000, including:
- $24,239,000 (55 percent) for 6 Safe-Routes-to-School projects
- $43,756,000 (100 percent) for 9 projects that provide benefits to disadvantaged communities.
Commission staff recommendations were revised on January 18, 2019 and differ from the recommendations initially released on December 28, 2018. The December recommendations conditionally awarded $22,572,000 to the project submitted by the City of Compton, Blue Line First/Last Mile Improvements: Compton and Artesia Station Areas. The City of Compton did not meet the programming conditions to designate a replacement project implementor by January 16, 2019. As a result, the City of Compton will forego the award, and their requested amount of $22,572,000 will be distributed to the next highest scoring applicants.

For those projects receiving the same score at the cut-off for funding, Commission staff used a secondary ranking system to recommend projects. This secondary ranking system was adopted by the Commission in the 2019 Active Transportation Program Guidelines. This ranking is based on the following sequence of priority: 1) infrastructure projects, 2) construction readiness, and 3) which applicant received the highest score on question 2, then question 3, then question 4.

The revised cut-off score for funding in the Statewide Component is 89. Programming capacity at the cut-off score is available to fully fund five of twelve projects that scored 89 and fund $3,217,000 of the $4,756,000 requested by the City of Santa Barbara for the U.S. 101 State Street Undercrossing Active Transportation Improvements project. Since the City of Santa Barbara also qualifies for the Small Urban and Rural Component, the remaining $1,539,000 will be funded from that component to fully fund the project.

In the Small Urban & Rural Component, the cut-off score for funding was an 85. Four projects eligible for the Small Urban & Rural Component scored an 85 and were subject to the secondary ranking system described above. Enough programming capacity at the cut-off score was available to fund $14,583,000 of the $17,959,000 requested by the City of Goleta for the San Jose Multi-Purpose project in the City of Goleta. Commission staff will work with the City of Goleta to determine if the project can be delivered with the funding available.

Further background information is included in Tab 18, item reference number 4.6.

The Commission’s adoption of the 2019 Active Transportation Program Statewide and Small Urban & Rural Components is not authorization to begin work on a project. Contracts may not be awarded nor may work begin until an allocation is approved by the Commission for a project in the adopted program.

Attachments:
- Attachment A: Resolution G-19-01
- Attachment B: 2019 Active Transportation Program – Statewide Component Revised
- Attachment C: 2019 Active Transportation Program – Small Urban & Rural Component Revised
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Adoption of the 2019 Active Transportation Program
Statewide and Small Urban & Rural Components

Resolution No. G-19-01

1.1 WHEREAS, Streets and Highways Code Section 2384 requires the California Transportation Commission (Commission) to adopt a program of projects to receive allocations under the Active Transportation Program; and

1.2 WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2384, the 2019 Active Transportation Program is a four-year program covering program years 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23; and

1.3 WHEREAS, pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2381, the program will be funded by state and federal funds from appropriations in the annual budget, as estimated in the Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate adopted by the Commission on May 16, 2018; and

1.4 WHEREAS, pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 2382, the Commission adopted Active Transportation Program Guidelines on May 16, 2018 with applicability to the 2019 Active Transportation Program development process; and

1.5 WHEREAS, the 2019 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate provided $445,560 million in Active Transportation Program programming capacity to be apportioned to Statewide (50%), Small Urban & Rural (10%) and MPO (40%) Components; and

1.6 WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2382(c), no less than 25% of overall program funds will benefit disadvantaged communities during each program cycle; and

1.7 WHEREAS, the Commission staff recommendations for the 2019 Active Transportation Program, Statewide and Small Urban & Rural components, were published and made available to the Commission, the California Department of Transportation (Department), regional transportation agencies, and county transportation commissions on December 28, 2018; and

1.8 WHEREAS, the Commission staff recommendations for the 2019 Active Transportation Program, Statewide and Small Urban & Rural components, were revised on January 18, 2019 since the City of Compton did not meet the programming conditions to designate a replacement project implementor for the Blue Line First/Last Mile Improvements: Compton and Artesia Station Areas project by January 16, 2019; as a result, the City of Compton will forego the award, which will be distributed to the next highest scoring applicants; and

1.9 WHEREAS, the staff recommendations conform to the Fund Estimate and other requirements of statute for the Active Transportation Program; and

1.10 WHEREAS, the Commission considered the staff recommendations and public testimony at its January 30, 2019 meeting.

2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the California Transportation Commission hereby adopts the 2019 Active Transportation Program, Statewide and Small Urban & Rural Components, to include the program described in the staff recommendations, including the attachments to this resolution; and
2.2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Department will continue to work with project sponsors to resolve any project component eligibility and deliverability issues, and provide an update to Commission staff within six months with project specific programming recommendations to resolve those issues; and

2.3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that having a project included in the adopted 2019 Active Transportation Program, Statewide and Small Urban & Rural Components, is not authorization to begin work on that project. Contracts may not be awarded nor work begin until an allocation is approved by the Commission for a project in the adopted program; and

2.4 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that if available funding is less than assumed in the Fund Estimate, the Commission may be forced to delay or restrict allocations using interim allocation plans, or, if available funding proves to be greater than assumed, it may be possible to allocate funding to some projects earlier than the year programmed; and

2.5 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that Commission staff, in consultation with the Department and regional agencies, is authorized to make further technical changes in cost, schedules, and descriptions for projects in the 2019 Active Transportation Program Statewide and Small Urban & Rural Components, consistent with the Fund Estimate, in order to reflect the most current information, or to clarify the Commission’s programming commitments, with report of any substantive changes back to the Commission for approval at the March 13-14, 2019 meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Recommended ATP Funding</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>22-23</th>
<th>PABE</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>CON NI</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>DAC</th>
<th>SRTS</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Transporta...</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Active Transportation Resource Center</td>
<td>$4,630</td>
<td>$4,630</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>4,630</td>
<td>Non-Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Parlier-1</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Parlier Bicycle and Trails Master Plan</td>
<td>$209</td>
<td>$209</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Kern County-4</td>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>South Chester Avenue Pedestrian Safety Project</td>
<td>$2,257</td>
<td>$1,976</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Butte County-3</td>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>Butte County Safe Routes Resource Center and 5 Community Projects</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>$985</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>Non-Infrastructure</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Mendota-1</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>City of Mendota SRTS Master Plan</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Humboldt County-1</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Humboldt Bay Trail South</td>
<td>$22,600</td>
<td>$13,296</td>
<td>$13,296</td>
<td>$13,296</td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-National City-5</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Central Community Mobility Enhancements</td>
<td>$1,483</td>
<td>$1,286</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-LA Department of Transportation-13</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Leichty Middle and Neighborhood Elementary Schools Safety Improvement Project</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$23,198</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>18,157</td>
<td>18,157</td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Desert Hot Springs-1</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Hacienda Avenue SRTS Improvement Project</td>
<td>$1,498</td>
<td>$1,322</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-San Bernardino Assoc of Government-1</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>SBCTA Metrolink Station Accessibility Improvement Project - Phase II</td>
<td>$6,983</td>
<td>$6,132</td>
<td>6,132</td>
<td>6,132</td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-National City-2</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway - Segment 5</td>
<td>$6,391</td>
<td>$5,421</td>
<td>5,421</td>
<td>5,421</td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Tehachapi-1</td>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>SRTS Snyder Avenue Gap Closure Project</td>
<td>$1,495</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Gustine-1</td>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>City of Gustine Active Transportation Plan</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Stanislaus County-1</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>Airport Neighborhood Active Transportation Connectivity and Safety Project</td>
<td>$6,161</td>
<td>$4,926</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4,907</td>
<td>4,907</td>
<td>Infrastructure + NI - M</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Pomona-2</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Pomona Multi-Neighborhood Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements</td>
<td>$9,864</td>
<td>$9,269</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>8,534</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,534</td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Duarte-1</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Duarte Active Transportation Safety Project</td>
<td>$2,293</td>
<td>$2,270</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-LA Department of Transportation-14</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>112th Street and Fournoy Elementary Schools Safety Improvements Project</td>
<td>$6,999</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4,448</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4,448</td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Stockton-3</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>Stockton SRTS Safety and Connectivity Improvements</td>
<td>$3,225</td>
<td>$2,838</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Santa Barbara-2</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Downtown De LaVina Street Safe Crosswalks and Buffered Bike Lanes</td>
<td>$1,494</td>
<td>$1,494</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-LA Department of Transportation-10</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Safe Routes for Seniors</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Inyo County-2</td>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>Lone Pine Sidewalk Construction and ADA Improvements</td>
<td>$1,939</td>
<td>$1,939</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Riverside County Transportation Department-7</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Active Transportation Improvements for the Communities of Thermal and Oasis</td>
<td>$6,944</td>
<td>$6,844</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>5,994</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>5,994</td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Stockton-1</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>California Street Separated Bikeway Project</td>
<td>$6,390</td>
<td>$4,390</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Chico-2</td>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>Little Chico Creek Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge Connection at Community Park</td>
<td>$2,142</td>
<td>$1,497</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Long Beach-2</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Orange Avenue Backbone Bikeway and Complete Streets Improvements</td>
<td>$15,526</td>
<td>$13,363</td>
<td>13,363</td>
<td>13,363</td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Temecula-1</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Santa Gertrudis Creek Trail, Phase 2</td>
<td>$2,085</td>
<td>$1,502</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>Infrastructure + NI - M</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application ID</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Recommended ATP Funding</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>PABED</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>CON NI</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Alemany Interchange Improvements, Phase 2</td>
<td>$2,727</td>
<td>$1,971</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Every Child: Community-Supported SRTS</td>
<td>$2,225</td>
<td>$2,143</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>High School G Street Bike/Pedestrian Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>$703</td>
<td>$703</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Pedestrian Plans for Disadvantaged Communities in Unincorporated Los Angeles County</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Doran Street Grade Separation Active Transportation Access Project</td>
<td>$22,219</td>
<td>$16,319</td>
<td>16,319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Kennedy Elementary and Villa Fundamental Intermediate SRTS</td>
<td>$1,482</td>
<td>$1,482</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Avenue R Complete Streets and Safe Routes Project – Construction Phase</td>
<td>$9,630</td>
<td>$5,150</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>Highway 49 Sidewalk Gap Closure</td>
<td>$16,403</td>
<td>$14,403</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure + NI - L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Fremont Elementary and Spurgeon Intermediate SRTS</td>
<td>$5,776</td>
<td>$5,776</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>4,849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>National City Bike Wayfinding</td>
<td>$942</td>
<td>$942</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>832</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Townsite Complete Street Improvements</td>
<td>$4,177</td>
<td>$3,968</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Jurupa Valley Sunnyslope Area SRTS Sidewalk Gap Closure</td>
<td>$3,173</td>
<td>$2,855</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>North/South Bike Network Gap Closure &amp; Connectivity to North Eastvale</td>
<td>$8,093</td>
<td>$6,471</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure + NI - L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Tweedy Boulevard Complete Streets Project</td>
<td>$5,776</td>
<td>$4,620</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Citywide SRTS Sidewalk Gap Closure</td>
<td>$4,199</td>
<td>$4,149</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure + NI - M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Jehue Corridor and Eucalyptus Avenue Class I Bike Paths</td>
<td>$2,820</td>
<td>$2,720</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure + NI - M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>Walk Isabella</td>
<td>$6,086</td>
<td>$5,140</td>
<td>854</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,286</td>
<td></td>
<td>854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Alexandria Avenue Elementary School Neighborhood Safety Improvements Project</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$4,480</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td>549</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Rancho Cordova School Zone Improvement Project</td>
<td>$1,282</td>
<td>$1,122</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Juan Bautista de Anza Multi-Use Trail Project</td>
<td>$8,653</td>
<td>$8,403</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>7,393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application ID</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Recommended ATP Funding</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>P&amp;A&amp;E</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>CON Ni</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Final Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-San Jose-2</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Better BikewaySJ - San Fernando Corridor</td>
<td>$11,919</td>
<td>$9,992</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>8,208</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>8,208</td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Monterey Park-1</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Monterey Park School and Crosswalk Safety Enhancement Project</td>
<td>$1,367</td>
<td>$1,367</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>Infrastructure - S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Transportation Agency for Monterey County-1</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Fort Ord Regional Trail &amp; Greenway: Highway 218 Segment (Monterey County)</td>
<td>$12,397</td>
<td>$10,379</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>9,181</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>9,181</td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Santa Barbara-1</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>U.S. 101 State Street Undercrossing Active Transportation Improvements</td>
<td>$5,961</td>
<td>$3,217</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>9,181</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>9,181</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>9,181</td>
<td>Infrastructure - L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $290,273 $237,566 $22,569 $78,894 $77,152 $58,951

* Prior to programming Caltrans will contact applicant for project clarifications.

† Recommended funding year(s) programming differs from proposed for deliverability purposes.

§ This project requested $4,756,000, however only $3,217,000 of programming capacity remains. Since this project would be fully funded in the Small Urban and Rural Component, the remaining $1,539,000 will be used from the SUR component to fully fund this project.
| Application ID | County        | Project Title                                                                 | Total Project Cost | Recommended ATP Funding | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | PA&ED | PS&E | ROW | CON | CON NI | Project Type | DAC | SRTS | Final Score |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|---------------|-----|------|-------------|
| 5-Santa Barbara County-1 | Santa Barbara | Modoc Road Multimodal Path Gap Closure                                       | $6,990             | $5,351                 | 388   | 621   |        |       | 4,342 | 388 | 543 | 78   | 4,342         | Infrastructure - M | X   | X    | 89          |
| 5-Santa Barbara-1 | Santa Barbara | U.S. 101 State Street Undercrossing Active Transportation Improvements      | $5,961             | $1,539                 | 412   | 596   | 531   | 412   | 45    | 531 |     |      | Infrastructure - M | X   | X    | 89          |
| 3-Chico-1      | Butte         | Bikeway 99 Phase 5 - 20th Street Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing             | $15,464            | $12,356                | 2,252 | 10,104| 2,252 | 10,104|       |     |     |      | Infrastructure - L | X   |       | 89          |
| 1-Willits-1    | Mendocino     | City of Willits Rail with Trail Project                                    | $6,362             | $6,362                 | 350   | 400   | 5,612 | 350   | 400   | 5,423|     |      | Infrastructure + NI - M | X   |       | 87          |
| 2-Corning-2    | Tehama        | Olive View School Connectivity Project                                    | $1,123             | $1,118                 | 30    | 150   | 80    | 858   | 30    | 150 | 80   | 858  | Infrastructure + NI - S | X   | X    | 86          |
| 5-UC Santa Cruz-1 | Santa Cruz    | UCSU Bike Path Safety Improvement Phase 2/Bike Safety Education              | $1,499             | $799                   | 799   |       |       |       | 65    | 368 | 365  |      | Infrastructure + NI - S | X   |       | 86          |
| 5-Santa Barbara-4 | Santa Barbara | Lower Eastside Community Connectivity Active Transportation Plan            | $344               | $344                   | 344   |       |       |       | 344   |     |     |      | Plan           | X   | X    | 86          |
| 2-Corning-1    | Tehama        | West Street School Connectivity Project                                    | $1,309             | $1,304                 | 30    | 185   | 80    | 1,009 | 30    | 185 | 80   | 1,009| Infrastructure + NI - S | X   | X    | 86          |
| 5-Goleta-1     | Santa Barbara | San Jose Multi-Purpose Path                                                 | $20,179            | $14,583                | 2,669 | 11,914|       |       | 1,800 | 869 | 11,914|       | Infrastructure - L | X   | X    | 85          |

|               |               |                                                                               | $59,231            | $43,756                | $4,645| $3,625| $13,070| $22,456|        |     |     |      |     |     |               |

* Prior to programming Caltrans will contact applicant for project clarifications.
† Recommended programming funding year(s) differs from proposed for deliverability purposes.
‡ This project requested $17,959,000, however only $14,583,000 of programming capacity remains. Staff will work with the agency to ensure a fully funded project.
§ This project requested $4,756,000, however only $3,217,000 of programming capacity remains in the Statewide Component. Since this project would be fully funded in the Small Urban and Rural Component, the remaining $1,539,000 will be used from the SUR component to fully fund this project.

PS&E: Plans, Specifications & Estimate Phase
PA&ED: Environmental Phase
Plan: Active Transportation Plan
M: Medium
L: Large
DAC: Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities
SRTS: Safe Routes to School
CON: Construction Phase
RW: Right-of-Way Phase
NI: Non-Infrastructure
S: Small
DAC: Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Reference No.: 4.8

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Action

Published Date: January 18, 2019

Prepared By: Christine Gordon
Assistant Deputy Director

Subject: AMENDMENT TO THE 2019 LOCAL PARTNERSHIP FORMULAIC PROGRAM
RESOLUTION G-19-02, AMENDING RESOLUTION G-18-44

ISSUE:
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) amend the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program to program one new project totaling $4.5 million in Fiscal Year 2019-20?

RECOMMENDATION:
Commission staff recommends that the Commission approve the amendment to the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program to program $4,497,000 in Fiscal Year 2019-20 Local Partnership Program funding for the Montague Expressway Pedestrian Overcrossing (Milpitas BART Station) project.

BACKGROUND:

Enabling Legislation
Senate Bill 1 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), which created the Local Partnership Program, was signed by the Governor on April 28, 2017. Assembly Bill 115 (Chapter 20, Statutes of 2017), signed by the Governor on June 27, 2017, clarified Senate Bill 1 language regarding local and regional transportation agency eligibility and expanded the types of projects eligible for the program. The objective of the Local Partnership Formulaic Program is to reward counties, cities, districts, and regional transportation agencies in which voters have approved fees or taxes solely dedicated to transportation improvements.

Local Partnership Formulaic Program
The 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program is funded from $100 million annually in state funds authorized by Senate Bill 1 that are appropriated from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account for Fiscal Year 2019-20. Only agencies with Commission-adopted shares and committed local matching funds are eligible to receive funding.

On June 27, 2018, the Commission adopted the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program Funding Share Distribution for Fiscal Year 2019-20, which included shares for 40 agencies. On October 17, 2018, the Commission adopted the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program.
Among the 40 agencies eligible for the program, 22 agencies received programmed funds for 33 projects.

The adopted cycle 2 formulaic program totals $72.6 million, over Fiscal Year 2019-20. The remaining $32.4 million can be programmed through June 30, 2021. Agencies with unprogrammed shares must submit eligible project proposals to the Commission to receive their distribution share of funding. If these project funding requests are in accordance with the Local Partnership Program Guidelines, the Commission will adopt an agency’s programming request through an amendment to the initial program of projects.

The following project nominated for funding in the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program is consistent with the Local Partnership Program Guidelines:

- Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority - Montague Expressway Pedestrian Overcrossing (Milpitas BART Station), nominated for available formulaic programming shares of $4,497,000 in Fiscal Year 2019-20.

Approval of this amendment to the current program of projects would result in a new total of 23 agencies programmed with $77.2 million for Fiscal Year 2019-20 for 34 projects. The remaining $27.8 million is available for programming through June 30, 2021.

Attachments:
- Attachment B: Changes to Adopted 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program
- Attachment C: Amended 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Adoption of Amendment to the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program
January 30-31, 2019

RESOLUTION G-19-02
Amending Resolution G-18-44

1.1 WHEREAS, on April 28, 2017, the Governor signed Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Beall, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), enacted as the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, creating the Local Partnership Program to provide funding to jurisdictions that have sought and received voter approved taxes and enacted fees for road maintenance and rehabilitation and other transportation improvement projects; and

1.2 WHEREAS, on June 27, 2017, the Governor signed Assembly Bill (AB) 115 (Ting, Chapter 20, Statutes of 2017) which clarified language in SB 1 regarding local and regional transportation agency eligibility and expanded the types of projects eligible for program funding; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the Commission adopted the amended 2019 Local Partnership Program Guidelines on June 27, 2018; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the Commission adopted the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program funding share distribution on June 27, 2018; and

1.5 WHEREAS, the Commission adopted the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program on October 17, 2018; and

1.6 WHEREAS, the program of projects programmed $72.6 million, over Fiscal Year 2019-20. The remaining balance of $32.4 million can be programmed through June 30, 2021; and

1.7 WHEREAS, agencies with unprogrammed shares must submit eligible project proposals to the Commission to receive their distribution share of funding; and

1.8 WHEREAS, if subsequent project funding requests are made in accordance with the Local Partnership Program Guidelines, the Commission will adopt an agency’s programming through an amendment to the initial program of projects; and

1.9 WHEREAS, the Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority requests that the Montague Expressway Pedestrian Overcrossing (Milpitas BART Station) project be amended into the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program for programming their available formulaic shares of $4,497,000 in Fiscal Year 2019-20; and

1.10 WHEREAS, the Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority request is consistent with the Local Partnership Program; and
1.11 WHEREAS, the aforementioned nominated project has been determined to be eligible for Local Partnership Formulaic Program funding.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission approves the amendment to the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program, as reflected in the Attachment; and

2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that, with this amendment, the 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program includes 23 agencies programmed with $77.2 million for Fiscal Year 2019-20, and a total of 34 projects. The remaining $27.8 million is available for programming through June 30, 2021; and

2.3 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission staff is authorized to make minor technical changes as needed to the program of projects; and

2.4 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission directs staff to post the amended 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program of Projects on the Commission’s website.
### California Transportation Commission

**Resolution G-19-02, Amending Resolution G-18-44**

**Changes to the Adopted 2019 Local Partnership Formulaic Program**

($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Applicant Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Total Proposed Cycle 1 and 2</th>
<th>Cycle 2 Shares</th>
<th>Cycle 1 Unprogrammed Shares</th>
<th>Unprogrammed balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Bay Area Toll Authority</td>
<td>Richmond San Rafael Structural Steel Paint - lower deck and towers</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$19,885</td>
<td>$9,649</td>
<td>$10,236</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Contra Costa Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Innovate 880: 1680 Northbound HOT/HOV</td>
<td>Contra Costa Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$478,600</td>
<td>$2,286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Avenue and Carson Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
<td>El Camino</td>
<td>$909</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$2,456</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arnold Drive Shoulder Gap Closure</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orinda 2019 Annual Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Orinda</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Fresno County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Veterans Boulevard Interchange and Extension Phase 4a</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>$6,737</td>
<td>$2,173</td>
<td>$2,173</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>Madera County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Avenue 7 Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Madera Co.</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$341</td>
<td>$341</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>Transportation Authority of Marin County</td>
<td>Downtown SMART Station Phase 2</td>
<td>SMART/Novato</td>
<td>$5,214</td>
<td>$483</td>
<td>$483</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>Fort Bragg</td>
<td>2030 Maple Street Storm Drain and Street Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Fort Bragg</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Point Arena Windy Hollow Road &amp; Riverside Drive Repaving and Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>Point Arena</td>
<td>$526</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilds 2019 Asphalt Maintenance</td>
<td>Wilds</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Transportation Agency for Monterey County</td>
<td>Regional Wayfinding Program</td>
<td>TAMC</td>
<td>$1,931</td>
<td>$724</td>
<td>$724</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey-Salinas Transit District</td>
<td>BUS Replacements</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$241</td>
<td>$241</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Truckee</td>
<td>2019 Slurry Seal</td>
<td>Truckee</td>
<td>$1,058</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Sacramento Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Circulator Bus Service Expansion</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>$1,882</td>
<td>$991</td>
<td>$991</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADA Accessibility and Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>Calspec</td>
<td>$641</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020 Pavement Resurfacing</td>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>$3,754</td>
<td>$254</td>
<td>$254</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Bidwell Street Widening and Sidewalk</td>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td>$548</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunrise Boulevard Roadway Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>$4,385</td>
<td>$401</td>
<td>$401</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Folsom Boulevard Roadway Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$2,022</td>
<td>$722</td>
<td>$722</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Streets Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Sacramento Co.</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$973</td>
<td>$973</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Sunset and Parkside Streets Pavement Renovation</td>
<td>SFPW</td>
<td>$2,340</td>
<td>$2,002</td>
<td>$2,002</td>
<td>$333</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>San Joaquin County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Turner Road Intersection Operational Improvements</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$4,272</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Sonoma County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>2019 Pedestrian and Surfacing Improvements</td>
<td>Sonoma Co.</td>
<td>$1,352</td>
<td>$551</td>
<td>$551</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma/Marin</td>
<td>Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit District</td>
<td>SMART Rail Maintenance Equipment Expansion Phase 2</td>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>$2,166</td>
<td>$743</td>
<td>$743</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td>Erie Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td>$678</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
<td>West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor (WSBT)</td>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$5,478</td>
<td>$5,478</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Access Pass (TAP) Bus Farebox Upgrade - Municipal Transit Operators</td>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$2,686</td>
<td>$2,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Line Extension (Redondo Beach-Fort Carson)</td>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>$1,167,273</td>
<td>$1,167,273</td>
<td>$1,167,273</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>I-5 Improvement, Alicia Parkway - El Toro Road (Segment 3)</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$154,052</td>
<td>$9,388</td>
<td>$9,388</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Riverside County Transportation Commission</td>
<td>Palm Avenue Street Rehabilitation</td>
<td>RCTC</td>
<td>$76,975</td>
<td>$7,090</td>
<td>$7,090</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Santa Barbara County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Calleblanco Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>$3,754</td>
<td>$254</td>
<td>$254</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Claus Lane Streetscape, Coastal Access Parking and Railroad Crossing</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Co.</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Recommended for 2019 Formulaic Program:

$3,302,372 $88,472 $77,153

No Projects Proposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Agency</th>
<th>Cycle 1 Unprogrammed Shares</th>
<th>Cycle 2 Unprogrammed Shares</th>
<th>Unprogrammed Total Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Transportation Commission</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,802</td>
<td>$3,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit District</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$845</td>
<td>$845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td>$192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Clearlake</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$1,076</td>
<td>$556</td>
<td>$1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$1,253</td>
<td>$559</td>
<td>$1,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa Valley Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$323</td>
<td>$311</td>
<td>$634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada City</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,196</td>
<td>$1,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,494</td>
<td>$4,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Transit District</td>
<td>$1,757</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$2,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Transportation Commission</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$302</td>
<td>$302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Metropolitan Transit Authority</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$302</td>
<td>$302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,339</td>
<td>$6,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>$5,346</td>
<td>$9,727</td>
<td>$15,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,385</td>
<td>$1,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $9,340 $27,848 $37,188

* Cycle 2 Shares include a $5 million incentive grant

**Funding cycles - detailed breakdown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
<th>Funding year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$787,375</td>
<td>$72,685</td>
<td>$12,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>End of cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment B**

*Rev. 01/18/2019*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Applicant Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Total Proposed Cycle 1 and 2</th>
<th>Cycle 2 Shares</th>
<th>Cycle 1 Unprogrammed Shares</th>
<th>Unprogrammed balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Bay Area Toll Authority</td>
<td>Richmond San Rafael Structural Steel Paint - lower deck and towers</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$10,885</td>
<td>$9,649</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Contra Costa Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Innovate 680 Northbound HOT/HOV</td>
<td>CCTA</td>
<td>$478,600</td>
<td>$2,286</td>
<td>$2,486</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Avenue and Carlson Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
<td>El Cerito</td>
<td>$909</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$2,486</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arnold Drive Sidewalk Gap Closure</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$9,649</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019 Annual Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Fresno County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Veterans Boulevard Interchange and Extension Phase 4a</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>$6,737</td>
<td>$2,173</td>
<td>$2,173</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>Merced County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Avenue 7 Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Merced Co.</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$341</td>
<td>$341</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>Transportation Authority of Marin County</td>
<td>Downtown SMART Station Phase 2</td>
<td>SMART/Novato</td>
<td>$2,214</td>
<td>$483</td>
<td>$483</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>Port Bragg</td>
<td>2050 Maple Street Storm Drain and Steel Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Port Bragg</td>
<td>$687</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Point Arena</td>
<td>Point Arena</td>
<td>$256</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunnyvale Boulevard Roadway Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Palomar Cordova</td>
<td>$4,585</td>
<td>$401</td>
<td>$634</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yolisom Boulevard Roadway Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$2,222</td>
<td>$722</td>
<td>$722</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Streets Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Sacramento Co.</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$973</td>
<td>$973</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Transportation Agency for Monterey County</td>
<td>Regional Wayfinding Program</td>
<td>VAMC</td>
<td>$1,891</td>
<td>$724</td>
<td>$724</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey-Salinas Transit District</td>
<td>Bus Replacements</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$587</td>
<td>$241</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Truckee</td>
<td>2019 Slurry Seal</td>
<td>Truckee</td>
<td>$1,058</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Sacramento Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Circulator Bus Service Expansion</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>$1,582</td>
<td>$591</td>
<td>$591</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADA Accessibility and Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>Citrus Heights</td>
<td>$941</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 Pavement Resurfacing</td>
<td>Bk Grove</td>
<td>$3,754</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Bidwell Street Widening and Sidewalk</td>
<td>Folson</td>
<td>$543</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$3,304</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunnyvale Boulevard Roadway Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Palomar Cordova</td>
<td>$4,656</td>
<td>$401</td>
<td>$401</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yolisom Boulevard Roadway Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$2,222</td>
<td>$722</td>
<td>$722</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Streets Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Sacramento Co.</td>
<td>$2,090</td>
<td>$973</td>
<td>$973</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Sunset and Parkside Streets Pavement Renovation</td>
<td>SPFW</td>
<td>$4,972</td>
<td>$2,346</td>
<td>$2,007</td>
<td>$333</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montague Expressway Pedestrian Overcrossing (Mipitas BART Station)</td>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td>$19,231</td>
<td>$4,497</td>
<td>$4,497</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>Limer Road Interchange Operational Improvements</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$4,171</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>2019 Pedestrian and Surfacing Improvements</td>
<td>Sonoma Co.</td>
<td>$1,352</td>
<td>$551</td>
<td>$551</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonoma/Marin</td>
<td>Sonoma-Marin Rail Transit District</td>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>$1,486</td>
<td>$743</td>
<td>$743</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuba Co.</td>
<td>Eto Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td>$1,298</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
<td>West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor (WSBT)</td>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$397</td>
<td>$397</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Transit Access Pass (TAP) Bus Farebox Upgrade - Municipal Transit Operators</td>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,006</td>
<td>$29,973</td>
<td>$2,686</td>
<td>$2,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Green Line Extension (Redondo Beach-Torrance)</td>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>$1,167,273</td>
<td>$10,745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>1-5 Improvement, Alicia Parkway - El Toro Road (Segment 3)</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$154,090</td>
<td>$9,388</td>
<td>$9,388</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Riverside County Transportation Commission</td>
<td>OCTC</td>
<td>$16,815</td>
<td>$7,095</td>
<td>$7,095</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Barbara County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Calvino Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Co.</td>
<td>$8,590</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Carlos Lane Streetscape, Coastal Access Parking and Railroad Crossing</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Co.</td>
<td>$8,590</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recommended for 2019 Formulaic Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,302,372</td>
<td>$88,472</td>
<td>$77,153</td>
<td>$13,503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Agency</th>
<th>Cycle 1 Unprogrammed Shares</th>
<th>Cycle 2 Unprogrammed Shares</th>
<th>Unprogrammed Total Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Transportation Commission</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,892</td>
<td>$3,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit District</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$845</td>
<td>$845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$122</td>
<td>$122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cudahy</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County Local Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$1,276</td>
<td>$556</td>
<td>$1,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$1,891</td>
<td>$591</td>
<td>$1,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa Valley Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$323</td>
<td>$311</td>
<td>$634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada City</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,196</td>
<td>$1,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Transit District</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,757</td>
<td>$1,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,539</td>
<td>$6,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,897</td>
<td>$10,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,387</td>
<td>$1,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cycle 2 Shares include a $5 million incentive grant

Funding cycles - detailed breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding year(s)</th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$187,575</td>
<td>$77,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>$12,425</td>
<td>$27,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$39,570</td>
<td>$63,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of cycle

California Transportation Commission
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Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
       Chief Financial Officer

Subject: ADVANCE MITIGATION PROGRAM GUIDELINES UPDATE

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 4.4
Prepared by: Jeremy Ketchum, Chief (Acting)
Division of Environmental Analysis

SUMMARY:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) will provide an update to the California Transportation Commission (Commission) on changes from the “Informal Draft Advance Mitigation Program Guidelines” to the “Draft Formal Guidelines”, as an informational item at its January 2019 meeting.

BACKGROUND:

At its June 2018 meeting, the Department presented to the Commission its “Informal Draft Advance Mitigation Program Guidelines” (Guidelines) for review and comment. Then at the August 2018 meeting, the Commission provided comments to the Department on the Guidelines.

As of December 2018, the Department has transmitted to the Commission its response to the comments received on the Guidelines, which were used to help develop the “Draft Formal Guidelines”. In addition, the Department has scheduled public workshops to provide an opportunity for the public to review and provide comments on the “Draft Formal Guidelines”. These workshops are scheduled for January 14 and January 16, 2019.

HISTORY

The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (Senate Bill [SB] 1), amended by SB 103 (2017), and codified in California Streets and Highway Code (SHC) Section 800 et seq, established the Advance Mitigation Program (Program).

The purpose of the Program is to enhance communications between the Department and stakeholders to protect natural resources through project mitigation, to meet or exceed applicable environmental requirements, accelerate project delivery, and to mitigate, to the maximum extent required by law, environmental impacts from transportation infrastructure projects.

SB 1 also established the Advance Mitigation Account (AMA), a revolving account, to support the Program. The Program has received the first of four annual $30,000,000 installments from the State Highway Account for the planning and implementation of advance mitigation projects. Annual reporting regarding AMA activity to the Commission will begin in August 2019.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
M e m o r a n d u m

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 4.26
Action

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Prepared By: Laura Pennebaker
Associate Deputy Director

Subject: PROPOSED STATE WETLAND DEFINITION AND AMENDMENTS TO PROCEDURES FOR DISCHARGES OF DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL TO WATERS OF THE STATE

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) provide comments in response to the California State Water Resources Control Board’s (SWRCB) proposed Procedures for Discharges of Dredged or Fill Material to Waters of the State (procedures)?

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the attached letter for submission to the SWRCB as the proposed regulations may potentially increase the cost and schedule of delivering transportation infrastructure projects.

BACKGROUND:

The SWRCB and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Water Boards) are the agencies with primary responsibility for control of water quality. For more than three decades, and under the authority of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act, state regulations and policy have directed the Regional Water Quality Control Boards to protect all waters of the state, including wetlands. The federal government shares in these responsibilities for those waters of the state that are also designated as waters of the United States under the federal Clean Water Act.

The SWRCB is considering proposed regulations regarding the state wetland definition and procedures for discharges of dredged or fill material to waters of the state. The SWRCB has been working on the development of these procedures since 2007. According to the SWRCB, these proposed procedures are needed to strengthen protections for waters of the state due to the diminishing jurisdiction of the federal government related to water protection. Traditionally, California has heavily relied on the federal regulatory program under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act to govern the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the state. This program
is administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

According to the SWRCB, as a result of U.S. Supreme Court decisions, federal law and its application over waters of the U.S. have proven insufficient to protect the diverse array of California’s wetlands. In addition, there is statewide inconsistency across the nine regional water boards regarding requirements for discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the state, including wetlands. There is no single accepted definition of wetlands at the state level, and the water boards may have different requirements and levels of analysis with regard to the issuance of dredge or fill orders. Finally, the SWRCB states that current regulations have not been adequate to prevent losses in the quantity and quality of wetlands in California.

To uniformly protect all waters of the state, the SWRCB is proposing to add new procedures to the current regulatory program for the discharge of dredged or fill material to address the issues identified above. The proposed procedures consist of the following components: 1.) a wetland definition, 2.) wetland delineation procedures, and 3.) procedures for applications as well as the review and approval of Water Quality Certifications, Waste Discharge Requirements, and waivers of Waste Discharge Requirements for dredged and fill activities. The Commission last received an update on these procedures and provided comments in August 2016.

At that time the Commission noted that the SWRCB had produced limited information related to the potential cost implications of these proposed procedures and had only provided a qualitative assessment of potential costs or consequences associated with the proposal. Given the magnitude of the new program created by these procedures, the broad consequences for both public and private sector entities could be significant in both project cost and delay. The Commission recommended that the SWRCB work closely with the Department and other stakeholders to quantitatively estimate the potential costs of these proposed procedures, fully analyze the potential consequences for project delivery, and to carefully weigh the estimated costs against the expected benefits before taking any formal action.

In July 2017 the SWRCB circulated another draft of the proposed procedures allowing for comment through September 2017. Extensive stakeholder feedback was received during this time including comments from the California Department of Transportation. On January 3, 2019, a final draft version of the procedures was noticed. It is Commission staff’s understanding that no additional written comments are being solicited by the SWRCB at this time. The revised procedures are scheduled to be presented and considered for adoption by the SWRCB at their February 5, 2019 meeting.

Commission staff has prepared the attached draft letter to the SWRCB advising that the SWRCB consider providing additional opportunity for public comment and reiterating our previous concerns related to the proposed procedures especially the need to estimate the potential costs and carefully weigh the costs against the expected benefits before taking formal action. The letter also acknowledges that the final draft procedures include a process for the Department to use an alternative written agreement in lieu of the proposed procedures and recommends that the SWRCB
consider offering this provision to regional and local transportation agencies as well given their key role in project delivery.

Please see https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/cwa401/wrapp.html for the “State Wetland Definition and Procedures for Discharges of Dredged or Fill Material to Waters of the State” link to the notice and procedures.

Attachment A: Draft Comment Letter for the Final Draft Proposed State Wetland Definition and Procedures of Discharges of Dredged or Fill Material to Waters of the State
January 30, 2019

Ms. Jeanine Townsend, Clerk of the Board  
State Water Resources Control Board  
P.O. Box 100  
Sacramento, CA 95812-2000

RE: Comment Letter – Final Draft State Wetland Definition and Procedures for Discharges of Dredged or Fill Material to Waters of the State

Dear Ms. Townsend,

The California Transportation Commission (Commission) considered the State Water Resources Control Board’s (SWRCB) Final Draft State Wetland Definition and Procedures for Discharge of Dredged or Fill Material to Waters of the State as noticed on January 3, 2019 at its January 30-31, 2019 meeting. The Commission is primarily concerned with the effect this new policy will have on the time and cost required to complete environmental analysis and permitting of transportation infrastructure projects delivered by the California Department of Transportation as well as local and regional agencies.

The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (Senate Bill 1, Beall, 2017) provided critically needed funding for multimodal transportation projects statewide and has resulted in an increased volume of transportation projects going through the project development and delivery process. It is imperative that changes in the permitting process do not delay or otherwise impede the delivery of these projects that are critical to improving safety, mobility, environmental sustainability, economic vitality, and quality of life in California.
The Commission commends the SWRCB efforts to work with all stakeholders throughout the long and intensive process of developing the final draft procedures. In particular, the Commission supports the inclusion in the final draft of a six-month delay in the effective date for the new procedures as well as an option for the California Department of Transportation and other state agencies to utilize an alternative written agreement in lieu of the proposed procedures. However, in recognition that regional and local agencies also play a key role in transportation project construction, the Commission recommends that the SWRCB consider extending the written agreement provision (identified in footnote 8 on p. 4) to these agencies as well.

Given the magnitude and complexity of this program, and the potential impact on transportation project delivery, the Commission urges the SWRCB to provide additional opportunity for written comments and to work with the California Department of Transportation and all transportation stakeholders including regional and local agencies to fully analyze the potential permitting cost and schedule implications of these procedures prior to adoption.

Careful deliberation and analysis of the proposed procedures is critical prior to adoption to prevent delay and increased costs for the delivery of important multimodal transportation infrastructure and the associated economic and environmental benefits that these projects provide.

The Commission appreciates the opportunity to convey our concerns and to request the SWRCB’s consideration of all comments received. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Susan Bransen, Commission Executive Director, at (916) 654-4245.

Sincerely,

FRAN INMAN
Chair
MEMORANDUM

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
   Chief Financial Officer

Subject: COMMENTS ON THE PROCEDURES FOR DISCHARGES OF DREDGED OR FILL MATERIALS TO WATERS OF THE STATE

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 4.26 Information Item

Prepared by: Jeremy Ketchum, Chief (Acting)
Division of Environmental Analysis

ISSUE:

The California State Water Resources Control Board (Water Board) has published its final draft procedures for discharges of dredged or fill materials to waters of the state, and will be considering adoption at a February 5 board meeting. The California Department of Transportation (Department) has worked with the Water Board and provided comments as guidance was developed, and is assessing impacts to project delivery.

BACKGROUND:

On January 3, 2019, the Water Board publicly noticed that they are considering to adopt procedures for discharges of dredged or fill material to waters of the state (Proposed Procedures).

The Proposed Procedures consist of the following components: (1) a wetland definition, (2) wetland delineation procedures, and (3) procedures for applications, and the review and approval of Water Quality Certifications, Waste Discharge Requirements, and waivers of Waste Discharge Requirements for dredged and fill activities.

The Water Board developed the Proposed Procedures not only due to the diminishing jurisdiction of the federal government, but to also address the inconsistency across the Regional Water Boards regarding requirements for discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the state, including wetlands. There is no single accepted definition of wetlands at the state level, and the Regional Water Boards may have different requirements and levels of analysis with regard to the issuance of dredge or fill orders.

The Department has been an active stakeholder in the development of these Proposed Procedures. The Department has had several opportunities to submit comment letters on the drafts released in 2007, 2008, 2010, 2011, 2016, and 2017. Following up on the Department's September 2017 comment letter, the Department and Water Board staff have engaged in ongoing discussions regarding revisions to the Proposed Procedures and measures to reduce the impact to the Department's programs. The Department and Water Board staff will continue working toward an agreement of alternative procedures and requirements, as permitted under the Proposed Procedures.

The Water Board is holding informational public workshops on January 9 and 22, 2019; and considering adoption at a February 5, 2019 board meeting.
MEMORANDUM

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 4.10

Information

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN

Executive Director

Prepared By: Laura Pennebaker

Associate Deputy Director

Subject: CALTRANS AND CALIFORNIA TRUCKING ASSOCIATION PUSHER TRUCK PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

SUMMARY:

Eric Sauer, Senior Vice-President of Government Affairs for the California Trucking Association will provide an overview of the California Pusher Truck Program.

BACKGROUND:

The California Pusher Truck Program is a partnership effort between the California Trucking Association, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the California Highway Patrol. The program uses modified Class 8 trucks known as “pusher trucks” operated by Caltrans to move semi-trucks out of traffic or give them the momentum needed to move through the snow after a loss of traction on the steep inclines of Donner Pass along Interstate 80. This service, which is provided free of charge to disabled trucks, is instrumental in keeping traffic moving as smoothly as possible. This is critical on the Interstate 80 corridor where it is estimated that on average, 3,500 trucks and 29,000 cars per day traverse Donner Pass, and $4.7 million per hour in commerce moves through the corridor.

As part of this partnership, the California Trucking Association provides maintenance, parts, and service for the pusher trucks. Caltrans, in return, provides fuel, insurance, operational inspections, and qualified operators. Financial support for this program comes from voluntary donations from California Trucking Association members. The program recently received a donation from FedEx of two newer diesel trucks that have been retrofitted to serve as new pusher trucks for the program. The program provides a great example of a public-private partnership effort that is helping to support the efficient movement of freight and increase safety for the travelling public on the state highway system.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Subject: INFORMATIONAL REPORTS – DELEGATED ALLOCATIONS
         EMERGENCY G-11-16, SHOPP G-03-10 SAFETY, AND MINOR G-05-16

SUMMARY:

Since the period reported at the last California Transportation Commission (Commission) meeting, the California Department of Transportation (Department) allocated or sub-allocated:

- $22,153,000 for construction and $4,015,000 for construction engineering for 12 emergency construction projects, pursuant to the authority granted under Resolution G-11-16 (2.5f.(1)).
- $2,579,000 for construction and $1,640,000 for construction engineering for four safety projects, pursuant to the authority granted under Resolution G-03-10 (2.5f.(3)).
- $758,000 for two State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Minor A projects, pursuant to the authority granted under Resolution G-05-16 (2.5f.(4)).

As of December 27, 2018, the Department has allocated or sub-allocated the following for construction in the Fiscal Year 2018-19:

- $181,548,000 for 52 emergency construction projects.
- $164,532,000 for 29 safety delegated projects.
- $8,087,000 for 13 SHOPP Minor A projects.

BACKGROUND:

The Commission, by Resolution G-11, as amended by Resolution G-11-16, delegated to the Department authority to allocate funds to correct certain situations caused by floods, slides, earthquakes, material failures, slip outs, unusual accidents or other similar events.
This authority is operative whenever such an event:

1. Places people or property in jeopardy.
2. Causes or threatens to cause closure of transportation access necessary for:
   a. Emergency assistance efforts.
   b. The effective functioning of an area’s services, commerce, manufacture or agriculture.
   c. Persons in the area to reach their homes or employment.
3. Causes either an excessive increase in transportation congestion or delay, or an excessive increase in the necessary distances traveled.

Resolution G-11 authorizes the Department to allocate funds for follow-up restoration projects associated with, and that immediately follow an emergency condition response project. Resolution G-11 also requires the Department to notify the Commission, at their next meeting, whenever such an emergency allocation has been made.

On March 30, 1994, the Commission delegated to the Department authority to allocate funds under Resolution G-11, as amended by Resolution G-11-16. This authority allows the Department to begin work without waiting for the next Commission meeting to receive an allocation.

On March 28, 2001, the Commission approved Resolution G-01-10, as amended by Resolution G-03-10, delegating to the Department authority to allocate funds for SHOPP safety projects. This authority allows the Department to begin work without waiting for the next Commission meeting to receive an allocation.

Resolution G-05-16 authorizes the Department to sub-allocate funds for Minor projects. At the June 2018 meeting, the funding and project listing for the FY 2018-19 Lump Sum Minor Construction Program was approved by the Commission under Resolution FM-17-05.

The SHOPP, as approved by the Commission, is a four-year program of projects with the total annual proposed expenditures limited to the biennial Commission-approved Fund Estimate. The Commission, subject to monthly reporting and briefings, has delegated to the Department the authority to allocate funds for safety projects and emergency projects. The Department uses prudent business practices to manage the combination of individual project cost increases and savings to meet Commission policies.

In all cases, the delegated authority allows the Department to begin work without waiting for the next Commission meeting to receive an allocation.

The Department has complied with the National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act requirements in preparing these projects.

Attachment
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### 2.5f.1  Informational Report - Emergency G-11 Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Near Ukiah, from 0.3 mile south of to 0.7 mile north of Route 253. Recent inspection discovered the failing of arch culverts resulting in voids under the pavement and a sinkhole on the shoulder. This project will use Cured In Place Pipe (CIPP) Liner to repair the culverts, grade shoulders, and install temporary water treatment measures.</td>
<td>Mendocino, 01-Men-101 Dist-Co-Rte 21.0/R22.0</td>
<td>01-4719 SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$275,000 2018-19</td>
<td>0119000023 CON ENG</td>
<td>$625,000 20.20.201.130</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In the city of Sacramento, from the San Joaquin County line (PM 0.018) to Richards Boulevard; also on Route 50 from Route 5 to the Manlove Pedestrian Overcrossing (PM L0.5/R5.8). On August 30, 2018 the Department identified numerous concrete slabs failed on Route 5 and Route 50. An Emergency Force Account project EA 03-4H700 was approved to commence work immediately and addressed over 300 failed slabs. Ongoing site investigations has determined additional slabs have failed and need immediate attention. This project will remove and replace those slabs under a Emergency Limited Bid contract as well as provide traffic control and install striping.</td>
<td>Sacramento, 03-Sac-5 Dist-Co-Rte 0.0/24.7</td>
<td>03-5873 SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$500,000 2018-19</td>
<td>0319000054 CON ENG</td>
<td>$3,500,000 20.20.201.130</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Near Camptonville, at 0.1 mile north of Sleighville Circle (right). On August 23, 2018 the Department was notified of slope failure near a culvert outlet. Subsequent investigation determined the slope failure was caused by a deteriorated 90 inch Structural Steel Pipe culvert (SSPP). This project will provide water diversion, grout the voids around the 90 inch SSPP and headwall, construct a reinforced concrete invert lining, and repair slope. This supplemental is necessary to remove and replace the failed pipe that has been determined unsalvageable since initial Director's Order.</td>
<td>Yuba, 03-Yub-49 Dist-Co-Rte 7.4</td>
<td>03-9684 SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$0 2018-19</td>
<td>0319000037 CON ENG</td>
<td>$50,000 20.20.201.130</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Near Olema, at Olema Creek Bridge No. 27-0020. Construct sheet pile retaining wall and replace culvert. This supplemental is necessary to complete the construction of the three-sided culvert &quot;bridge&quot;. The higher cost to construct the bridge is due to the right-of-way, permitting and remote location constraints. Due to the remote location a precast bridge was selected instead of a cast in place. This requires a high cost polyester concrete wearing surface be placed on the bridge deck. The Coastal Commission required aesthetic raling as part of their permit.</td>
<td>Marin, 04-Mrn-1 Dist-Co-Rte 22.8</td>
<td>04-1460C SHOPP/16-17</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$450,000 2018-19</td>
<td>0417000378 CON ENG</td>
<td>$2,700,000 20.20.201.130</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial G-11 Allocation 11/19/18: $900,000
(Additional $10,000 was allocated for right of way purposes.)

Initial G-11 Allocation 11/14/18: $4,000,000

Initial G-11 Allocation 09/24/18: $700,000
Supplemental G-11 Allocation 10/25/18: $50,000
Revised Allocation: $750,000

Initial G-11 Allocation 04/13/17: $5,400,000
Supplemental G-11 Allocation 09/28/18: $3,150,000
Revised Allocation: $8,550,000

Emergency
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Allocation History</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Adv Phase</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5f.(1) Informational Report - Emergency G-11 Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>06-Tul-190</td>
<td>R40.0/44.0</td>
<td>Near Camp Nelson, from 7.3 miles east of Balch Park Drive to 2.5 miles west of Pierpoint Drive. On October 23, 2018, a severe thunderstorm brought rain to fire scar burn area causing multiple slides. The debris resulted in damaged slopes, drainage systems, and roadway. This project will remove the debris, regrade slopes, place erosion control, and repair the roadway and drainage systems. This supplemental is needed to complete an additional 20 locations discovered during construction road closures.</td>
<td>Initial G-11 Allocation 10/22/18: $850,000</td>
<td>Supplemental G-11 Allocation 11/19/18: $1,900,000</td>
<td>Revised Allocation: $2,750,000</td>
<td>06-6979</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>20.20.201.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>07-LA-Var</td>
<td>Var</td>
<td>Near Long Beach, on Routes 47, 110, and 405 at various locations. Beginning January 19, 2017, a series of storm events caused embankment washouts, a sinkhole at a bridge abutment, and damaged irrigation lines. The project will reconstruct embankments, repair sinkhole and reconnect irrigation lines. Suplemental work is required to close out the project.</td>
<td>Initial G-11 Allocation 02/16/17: $341,000</td>
<td>Supplemental G-11 Allocation 01/04/18: $16,000</td>
<td>Supplemental G-11 Allocation 06/05/18: $5,000</td>
<td>Supplemental G-11 Allocation 10/25/18: $2,500</td>
<td>Revised Allocation: $364,500</td>
<td>07-5174</td>
<td>SHOPP/16-17</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$6,650,000</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>08-Riv-10</td>
<td>R74.0/R121.8</td>
<td>Near Indio, from 15.0 miles east of Dillon Road to 18.0 miles west of Route 78. On October 13, 2018, an intense rain event occurred in the low desert area causing flooding, erosion, scour at bridge locations, and undermining the roadway. This project will excavate and backfill, place rock slope protection along bridges and eroded embankments, remove and replace asphalt, and remove debris.</td>
<td>Initial G-11 Allocation 11/19/18: ($6,650,000 (Additional $50,000 was allocated for right of way purposes.)</td>
<td>08-3013E</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>20.20.201.130</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>0819000030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>08-Riv-243</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>Near Idyllwild, 1.1 miles north of Lake Fulmor Bridge. On September 11, 2018, field investigation determined a misaligned culvert had joint separation and caused pavement distress and embankment erosion. This project will replace the 36 inch Reinforced Concrete Pipe (RCP), restore embankment, and repair the distressed pavement.</td>
<td>Initial G-11 Allocation 10/24/18: $1,150,000 (Additional $10,000 was allocated for right of way purposes.)</td>
<td>08-3012Y</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>20.20.201.130</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>0819000024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*January 30-31, 2019*

*CTC Financial Vote List*

*Page 2*
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

### 2.5f.(1) Informational Report - Emergency G-11 Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Adv Phase</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>08-SBd-15</td>
<td>Near Baker, at Valley Wells Safety Rest Area (SRRA). Four years of drought have led to a reduction in groundwater and water quality at the Valley Wells SRRA, forcing this heavily used facility to be closed to public use. An adjacent SRRA is also closed for similar reasons resulting in a very large section of isolated Route 15 without these types of services for the traveling public. This project will abandon the existing failing well, drill a new well and connect to the existing system, allowing the facility to be reopened. This supplemental is needed to replace potable water system components not included in the original Directors Order but required by the permitting agency.</td>
<td>08-3010V</td>
<td>001-0042 SHA</td>
<td>SHOPP/17-18</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0818000195</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>08-SBd-62</td>
<td>Near Vidal, 29.0 miles west of Route 95. On October 13, 2018, an intense rain event occurred in the low desert area causing flooding, erosion and undermining the roadway. This project will excavate and backfill, remove and replace the asphalt, reconstruct slope embankment, and remove debris.</td>
<td>08-3013C</td>
<td>001-0042 SHA</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0819000028</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>10-Mpa-140</td>
<td>Near Gustine, 0.4 mile south of Route 140 at Garzas Creek Bridge No. 39-0181R/L. A field inspection in September 2018 determined the bridge foundation piers sustained scour damage. This project will backfill piers with slurry cement and install channel rock lining.</td>
<td>10-3430</td>
<td>001-0042 SHA</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1019000021</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mariposa</td>
<td>10-Mpa-140</td>
<td>Near the community of Mariposa, from 13.7 miles east of Triangle Road to 1.0 mile east of Crane Creek Road. On July 13, 2018, the Ferguson Fire started and a Proclamation of a State of Emergency was signed by the Governor on July 26, 2018. On October 4, 2018, Department staff observed sediment slide in the fire scar areas, subsequent investigation identified other areas in the burnt area requiring immediate attention. This contract will provide slope stabilization, drainage repairs and removal of burnt trees to protect the prior to the winter season.</td>
<td>10-3432</td>
<td>001-0042 SHA</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1019000029</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial G-11 Allocation 07/05/18: $1,100,000  
Supplemental G-11 Allocation 11/07/18: $1,100,000  
Revised Allocation: $2,200,000  
Initial G-11 Allocation 11/14/18: $825,000  
(Additional $75,000 was allocated for right of way purposes.)  
Initial G-11 Allocation 10/24/18: $1,490,000  
(Additional $50,000 was allocated for right of way purposes.)  
Initial G-11 Allocation 11/07/18: $5,850,000  
(Additional $5,000,000 was allocated for right of way purposes.)
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>PPNO Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Adv Phase</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,408,000</td>
<td>In Twentynine Palms, from 0.1 mile west to 0.4 mile east of Utah Trail. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Install traffic signals meeting current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards, crosswalks and flashing beacon system. This project will improve safety and reduce the number and severity of collisions.</td>
<td>08-3005K</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>0815000238</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>01-0042</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,159,000</td>
<td>In Laguna Beach, on southbound Route 73, from Route 133 to 0.2 mile north of Route 133. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Modify roadway cross slope, install drainage inlets, place Open Graded Asphalt Concrete (OGAC) and place pavement delineation. This project will improve safety and reduce the number and severity of collisions.</td>
<td>12-4096P</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>1214000115</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>01-0042</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allocation Date:** 11/30/18

---

### 2.5f.(3) Informational Report - SHOPP Safety Resolution G-03-10 Delegated Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>PPNO Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Adv Phase</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,408,000</td>
<td>In Twentynine Palms, from 0.1 mile west to 0.4 mile east of Utah Trail. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Install traffic signals meeting current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards, crosswalks and flashing beacon system. This project will improve safety and reduce the number and severity of collisions.</td>
<td>08-3005K</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>0815000238</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>01-0042</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,159,000</td>
<td>In Laguna Beach, on southbound Route 73, from Route 133 to 0.2 mile north of Route 133. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Modify roadway cross slope, install drainage inlets, place Open Graded Asphalt Concrete (OGAC) and place pavement delineation. This project will improve safety and reduce the number and severity of collisions.</td>
<td>12-4096P</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>1214000115</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>01-0042</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allocation Date:** 12/26/18
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

#### 2.5f(3) Informational Report - SHOPP Safety Resolution G-03-10 Delegated Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$860,000</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>In Buena Park, on the 91 eastbound connector from northbound Route 39 (Beach Boulevard).</td>
<td>Improve safety during wet weather conditions by placing Open Graded Friction Course (OGFC) pavement. This project will reduce the number and severity of collisions during wet conditions.</td>
<td>Planned: 17, Actual: 17 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td>12-4533A</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$792,000</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>In Irvine, from Walnut Road to 0.1 mile north of northbound Jamboree Road Overcrossing.</td>
<td>Install double three-beam barrier to prevent cross-median collisions. This project will improve safety and reduce the number and severity of collisions.</td>
<td>Planned: 3, Actual: 3 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td>12-4926F</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preliminary Engineering Budget Expended**

- **PA&ED** $0 $0
- **PS&E** $360,000 $275,778
- **R/W Sup** $0 $0

(CEQA - CE, 3/27/2017; Re-validation 5/16/2018)  
(NEPA - CE, 3/27/2017; Re-validation 5/16/2018)

Allocation Date: 11/07/18

- **Allocation Date:** 12/07/18
### Highway Financial Matters

#### 2.5f.(4) Informational Report - Minor Construction Program - Resolution G-05-16 Delegated Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA1</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Original Est.</th>
<th>Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Sha</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>R0.2</td>
<td>Install free right turn.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2H730</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$362,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Sie</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25.2/27.6</td>
<td>Install shoulder under drains and connects to existing culverts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0H820</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$396,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
       Chief Financial Officer

Reference No.: 3.2a.
   Information Item

Subject: STATUS OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARD FOR STATE HIGHWAY PROJECTS

SUMMARY:

The California Department of Transportation is presenting this informational item to provide the status of construction contract award for projects on the State Highway System allocated in Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-19.

In 2017-18, the Commission voted 399 State-Administered STIP, SHOPP, and Proposition 1B projects on the State Highway System. As of January 14, 2019, 376 projects totaling $2.36 billion have been awarded. Funds for one project have lapsed.

In 2018-19, the Commission voted 186 State-Administered STIP, SHOPP, and Proposition 1B projects on the State Highway System. As of January 14, 2019, 132 projects totaling $646 million have been awarded.

BACKGROUND:

In accordance with the STIP Guidelines, and Interim SHOPP Guidelines, projects are required to be ready to proceed to construction within six months of allocation.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability.”
FY 2017-18 Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Allocated</th>
<th>No. of Projects Voted</th>
<th>Voted Projects $x1000</th>
<th>No. of Projects Awarded</th>
<th>Awarded Projects $x1000</th>
<th>No. of Projects Pending/Award</th>
<th>No. of Projects Funds Lapsed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$928,504</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>$865,321</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$147,145</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$143,233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$156,677</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$107,879</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$178,910</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$185,613</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$159,071</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$194,085</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$549,407</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$283,595</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$608,738</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$580,930</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>$2,728,452</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>$2,360,656</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Total awarded amount reflects total project allotment, including G-12 and supplemental funds.  
2. FY 2017-18 table includes projects with financial contribution only, Department delegated safety, and emergency projects.

FY 2018-19 Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Allocated</th>
<th>No. of Projects Voted</th>
<th>Voted Projects $x1000</th>
<th>No. of Projects Awarded</th>
<th>Awarded Projects $x1000</th>
<th>No. of Projects Pending/Award</th>
<th>No. of Projects Funds Lapsed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$1,389,697</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$486,565</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$312,425</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$102,869</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$164,816</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$56,631</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>$1,866,938</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>$646,065</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Total awarded amount reflects total project allotment, including G-12 and supplemental funds.  
2. FY 2018-19 table includes projects with financial contribution only, Department delegated safety, and emergency projects.

Attachment

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Allocation Date</th>
<th>Award Deadline</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>04-</td>
<td>0730E</td>
<td>1G840</td>
<td>In Sebastopol, from Keating Avenue to Willow Street in southbound direction (Main Street); also from McKinley Street to Joe Rodora Trail in northbound direction (Petaluma Avenue). Upgrade curb ramps, driveways and sidewalks.</td>
<td>8/16/17</td>
<td>10/31/19</td>
<td>$4,091,000</td>
<td>Project was advertised on 10/9/17. Bids were opened on 11/15/17. The Department delayed the award to address concerns from the City of Sebastopol and other stakeholders. A 20-month time extension was approved at the March 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>04-</td>
<td>0064A</td>
<td>15500</td>
<td>In Alameda, Contra Costa, and Solano Counties, on Routes 80, 580 and 980 at various locations. Install traffic operations systems (TOS).</td>
<td>10/18/17</td>
<td>6/30/19</td>
<td>$40,973,000</td>
<td>Project was advertised on 3/12/18. Bids were opened on 5/10/18. A 14-month time extension was approved at the May 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11-</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>28882</td>
<td>In and near San Diego, at the Route 11/125/905 Separation. Construct southbound freeway to freeway connectors from Route 125 to eastbound Route 905 and Route 11.</td>
<td>12/6/17</td>
<td>8/31/19</td>
<td>$49,747,000</td>
<td>Project was scheduled to be advertised on 1/22/18. However, the Department has determined that it will delay the advertisement of this project to update federal funding. A 14-month time extension was approved at the May 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>09-</td>
<td>0615</td>
<td>35780</td>
<td>Near Bridgeport, from 0.3 mile south of Route 108 to 2 miles north of Route 108. Widen shoulders and install rumble strips.</td>
<td>1/31/18</td>
<td>7/31/19</td>
<td>$7,822,000</td>
<td>Project was advertised on 3/19/18. Bids were opened on 4/25/18. All bids were rejected on 5/16/18. The Department will update and re-package in September 2018 and re-advertise in November 2018. A 12-month time extension was approved at the June 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>07-</td>
<td>4702</td>
<td>30130</td>
<td>In Burbank, from Verdugo Avenue to Magnolia Boulevard. Rehabilitate pavement.</td>
<td>3/21/18</td>
<td>9/30/18</td>
<td>$16,739,000</td>
<td>Project was originally scheduled to be advertised on 5/7/18. Due to a change to the original traffic control plans on two adjacent construction projects, the advertisement and bid opening have been postponed until May 2019. A 12-month time extension was approved at the October 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10-</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>1C460</td>
<td>In Tuolumne, Stanislaus, and Mariposa counties, on Routes 120 and 108 at various locations. Install centerline, shoulder, and edge-line rumble strips.</td>
<td>3/26/18</td>
<td>9/30/18</td>
<td>$1,817,000</td>
<td>Project was advertised on 6/4/18. Bids were opened on 7/3/18. The Department is currently working with the fourth bidder. A 12-month time extension was approved at the October 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>03-</td>
<td>5854</td>
<td>0H100</td>
<td>In and near the city of Sacramento, from Beach Lake Bridge at Morrison Creek to the American River Bridge. Rehabilitate deteriorating mainline, ramps and connectors, replace Casilada Way pedestrian overcrossing, widen ramps, construct auxiliary lane, upgrade curb ramps, drainage systems and overhead signs, and install Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) elements. This project will extend the life of existing pavement and improve ride quality.</td>
<td>5/16/18</td>
<td>11/30/18</td>
<td>$294,200,000</td>
<td>A time extension is needed to re-advertise based upon the outcome of the bidders protests and award. Note: Four projects (0H100, 3H570, 4F450, 3C001) will be combined under 0H10U for construction. An 8-month time extension was approved at the December 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>03-</td>
<td>5835</td>
<td>3C001</td>
<td>In Sacramento County on I-5, from U.S. 50 to Morrison Creek. Construct high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and soundwalls in both directions. HOV/HOT lane miles constructed: 17</td>
<td>5/16/18</td>
<td>11/30/18</td>
<td>$14,800,000</td>
<td>A time extension is needed to re-advertise based upon the outcome of the bidders protests and award. Note: Four projects (0H100, 3H570, 4F450, 3C001) will be combined under 0H10U for construction. An 8-month time extension was approved at the December 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>03-</td>
<td>9427</td>
<td>3F550</td>
<td>In West Sacramento, at the Tower Bridge (Sacramento River Bridge No. 22-0021). Replace the deteriorating bridge fender system to protect marine vessels and bridge piers</td>
<td>5/16/18</td>
<td>11/30/18</td>
<td>$14,976,000</td>
<td>A time extension is being requested to complete the noise attenuation negotiations with the regulatory agency and for additional time needed to evaluate contractor bids. A 3-month time extension was approved at the December 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>03-</td>
<td>5870</td>
<td>3H570</td>
<td>Near Elk Grove, from Elk Grove Boulevard Overcrossing to 0.4 mile south of Laguna Boulevard Overcrossing. Improve safety by extending Elk Grove Boulevard onramp merge lane in the northbound direction. This project will reduce the number and severity of collisions.</td>
<td>5/16/18</td>
<td>11/30/18</td>
<td>$1,110,000</td>
<td>A time extension is needed to re-advertise based upon the outcome of the bidders protests and award. Note: Four projects (0H100, 3H570, 4F450, 3C001) will be combined under 0H10U for construction. An 8-month time extension was approved at the December 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>03-</td>
<td>5846</td>
<td>4F450</td>
<td>In Sacramento, from 1.1 miles south of Elk Grove Boulevard to Route 50. Install fiber optic cable to improve communication system for the Regional Transportation Management Center (RTMC).</td>
<td>5/16/18</td>
<td>11/30/18</td>
<td>$9,150,000</td>
<td>A time extension is needed to re-advertise based upon the outcome of the bidders protests and award. Note: Four projects (0H100, 3H570, 4F450, 3C001) will be combined under 0H10U for construction. An 8-month time extension was approved at the December 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Voted Not Awarded Project Status

### FY 2017-18 Project Award Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Allocation Date</th>
<th>Award Deadline</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>6732</td>
<td>0T210</td>
<td>In and near Chowchilla, from Route 152 to the Merced County line. Rehabilitate roadway by resurfacing asphalt pavement, widen shoulders, replacing guardrail systems, reconstructing structure approach slabs, and reinstalling rumble strips and detector loops. This project will improve safety and ride quality.</td>
<td>5/16/18</td>
<td>11/30/18</td>
<td>$18,087,000</td>
<td>The project could not be awarded as the current funding allocation is not adequate. The PSE package will be modified and re-advertised. A 6-month time extension was approved at the December 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>6880</td>
<td>0v920</td>
<td>In Fresno County, on Routes 41, 99, 168 and 180; also in Kern County on Route 99 and Madera County on Route 41. Repair detection systems with wire theft prevention measures. Work to be completed by Service Contract.</td>
<td>5/16/18</td>
<td>11/30/18</td>
<td>$1,340,000</td>
<td>The Department’s Procurement Division is involved in a significant amount of safety and emergency projects. A 3-month time extension was approved at the December 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>5031</td>
<td>32570</td>
<td>In Santa Fe Springs, at 14044 Freeway Drive adjacent to Route 5 between Valley View Ave and Alondra Boulevard. Construct Southern Region Equipment Repair Shop to combine and replace existing obsolete facilities located in Commerce and Orange for Districts 7 and 12 use.</td>
<td>5/16/18</td>
<td>11/30/18</td>
<td>$32,550,000</td>
<td>This project requires State Fire Marshall (SFM) approval. However, SFM is experiencing an increase in workload due to the fires so the project reviews have a longer than anticipated timeline. A 6-month time extension was approved at the December 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $507,402,000
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 3.2b.
Information Item

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Prepared by: Rihui Zhang, Chief
Division of Local Assistance

Subject: MONTHLY STATUS OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARD FOR LOCAL ASSISTANCE STIP PROJECTS, PER STIP GUIDELINES

SUMMARY:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) is presenting this item for information purposes only. The item provides the status of locally-administered State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects that received a construction allocation in Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18 and FY 2018-19.

In FY 2017-18, the Commission allocated $12,678,000 to construct 14 locally-administered STIP projects. As of December 21, 2018, 11 projects totaling $9,136,000 have been awarded. Three projects have approved time extensions.

In FY 2018-19, the Commission allocated $17,087,000 to construct six locally-administered STIP projects. As of December 21, 2018, two projects have been awarded.

BACKGROUND:

Current STIP Guidelines require projects to be ready to proceed to construction within six months of allocation. The policy also requires the Department to report to the Commission on those projects that have not been awarded within four months of allocation.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
**FY 2017-18 Allocations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Allocated</th>
<th>No. Projects Voted</th>
<th>Voted Projects (in 1000s)</th>
<th>No. Projects Awarded</th>
<th>No. Projects Lapse</th>
<th>No. Projects Pending Award</th>
<th>No. Projects Awarded within 6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,846</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,356</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2018</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$4,195</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,495</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$786</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$12,678</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2018-19 Allocations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Allocated</th>
<th>No. Projects Voted</th>
<th>Voted Projects (in 1000s)</th>
<th>No. Projects Awarded</th>
<th>No. Projects Lapse</th>
<th>No. Projects Pending Award</th>
<th>No. Projects Awarded within 6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$11,725</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,767</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,595</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$17,087</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Excludes STIP Planning, Programming, and Monitoring allocations and locally-administered STIP Regional Rideshare Program allocations, as no contract is awarded for these programs.
Local STIP Projects, Beyond Four Months of Construction Allocation, Not Yet Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Allocation Date</th>
<th>Award Deadline</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Tracy</td>
<td>MacArthur Drive Widening and Reconstruction</td>
<td>10-6629</td>
<td>16-Aug-18</td>
<td>8-Feb-19</td>
<td>$3,194,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Alturas</td>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements along Alturas Central Business District</td>
<td>02-2534</td>
<td>22-Mar-18</td>
<td>31-May-19</td>
<td>$942,000</td>
<td>(1) The project will be awarded by the extended deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>Green Valley Road Pavement Preservation (Struve Slough-Freedom Boulevard)</td>
<td>05-2733</td>
<td>17-May-18</td>
<td>31-Aug-19</td>
<td>$795,000</td>
<td>(2) The project will be awarded by the extended deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Segment 7</td>
<td>05-2551</td>
<td>17-May-18</td>
<td>30-Nov-19</td>
<td>$1,805,000</td>
<td>(1) The project will be awarded by the extended deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$6,736,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) This extended deadline was approved in October 2018 (Waiver 18-47)
(2) This extended deadline was approved in December 2018 (Waiver 18-53)

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
       Chief Financial Officer

Subject: MONTHLY STATUS OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARD FOR LOCAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM PROJECTS, PER ATP GUIDELINES

SUMMARY:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) is presenting this item for information purposes only. The item provides the status of Active Transportation Program (ATP) projects that received a construction allocation in Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17, FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19.

In FY 2016-17, the Commission allocated $153,030,000 to construct 113 ATP projects. As of December 21, 2018, 110 projects totaling $147,061,000 have been awarded. One project has an approved time extension. Two projects have lapsed.

In FY 2017-18, the Commission allocated $106,831,000 to construct 86 ATP projects. As of December 21, 2018, 58 projects totaling $42,228,000 have been awarded. Twelve projects have approved time extensions. Two projects have deferred time extensions. Eight projects have concurrent time extension requests on the January 2019 Commission meeting agenda.

In FY 2018-19, the Commission allocated $12,449,000 to construct 16 ATP projects. As of December 21, 2018, four projects have been awarded.

BACKGROUND:

Current ATP Guidelines require projects to be ready to proceed to construction within six months of allocation. The policy also requires the Department to report to the Commission on those projects that have not been awarded within four months of allocation.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
FY 2016-17 Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Allocated</th>
<th>No. Projects Voted</th>
<th>Voted Projects (in 1000's)</th>
<th>No. Projects Awarded</th>
<th>No. Projects Lapse</th>
<th>No. Projects Pending Award</th>
<th>No. Projects Awarded within 6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$6,233</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$10,958</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$27,711</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,061</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$18,038</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$31,338</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$33,691</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>$153,030</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2017-18 Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Allocated</th>
<th>No. Projects Voted</th>
<th>Voted Projects (in 1000's)</th>
<th>No. Projects Awarded</th>
<th>No. Projects Lapse</th>
<th>No. Projects Pending Award</th>
<th>No. Projects Awarded within 6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2017</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3,154</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$6,072</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$9,880</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$5,036</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2018</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$25,156</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$18,920</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$38,613</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>$106,831</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2018-19 Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Allocated</th>
<th>No. Projects Voted</th>
<th>Voted Projects (in 1000's)</th>
<th>No. Projects Awarded</th>
<th>No. Projects Lapse</th>
<th>No. Projects Pending Award</th>
<th>No. Projects Awarded within 6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2,405</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$8,819</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,449</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes all ATP Infrastructure and Non-Infrastructure projects.
### ATP Projects, Beyond Four Months of Construction Allocation, Not Yet Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Allocation Date</th>
<th>Award Deadline</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carson</td>
<td>City of Carson Active Transportation Project</td>
<td>07-4934</td>
<td>8-Dec-16</td>
<td>31-Dec-17</td>
<td>$1,436,000</td>
<td>Lapsed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>International Boulevard Pedestrian Lighting and Sidewalk Repair Project</td>
<td>04-2190C</td>
<td>17-May-17</td>
<td>31-May-18</td>
<td>$2,481,000</td>
<td>Lapsed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Paradise</td>
<td>Almond Street Multi-Modal Improvements</td>
<td>03-1019</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,005,000</td>
<td>Extension deferred at the December 2018 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Paradise</td>
<td>Active Transportation Gap Closure Complex</td>
<td>03-1028</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,787,000</td>
<td>Extension deferred at the December 2018 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District</td>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District Middle School Bicycle Safety Physical Education Program</td>
<td>07-5109</td>
<td>7-Dec-17</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$1,359,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the extended deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Sixth (6th) Street Viaduct Replacement Project: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>07-4931</td>
<td>29-Jun-17</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$2,052,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the extended deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Selma</td>
<td>Safety for an Active Selma School Community</td>
<td>06-6836A</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$366,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Selma</td>
<td>Safety for an Active Selma School Community</td>
<td>06-6836B</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Downey</td>
<td>City of Downey Pedestrian Plan</td>
<td>07-5141</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>A Concurrent Time Extension was submitted at the January 2019 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Metro Bike Share University of Southern California /South Los Angeles/Exposition Line Communities</td>
<td>07-5383A</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$2,287,000</td>
<td>A Concurrent Time Extension was submitted at the January 2019 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments</td>
<td>Bike Share Expansion into the San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>07-5384A</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$4,281,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments</td>
<td>Bike Share Expansion into the San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>07-5384B</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oxnard</td>
<td>New Traffic Signal</td>
<td>07-5143</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>A Concurrent Time Extension was submitted at the January 2019 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>Camino Aventura Sidewalk Safety Improvements</td>
<td>08-1199B</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>A Concurrent Time Extension was submitted at the January 2019 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>Thousand Palms Sidewalk Safety Improvements</td>
<td>08-1200B</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>A Concurrent Time Extension was submitted at the January 2019 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jacinto</td>
<td>San Jacinto Valley Connect</td>
<td>08-1203</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$546,000</td>
<td>A Concurrent Time Extension was submitted at the January 2019 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Plymouth</td>
<td>Main Street/Shenadoah Safe Routes to School Project</td>
<td>10-3178</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$770,000</td>
<td>A Concurrent Time Extension was submitted at the January 2019 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Turlock</td>
<td>Christoferrson Parkway Pedestrian and Bike Improvements with Connectors</td>
<td>10-3184A</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>A Concurrent Time Extension was submitted at the January 2019 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Commerce</td>
<td>City of Commerce Active Transportation and Safe Routes to School Plan</td>
<td>07-5447</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Montebello</td>
<td>Montebello Boulevard Bike Lane and Sidewalk Improvements Project</td>
<td>07-5454</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>$4,187,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Centro</td>
<td>Establishment of Safe Routes to School Program and Bicycle Route Improvements</td>
<td>11-1226A</td>
<td>22-Mar-18</td>
<td>31-Jan-19</td>
<td>$247,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the extended deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Folsom</td>
<td>South Fortuna Elementary School Safe Routes to School Project</td>
<td>09-2441B</td>
<td>16-Aug-18</td>
<td>28-Feb-19</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Association of Governments</td>
<td>Southern California Disadvantaged Communities Planning Initiative</td>
<td>07-5335</td>
<td>17-May-18</td>
<td>28-Feb-19</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the extended deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Pasadena-Pasadena Unified School District Safe Routes to School Education and Encouragement Program</td>
<td>07-5446</td>
<td>16-Aug-18</td>
<td>28-Feb-19</td>
<td>$780,000</td>
<td>The project will be awarded by the deadline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEMORANDUM

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
       Chief Financial Officer

Subject: STATUS OF THE START TIME OF EXPENDITURES FOR PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT PHASES FOR SHOPPP PROJECTS PER THE TIMELY USE FUNDS POLICY

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 3.3
Prepared by: Bruce De Terra, Chief
             Division of Transportation Programming

SUMMARY:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) is presenting this informational item on the status of preconstruction support phases for State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPPP) allocated since August 2017. The preconstruction support phases are Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED), Plans, Specifications and Estimate (PS&E) and Right-of-Way Support (R/W Sup).

In 2017-18, the Commission allocated 1,034 SHOPPP preconstruction support phases. As of January 10, 2019, 1,020 phases have expenditures. Nine preconstruction phases have been rescinded.

In 2018-19, the Commission allocated 319 SHOPPP preconstruction support phases. As of January 10, 2019, 290 phases have expenditures.

The attachment reflects those phases allocated in 2017-18 and that have reached the six-month milestone but have not yet begun to incur expenditures; this includes phases allocated at the June 2018 Commission meeting. Per the Interim SHOPPP Guidelines, any phases allocated need to begin incurring expenditures within six months.

BACKGROUND:

The passage of the Road Repair and Accountability Act (Senate Bill 1) necessitates that the Department and the Commission establish baseline budgets for each preconstruction support phase of each project in the 2016 and 2018 SHOPPP. Government Code Section 14526.5(g) formalizes the condition of allocation for preconstruction support phases on or after July 1, 2017 for all SHOPPP projects. The Interim SHOPPP Guidelines developed by Commission staff, in partnership with the Department, and adopted by the Commission at the June 2017 meeting, requires that expenditures allocated for SHOPPP projects for preconstruction support phases begin accruing expenditures within six months of the date of allocation by the Commission.

Attachments
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## FY 2017-18 Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Allocated</th>
<th>Pre-construction Support Phase</th>
<th>No. of Support Phases Voted</th>
<th>Voted Phases $ x 1000</th>
<th>No. of Phases Started</th>
<th>No. of Phases Approved Time Ext.</th>
<th>No. of Phases Not Started</th>
<th>No. of Phases Rescinded</th>
<th>No. of Phases Lapsed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$51,222</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$75,748</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$14,720</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 2017 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$141,690</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>$178,185</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$33,982</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$11,317</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 2017 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>$223,484</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$20,050</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$39,368</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$3,145</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 2017 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$62,563</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3,635</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$41,219</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$2,385</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 2018 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$47,239</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$145,235</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$69,848</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$10,188</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 2018 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td>$225,271</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$39,757</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$50,050</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$3,973</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 2018 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$93,780</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$84,681</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$78,295</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$8,460</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 2018 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
<td>$171,436</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 17-18 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>$965,463</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 2018-19 Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Allocated</th>
<th>Pre-construction Support Phase</th>
<th>No. of Support Phases Voted</th>
<th>Voted Phases $ x 1000</th>
<th>No. of Phases Started</th>
<th>No. of Phases Approved Time Ext.</th>
<th>No. of Phases Not Started</th>
<th>No. of Phases Rescinded</th>
<th>No. of Phases Lapsed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$35,259</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$69,202</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$13,493</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 2018 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>$117,954</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-18</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$32,943</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$60,122</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$9,123</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 2018 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$102,188</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-18</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$41,581</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$62,331</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$8,111</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 2018 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$112,023</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 18-19 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>$332,165</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 17-18 Pre-Construction Allocations for SHP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dist-PPNO</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Allocation Date</th>
<th>Award Deadline</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>07-5196</td>
<td>33520</td>
<td>In Pasadena and South Pasadena, at the Fair Oaks Avenue northbound offramp. The city of South Pasadena will Advertise, Award, and Administer (AAA) the project construction contract.</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>03/21/2018</td>
<td>09/30/2018</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>Additional time is needed to start PA&amp;ED. The Commission approved a 12-month time extension at the October 2018 CTC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>08-3008P</td>
<td>1H210</td>
<td>Near Blythe, from Rubble Ditch to Palowalla Ditch. Replace existing Rock Slope Protection (RSP) to prevent further scour damage and preserve the structural integrity of eighteen bridges.</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>03/21/2018</td>
<td>09/30/2018</td>
<td>$938,000</td>
<td>No PA&amp;ED needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11-1204</td>
<td>42040</td>
<td>In Imperial Beach, from Georgia Street to 0.2 mile north of Rainbow Drive. Relinquish roadway to Imperial Beach. Financial Contribution Only (FCO).</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>03/21/2018</td>
<td>09/30/2018</td>
<td>$348,000</td>
<td>No PA&amp;ED needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>01-4526</td>
<td>0A130</td>
<td>Near Hopland, from 0.1 mile south to 0.3 mile north of Russian River Bridge. Bridge seismic and rail upgrade and widen for standard shoulders with partial or complete structure replacement.</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>06/27/2018</td>
<td>12/31/2018</td>
<td>$1,176,000</td>
<td>unpar (Long Lead Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>01-2423</td>
<td>0F350</td>
<td>Near Weitchpec, at Klamath River Bridge No. 04-0144. Seismically retrofit bridge, upgrade bridge rails, and provide shoulders and pedestrian access.</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>06/27/2018</td>
<td>12/31/2018</td>
<td>$2,434,000</td>
<td>unpar (Long Lead Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>01-2432</td>
<td>0F600</td>
<td>Near Hoopa, at Trinity River Bridge No. 04-0137. Upgrade bridge rails, widen for pedestrian access, and strengthen for truck permit load capacity.</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>06/27/2018</td>
<td>12/31/2018</td>
<td>$2,621,000</td>
<td>unpar (Long Lead Project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PA&ED Phase - 6 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dist-PPNO</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Allocation Date</th>
<th>Award Deadline</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11-1125</td>
<td>41740</td>
<td>In Oceanside, from 0.8 mile to 0.4 mile west of College Boulevard. Stormwater mitigation and slope erosion repair.</td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>01/31/2018</td>
<td>07/31/2018</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>No R/W Support needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11-1177</td>
<td>42000</td>
<td>In the city of San Diego, from Spring Street to Route 54. Pavement rehabilitation.</td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>01/31/2017</td>
<td>07/31/2018</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>No R/W Support needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R/W Supp - 2 Projects

Total: $8,982,000
MEMORANDUM

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

Reference No.: 3.4

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Prepared By: Teresa Favila
Associate Deputy Director

Subject: LOCAL AND REGIONAL AGENCY NOTICES OF INTENT TO EXPEND FUNDS ON STIP PROJECTS PRIOR TO COMMISSION ALLOCATION PER SENATE BILL 184

SUMMARY:
Senate Bill (SB) 184 (Chapter 462, Statutes of 2007) authorizes a local or regional agency, upon notifying the California Transportation Commission (Commission), to expend its own funds for a project programmed in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to which the Commission has not yet made an allocation. This report (Attachment A) includes a list of local STIP projects programmed in Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-19 for which notification letters pursuant to SB 184 and allocation requests were received by the Commission.

The Commission received one SB 184 notification letter for a project programmed in the STIP in FY 2018-19, the Route 1, 41st Avenue to Soquel Avenue Auxiliary Lanes, Bike/Ped Bridge Project in Santa Cruz County. Based on SB 184, the effective date that funds may be expended for projects in advance of a Commission allocation is December 21, 2018. The project is highlighted on Attachment A.

BACKGROUND:
Government Code Section 14529.17, as amended by SB 184, permits an agency to expend its own funds for a STIP project, in advance of the Commission’s approval of a project allocation, and to be reimbursed for the expenditures subsequent to the Commission’s approval of the allocation.

Section 14529.17 is limited to advance expenditures for projects programmed in the current fiscal year of the STIP. FY 2018-19 notifications received prior to the beginning of the fiscal year are effective on July 1, 2018. Notifications received after July 1, 2017, are effective the date the Commission receives the notification letter.

Section 64A of the STIP guidelines directs the agency to submit a copy of the allocation request and SB 184 notification letter to the Commission’s Executive Director. The original allocation request should be submitted to the California Department of Transportation at the same time.

Invoking SB 184 does not establish a priority for allocations made by the Commission nor does it establish a timeframe for when the allocations will be approved by the Commission. The statute does not require the Commission to approve an allocation it would not otherwise approve. SB 184 advance expenditures must be eligible for reimbursement in accordance with state laws and
procedures. In the event the advance expenditures are determined to be ineligible, the state has no obligation to reimburse those expenditures.

Attachment:
- Attachment A: SB 184 Notifications for Local STIP Projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Rte</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Date Letter is Effective</th>
<th>Meeting Reported</th>
<th>Planned Allocation FY 18-19</th>
<th>Project Totals by Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>ACTC</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 565 $</td>
<td>R/W 565, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 140 $</td>
<td>R/W 140, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>CCTA</td>
<td>20110</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 454 $</td>
<td>R/W 454, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 91 $</td>
<td>R/W 91, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>DNLC</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 42 $</td>
<td>R/W 42, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Lake APD</td>
<td>3002P</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 35 $</td>
<td>R/W 35, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>2127</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 26 $</td>
<td>R/W 26, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>MCOG</td>
<td>4002P</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 89 $</td>
<td>R/W 89, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 16 $</td>
<td>R/W 16, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>NCTC</td>
<td>0L83</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 79 $</td>
<td>R/W 79, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td>2132</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 1,481 $</td>
<td>R/W 1,481, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>7402</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 1,605 $</td>
<td>R/W 1,605, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>2131</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 71 $</td>
<td>R/W 71, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>SM C/CAG</td>
<td>2140A</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 338 $</td>
<td>R/W 338, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 74 $</td>
<td>R/W 74, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>S.CVTA</td>
<td>2255</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 783 $</td>
<td>R/W 783, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>2144</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 163 $</td>
<td>R/W 163, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 174 $</td>
<td>R/W 174, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>2826</td>
<td>Cruz511 Traveler Information Program</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 181 $</td>
<td>R/W 181, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>73A</td>
<td>Rt 1, 41st Soquel, Aux Lanes, Bike/Ped Bridge</td>
<td>21-Dec-18</td>
<td>Jan-19</td>
<td>Jan-19 4,079 $</td>
<td>R/W 4,079, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>2263</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 204 $</td>
<td>R/W 204, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>2152</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 43 $</td>
<td>R/W 43, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>Aug-18 52 $</td>
<td>R/W 52, Const 0, E &amp; P 0, PS&amp;E 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (eligible on July 1, 2018, or from Effective Date of Letter, if received later) $9,535 0 9,535 0 0

Highlighted - project that invoked SB 184 since last Commission Meeting
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Subject: QUARTERLY REPORT – COMMISSION COMMENT LETTERS ON NOTICES OF PREPARATION AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORTS

SUMMARY:
The California Transportation Commission (Commission) delegated to the Executive Director authority to comment on routine Notices of Preparation and Draft Environmental Impact Reports.

For the period of October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018, the Commission received one Draft Environmental Impact Report. The Executive Director’s comment letter is attached.

BACKGROUND:
At the June 2009 Commission Meeting, the Commission delegated to the Executive Director the authority to provide comments to routine Notices of Preparation and Draft Environmental Impact Reports. The Commission’s delegation to the Executive Director requires that comments on routine Notices of Preparation and Draft Environmental Impact Reports be reported to the Commission quarterly.

The Commission staff prepared one comment letter this quarter on the following environmental document:

- Draft Second Supplemental Impact Report for the Eastridge to the Bay Area Rapid Transit Regional Connector: Capitol Expressway Light Rail Project (Attachment A)

Attachments:
- Executive Director’s comment letter on Draft Environmental Impact Report
November 20, 2018

Ms. Christina Jaworski
Senior Environmental Planner
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Environmental Programs
3331 North First Street, Building B-2
San Jose, CA 95134-1927

RE: Draft Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Eastridge to the Bay Area Rapid Transit Regional Connector: Capitol Expressway Light Rail Project

The California Transportation Commission (Commission), as a Responsible Agency, received the Draft Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Eastridge to the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Regional Connector: Capitol Expressway Light Rail Project (Project) in Santa Clara County. The environmental report was prepared by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

The Project would extend the light rail along Capitol Expressway between the existing Alum Rock Light Rail Station and the Eastridge Transit Center, approximately 2.4-miles. The light rail line would operate primarily in the median of Capitol Expressway within the exclusive and semi-exclusive rights-of-way, and includes elevated tracks along Capitol Expressway, an elevated station at Story Road, and a ground-level station at Eastridge Transit Center. The total Project cost is estimated at $453 million.

The Commission has no comments with respect to the Project purpose and need, the alternatives studied, the impacts evaluated, and the evaluation methods used to prepare the environmental document. The Commission should be notified as soon as the environmental process is finalized.
since Project funds cannot be allocated for Project design, right of way or construction until the final environmental document is complete. Once the final environmental process is concluded, the Commission will consider the environmental impacts in determining whether to approve the Project for future consideration of funding.

Upon completion of the environmental process, please ensure the Commission is notified in writing whether the selected alternative identified in the final environmental document is consistent with the appropriate Regional Transportation Plan and the Project programmed by the Commission. In the absence of such assurance of consistency, the Project may be considered inconsistent, and thus ineligible for funding.

If you have any questions, please contact Jose Osegueda, Assistant Deputy Director, at (916) 653-2094.

Sincerely,

SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

cc: Jeremiah Ketchum, Acting Chief, California Department of Transportation, Division of Environmental Analysis
MEMORANDUM

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FISCAL YEAR 2018-19 FIRST QUARTER INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL OPERATIONS REPORT

SUMMARY:

Attached is the California Department of Transportation’s (Department) Intercity Passenger Rail Operations Report for the first quarter (July through September) of Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-19, for the three State-supported intercity passenger rail routes:

- Capitol Corridor, connecting San Jose, Oakland, and Sacramento-Auburn, managed by the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority
- Pacific Surfliner, connection San Diego, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo, managed by the Los Angeles – San Diego – San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency
- San Joaquins, connecting Bakersfield, Oakland, and Sacramento, managed by the San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority

This report is an informational item at the California Transportation Commission’s January, 2019 meeting.

BACKGROUND:

In addition to owning the majority of equipment utilized on two of the three routes, the Department provides State funding for Amtrak operating costs for intercity passenger rail service and equipment capital costs for non-state owned equipment, while providing planning to support expansion of service and oversight to ensure statewide integration and monitor performance.

This report compares ridership, on-time performance, and financial results reported for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, to those reported for the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

These routes were three of the five busiest state-supported intercity passenger rail routes in the nation for Federal FY 2017-18.
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COMBINED STATEWIDE RESULTS

RIDERSHIP
Total combined ridership across the three routes for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 5,731,733. This is an increase of 0.2% over ridership of 5,718,185 for the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

Taken together, the Capitol Corridor, Pacific Surfliner, and San Joaquin accounted for 38% of the total Amtrak state-supported passenger rail ridership in federal fiscal year 2017-18.

ON-TIME PERFORMANCE (OTP)
Combined endpoint on-time performance across the three routes for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 82.5%. This is an increase of 2.5 percentage points over on-time performance of 80.0% for 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

REVENUE and FAREBOX RATIO
Reconciliation between the JPAs and Amtrak for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, has not been completed. As a result, revenue and expense figures for that period use preliminary data from Amtrak.

Total combined revenue across the three routes for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was $158,698,786. This is an increase of 1.8% over revenue of $155,831,228 from the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

Total expenses for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, were $257,065,918, an increase of 6.2% over expenses of $242,046,340 reported in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017. The resulting farebox ratio for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 61.7%, a decrease of 2.6 percentage points from farebox ratio of 64.4% for the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.
### SUMMARY

The following table provides further detail on the combined ridership, revenue, expense, and farebox ratio for the three State-supported routes for the 12 months ending in the first quarter of both FY 2018-19 and FY 2017-18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State-Supported Intercity Passenger Rail</th>
<th>All Routes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Months Ending 9/30/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>5,731,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$158,698,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$257,065,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Time Performance</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PP - Percentage Points*
CAPITOL CORRIDOR ROUTE

There are 15 weekday round-trips between Oakland and Sacramento. One of the trains extends beyond Sacramento to Auburn, and seven of the trains extend beyond Oakland to San Jose. On weekends, there are 11 round-trips between Oakland and Sacramento, with one extension to Auburn and seven round trips to San Jose. The Capitol Corridor has the second-highest ridership of all Amtrak state-supported passenger rail services.

Since 1998, day-to-day operations of the Capitol Corridor have been managed by the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority through an Interagency Transfer Agreement with the Department of Transportation.

RIDERSHIP

Total ridership on the Capitol Corridor for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 1,706,849. This is an increase of 6.2% over ridership of 1,607,277 in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

ON-TIME PERFORMANCE (OTP)

Endpoint on-time performance for the Capitol Corridor for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 90.1%. This is a decrease of 1.3 percentage points from on-time performance of 91.3% in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.
REVENUE and FAREBOX RATIO

Total revenue for the Capitol Corridor for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was $36,305,769. This is an increase of 6.9% over revenue of $33,968,835 in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

Total expenses for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, were $61,222,464, an increase of 5.5% over expenses of $58,010,356 in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017. The resulting farebox ratio in the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 59.3%, an increase of 0.7 percentage points over farebox ratio of 58.6% in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

Amtrak costs and contracted services constitute 81.8% of the total operations expenses and fuel costs constitute 7.3% of the total operations expenses.
SUMMARY

The following table provides further detail on the ridership, revenue, expense, farebox ratio, and on-time performance for the Capitol Corridor for the 12 months ending in the first quarter of both FY 2018-19 and FY 2018-19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12 Months Ending 9/30/2018</th>
<th>12 Months Ending 9/30/2017</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>1,706,849</td>
<td>1,607,277</td>
<td>99,572</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$36,305,769</td>
<td>$33,968,835</td>
<td>$2,336,934</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$61,222,464</td>
<td>$58,010,356</td>
<td>$3,212,109</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>0.7PP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Time Performance</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>-1.3PP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PP - Percentage Points*
**PACIFIC SURFLINER ROUTE**

There are 12 daily round-trips between Los Angeles and San Diego, five of which are through-trains between San Diego and Goleta (Santa Barbara) and two of which continue north, allowing connectivity with San Luis Obispo. The *Pacific Surfliner* has the highest ridership of all Amtrak state-supported passenger rail services.

Since 2015, day-to-day operations of the *Pacific Surfliner* have been managed by the Los Angeles – San Diego – San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency through an Interagency Transfer Agreement with the Department of Transportation.

**RIDERSHIP**

Total ridership on the *Pacific Surfliner* for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 2,945,982. This is a decrease of 1.5% from ridership of 2,990,871 in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

![Pacific Surfliner Ridership Chart](chart)

**ON-TIME PERFORMANCE (OTP)**

Endpoint on-time performance for the *Pacific Surfliner* for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 77.2%. This is an increase of 8.4 percentage points over on-time performance of 68.8% in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.
**REVENUE and FAREBOX RATIO**

Total revenue for the *Pacific Surfliner* for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was $86,319,147. This is an increase of 4.0% over revenue of $83,016,156 in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

Total expenses for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, were $111,967,818, an increase of 6.5% over expenses of $105,138,447 in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017. The resulting farebox ratio in the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 77.1%, a decrease of 1.9 percentage points from the farebox ratio of 79.0% in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

Amtrak costs and contracted services constitute 81.5% of the total operations expenses and fuel costs constitute 9.9% of the total operations expenses.
**SUMMARY**

The following table provides further detail on the ridership, revenue, expense, farebox ratio, and on-time performance for the *Pacific Surfliner* for the 12 months ending in the first quarter of both FY 2018-19 and FY 2018-19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State-Supported Intercity Passenger Rail</th>
<th>Pacific Surfliner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Months Ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>2,945,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$86,319,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$111,967,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Time Performance</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PP - Percentage Points*
SAN JOAQUIN ROUTE

Seven daily round-trips serve the San Joaquin Route, five operating between Oakland and Bakersfield and two between Sacramento and Bakersfield. All seven round-trips have dedicated bus connections between Bakersfield, Los Angeles, and other points throughout Southern California. On the north end, buses at Stockton connect Sacramento with Oakland trains and connect Oakland with Sacramento trains, thus providing seven daily arrivals and departures for both northern terminals. Additional connecting buses provide feeder service to communities throughout the north end of the State. The San Joaquin has the fifth-highest ridership of all Amtrak state-supported passenger rail services.

Since 2015, day-to-day operations of the San Joaquin have been managed by the San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority through an Interagency Transfer Agreement with the Department of Transportation.

RIDERSHIP

Total ridership on the San Joaquin for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 1,078,902. This is a decrease of 3.7% from ridership of 1,120,037 in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

![San Joaquin Ridership Graph](image-url)
**ON-TIME PERFORMANCE (OTP)**

Endpoint on-time performance for the *San Joaquin* for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 77.0%. This is an increase of 0.4 percentage points over on-time performance of 76.6% in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

![San Joaquin On-Time Performance](chart)

**REVENUE and FAREBOX RATIO**

Total revenue on the *San Joaquin* for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was $36,073,870. This is a decrease of 7.1% from revenue of $38,846,236 in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

Total expenses for the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, were $83,875,635, an increase of 6.3% over expenses of $78,897,537 in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017. The resulting farebox ratio in the 12 months ending September 30, 2018, was 43.0%, a decrease of 6.2 percentage points from the farebox ratio of 49.2% in the 12 months ending September 30, 2017.

Amtrak costs and contracted services constitute 83.7% of the total operations expenses and fuel costs constitute 6.1% of the total operations expenses.

![San Joaquin Revenue and Farebox](chart)
**SUMMARY**

The following table provides further detail on the ridership, revenue, expense, farebox ratio, and on-time performance for the *San Joaquin* for the 12 months ending in the first quarter of both FY 2018-19 and FY 2018-19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State-Supported Intercity Passenger Rail</th>
<th>12 Months Ending 9/30/2018</th>
<th>12 Months Ending 9/30/2017</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>1,078,902</td>
<td>1,120,037</td>
<td>-41,135</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$36,073,870</td>
<td>$38,846,236</td>
<td>-$2,772,366</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$83,875,635</td>
<td>$78,897,537</td>
<td>$4,978,098</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>-6.2PP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Time Performance</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>0.4PP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PP - Percentage Points*
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
    CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
    Chief Financial Officer

Subject: REPORT OF FINAL EXPENDITURES FOR STIP PROJECTS

SUMMARY:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) is presenting this as an informational item to the California Transportation Commission (Commission), to report the final support expenditures for two State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects.

BACKGROUND:

Current STIP Guidelines (Resolution G-17-22), adopted by the Commission on August 16, 2017, stipulate that the Commission will maintain a long-term balance of county shares and interregional shares, as specified in Streets and Highways Code Section 188.11. Typically, share balance adjustments for final project development and Right of Way are reported to the Commission at the time of construction allocation.

For the projects on this report, one of the projects shown on the attached list, is programmed for pre-construction components only and does not require Commission action. For the other project, the final expenditures were inadvertently not reported at the time of allocation of construction funds. Final expenditure details for each project are listed on the attached spreadsheet. The Department has officially notified the regional transportation planning agencies of this report.

Attachment

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
## Report of Final Expenditures for STIP Projects (S in 1,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Rte</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>PA&amp;ED Programmed</th>
<th>PA&amp;ED Final Expenditures</th>
<th>PS&amp;E Programmed</th>
<th>PS&amp;E Final Expenditures</th>
<th>R/W Support Programmed</th>
<th>R/W Support Final Expenditures</th>
<th>R/W Programmed</th>
<th>R/W Final Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0298E</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Final Expenditures</td>
<td>Program Final Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680/SR 4 Interchange - Widen Route 4</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101/Willow Road Interchange</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>$3,534</td>
<td>$1,352</td>
<td>$4,946</td>
<td>$8,041</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>$2,217</td>
<td>$2,217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
- Final right of way estimate was inadvertently not provided at the time of June 2018 allocation of construction funds.
- Construction is funded with local funds.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
       Chief Financial Officer

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 4.15
   Information Item

Subject: TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF PROGRAM - ANNUAL REPORT

SUMMARY:

The California Transportation Commission’s (Commission) Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) guidelines require lead agencies to periodically report on project status; Commission policy requires these reports annually. The California Department of Transportation (Department) assists the Commission in reporting on TCRP activity and does so by administering the annual reporting process.

With the passage of Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Beall, 2017), the TCRP has been deemed complete and final as of June 30, 2017, with no further programming or allocations of TCRP projects. Therefore, there was no activity for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18 except for project expenditures.

As of June 30, 2018, of the $4,908,900,000 legislated to the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund (TCRF), $4,572,059,000 was ultimately programmed and $4,564,296,000 allocated. The program legislated 141 specific projects, some of which have been subdivided, creating a total of 217 separate projects.

BACKGROUND:

The Traffic Congestion Relief Act of 2000 (Assembly Bill 2928, Chapter 91, Statutes of 2000 and SB 1662, Chapter 656, Statutes of 2000) created the TCRP and the TCRF, and committed $4,908,900,000 to 141 specific projects.

PROGRAM STATUS

Programming: Of the $4,908,900,000 legislated for the Traffic Congestion Relief Program, a total of $4,572,059,000 in TCRF funding had been programmed to projects or project components.

Allocations: As of June 30, 2017, at the close of the program, a total of $4,564,296,000 has been allocated to these programmed projects. Of the amount allocated, approximately $4,245,000,000 has been expended.

Number of TCRP projects: According to TCRP statutes, 141 projects were originally identified. Subsequently, 39 of those projects had been subdivided, establishing a total of 217 TCRP projects.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
approved by the Commission. Of the 217 individual projects, 14 either were substituted with other projects and not funded or the funding was incorporated into other TCRP projects leaving a total of 203 projects funded with TCRP funds. During FY 2017-18, 20 projects, or TCRP funded phases, were reported as completed. As of June 30, 2017, a total of 195 projects, or 94 percent of the funded projects have been completed or considered closed. The remaining projects will continue to be reported on until complete. The attachments list the TCRP projects that are currently active and those TCRP funded phases considered complete or closed.

**SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Congestion Relief Fund ($1000s)</th>
<th>In Statute</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Expended*</th>
<th>Unprogrammed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total All Projects</td>
<td>$4,908,900</td>
<td>$4,572,059</td>
<td>$4,564,296</td>
<td>$4,245,000</td>
<td>$336,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93.14%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>6.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent based on total amount allocated.

Attachment A: List of active projects.
Attachment B: List of completed projects.
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to enhance California’s economy and livability”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCRP No.</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>var</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ala</td>
<td>Route 680; add northbound HOV lane over Sunol Grade, Milpitas to Route 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>T0073</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>CalTrain Service Improvement Phase III Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2011F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Hercules Intercity Rail Station project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor Extension to Monterey County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>0192E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>SR-4 East Widening from Loveridge to Somersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>var</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mnr</td>
<td>Route 101 HOV Lane Gap Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>L.A.-Fullerton Triple Track and Grade Separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0851G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>I-405 Carpool Lane I-10 to US 101(Northbound)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>var</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Route 10 HOV Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>var</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>I-5 Carpool Lane-Orange CL to I-605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2808A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Orange County to Route 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>21070</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ven</td>
<td>Route 101; California Street off-ramp in Ventura Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>var</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Route 71 Expressway to Freeway Conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sbd</td>
<td>ACE: South Milliken Avenue Railroad Grade Separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>T0561</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sbd</td>
<td>San Bernardino Line - Turnouts at Control Point Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.11</td>
<td>T7411</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Elvira to Moreno Double Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>2117</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mer</td>
<td>Project 99.4 - Merced to LeGrand Double Track, Segment 2 (2b), including Second Platform at Amtrak Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mer</td>
<td>Campus Parkway; new arterial in Merced County from Route 99 to Bellevue Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Var</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ker</td>
<td>Route 46 Expressway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>3L05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sac</td>
<td>South LRT ext, Meadowview-Calvine (TCRP #115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>3148</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sac</td>
<td>Northeast Corridor Enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.1</td>
<td>0042A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>Widen State Route 98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCRP No</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>T0011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>BART to San Jose; extend BART from Fremont to Warm Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>T0012, 2147D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>BART to San Jose; extend BART from Warm Springs to Downtown San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>T0013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>BART to San Jose; Extend from Berryessa to San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>Alternate Project; Acquire rail line for BART to San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>T0003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>Route 101; widen freeway from four to eight lanes-Bernal Road to Burnett Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0468E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>Rte 101; add NB lane to fwy thru San Jose, Rte 87 to Trimble Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T0060</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>Route 262; major investment study, Route 680 to Route 880 near Warm Springs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>T0071</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>CalTrain; expand service to Gilroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>T0072</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>CalTrain; Caltrain Service Improvement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0409C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>Route 880; reconstruct Coleman Avenue Interchange near San Jose Airport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>T0091</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA/SCL</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor; improve intercity rail line between Oakland and San Jose. Harder Road Overcrossing Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2086</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor; Emeryville Station track and platform improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>Cap Corridor Improvements (Jack London Square Station Track and Platform Improvements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA/SCL</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor; Oakland to San Jose intercity track improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T0100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>Regional Express Bus; acquire low-emission buses in nine counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>T0110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Southern Crossing; complete feasibility and financial studies for new San Francisco Bay crossing (new bridge, HOV/Transit bridge or second BART tube) in Alameda and San Francisco or San Mateo Counties. Segment I - 2000 SF Bay Crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2011H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>BART Extension Eastward from Pittsburg/Bay Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>T0123</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA/CC</td>
<td>Bay Area Transit Connectivity; studies and improvements for, the I-580 Livermore Corridor, the Hercules Rail Station and related improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T0130</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Var</td>
<td>CalTrain Peninsula Corridor; acquire rolling stock, add passing tracks, and construct pedestrian access structure at stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>29491</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>Caldecott Tunnel; add 4th bore tunnel w/ additional lanes in Alameda &amp; Contra Costa Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0190D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Route 4; widen freeway to eight lanes from Railroad through Loveridge Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0360F, 0360J, 0360H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MRN/SON</td>
<td>Rte 101; widen 8 miles of fwy to 6 lanes, Novato to Petaluma (Novato Narrows)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>T0181</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MRN/SON</td>
<td>Rte 101; widen 8 miles of fwy to 6 lanes (East Washington Boulevard Interchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0360G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MRN/SON</td>
<td>Rte 101; widen 8 miles of fwy to 6 lanes (San Antonio Creek Curve Correction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T0190</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Bay Area Water Transit Auth; establish a regional water transit system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>San Francisco Muni 3rd Street Light Rail Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>T0202</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>San Francisco Muni 3rd Street Light Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>T0210</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>San Francisco Muni Ocean Avenue Light Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0619A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Doyle Drive Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP No</td>
<td>PPNO</td>
<td>Dist</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1003G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SM/SF</td>
<td>CalTrain Peninsula Corridor; complete grade seps at Poplar Avenue in (San Mateo), 25th Avenue (San Mateo), and Linden Avenue (South SF) in San Mateo County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>T0240</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SOL</td>
<td>Vallejo Baylink Ferry; expand Baylink Vallejo-San Francisco service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>T0251</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SOL</td>
<td>I-80/I-680/Route 12 Interchange in Fairfield Major Investment Study/Corridor Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>5301K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SOL</td>
<td>I-80/I-680/Route 12 Interchange Connector, Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>5301K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SOL</td>
<td>I-80/I-680/Route 12 Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>Livermore Valley Siding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>2009L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA/CC</td>
<td>Vasco Road Safety and Transit Enhancement Project-Parking Structure for VC Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>T0272</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA/CC</td>
<td>Vasco Road Safety and Transit Enhancement Project-Parking Structure for VC Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>T0273</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA/CC</td>
<td>Vasco Road Safety and Transit Enhancement Project-Parking Structure for VC Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2011G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Parking Structure at Transit Village at Richmond BART Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>T0290</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA/CC</td>
<td>AC Transit; buy two fuel cell buses and fueling facility for demonstration project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>T0300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MRN</td>
<td>Implementation of commuter rail passenger service from Cloverdale south to San Rafael &amp; Larkspur in Marin and Sonoma Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0112A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>Route 580; construct EB &amp; WB HOV lanes from Tassajara Road/Santa Rita Road to Vasco Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0112B, 0112D, 0112F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>T0321</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>North Coast Railroad; repair and upgrade track. Subparagraph (a)(2) defray administrative costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>T0322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>North Coast Railroad; repair and upgrade track. Sub-paragraph (b) completion of rail line from Lombard to Willits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>T0323</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Authority; Complete Rail Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>T0324</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NAP/SON/M RN</td>
<td>NCRA repair &amp; upgrade track to meet Class II (freight) standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>T0325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NAP/SON/M RN</td>
<td>NCRA; repair &amp; upgrade track to meet Class II (freight) standards, environmental remediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>T0326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>North Coast Railroad; repair and upgrade track. Sub-paragraph (f) debt reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>T0327</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>North Coast Railroad; local match funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>T0328</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>North Coast Railroad; Repayment of Q Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>T0329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>North Coast Railroad; long-term stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>T0330</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Bus Transit-Acquire low-emission buses for LA County MTA bus service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>T0340</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Blue Line to Los Angeles; new rail line Pasadena to Los Angeles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>T0351</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; triple track intercity rail line add run-through-tracks thru LA Union Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>T0353</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; triple track intercity railline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>T0354</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; Valley View Grade Separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>T0355</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; Passons Blvd. Grade Separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2890</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Eastside Transit Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>4025</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Los Angeles Mid-City Transit Improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TCRP No. PPNO Dist Co Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCRP No</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>3447</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Exposition Light Rail Transit Corridor, Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>2891</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Los Angeles - San Fernando Valley Transit Extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>T0382</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>North-South Bus Transit Project (Env only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>3236, 0162P</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Route 5; add HOV lanes on Golden State Freeway through San Fernando Valley, Route 170 to Route 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>0158K</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Route 5; HOV lanes in San Fernando Valley (Segment 1, from Route 118 to Route 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Route 5; widen to 10 lanes in Los Angeles County. (Segment B, Route 605 Interchange to Route 710)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Route 5; widen to 10 lanes in Los Angeles County. (Segment C, Route 710 Interchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>T0440</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Route 47 (Terminal Island Freeway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>T0450</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Route 710; complete Gateway Corridor Study, Los Angeles/Long Beach ports to Route 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>T0460</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Route 1; reconstruct intersection at Route 107 in Torrance in Los Angeles County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>T0480</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA/VEN</td>
<td>Route 101; corridor analysis and PSR to improve corridor from Route 170 to Route 23 in Thousand Oaks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>T0491</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Hollywood Intermodal Transportation Center at Highland &amp; Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Hollywood Intermodal Transportation Center at Highland-Hawthorn-ATCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>T0510</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>NB Route 405/101 Connector Gap Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2333</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>GARVEE Debt Service (Route 405-Waterford Avenue-Route 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>T0530</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Automated Signal Corridors (ATSAC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>2318</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Alameda Corridor East; build grade sgs on BNSF &amp; UPRR lines, downtown LA to county line ACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>T0543</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Alameda Corridor East; build grade sgs on BNSF line at Passons Boulevard in Pico Rivera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>T0551</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>Alameda Corridor East; build grade sgs on BNSF and UP rail lines. Los Angeles County line to Colton in San Bernardino County (Montclair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>T0552</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>Alameda Corridor East; build grade sgs on BNSF and UP rail lines. San Bernardino County (Ontario)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>T0553</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>Alameda Corridor East; SANBAG - Hunts Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>Alameda Corridor East; SANBAG (Colton) - Laurel Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3071</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>Metrolink; track and signal improvements on Metrolink; San Bernardino line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>T0057 0247P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>Route 215; HOV lanes through downtown San Bernardino, Route 10 to Route 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0247P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>Route 10; widen freeway through Redlands, Route 30 to Ford Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>T0590</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I-10/Live Oak Canyon Interchange Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>T0601</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Route 15; Southbound Truck Climbing Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>0176A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Route 15; Southbound Truck Climbing Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>T0610</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Route 10; reconstruct Apache Trail Interchange east of Banning in Riverside County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0092A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RIV</td>
<td>Route 91; Add HOV Lanes; Adams Street to Route 60/215 Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>0121L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RIV</td>
<td>Route 215 Corridor; Route 60/91/215 Connectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0033</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RIV</td>
<td>Route 60; add 7 mi of HOV lanes west of Riverside, Route 15 to Valley Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCRP No</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>0076B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RIV</td>
<td>Route 91; replace Green River Road Overcrossing, in Riverside County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>T0701</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ORA</td>
<td>Route 22; add HOV lanes on Garden Grove Freeway, Route I-405 to Route 55 in Orange County – Construction of soundwalls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>T0702</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ORA</td>
<td>Route 22; Add HOV lanes on Garden Grove Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>9656</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ORA</td>
<td>Route 22; HOV lanes on Garden Grove freeway, Route 405-Route 55 (Landscape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>TC38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ORA</td>
<td>Alameda Corridor East; (Orangethorpe Corridor) build grade seps on BNSF line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>2073</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; within San Diego County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>2072</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; double track intercity rail line within San Diego County - improvements to the LOSSAN Corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; double track intercity rail line within San Diego County - Track and signal improvements at Fallbrook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; double track intercity rail line within San Diego County - Encinitas Passing Track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>2076</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; double track intercity rail line within San Diego County - Leucadia Blvd Grade Separation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>In Encinitas, between La Costa Boulevard and Chesterfield Drive. Construct a grade separated pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of Santa Fe Drive. (TCRP #74.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; double track intercity rail line within San Diego County - CP O’Neil to CP Flores Double Track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>2079</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; Santa Margarita River Bridge and Doubletrack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.10</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner; within San Diego Co. (Carlsbad Doubletrack)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>San Diego Transit Buses – Acquire CNG buses, purchase three fueling facilities, and expand one fueling facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>San Diego Transit Buses; acquire 85 low-emission buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>2083</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Coaster Commuter Rail; acquire one new train set to expand commuter rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Coaster Commuter Rail; acquire one new train set to expand commuter rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Route 94 environmental &amp; HOV lanes from Route 5 in downtown to Route 805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2086</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>East Village access; improve access to light rail from new in-town East Village development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2087</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>North County Light Rail; build new 20-mile light rail line from Oceanside to Escondido.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2088</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mid-Coast University City Extension, PS&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2089</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>San Diego Ferry; acquire low-emission high-speed ferryboat for new off-coast service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Route 5/805 Widening &amp; Interchange (Stage 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Route 5/805 North Coast Corridor Project (Stage 1A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Route 15; managed lanes north of San Diego (State 1-Transit elements)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCRP No</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>T1490</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SCr</td>
<td>Purchase of low-emission buses for express service on Route 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>T1500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SCr</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Metro Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>T0151</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Purchase of 5 alternative fuel buses for the Pasadena Area Rapid Transit System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>T1520</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Pasadena Blue Line transit-oriented mixed-use development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>T0153</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Pasadena Blue Line utility relocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>T0154</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Route 134/I-5 interchange study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>BART Trans Bay Tube Seismic Retrofit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>0367D, 0367H, 0367I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NAP/SOL</td>
<td>Route 12; Congestion Relief Improvements, Route 29 to I-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.1</td>
<td>T1581</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Remodel the intersection of Olympic Boulevard, Mateo Street, and Porter Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.2</td>
<td>T1582</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Intersection of Olympic Boulevard/Mateo Street/Porter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>0789A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SON</td>
<td>Route 101 HOV Lanes; Route 12 to Steele Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To:     CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

From:  SUSAN BRANSEN
        Executive Director

Subject: APPROVAL OF PROJECT FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING – MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE ANNIE AND MARY TRAIL: PHASE 1 PROJECT (RESOLUTION E-19-10)

ISSUE:
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission), as a Responsible Agency, accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Annie and Mary Trail: Phase 1 Project (Project) in Humboldt County and approve the Project for future consideration of funding?

RECOMMENDATION:
Commission staff recommends the Commission accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve the Project for future consideration of funding.

BACKGROUND:
The City of Blue Lake (City) is the California Environmental Quality Act lead agency for the Project. The Project will construct a Class 1 multi-use trail, including a paved-tread surface, install coverts, construct a bridge over Powers Creek, and informational signage and pedestrian scale lighting.

On November 5, 2018, the City of Blue Lake Planning Commission adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project and found that the Project will not have a significant effect on the environment after mitigation.

Impacts that require mitigation measures to be reduced to less than significant levels relate to biological and cultural resources, and air quality. Mitigation measures include, but are not limited to: restrict vegetation clearing to occur outside the bird nesting season from February 15 to September 1; notify the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for Blue Lake Rancheria, Wiyot Tribe, and the River Band of Rohnerville Rancheria if artifacts are encountered during excavation activities; and require construction areas to be watered down two-times daily during the dry season to reduce airborne dust particles.
On November 16, 2018, the City confirmed that the preferred alternative set forth in the final environmental document is consistent with the Project scope of work programmed by the Commission.

The Project is estimated to cost $983,000 and is fully funded through construction with Active Transportation Program Funds ($976,000) and Friends of Annie and Mary Local Funds ($7,000).

Construction is estimated to begin in Fiscal Year 2019-20.

Attachments:
A. Resolution E-19-10
B. Notice of Determination
C. Project Location Map
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
1 – Humboldt County
Resolution E-19-10

1.1 WHEREAS, the City of Blue Lake (City) has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines for the Annie and Mary Trail: Phase 1 Project (Project); and

1.2 WHEREAS, the City has certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the Project is located on the Annie and Mary Railroad Line right of way in Humboldt County; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the Project will construct a Class 1 multi-use trail, including a paved-tread surface, install coverts, construct a bridge over Powers Creek, and informational signage and pedestrian scale lighting; and

1.5 WHEREAS, on November 5, 2018, the City of Blue Lake Planning Commission found that the proposed Project would not have a significant effect on the environment after mitigation; and

1.6 WHEREAS, on November 5, 2018, the City of Blue Lake Planning Commission adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

1.7 WHEREAS, on November 16, 2018, the City confirmed that the preferred alternative set forth in the final environmental document is consistent with the Project scope of work programmed by the Commission; and

1.8 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a Responsible Agency, has considered the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approves the above referenced Project for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission
Attn: Jose Oseguera
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-2094

Subject: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 of the Public Resources Code.

Annie and Mary Trail:  Phase 1 Project
Project Title

2018102003                                   Garry Rees                                            (707) 822-5785
State Clearinghouse Number Lead Agency Contact Person Area Code/Telephone

Project Location (include county):  The project is located on the Annie and Mary Railroad Line right of way in Humboldt County.

Project Description:  The project will construct a Class 1 multi-use trail, including a paved-tread surface, install coverts, construct a bridge over Powers Creek, and informational signage and pedestrian scale lighting.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project (_will/_ X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. _X_ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. _X_ A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures (_X_ were/ _____ were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. Mitigation reporting or monitoring plan (_X_ was / _____ was not) adopted for this project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations (_X_ was / _____ was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings (_X_ were/ _____ were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at:  111 Greenwood Road, Blue Lake, CA 95525

SUSAN BRANSEN       California Transportation Commission
Signature (Public Agency)                  Date                        Title

Date received for filing at OPR:
MEMORANDUM

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Subject: APPROVAL OF PROJECT FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING – MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE EL DORADO TRAIL: MISSOURI FLAT ROAD TO EL DORADO PROJECT (RESOLUTION E-19-11)

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 2.2c.(3) Action

Published Date: January 18, 2019

Prepared By: Jose Oseguera
Assistant Deputy Director

I ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission), as a Responsible Agency, accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the El Dorado Trail: Missouri Flat Road to El Dorado Project (Project) in El Dorado County and approve the Project for future consideration of funding?

RECOMMENDATION:

Commission staff recommends the Commission accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve the Project for future consideration of funding.

BACKGROUND:

The County of El Dorado (County) is the California Environmental Quality Act lead agency for the Project. The Project will construct a Class 1 multi-use trail, including a paved bicycle and pedestrian path extending for approximately 2.2-miles, an above-grade crossing at Missouri Flat Road, install fencing/railing, add multiple small culvert crossings, and signage.

On December 19, 2017, the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project and found that the Project will not have a significant effect on the environment after mitigation.

Impacts that require mitigation measures to be reduced to less than significant levels relate to air quality, biological and cultural resources, geology, hydrology, and noise. Mitigation measures include, but are not limited to: require the implementation of an Asbestos Hazard Mitigation Plan, conduct botanical and wetland resource surveys, develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan to minimize disturbances to perennial and ephemeral drainages, contract with a qualified archaeologist if historical artifacts are discovered, conduct a Long-Term Maintenance of Corridor Study before the rainy season commences, prepare a Drainage Control Plan for management of...
drainage flow, and limit construction activities from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm Monday through Friday to limit heavy machinery noise.

On November 30, 2018, the County confirmed that the preferred alternative set forth in the final environmental document is consistent with the Project scope of work programmed by the Commission.

The Project is estimated to cost $4,639,960 and is fully funded through construction with Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program Funds ($790,000), Active Transportation Program Funds ($3,419,000), Motor Vehicle Emissions Reductions Grant Program Funds ($215,960), and Local Funds ($215,000).

Construction is estimated to begin in Fiscal Year 2018-19.

Attachments:
A. Resolution E-19-11
B. Notice of Determination
C. Project Location Map
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
3 – El Dorado County
Resolution E-19-11

1.1 WHEREAS, the County of El Dorado (County) has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines for the El Dorado Trail: Missouri Flat Road to El Dorado Project (Project); and

1.2 WHEREAS, the County has certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the Project is located on the Sacramento/Placerville Transportation Corridor between Missouri Flat Road in Diamond Springs and Oriental Street; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the Project will construct a Class 1 multi-use trail, including a paved bicycle and pedestrian path extending for approximately 2.2-miles, an above-grade crossing at Missouri Flat Road, install fencing/railing, add multiple small culvert crossings, and signage; and

1.5 WHEREAS, on December 19, 2017, the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors found that the proposed Project would not have a significant effect on the environment after mitigation; and

1.6 WHEREAS, on December 19, 2017, the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

1.7 WHEREAS, on November 30, 2018, the County confirmed that the preferred alternative set forth in the final environmental document is consistent with the Project scope of work programmed by the Commission; and

1.8 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a Responsible Agency, has considered the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approves the above referenced Project for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission
Attn: Jose Oseguera
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-2094

Subject: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 of the Public Resources Code.

El Dorado Trail: Missouri Flat Road to El Dorado Project

Project Title

2017102014                               Donna Keeler                                         (530) 621-3829
State Clearinghouse Number       Lead Agency Contact Person       Area Code/Telephone

Project Location (include county): The project is located on the Sacramento/Placerville Transportation Corridor between Missouri Flat Road in Diamond Springs and Oriental Street in El Dorado County.

Project Description: The project will construct a Class 1 multi-use trail, including a paved bicycle and pedestrian path extending for approximately 2.2-miles, an above-grade crossing at Missouri Flat Road, install fencing/railing, add multiple small culvert crossings, and signage.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project (will/ X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. X An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures ( X were/ _____ were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. Mitigation reporting or monitoring plan ( X was / _____ was not) adopted for this project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations ( _____ was / X was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings ( X were/ _____ were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at: 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

SUSAN BRANSEN       California Transportation Commission
Executive Director
Signature (Public Agency)    Date    Title

Date received for filing at OPR:
Project Vicinity and Location Maps

SITE LOCATION

VICTINITY MAP
COUNTY OF EL DORADO

Project Location

El Dorado

To Sacramento

Diamond Springs

To South Lake Tahoe

Placerville

Existing Class I Paved Trail
El Dorado Trail

Existing Class II Bike Lane and Sidewalk

Class I Paved Trail

Existing Class III Bike Lane
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 2.2c.(4)
Action

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Prepared By: Jose Oseguera
Assistant Deputy Director

Subject: APPROVAL OF PROJECT FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING – MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE FOLSOM BOULEVARD COMPLETE STREETS: PHASE 1 PROJECT (RESOLUTION E-19-12)

ISSUE:
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission), as a Responsible Agency, accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Folsom Boulevard Complete Streets: Phase 1 Project (Project) in Sacramento County and approve the Project for future consideration of funding?

RECOMMENDATION:
Commission staff recommends the Commission accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve the Project for future consideration of funding.

BACKGROUND:
The County of Sacramento (County) is the California Environmental Quality Act lead agency for the Project. The Project will construct approximately 4,750 linear feet of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, including ramps that meet American with Disabilities (ADA) requirements, a landscaping buffer and safety fencing, pedestrian push button signals, storm drain inlets, curbs and gutters, bike lanes, restriping, and the relocation of utility poles.

On December 4, 2018, the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project and found that the Project will not have a significant effect on the environment after mitigation.

Impacts that require mitigation measures to be reduced to less than significant levels relate to biological and cultural resources, and hazardous materials. Mitigation measures include, but are not limited to: conduct a focused survey on the impacts to the nesting patterns of the Swainson’s Hawk, contract with a certified arborist to assist with the preparation of the Replacement Tree Planting Plan, notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours if human remains are encountered, and conduct soil samples to determine lead concentrations before construction occurs.
On December 12, 2018, the County confirmed that the preferred alternative set forth in the final environmental document is consistent with the Project scope of work programmed by the Commission.

The Project is estimated to cost $4,751,000 and is fully funded through construction with Active Transportation Program Funds ($4,180,000) and Local Funds ($571,000).

Construction is estimated to begin in Fiscal Year 2019-20.

**Attachments:**

A. Resolution E-19-12  
B. Notice of Determination  
C. Project Location Map
1.1 WHEREAS, the County of Sacramento (County) has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines for the Folsom Boulevard Complete Streets: Phase 1 Project (Project); and

1.2 WHEREAS, the County has certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the Project is located on the south side of Folsom Boulevard, starting at the intersection of Folsom Boulevard and Mayhew Road, and extending to the intersection of Folsom Boulevard and Bradshaw Road; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the Project will construct approximately 4,750 linear feet of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, including ramps that meet American with Disabilities (ADA) requirements, a landscaping buffer and safety fencing, pedestrian push button signals, storm drain inlets, curbs and gutters, bike lanes, restriping, and the relocation of utility poles; and

1.5 WHEREAS, on December 4, 2018, the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors found that the proposed Project would not have a significant effect on the environment after mitigation; and

1.6 WHEREAS, on December 4, 2018, the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

1.7 WHEREAS, on December 12, 2018, the County confirmed that the preferred alternative set forth in the final environmental document is consistent with the Project scope of work programmed by the Commission; and

1.8 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a Responsible Agency, has considered the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approves the above referenced Project for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research  From: California Transportation Commission
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121  Attn: Jose Oseguera
Sacramento, CA 95814  1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814  (916) 653-2094

Subject: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 of the Public Resources Code.

Folsom Boulevard Complete Streets: Phase 1 Project

Project Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Clearinghouse Number</th>
<th>Lead Agency Contact Person</th>
<th>Area Code/Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018112004</td>
<td>Julie Newton</td>
<td>(916) 876-8502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Location (include county): The project is located on the south side of Folsom Boulevard, starting at the intersection of Folsom Boulevard and Mayhew Road, and extending to the intersection of Folsom Boulevard and Bradshaw Road in Sacramento County.

Project Description: The project will construct approximately 4,750 linear feet of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, including ramps that meet American with Disabilities (ADA) requirements, a landscaping buffer and safety fencing, pedestrian push button signals, storm drain inlets, curbs and gutters, bike lanes, restriping, and the relocation of utility poles.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project (____will/  X  will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. ____ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.  X  A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures ( X  were/ _____ were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. Mitigation reporting or monitoring plan ( X  was / _____ was not) adopted for this project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations ( _____ was /  X  was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings ( X  were/ _____ were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at:  827 7th Street, Room 225, Sacramento, CA  95814

Executive Director  California Transportation Commission
SUSAN BRANSEN
Signature (Public Agency)  Date  Title

Date received for filing at OPR:
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.2c.(5) Action
Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director
Prepared By: Jose Oseguera
Assistant Deputy Director

Subject: APPROVAL OF PROJECT FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING – MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND ADDENDUM FOR THE DOWNTOWN RIVERFRONT STREETCAR PROJECT (RESOLUTION E-19-13)

ISSUE:
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission), as a Responsible Agency, accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Addendum for the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project (Project) in Sacramento and Yolo Counties, and approve the Project for future consideration of funding?

RECOMMENDATION:
Commission staff recommends the Commission accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Addendum, and approve the Project for future consideration of funding.

BACKGROUND:
The Sacramento Area Council of Governments is the California Environmental Quality Act lead agency for the Project. The Project will construct a 4.4-mile streetcar alignment that will extend from the West Sacramento Civic Center to the Midtown Sacramento entertainment and retail district.

On August 6, 2015, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Transportation Committee adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project and found that the Project will not have a significant effect on the environment after mitigation.

On January 17, 2019, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Transportation Committee approved an Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration with the following six minor modifications:

1. Incorporate a minor shift to the south of the previously-approved maintenance storage facility in West Sacramento.
2. Eliminate the second maintenance storage facility in Sacramento.
3. Relocate the West Sacramento electric power substation.
4. Incorporate minor revisions to the streetcar track alignment along H Street, near 5th and 6th Streets in Sacramento.
5. Shift several station/platform locations, including the Light Rail Transit station on H Street.
6. Regain a segment of 12th Street, between H Street and J Street, with the removal of an existing Light Rail Transit track and associated features.

Impacts that require mitigation measures to be reduced to less than significant levels relate to biological and archaeological resources, public utilities, hazardous materials and noise. Mitigation measures include, but are not limited to: restrict construction to occur during the non-nesting season from September 1 through February 15 to avoid impacting the Swainson’s Hawk, utilize ground-penetrating radar or other means to determine the presence or absence of hollow sidewalk segments, coordinate with utility providers on ways to minimize interruptions during utility relocations, conduct a Phase I Environmental Assessment to identify unknown soil and/or groundwater contamination, and implement noise control measures during construction.

On January 18, 2019, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments confirmed that the Mitigated Negative Declaration, including the Addendum, remains valid and that there are no new identified impacts requiring mitigation. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments also confirmed that the preferred alternative set forth in the final environmental document is consistent with the Project scope of work programmed by the Commission.

The Project is estimated to cost $209,770,000 and is fully funded with Small Starts Program Funds ($100,000,000), Sacramento/West Sacramento Local Funds ($44,000,000), Cap and Trade Funds ($30,000,000), Proposition IA Program Funds ($25,000,000), Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account Program Funds ($1,570,000), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program Funds ($5,000,000), and City/County Local Funds ($4,200,000).

Construction is estimated to begin in Fiscal Year 2019-20.

Attachments:
A. Resolution E-19-13
B. Notice of Determination
C. Project Location Map
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
3 – Sacramento and Yolo Counties
Resolution E-19-13

1.1 WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Addendum pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines for the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project (Project); and

1.2 WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Addendum have been completed pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the Project is located on the alignment that commences at the West Sacramento Civic Center in Yolo County and runs east, terminating in the Midtown District in the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the Project will construct a 4.4-mile streetcar alignment that will extend from the West Sacramento Civic Center to the Midtown Sacramento entertainment and retail district; and

1.5 WHEREAS, on August 6, 2015, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Transportation Committee found that the proposed Project would not have a significant effect on the environment after mitigation; and

1.6 WHEREAS, on August 6, 2015, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Transportation Committee adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

1.7 WHEREAS, on January 17, 2019, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Board of Directors adopted an Addendum to the Mitigation Negative Declaration; and

1.8 WHEREAS, on January 18, 2019, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments confirmed that the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Addendum remains valid with no new identified impacts; and

1.9 WHEREAS, on January 18, 2019, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments also confirmed that the preferred alternative set forth in the final environmental document is consistent with the Project scope of work programmed by the Commission; and

1.10 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a Responsible Agency, has considered the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Addendum.
2.1 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the California Transportation Commission does hereby accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Addendum, and approves the above referenced Project for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research

1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission

Attn: Jose Oseguera
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-2094

Subject: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 of the Public Resources Code.

Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project
Project Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Clearinghouse Number</th>
<th>Lead Agency Contact Person</th>
<th>Area Code/Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015052050</td>
<td>Kirk Trost</td>
<td>(916) 340-6210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Location (include county): The project is located on the alignment that commences at the West Sacramento Civic Center in Yolo County and runs east, terminating in the Midtown District in the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County.

Project Description: The project will construct a 4.4-mile streetcar alignment that will extend from the West Sacramento Civic Center to the Midtown Sacramento entertainment and retail district.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project ( _will/ X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures ( _were/ X were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. Mitigation reporting or monitoring plan ( _was/ X was not) adopted for this project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations ( _was/ X was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings ( _were/ X were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at: 1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director
California Transportation Commission

Signature (Public Agency) Date Title

Date received for filing at OPR:
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
       Chief Financial Officer

Subject: APPROVAL OF PROJECTS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 2.2c.(1) Action Item

Prepared by: Jeremy Ketchum, Chief (Acting)
             Division of Environmental Analysis

 ISSUE:


RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends that the Commission, as a responsible agency, approve the attached Resolutions E-19-01, E-19-02, E-19-03, E-19-04, E-19-05, E-19-06, E-19-07, E-19-08 and E-19-09.

BACKGROUND:

01-Lak-20, PM 5.8
RESOLUTION E-19-01

The attached resolution proposes to approve for future consideration of funding the following project for which a Negative Declaration (ND) has been completed:

- State Route (SR) 20 in Lake County. Replace existing culverts on a portion of SR 20 near the town of Upper Lake. (PPNO 3107)

The proposed project is located on SR 20 west of the SR 20/SR 29 intersection near Upper Lake in Lake County. The project proposes to replace a deficient culvert and repair erosion at the outlet. The proposed project will replace three existing 9 feet diameter multi-plate steel culverts with precast concrete box culverts at the Bachelor Creek Bridge (No. 14-0001). The purpose of this project is to prevent further deterioration of the three culverts that would cause culvert and pavement failure. The estimated total cost for the proposed project is $6.1 million. The proposed project is fully funded in the 2018 SHOPP for an estimated $5.3 million which includes Construction (capital and support) and Right-of-Way (capital and support). Construction is estimated to begin in fiscal year 2020-21. The scope, as described for the preferred alternative, is consistent with the project scope programmed by the Commission in the 2018 SHOPP.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
A copy of the ND has been provided to Commission staff. The project will result in less than significant impacts to the environment. As a result, an ND was completed for this project.

Attachment 1

**02-Tri-3, PM 58.7/60.7**

**RESOLUTION E-19-02**

The attached resolution proposes to approve for future consideration of funding the following project for which a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been completed:

- State Route (SR) 3 in Trinity County. Replace existing bridge on SR 3 near the community of Trinity Center. (PPNO 3485)

The proposed project is located on SR 3 near the community of Trinity Center in Monterey County. The project proposes to replace the Swift Creek Bridge (No. 05-0059). The purpose of this project is to address the structural deficiencies and scour issues as the deck, abutment, piers and wingwall exhibit significant deterioration. The project proposes to reduce the need for continued maintenance and repairs while restoring the long-term reliability of the Swift Creek Bridge. The estimated total cost for the proposed project is $16.9 million. The proposed project is fully funded in the 2018 SHOPP for an estimated $14.3 million which includes Construction (capital and support) and Right-of-Way (capital and support). Construction is estimated to begin in fiscal year 2020-21. The scope, as described for the preferred alternative, is consistent with the project scope programmed by the Commission in the 2018 SHOPP.

A copy of the MND has been provided to Commission staff. The project will result in less than significant impacts to the environment after mitigation. The following resource area may be impacted by the project: biological resources. Avoidance and minimization measures will reduce any potential effects on the environment. These measures include, but are not limited to, in-stream work will be conducted during the dry season from June 15 to October 15, environmentally sensitive areas will be fenced, exclusion fencing will be installed to protect the foothill yellow-legged frog from construction activities, and the site will be surveyed daily for potential conflicts with riparian habitat or the foothill yellow legged frog. As a result, an MND was completed for this project.

Attachment 2
03-Sac/SJ-5, PM Various
RESOLUTION E-19-03

The attached resolution proposes to approve for future consideration of funding the following project for which a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been completed:

- Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route (SR) 160 in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties. Seismic retrofit of four bridges on I-5 in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties.  (PPNO 5832)

This project will construct seismic repairs on four bridges on I-5 and SR 160 in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties. The project proposes to seismically retrofit the Mokelumne River Bridges (No 29-0197 R and L), the Paintersville Bridge (No. 24-0053) and the North Sacramento Undercrossing Bridge (No. 24-0111L). The purpose this project is bring these four bridges in compliance with current seismic safety structural standards. The proposed project will include retrofitting seat hinges, columns, stress trusses as well as bearing and supports at bridge abutments, piers and bents. The estimated total cost for the proposed project is $38 million. The proposed project is funded for one phase of the project and is programmed in the 2016 SHOPP for an estimated $38.7 million. Construction is estimated to begin in 2019. The scope, as described for the preferred alternative, is consistent with the project scope programmed by the Commission in the 2016 SHOPP.

A copy of the MND has been provided to Commission staff. The project will result in less than significant impacts to the environment after mitigation. The following resource areas may be impacted by the project: Traffic/community impacts and biological resources. Avoidance and minimization measures will reduce any potential effects on the environment. These measures include, but are not limited to, dates of temporary bridge closures and detour routes will be publicly noticed, in-water work will be limited to July 1 to September 30 when sensitive species are absent, off-site mitigation bank credits will be purchased for impacts to Giant garter snake habitat, Valley elderberry and Valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat. As a result, an MND was completed for this project.

Attachment 3

05-Mon-1, PM 20.4
RESOLUTION E-19-04

The attached resolution proposes to approve for future consideration of funding the following project for which a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been completed:

- State Route (SR) 1 in Monterey County. Construct safety improvements along a portion of SR 1 near the community of Lucia.  (PPNO 2230)
The proposed project is located on SR 1, south of Limekiln Creek and north of Nacimiento-Ferguson Road, near the community of Lucia in Monterey County. The project proposes to replace a deficient culvert and repair erosion at the outlet. The proposed project includes trenching, grading and replacement of a corrugate pipe culvert crossing and down drain. The estimated total cost for the proposed project is $4.3 million. The proposed project is fully funded in the 2018 SHOPP for an estimated $4.3 million which includes Construction (capital and support) and Right-of-Way (capital and support). Construction is estimated to begin in 2020. The scope, as described for the preferred alternative, is consistent with the project scope programmed by the Commission in the 2018 SHOPP.

A copy of the MND has been provided to Commission staff. The project will result in less than significant impacts to the environment after mitigation. The following resource areas may be impacted by the project: cultural, visual, and biological resources. Avoidance and minimization measures will reduce any potential effects on the environment. These measures include, but are not limited to, all work shall be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, posts and beams of new guardrail will be stained to match the surrounding area, work activities will be avoided 150 feet from active bird nests, and environmentally sensitive areas will be fenced. As a result, an MND was completed for this project.

Attachment 4

06-Fre-99, PM R5.7/11.1
RESOLUTION E-19-05

The attached resolution proposes to approve for future consideration of funding the following project for which a Negative Declaration (ND) has been completed:

- State Route (SR) 99 in Fresno County. Rehabilitate a portion of SR 99 in Fresno County. (PPNO 6800)

The proposed project is located on SR 99, south of the Rose Avenue undercrossing bridge in the city of Selma to the Merced Street undercrossing bridge in the city of Fowler in Fresno County. This project proposes to replace two lanes with reinforced concrete pavement. The proposed project will also update curb ramps to meet current Americans with Disabilities Act standards. The purpose of this proposed pavement rehabilitation project is to extend the service life of the pavement structures for the State of California and traveling public. The estimated total cost for the proposed project is $99.9 million. The proposed project is fully funded and currently programmed in the 2018 SHOPP for an estimated $99.9 million which includes Construction (capital and support) and Right-of-Way (capital and support). Construction is estimated to begin in fiscal year 2021-22. The scope, as described for the preferred alternative, is consistent with the project scope programmed by the Commission in the 2019 SHOPP.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
A copy of the ND has been provided to Commission staff. The project will result in less than significant impacts to the environment. As a result, an ND was completed for this project.

Attachment 5

08-SBd/Riv-Various, PM Various
RESOLUTION E-19-06

The attached resolution proposes to approve for future consideration of funding the following project for which a Negative Declaration (ND) has been completed:

- State Route (SR) 91, Interstate 10 (I-10), and Interstate 15 (I-15) in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. Rehabilitate six bridges at various locations on SR 91, I-10, and I-15 in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. (PPNO 3002G)

The project is located at various locations on SR 91, I-10 and, I-15, in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. The proposed project involves six bridges and proposes to perform rehabilitation activities including scour mitigation, application of methacrylate, joint seal replacement and access opening installation. The project proposes to maintain and ensure the integrity of these bridges by preventing further deterioration of the decks, substructures and joints. The estimated total cost for the proposed project is $3.2 million. The proposed project is fully funded in the 2018 SHOPP for an estimated $3.2 million which includes Construction (capital and support) and Right-of-Way (capital and support). Construction is estimated to begin in fiscal year 2019-20. The scope, as described for the preferred alternative, is consistent with the project scope programmed by the Commission in the 2018 SHOPP.

A copy of the ND has been provided to Commission staff. The project will result in less than significant impacts to the environment. As a result, an ND was completed for this project.

Attachment 6

10-SJ-4, PM 4.1/4.9
RESOLUTION E-19-07

The attached resolution proposes to approve for future consideration of funding the following project for which a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been completed:

- State Route (SR) 4 in San Joaquin County. Curve correction on the east end of the Middle River Bridge on SR 4 west of the city Stockton. (PPNO 3177)
This project is located at the Middle River Bridge on SR 4, west of the city of Stockton in San Joaquin County. The project proposes to realign the approach curve and widen shoulders on the east end of the Middle River Bridge. The project also proposes to upgrade safety devices, install flashing beacons, closed circuit cameras and upgrade guardrail. The estimated total cost for the proposed project is $13.5 million. The project is fully funded and programmed in the 2018 SHOPP for an estimated total of $13.5 million, which includes Construction (capital and support) and Right-of-Way (capital and support). Construction is estimated to begin in fiscal year 2019-20. The scope, as described for the preferred alternative, is consistent with the project scope programmed by the Commission in the 2018 SHOPP.

A copy of the MND has been provided to Commission staff. The project will result in less than significant impacts to the environment after mitigation. The following resource area may be impacted by the project: biological resources. Avoidance and minimization measures will reduce any potential effects on the environment. These measures include, but are not limited to, Caltrans will consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the amount and type of mitigation for impacts to Swainson’s hawk habitat as part of the Incidental Take Permit process. As a result, an MND was completed for this project.

Attachment 7

10-SJ-88, PM 13.70/14.0, 10-Alp-88, PM 0.20/2.60
RESOLUTION E-19-08

The attached resolution proposes to approve for future consideration of funding the following project for which a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been completed:

- State Route (SR) 88 in San Joaquin and Alpine Counties. Replace existing and construct new culverts along SR 88 in San Joaquin and Alpine Counties. (PPNO 3141)

This project is located on SR 88, near Lockford in San Joaquin County and Kirkwood in Alpine County. The project proposes to replace existing drainage culverts where needed. The purpose of the proposed project to protect the roadway from ongoing poor drainage and insufficient storm water runoff due to failed culverts. The estimated total cost for the proposed project is $6.4 million and is fully funded and programmed in the 2018 SHOPP for an estimated total of $6.4 million, which includes Construction (capital and support) and Right-of-Way (capital and support). Construction is estimated to begin in fiscal year 2020-21. The scope, as described for the preferred alternative, is consistent with the project scope programmed by the Commission in the 2018 SHOPP.

A copy of the MND has been provided to Commission staff. The project will result in less than significant impacts to the environment after mitigation. The following resource area may be impacted by the project: biological resources. Avoidance and minimization
measures will reduce any potential effects on the environment. These measures include, but are not limited to, revegetating all disturbed areas, environmentally sensitive areas will be fenced, and pre-construction surveys will be conducted for the great grey owl, Yosemite toad, California Tiger Salamander, and the Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog. As a result, an MND was completed for this project.

Attachment 8

12-Ora-605, PM 1.1/1.6
RESOLUTION E-19-09

The attached resolution proposes to approve for future consideration of funding the following project for which a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been completed:

- Interstate 605 (I-605) in Orange County. Construct roadway and safety improvements on a portion of I-605 in Orange County. (EA 0K870)

This project is at the I-605 and Katella Avenue, in the city of Los Alamitos, in Orange County and proposes to improve the interchange traffic operations and pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the project limits. This project is intended to bring the highway alignment up to current design standards and extend the service life of the pavement. The total estimated project cost is $30.6 million; with $1.2 million currently entered in the 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program and expected to be funded from Orange County local measure funds for the Project Approval and Environmental Document phase of this project. Additional funding for the proposed project is to be determined and anticipated to be combined from State, Federal and local sources. Construction is estimated to begin in fiscal year 2033-34.

A copy of the MND has been provided to Commission staff. The project will result in less than significant impacts to the environment after mitigation. The following resource areas may be impacted by the project: cultural and biological resources. Avoidance and minimization measures will reduce any potential effects on the environment. These measures include, but are not limited to, a Paleontological Mitigation Plan will be prepared, and the standards and requirements of the OCTA Aliso Creek Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan will be adhered to. As a result, an MND was completed for this project.

Attachment 9
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
01-Lak-20, PM 5.8
Resolution E-19-01

1.1 WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has completed a Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines for the following project:

- State Route (SR) 20 in Lake County. Replace existing culverts on a portion of SR 20 near the town of Upper Lake. (PPNO 3107)

1.2 WHEREAS, the Department has certified that the Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines for its implementation; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a responsible agency, has considered the information contained in the Negative Declaration; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby approve the above referenced project to allow for future consideration of funding.
Vicinity Map

Bachelor Creek Bridge
LAK-20-PM 5.8
01-0F490

NO SCALE
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research  
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121  
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission  
Attention: Jose Oseguera  
1120 N Street, MS 52  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 653-2094

Project Title: Bachelor Creek Bridge Project

2018102017 Michelle Holtz (530) 741-5532  
State Clearinghouse Number Lead Agency Contact Person Area Code/Telephone

Project Location (include county): State Route (SR) 20 in Lake County.

Project Description: Replace existing culverts and construct roadway improvements on a portion of SR 20 in Lake County.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project (_ Lead Agency / X Responsible Agency) on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project (will / X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. X An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
4. Mitigation measures (were / X were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
5. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan (was / X was not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
6. Findings (were / X were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at: Caltrans Dist. 3, 703 B Street, Marysville, CA 95901

Susan Bransen Executive Director  
Signature (Public Agency) Date Title
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Date received for filing at OPR:
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
02-Tri-3, PM 58.7/60.7
Resolution E-19-02

1.1 WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines for the following project:

- State Route (SR) 3 in Trinity County. Replace existing bridge on SR 3 near the community of Trinity Center. (PPNO 3485)

1.2 WHEREAS, the Department has certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines for its implementation; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a responsible agency, has considered the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby approve the above referenced project to allow for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission
Attention: Jose Oseguera
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-2094

Project Title: Swift Creek Bridge Replacement Project

2018102086 Cabe Cornelius (530) 225-3514
State Clearinghouse Number Lead Agency Contact Person Area Code/Telephone

Project Location (include county): State Route (SR) 3 in Trinity County.

Project Description: Construct a new bridge and roadway improvements on a portion of SR 3 in Trinity County.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project (Lead Agency / X Responsible Agency) on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project (will / X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. X An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. X A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
4. Mitigation measures (X were / _ were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations ( _ was / X was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings ( _ were / X were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at: Caltrans Dist. 2, 1031 Butte Street, Redding, CA 96001

Susan Bransen Executive Director
Signature (Public Agency) Date Title

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Date received for filing at OPR:
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
03-Sac/SJ-5, PM Various
Resolution F-19-03

1.1 WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines for the following project:

- Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route (SR) 160 in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties. Seismic retrofit of four bridges on I-5 in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties. (PPNO 5832)

1.2 WHEREAS, the Department has certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines for its implementation; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a responsible agency, has considered the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby approve the above referenced project to allow for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission
Attention: Jose Osenguera
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-2094

Project Title  State Route 160 and Interstate 5 Bridge Seismic Retrofit Project

2018051048  Georgette Neale  (530) 741-5774
State Clearinghouse Number  Lead Agency Contact Person  Area Code/Telephone

Project Location (include county): Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route (SR) 160 in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties.

Project Description: Seismic retrofit of four existing bridges on I-5 and SR 160 in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project
(Lead Agency / X Responsible Agency)
on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project (will / X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. X An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures (X were / _ were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan (X was / _ was not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations (X was / _ was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings (X were / _ were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at: Caltrans Dist. 3, 703 B Street, Marysville, CA 95901

Susan Bransen  X  Title
Signature (Public Agency)  Date
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Date received for filing at OPR:
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
05-Mon-1, PM 20.4
Resolution E-19-04

1.1 WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines for the following project:

- State Route (SR) 1 in Monterey County. Construct safety improvements along a portion of SR 1 near the community of Lucia. (PPNO 2230)

1.2 WHEREAS, the Department has certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines for its implementation; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a responsible agency, has considered the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby approve the above referenced project to allow for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research  
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121  
Sacramento, CA 95814  

From: California Transportation Commission  
Attention: Jose Oseguera  
1120 N Street, MS 52  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 653-2094

Project Title: Replace Culvert near Limekiln Creek Project

2018051048 Lara Bertania (805) 542-4610
State Clearinghouse Number Lead Agency Contact Person Area Code/Telephone

Project Location (include county): State Route (SR) 1 in Monterey County.

Project Description: Replace existing culvert and repair erosion damage on a portion of SR 1 in Monterey County.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project (Lead Agency / X Responsible Agency) on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project (will / X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. X An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. X A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
4. Mitigation measures (X were / _ were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
5. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan (X was / _ was not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
6. A Statement of Overriding Considerations (was / X was not) adopted for this project.
7. Findings (were / _ were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at: Caltrans Dist. 5, 50 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Susan Bransen  
Signature (Public Agency)  
Date  
Executive Director  
Title  
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Date received for filing at OPR:
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
06-Fre-99, PM R5.7/11.1
Resolution E-19-05

1.1 WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has completed a Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines for the following project:

- State Route (SR) 99 in Fresno County. Rehabilitate a portion of SR 99 in Fresno County. (PPNO 6800)

1.2 WHEREAS, the Department has certified that the Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines for its implementation; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a responsible agency, has considered the information contained in the Negative Declaration; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby approve the above referenced project to allow for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research  
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121  
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission  
Attention: Jose Oseguera  
1120 N Street, MS 52  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 653-2094

Project Title  Selma to Fowler Rehab Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018101026</th>
<th>Richard Putler</th>
<th>(559) 445-5329</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Clearinghouse Number</td>
<td>Lead Agency Contact Person</td>
<td>Area Code/Telephone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Location (include county): State Route (SR) 99 in Fresno County.

Project Description: Rehabilitate a portion of SR 99 between the cities of Selma and Fowler in Fresno County.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project  
(LeadAgency / X Responsible Agency)

on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project (___will / X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. ___An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
   X A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures (___were / X were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan (___was / X was not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations (___was / X was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings (___were / X were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at: Caltrans Dist. 6, 855 M Street, Suite 200, Fresno, CA 93721

Susan Bransen  
Signature (Public Agency)  
Date

Executive Director  
Title

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Date received for filing at OPR:
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
08-SBd/Riv-Various, PM Various
Resolution E-19-06

1.1 WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has completed a Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines for the following project:

- State Route (SR) 91, Interstate 10 (I-10), and Interstate 15 (I-15) in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. Rehabilitate six bridges at various locations on SR 91, I-10, and I-15 in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. (PPNO 3002G)

1.2 WHEREAS, the Department has certified that the Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines for its implementation; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a responsible agency, has considered the information contained in the Negative Declaration; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby approve the above referenced project to allow for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission
Attention: Jose Oseguera
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-2094

Project Title  Rehabilitative Activities on Six Bridges Project

2018061069  Shawn Oriaz  (909) 445-7034
State Clearinghouse Number  Lead Agency Contact Person  Area Code/Telephone

Project Location (include county): Interstate 10 (I-10), Interstate 5 (I-5), and State Route (SR) 91 in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties.

Project Description: Rehabilitate six existing bridges on I-10, I-5, and SR 91 in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project (Lead Agency / X Responsible Agency) on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project (will / X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
   X A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures (were / X were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan (was / X was not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations (was / X was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings (were / X were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at: Caltrans Dist. 8, 855 M Street, Suite 200, Fresno, CA 93721

Susan Bransen  Executive Director
Signature (Public Agency)  Date  Title
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Date received for filing at OPR:
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
10-SJ-4, PM 4.1/4.9
Resolution E-19-07

1.1 WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines for the following project:

- State Route (SR) 4 in San Joaquin County. Curve correction on the east end of the Middle River Bridge on SR 4 west of the city Stockton. (PPNO 3177)

1.2 WHEREAS, the Department has certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines for its implementation; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a responsible agency, has considered the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby approve the above referenced project to allow for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research
   1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
   Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission
   Attention: Jose Oseguera
   1120 N Street, MS 52
   Sacramento, CA 95814
   (916) 653-2094

Project Title  Middle River Bridge Roadway Realignment Project

2018082014    Andrew Chan    (209) 948-7879
State Clearinghouse Number    Lead Agency Contact Person    Area Code/Telephone

Project Location (include county): State Route (SR) 4 in San Joaquin County.

Project Description: Realign the approach curve and widen shoulders on the east end of Middle River Bridge on SR 4 in San Joaquin County.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project

(X Lead Agency / _ Responsible Agency)

on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project ( _ will / X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. X An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures ( X were / _ were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan ( _ was / X was not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations ( _ was / X was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings ( _ were / X were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at: Caltrans Dist. 10, 1976 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, Stockton, CA 95205

Susan Bransen    Executive Director
Signature (Public Agency)    Date    Title
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Date received for filing at OPR:
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
10-SJ-88, PM 13.70/14.0, 10-Alp-88, PM 0.20/2.60
Resolution E-19-08

1.1 WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines for the following project:

- State Route (SR) 88 in San Joaquin and Alpine Counties. Replace existing and construct new culverts along SR 88 in San Joaquin and Alpine Counties. (PPNO 3141)

1.2 WHEREAS, the Department has certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines for its implementation; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a responsible agency, has considered the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby approve the above referenced project to allow for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission
Attention: Jose Oseguera
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-2094

Project Title  State Route 88 Drainage Project

2018008108 J. Jennifer Lugo (559) 445-6172
State Clearinghouse Number Lead Agency Contact Person Area Code/Telephone

Project Location (include county): State Route (SR) 88 in San Joaquin and Alpine County.

Project Description: Remove existing culverts and replace with new culverts on a portion of SR 88 in San Joaquin and Alpine Counties.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project

( _ Lead Agency / X Responsible Agency)

on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project ( _ will / X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.

2. _ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

  X A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

3. Mitigation measures ( X were / _ were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.

4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan ( _ was / X was not) made a condition of the approval of the project.

5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations ( _ was / X was not) adopted for this project.

6. Findings ( _ were / X were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at: Caltrans Dist. 10, 1976 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, Stockton, CA 95205

Susan Bransen
Signature (Public Agency) Date

Executive Director Title

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Date received for filing at OPR:
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
12-Ora-605, PM 1.1/1.6
Resolution E-19-09

1.1 WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines for the following project:

- Interstate 605 (I-605) in Orange County. Construct roadway and safety improvements on a portion of I-605 in Orange County. (EA 0K870)

1.2 WHEREAS, the Department has certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines for its implementation; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a responsible agency, has considered the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby approve the above referenced project to allow for future consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research
   1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
   Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission
   Attention: Jose Oseguera
   1120 N Street, MS 52
   Sacramento, CA 95814
   (916) 653-2094

Project Title: Interstate 605/Katella Avenue Interchange Improvements Project

2018041026  Smita Deshpande  (657) 328-6151
State Clearinghouse Number  Lead Agency Contact Person  Area Code/Telephone

Project Location (include county): Interstate 605 (I-605) in Orange County.

Project Description: Construct roadway and safety improvements on I-605 at Katella Avenue
   in the city of Los Alamitos in Orange County.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project
   (Lead Agency / X Responsible Agency)
on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project (_will / X will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. _An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of
   CEQA.
   X A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of
   CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures (_X were / _were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan (_X was / _was not) made a condition of the approval
   of the project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations (_ was / X was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings (_were / X were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available
to the General Public at: Caltrans Dist. 12, 1750 E. 4th Street, Suite 100, Santa Ana CA 92705

Susan Bransen  Executive Director
Signature (Public Agency)  Date  Title
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Date received for filing at OPR:
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Subject: RELINQUISHMENT RESOLUTIONS

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation’s (Department) request for the relinquishment resolutions that will transfer highway facilities no longer needed for the State Highway System to the local agencies identified in the summary?

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department recommends that the Commission approve the relinquishment resolutions, summarized below, that will transfer highway facilities no longer needed for the State Highway System to the local agencies identified in the summary. It has been determined that each facility in the specific relinquishment resolution summarized below may be disposed of by relinquishment. Upon the recording of the approved relinquishment resolutions in the county where the facilities are located, all rights, title and interest of the State in and to the facilities to be relinquished will be transferred to the local agencies identified in the summary. The facilities are safe and drivable. The local authorities have been advised of the pending relinquishments a minimum of 90 days prior to the Commission meeting pursuant to Section 73 of the Streets and Highways Code. Any exceptions or unusual circumstances are described in the individual summaries.

RESOLUTIONS:

Resolution R-4018 – 04-Ala-185-PM 0.9/3.2
(Request No. 56140) – 2 Segments

Relinquishes right of way in the unincorporated territory of the county of Alameda (County) on Route 185 (East 14th Street and Mission Boulevard), under terms and conditions as stated in the relinquishment agreement dated November 27, 2018, determined to be in the best interest of the State. Authorized by Chapter 339, Statutes of 2017, which amended Section 485 of the Streets and Highways Code.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
Resolution R-4019 – 06-Tul-216-PM 1.97/2.46
(Request No. 86803) – 3 Segments

Relinquishes right of way in the city of Visalia (City) along Route 216 (Houston Avenue) on North Lovers Lane, McAuliff Street, and McAuliff Court, consisting of sidewalks and streets. The City by relinquishment agreement dated September 18, 2018, agreed to waive the 90-day notice requirement and accept title upon relinquishment by the State.

Resolution R-4020 – 06-Kin-198-PM R9.47
(Request No. 86800) – 1 Segment

Relinquishes right of way in the city of Lemoore (City) along Route 198 on 19th Avenue and Iona Avenue, consisting of local street improvements. The City by relinquishment agreement dated October 18, 2018, agreed to waive the 90-day notice requirement and accept title upon relinquishment by the State.

Resolution R-4021 – 09-Ker-14-PM 59.0/61.2
(Request No. 216) – 4 Segments

Relinquishes right of way in the county of Kern (County) along Route 14, from 1.4 miles south of and 0.5 mile north of the junction with Route 178, consisting of collateral facilities. The County, by controlled access highway agreement dated April 23, 2013, agreed to accept title upon relinquishment by the State. The 90-day notice period expires January 8, 2019.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS  
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  

From: STEVEN KECK  
Chief Financial Officer  

Subject: VACATION RESOLUTION  

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation’s (Department) request for the vacation resolution that will abandon the public's right of use of highway facilities?

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department recommends that the Commission approve the vacation resolution summarized below. It has been determined that the facilities in the vacation resolution summarized below are not essential to the proper functioning of the State Highway System and may be disposed of by vacation. Upon the recording of the approved vacation resolution in the county where the facilities are located, the public’s right to use the facilities will be abandoned. The vacation complies with Sections 892, 8313 and 8330.5 of the Streets and Highways Code. Any exceptions or unusual circumstances are described in the summary.

RESOLUTION:

Resolution A911 – 03-Sut-70-PM R2.8/R3.3  
(Request No. 036013-Z) - 2 Segments  

Vacates right of way in the county of Sutter along Route 70 from 0.15 mile south of to 0.30 mile north of Marcum Road, consisting of superseded highway right of way no longer needed for State highway purposes.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Subject: RESCINDING RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) adopt Resolutions of Necessity (Resolutions) CR-161 and CR-162, rescinding Resolutions C-21658 and C-21659, because some of the property owners did not receive the Notice of Intent (NOI) to Adopt Resolution of Necessity?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends the Commission adopt Resolutions CR-161 and CR-162. In accordance with statutory requirements, the owners have been advised that the Department is requesting rescission of Resolutions C-21658 and C-21659 as summarized below.

BACKGROUND:

Resolutions C-21658 and C-21659 were adopted by the Commission on December 5, 2018 for a conventional highway widening project. Resolutions C-21658 and C-21659 authorized condemnation of land in fee for State highway purposes. Resolutions C-21658 and C-21659 should be rescinded because some of the property owners did not receive their NOI to Adopt the Resolution of Necessity as it was returned undeliverable.

CR-161 - Cynthia C. Gregory, Trustee of The Collen Gregory, dated January 9, 2003, and Donald D. Gregory, as to an undivided one-half interest, and Paul C. Richter, III and Clara O. Richter, husband and wife as community property, as to an undivided one-half interest
06-Tul-137-PM 16.5/16.6 - Parcel 87865-1 - EA 06-0T3509.
Right of Way Certification (RWC) Date: 09/02/19; Ready to List (RTL) Date: 09/02/19.
Conventional Highway - install signals northbound and southbound and widen northbound ramp.
Rescinds Resolution of Necessity C-21659, adopted December 05, 2018, which authorized condemnation of land in fee for a State highway. Resolution C-21659 is rescinded because Paul C. Richter and Clara O. Richter did not receive their NOI to Adopt Resolution of Necessity.
Located in the city of Tulare at 1350 E. Sierra Avenue. Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 177-123-007.

CR-162 - Donald D. Gregory, Trustee of the Donald D. Gregory Revocable Trust of October 2, 2000, as to an undivided one-half interest, and Paul C. Richter, III and Clara O. Richter, husband and wife, as community property, as to an undivided one-half interest

06-Tul-137-PM 16.5/16.6 - Parcel 88027-1 - EA 06-0T3509.

RWC Date: 02/01/19; RTL Date: 02/06/19. Conventional Highway - install signals northbound and southbound and widen northbound ramp. Rescinds Resolution of Necessity C-21659, adopted December 05, 2018, which authorized condemnation of land in fee for a State highway. Resolution C-21659 is rescinded because Paul C. Richter and Clara O. Richter did not receive their NOI. Located in the city of Tulare at 1350 E. Sierra Avenue.

APN 177-123-014.

Attachment
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION RESCINDING RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY NO. C-21659
ADOPTED December 05, 2018, PROJECT 06-Tul-137

RESOLVED, that the action of the California Transportation Commission taken on December 05, 2018, in adopting Resolution of Necessity No. C-21659 as to parcel 87865-1 therein, which resolution authorized condemnation of land in fee for a State Highway, located in the County of Tulare, 06-Tul-137, is hereby rescinded.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 06-Tul-137-PM 16.5/16.6 PARCEL 88027-1
OWNER: Donald D. Gregory, Trustee of the Donald D. Gregory
Revocable Trust of October 2, 2000, as to an undivided one-half
interest, and Paul C. Richter, III and Clara O. Richter, husband
and wife, as community property, as to an undivided one-half
interest

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

Attorney, Department of Transportation

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Tulare, State of California, Highway 06-Tul-137 and described as follows:
Memorandum

To: Condemnation Unit

From: Lyn T. Bockmiller
Surveys, District 06

Subject: RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY TRANSMITTAL

The following information has been provided, as requested by District Right of Way, for use in the preparation of a Resolution of Necessity (RON) and other documents necessary for Condemnation, including:

- RON Mapping (2 pages)
  - Index Map (Exhibit A) — Shows parcel in relation to the overall project
  - Detail Map (Exhibit B) — Shows parcel in detail

- RON Legal Description for parcel(s): (1 page)
  - 88027-1

The electronic files for the above listed information have been transmitted by ROWMIS.

The attached real property description has been prepared by me, or under my direction, in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors’ Act.

Signature

Date Sept. 24th, 2018

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability."
Parcel 88027-1

For State Highway purposes, those portions of Lots 8, 9, and 10 in Block 2 of Fish Addition in the City of Tulare, County of Tulare, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 19, Page 103 of Maps, in the office of the Tulare County Recorder, included within the following described land:

COMMENCING at the Northwest Corner of Section 12, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, according to the Official Government Plat thereof; THENCE (1) along the west line of said Section 12, South 0°16'35" West, 689.57 feet to the center line of East Sierra Avenue; THENCE (2) along said center line North 89°41'03" East, 1314.14 feet; THENCE (3) leaving said center line North 50°14'00" West, 57.46 feet to a point on the south line of Lot 9 in Block 2 of Fish Addition, in the City of Tulare, County of Tulare, State of California, as per Map recorded in Book 19, Page 103 of Maps, in the office of the Tulare County Recorder, said point being the POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE (4) leaving said south line and continuing North 50°14'00" West, 78.00 feet; THENCE (5) South 87°55'00" West, 82.00 feet to the existing easterly Right of Way line of State Route 99; THENCE (6) along said existing easterly Right of Way line South 10°51'23" East, 28.22 feet; THENCE (7) leaving said existing easterly Right of Way line North 89°40'06" East, 45.00 feet; THENCE (8) South 58°11'44" East, 37.54 feet to said south line of said Lot 9 of said Fish Addition; THENCE (9) along said south line North 89°41'03" East, 59.69 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

The bearings and distances used in this description are on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone 4. Divide distances by 0.99995827 to convert to ground distances.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the foregoing resolution was duly passed by the California Transportation Commission at its meeting regularly called and held on the 5th day of December 2018, in the city of Riverside and that the foregoing is a full and correct copy of the original resolution.

Dated this the 5th day of December 2018.

SUSAN BRANSEN, Executive Director
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION RESCINDING RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY NO. C-21659
ADOPTED December 05, 2018, PROJECT 06-Tul-137

RESOLVED, that the action of the California Transportation Commission taken on December 05, 2018, in adopting Resolution of Necessity No. C-21659 as to parcel 88027-1 therein, which resolution authorized condemnation of land in fee for a State Highway, located in the County of Tulare, 06-Tul-137, is hereby rescinded.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 06-Tul-137-PM 16.5/16.6 PARCEL 87865-1
OWNER: Cynthia C. Gregory, Trustee of The Colleen Gregory, dated January 9, 2003, and Donald D. Gregory, as to an undivided one-half interest, and Paul C. Richter, III and Clara O. Richter, husband and wife as community property, as to an undivided one-half interest

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 102;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

Attorney, Department of Transportation

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Tulare, State of California, Highway 06-Tul-137 and described as follows:
Memorandum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>TUL</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>16.5/16.6</td>
<td>0615000065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To: Condemnation Unit

From: Lyn T. Bockmiller
Surveys, District 06

Subject: RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY TRANSMITTAL

The following information has been provided, as requested by District Right of Way, for use in the preparation of a Resolution of Necessity (RON) and other documents necessary for Condemnation, including:

- RON Mapping (2 pages)
  - Index Map (Exhibit A) – Shows parcel in relation to the overall project
  - Detail Map (Exhibit B) – Shows parcel in detail

- RON Legal Description for parcel(s): (1 page)
  - 87865-1

The electronic files for the above listed information have been transmitted by ROWMIS.

The attached real property description has been prepared by me, or under my direction, in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors' Act.

Signature

Date Sept. 24th, 2018
Parcel 87865-1

For State Highway purposes, those portions of Lots Nine (9) and Ten (10) of Bellevue Tract in the City of Tulare, County of Tulare, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 16, Page 22 of Maps, in the office of the Tulare County Recorder, included within the following described land:

COMMENCING at the Northwest Corner of Section 12, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, according to the Official Government Plat thereof; THENCE (1) along the west line of said Section 12, South 0°16'35" West, 689.57 feet to the center line of East Sierra Avenue; THENCE (2) along said center line North 89°41'03" East, 1314.14 feet; THENCE (3) leaving said center line North 50°14'00" West, 57.46 feet to a point on the south line of Lot 9 in Block 2 of Fish Addition, in the City of Tulare, County of Tulare, State of California, as per Map recorded in Book 19, Page 103 of Maps, in the office of the Tulare County Recorder, said point being the POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE (4) leaving said south line and continuing North 50°14'00" West, 78.00 feet; THENCE (5) South 87°55'00" West, 82.00 feet to the existing easterly Right of Way line of State Route 99; THENCE (6) along said existing easterly Right of Way line South 10°51'23" East, 28.22 feet; THENCE (7) leaving said existing easterly Right of Way line North 89°40'06" East, 45.00 feet; THENCE (8) South 58°11'44" East, 37.54 feet to said south line of said Lot 9 of said Fish Addition; THENCE (9) along said south line North 89°41'03" East, 59.69 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

The bearings and distances used in this description are on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone 4. Divide distances by 0.99995827 to convert to ground distances.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the foregoing resolution was duly passed by the California Transportation Commission at its meeting regularly called and held on the 16th day of October, 2018, in the city of Riverside and that the foregoing is a full and correct copy of the original resolution.

Dated this the 4th day of December, 2018.

SUSAN BRANSEN, Executive Director
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: RESOLUTIONS OF NECESSITY

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) adopt Resolutions of Necessity (Resolutions) for these parcels, whose owners are not contesting the declared findings of the California Department of Transportation (Department) under Section 1245.230 of the Code of Civil Procedure?

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department recommends the Commission adopt Resolution C-21673 through C-21695 summarized on the following pages.

BACKGROUND:

Prior to initiating Eminent Domain proceedings to acquire needed right of way for a programmed project, the Commission must first adopt a Resolution stipulating specific findings identified under Section 1245.230 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Moreover, for each of the proposed Resolutions, the property owners are not contesting the following findings contained in Section 1245.230 of the Code of Civil Procedure:

1. The public interest and necessity require the proposed project.
2. The proposed project is planned and located in a manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury.
3. The property is necessary for the proposed project.
4. An offer to purchase the property in compliance with Government Code Section 7267.2 has been made to the owner of record.

The only remaining issues with the property owners are related to compensation.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability”
Discussions have taken place with the owners, each of whom has been offered the full amount of the Department's appraisal, and where applicable, advised of any relocation assistance benefits to which the owners may subsequently be entitled. Adoption of the Resolutions will not interrupt our efforts to secure equitable settlement. In accordance with statutory requirements, each owner has been advised that the Department is requesting the Resolution at this time. Adoption will assist the Department in the continuation of the orderly sequence of events required to meet construction schedules.

C-21673 - Jerry Fagan
03-Yub-20-PM 14.2 - Parcel 36634-1, 2, 3, 4, 5 - EA 0A5709.
Right of Way Certification (RWC) Date: 04/01/19; Ready to List (RTL) Date: 04/15/19.
Conventional highway – shoulder widening. Authorizes condemnation of land in fee for a State highway, temporary easements for highway construction, and a permanent easement for water pipeline purposes to be conveyed to Browns Valley Irrigation District. Located in the unincorporated area of Yuba County at 5687 State Highway 20, Browns Valley.
Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 005-370-015.

C-21674 - Abdo Alrowhani
06-Ker-223-PM 21.1 - Parcel 87386-1, 2 - EA 0S5109.
RWC Date: 04/02/19; RTL Date: 04/02/19. Conventional highway - install traffic signals in and near Arvin from 0.2 mile west of Derby Street to King Street. Authorizes condemnation of land in fee for a State highway and a temporary construction easement for construction purposes. Located in the city of Arvin at 101 Bear Mountain Boulevard. APN 191-222-14.

C-21675 - Hithfallah Ahmed Alrowhani, a married man as his sole and separate property
06-Ker-223-PM 21.1 - Parcel 87387-2 - EA 0S5109.
RWC Date: 04/02/19; RTL Date: 04/02/19. Conventional highway - install traffic signals in and near Arvin from 0.2 mile west of Derby Street to King Street. Authorizes condemnation of a temporary construction easement for construction purposes. Located in the city of Arvin at southwest corner of State Route (SR) 223 and Derby Street. APN 191-222-13.

C-21676 - Cynthia C. Gregory, Trustee of The Collen Gregory, dated January 9, 2003, and Donald D. Gregory, as to an undivided one-half interest, and Paul C. Richter, III and Clara O. Richter, husband and wife as community property, as to an undivided one-half interest
06-Tul-137-PM 16.5/16.6 - Parcel 87865-1 - EA 0T3509.
RWC Date: 09/02/19; RTL Date: 09/02/19. Conventional Highway - install signals northbound and southbound and widen northbound ramp. Authorizes condemnation of land in fee for a State highway. Located in the city of Tulare at 1350 E. Sierra Avenue.
APN 177-123-007.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability”
Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability.
C-21683 - Fadi Shakkour  
07-LA-101-PM 20.0 - Parcel 80853-1 - EA 317909.  
RWC Date: 06/10/19; RTL Date: 06/20/19. Freeway - replace the Encino Avenue Pedestrian Overcrossing Bridge on U.S. Highway 101. Authorizes condemnation of a temporary easement for construction purposes. Located in the city of Los Angeles at 5461 Encino Avenue. APN 2257-003-035.

C-21684 - The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, a Public Corporation  
08-Riv-62-PM 82.00 - Parcel 24109-1 - EA 1E6119.  
RWC Date: 12/31/18; RTL Date: 01/03/19. Conventional highway - widen shoulders and install rumble strips. Authorizes condemnation of a permanent easement for State highway purposes. Located near the city of Twentynine Palms, near the Junction of SR 62 and SR 177. APNs 800-021-005; 800-022-005.

C-21685 - Robert J. Morin, etc., et al.  
08-Riv-074-PM 31.18 - Parcel 24168-1 - EA 0N6709.  
RWC Date: 06/30/18; RTL Date: 06/30/18. Conventional highway - construct raised curb median and left turn lanes. Authorizes condemnation of land in fee for a State highway. Located in the unincorporated area of Homeland on SR 74, east of Emperor Road and west of Sultanas Road. APNs 459-020-003, -045, -054, -056.

C-21686 - The City of Los Angeles, a municipal corporation  
09-Iny-6-PM 0.1 - Parcel 3982-1 - EA 345709.  
RWC Date: 06/01/19; RTL Date: 06/01/19. Maintenance station expansion - acquire additional acreage adjoining existing maintenance station to expand yard footprint. Authorizes condemnation of land in fee for a State highway. Located in the city of Bishop at 1250 Spruce Street. APN 008-360-01.

C-21687 - Iracema T. Larger, an unmarried woman  
10-SJ-4-PM 17.2 - Parcel 16888-1 - EA 0X3109.  
RWC Date: 12/02/19; RTL Date: 12/16/19. Conventional highway - provide standard vertical clearance for the bridge at Farmington Road Overcrossing (OC), over SR 99 in the city of Stockton. Authorizes condemnation of land in fee for a State highway. Located in the city of Stockton at 2032 Ladd Tract Road. APN 173-040-16.

C-21688 - 6125 Paseo Del Norte LLC, a California limited liability company  
11-SD-5-PM 46.6 - Parcel 35483-1 - EA 2T2119.  
RWC Date: 12/1/19; RTL Date: Construction Manager/General Contractor. Freeway - construct HOV Lanes and replace Batiquitos Lagoon Bridge. Authorizes condemnation of a temporary easement for construction purposes. Located in the city Carlsbad at 6183 Paseo Del Norte. APN 211-040-39-00.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
C-21689 - Pacific Bell, a California Corporation and The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company, a California Corporation
12-Ora-5-PM 14.2 - Parcel 202044-1 - EA 0K0219.
RWC Date: 02/01/19; RTL Date: 03/01/19. Freeway - add one lane in each direction between SR 73 to Oso Parkway, reconstruct Avery Parkway Interchange and add auxiliary lane where needed. Authorizes condemnation of a temporary construction easement for construction purposes. Located in the city of Laguna Niguel at 27402-27472 Camino Capistrano. APNs 636-021-11; 636-031-14.

C-21690 - Claire R. Schwan, Trustee, etc., et al.
12-Ora-5-PM 13.0 - Parcel 202057-1, 3, 01-01 - EA 0K0219.
RWC Date: 02/01/19; RTL Date: 03/01/19. Freeway - add one lane in each direction between SR 73 to Oso Parkway, reconstruct Avery Parkway Interchange and add auxiliary lane where needed. Authorizes condemnation of land in fee for a State highway, extinguishment of abutter's rights of access, and land in fee which is a remnant and would be of little market value. Located in the city of Mission Viejo at 26242 Avery Parkway. APN 740-014-05.

C-21691 - Tesoro South Coast Company, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company
12-Ora-5-PM 13.0 - Parcel 202058-1, 2, 3, 4 - EA 0K0219.
RWC Date: 02/01/19; RTL Date: 03/01/19. Freeway - add one lane in each direction between SR 73 to Oso Parkway, reconstruct Avery Parkway Interchange and add auxiliary lane where needed. Authorizes condemnation of land in fee for a State highway, extinguishment of abutter's rights of access, and a temporary easement for construction purposes. Located in the city of Mission Viejo at 28681 Marguerite Parkway. APN 740-014-01.

C-21692 - Pacific Castle International, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company
12-Ora-5-PM 13.0 - Parcel 202062-1, 2, 3, 4 - EA 0K0219.
RWC Date: 02/01/19; RTL Date: 03/01/19. Freeway - add one lane in each direction between SR 73 to Oso Parkway, reconstruct Avery Parkway Interchange and add auxiliary lane where needed. Authorizes condemnation of permanent easements for State highway purposes and temporary easements for construction purposes. Located in the city of Mission Viejo at 28601 Marguerite Parkway. APN 740-011-18.

C-21693 - Crown Valley Holdings, LLC a Delaware limited liability company
12-Ora-5-PM 13.8 - Parcel 202063-1, 2 - EA 0K0219.
RWC Date: 02/01/19; RTL Date: 03/01/19. Freeway - add one lane in each direction between SR 73 to Oso Parkway, reconstruct Avery Parkway Interchange and add auxiliary lane where needed. Authorizes condemnation of permanent easement for soil nail purposes and a temporary easement for construction purposes. Located in the city of Mission Viejo at 27741 Crown Valley Parkway. APN 761-111-16.
C-21694 - Business Properties Partnership No. 6, a California general partnership
12-Ora-5-PM 13.8 - Parcel 202064-1 - EA 0K0219.
RWC Date: 02/01/19; RTL Date: 03/01/19. Freeway - add one lane in each direction between
SR 73 to Oso Parkway, reconstruct Avery Parkway Interchange and add auxiliary lane where
needed. Authorizes condemnation of a permanent easement for soil nail purposes. Located

C-21695 - Business Properties Partnership No. 6, a California general partnership
12-Ora-5-PM 14.2 - Parcel 202068-1, 2 - EA 0K0219.
RWC Date: 02/01/19; RTL Date: 03/01/19. Freeway - add one lane in each direction between
SR 73 to Oso Parkway, reconstruct Avery Parkway Interchange and add auxiliary lane where
needed. Authorizes condemnation of land in fee for a State highway, extinguishment of
abutter’s rights of access, and a permanent easement for soil nail easement purposes. Located
in the city of Mission Viejo at 27539 Puerta Real. APN 761-111-07.

Attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.
C-21673

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 03-Yub-20-PM 14.2 PARCEL 36634-1, 2, 3, 4, 5
OWNER: Jerry Fagan

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102; and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.320 in that a portion of the property is
being acquired for conveyance to the Browns Valley Irrigation
District for utility purposes; and Code of Civil Procedure Section
1240.510 in that the property being acquired is for a compatible
use; and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.610 in that the
property is required for a more necessary public use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
The property sought to be acquired and described by this resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Yuba, State of California, Highway 03-Yub-20 and described as follows:
PARCEL 36634-1

For State highway purposes, all that portion of Parcel 1, as shown on Parcel Map No. 2.16, filed July 11, 1973, in Book 13 of Maps, Page 49, Yuba County records, State of California, as described on the DEED, recorded on August 20, 2018, in Document No. 2018-010247, Official Records of Yuba County, said portion lying southerly of the following described line:

COMMENCING at a found brass topper monument, at the intersection of the Centerline of the 60' Roadway with the southerly line of Parcels 2 and 3, as shown on Parcel Map No. 1.61, filed January 31, 1973, in Book 12 of Maps, Page 77, records of said county; said monument bears South 89°11'25" West, 1,976.06 feet, from a found brass topper monument stamped LS2692, marking the east 1/4 corner of Section 22, T16N, R5E, MDM, as shown on said Parcel Map No. 1.61;

Thence from said point of commencement, North 07°21'33" West, 385.22 feet, to the point on the existing northerly right of way line of State Route 20, and the POINT OF BEGINNING;

THENCE FROM SAID POINT OF BEGINNING, leaving said existing right of way line, North 86°05'39" East, 266.93 feet;

Thence South 85°15'11" East, 1,702.56 feet;

Thence South 80°45'17" East, 117.06 feet, to a point that bears North 14°05'21" East, 219.19 feet from said found brass topper monument stamped LS2692 and the end of the herein described line.


Excepting therefrom all oil, oil rights, minerals, mineral rights, natural gas, natural gas rights, and other hydrocarbons by whatsoever name known that may be within or under the parcel of land hereinabove described, together with the perpetual right of drilling, mining, exploring and operating thereon and removing the same from the land or any other land, including the right to whipstock or directionally drill and mine from lands other than those hereinabove described, oil or gas wells, tunnels and shafts into, through or across the subsurface of the land hereinabove described, and to bottom such whipstock or directionally drilled wells, tunnels and shafts under and beneath or beyond the exterior limits thereof, and to redrill, retunnel, equip, maintain, repair, deepen and operate any such wells or mines, without, however, the right to drill; mine, explore and operate through the surface or the upper 100 feet of the subsurface of the land hereinabove described or otherwise in such manner as to endanger the safety of any highway that may be constructed on the lands.

Bearing and distances used herein are grid based upon the California State Plane Coordinate System, Zone 2 NAD 83 (Epoch 2004.69). To obtain ground distances divide distances shown by the combined grid factor of 0.9999082.
PARCEL 36634-2

A temporary easement for construction purposes, all that portion of Parcel 1, as shown on Parcel Map No. 2.16, filed July 11, 1973, in Book 13 of Maps, Page 49, Yuba County records, State of California, as described on the DEED, recorded on August 20, 2018, in Document No. 2018-010247, Official Records of Yuba County, said portion more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at a found brass topper monument, at the intersection of the Centerline of the 60' Roadway with the southerly line of Parcels 2 and 3, as shown on Parcel Map No. 1.61, filed January 31, 1973, in Book 12 of Maps, Page 77, records of said county; said monument bears South 89°11'25" West, 1,976.06 feet, from a found brass topper monument stamped LS2692, marking the east 1/4 corner of Section 22, T16N, R5E, MDM, as shown on said Parcel Map No. 1.61;

Thence from said point of commencement, North 07°21'33" West, 385.22 feet, to the point on the existing northerly right of way line of State Route 20, and the POINT OF BEGINNING;

THENCE FROM SAID POINT OF BEGINNING, along said existing right of way line, North 85°40'35" West, 108.69 feet;

Thence leaving said existing right of way line, North 67°02'59" East, 91.51 feet;

Thence South 19°43'31" East 31.62 feet;

Thence North 86°05'39" East, 280.51 feet;

Thence South 85°15'11" East, 431.50 feet, to the East line of said Parcel 1;

Thence along said East line, South 00°21'42" East 15.06 feet;

Thence leaving said East line, North 85°15'11" West, 431.71 feet;

Thence South 86°05'39" West 266.93 feet, to said POINT OF BEGINNING.

Bearing and distances used herein are grid based upon the California State Plane Coordinate System, Zone 2 NAD 83 (Epoch 2004.69). To obtain ground distances divide distances shown by the combined grid factor of 0.9999082.

The rights to the above-described temporary easement shall cease and terminate no later than December 01, 2022. Said rights may also be terminated prior to stated date by the STATE upon notice to OWNER.
PARCEL 36634-3

A temporary easement for construction purposes, all that portion of Parcel 1, as shown on Parcel Map No. 2.16, filed July 11, 1973, in Book 13 of Maps, Page 49, Yuba County records, State of California, as described on the DEED, recorded on August 20, 2018, in Document No. 2018-010247, Official Records of Yuba County, said portion more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at a found brass topper monument, at the intersection of the Centerline of the 60' Roadway with the southerly line of Parcels 2 and 3, as shown on Parcel Map No. 1.61, filed January 31, 1973, in Book 12 of Maps, Page 77, records of said county; said monument bears South 89°11'25" West, 1,976.06 feet, from a found brass topper monument stamped LS2692, marking the east 1/4 corner of Section 22, T16N, R5E, MDM, as shown on said Parcel Map No. 1.61;

Thence from said point of commencement, North 07°21'33" West, 385.22 feet, to the point on the existing northerly right of way line of State Route 20;

Thence along said existing right of way line, North 85°40'35" West, 370.28 feet, to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

THENCE FROM SAID POINT OF BEGINNING, continuing along said existing right of way line, North 85°40'35" West, 66.01 feet, to the westerly most angle point of said Parcel 1;

Thentce leaving said existing right of way line, and along the northerly line of said Parcel 1, North 73°33'38" East, 62.83 feet;

Thence leaving said northerly line, South 13°45'01" East, 23.43 feet, to said POINT OF BEGINNING.

Bearing and distances used herein are grid based upon the California State Plane Coordinate System, Zone 2 NAD 83 (Epoch 2004.69). To obtain ground distances divide distances shown by the combined grid factor of 0.9999082.

The rights to the above-described temporary easement shall cease and terminate no later than December 01, 2022. Said rights may also be terminated prior to stated date by the STATE upon notice to OWNER.
PARCEL 36634-4

A permanent easement for water pipeline purposes, all that portion of Parcel 1, as shown on Parcel Map No. 2.16, filed July 11, 1973, in Book 13 of Maps, Page 49, Yuba County records, State of California, as described on the DEED, recorded on August 20, 2018, in Document No. 2018-010247, Official Records of Yuba County, said portion more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at a brass topper monument stamped LS2692, marking the easterly 1/4 corner of Section 22, T16N, R5E, MDM, as shown on Parcel Map No. 1.61, filed January 31, 1973, in Book 12 of Maps, Page 77, records of said county; said monument bears North 89°11'25" East 1,976.06 feet, from a brass topper monument at the intersection of the Centerline of the 60' Roadway with the southerly line of Parcels 2 and 3, as shown on said Parcel Map No. 1.61;

Thence from said Point of Commencement, North 15°02'23" West, 239.61 feet;

Thence North 85°15'11" West, 821.94 feet, to the point on the East line of Parcel 2, as shown on said Parcel Map No. 2.16, and the POINT OF BEGINNING;

THENCE FROM SAID POINT OF BEGINNING, leaving said East line of Parcel 2, continuing North 85°15'11" West, 461.45 feet;

Thence North 04°35'02" East, 15.00 feet;

Thence South 85°15'11" East, 460.14 feet, to said East line of Parcel 2;

Thence along said East line of Parcel 2, South 00°24'40" East, 15.06 feet, to said POINT OF BEGINNING.

The Bearings and distances used in the above description are on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone 2 (Epoch 2004.69). Divide all distances used in the above description by 0.9999082 to obtain ground level distances.
PARCEL 36634-5

A temporary easement for construction purposes, all that portion of Parcel 1, as shown on Parcel Map No. 2.16, filed July 11, 1973, in Book 13 of Maps, Page 49, Yuba County records, State of California, as described on the DEED, recorded on August 20, 2018, in Document No. 2018-010247, Official Records of Yuba County, said portion more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at a brass topper monument stamped LS2692, marking the easterly 1/4 corner of Section 22, T16N, R5E, MDM, as shown on Parcel Map No. 1.61, filed January 31, 1973, in Book 12 of Maps, Page 77, records of said county; said monument bears North 89°11'25" East 1,976.06 feet, from a brass topper monument at the intersection of the Centerline of the 60' Roadway with the southerly line of Parcels 2 and 3, as shown on said Parcel Map No. 1.61;

Thence from said Point of Commencement, North 15°02'23" West, 239.61 feet;

Thence North 85°15'11" West, 1,270.85 feet, to the point on the East line of said Parcel 1;

Thence along said East line, North 00°21'42" West, 15.06 feet, and the POINT OF BEGINNING;

THENENCE FROM SAID POINT OF BEGINNING, continuing along said East line, North 00°21'42" West, 15.06 feet;

Thence leaving said East line, North 85°15'11" West, 24.90 feet;

Thence South 04°39'56" West 15.00 feet;

Thence South 85°15'11" East 26.22 feet, to said POINT OF BEGINNING.

Bearing and distances used herein are grid based upon the California State Plane Coordinate System, Zone 2 NAD 83 (Epoch 2004.69). To obtain ground distances divide distances shown by the combined grid factor of 0.9999082.

The rights to the above-described temporary easement shall cease and terminate no later than December 01, 2022. Said rights may also be terminated prior to stated date by the STATE upon notice to OWNER.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.
C-21674

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 06-Ker-223-PM 21.1 Parcel 87386-1, 2
OWNER: Abdo Alrowhany

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of
Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and
empowered;

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Kern, State of California, Highway 06-Ker-223 and described as follows:
Parcel 87386-1

For State Highway purposes, a portion of Lot 1 in Block 1 of the Map of Stockton Addition to the Town of Arvin, recorded on December 21, 1920, in Book 3, Page 34 of Maps, Kern County Official Records, more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the Northwest Corner of Section 25, Township 31 South, Range 29 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, according to the Official Government Plat thereof; THENCE (1) along the west line of said Section 25 South 0°05'56" East, 99.98 feet; THENCE (2) North 90°00'00" West, 30.00 feet to the east line of said Lot 1; THENCE (3) along said east line North 0°05'56" West, 1.56 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE (4) continuing along said east line North 0°05'56" West, 55.01 feet to the south line of that land conveyed to the State of California as described in that Grant Deed recorded on December 4, 1947 in Book 1341, Page 408, Kern County Official Records; THENCE (5) along said south line North 89°50'00" West, 41.22 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave to the southwest having a radius of 58.00 feet, a radial line through said beginning of curve bears North 19°15'16" East; THENCE (6) easterly and southeasterly 71.99 feet along said curve through a central angle of 71°07'07"; THENCE (7) leaving said curve on a non-tangent line North 89°54'04" East, 2.44 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

The bearings and distances used in this description are on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone 5. Divide distances by .9999378 to convert to ground distances.
Parcel 87386-2

A temporary easement for construction of State Highway facilities and appurtenances thereto, under, upon, over and across a portion of Lot 1 in Block 1 of the Map of Stockton Addition to the Town of Arvin, recorded on December 21, 1920, in Book 3, Page 34 of Maps, Kern County Official Records, more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the Northwest Corner of Section 25, Township 31 South, Range 29 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, according to the Official Government Plat thereof; THENCE (1) along the west line of said Section 25 South 0°05'56" East, 99.98 feet; THENCE (2) North 90°00'00" West, 30.00 feet to the east line of said Lot 1; THENCE (3) along said east line North 0°05'56" West, 56.57 feet to the south line of that land conveyed to the State of California as described in that Grant Deed recorded on December 4, 1947 in Book 1341, Page 408, Kern County Official Records; THENCE (4) along said south line North 89°50'00" West, 41.22 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave to the southwest having a radius of 58.00 feet, a radial line through said beginning of curve bears North 19°15'16" East, said beginning of non-tangent curve also being the POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE (5) easterly and southeasterly 71.99 feet along said curve through a central angle of 71°07'07"; THENCE (6) South 89°54'04" West, 5.00 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave to the southwest having a radius of 53.00 feet, a radial line through said beginning of curve bears South 89°34'56" East;
THENCE (7) northerly and northwesterly and 65.01 feet along said curve through a central angle of 70°16'27"; THENCE (8) leaving last said curve on a non-tangent line North 89°50'00" West, 7.90 feet to the west line of said Lot 1; THENCE (9) along said west line North 0°05'56" West, 5.00 feet to said south line of said land conveyed to the State of California; THENCE (10) along said south line South 89°50'00" East 8.78 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Rights to the above described temporary easement shall cease and terminate on December 30, 2019. Said rights may also be terminated prior to the above date by STATE upon notice to OWNER.
Parcel 87386-2 (continued)

The bearings and distances used in this description are on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone 5. Divide distances by .9999378 to convert to ground distances.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.
C-21675

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 06-Ker-223-PM 2.1 PARCEL 87387-2
OWNER: Hifthallah Ahmed Alrowhany, a married man as his sole and separate property

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 102;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation
DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Kern, State of California, Highway 06-Ker-223 and described as follows:
Parcel 87387-2

A temporary easement for construction of State Highway facilities and appurtenances thereto, under, upon, over and across a portion of Lot 2 in Block 1 of the Map of Stockton Addition to the Town of Arvin, recorded on December 21, 1920, in Book 3, Page 34 of Maps, Kern County Official Records, more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the Northwest Corner of Section 25, Township 31 South, Range 29 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, according to the Official Government Plat thereof; THENCE (1) along the west line of said Section 25 South 0°05'56" East, 99.98 feet; THENCE (2) North 90°00'00" West, 30.00 feet to the east line of Lot 1 of said Block 1; THENCE (3) along said east line North 0°05'56" West, 56.57 feet to the south line of that land conveyed to the State of California as described in that Grant Deed recorded on December 4, 1947 in Book 1341, Page 408, Kern County Official Records; THENCE (4) along said south line North 89°50'00" West, 50.00 feet to the east line of said Lot 2 and the POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE (5) along last said east line South 0°05'56" East, 5.00 feet; THENCE (6) North 89°50'00" West, 16.01 feet; THENCE (7) North 0°15'37" East, 5.00 feet to said south line of said land conveyed to the State of California; THENCE (8) along said south line South 89°50'00" East, 15.98 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Rights to the above described temporary easement shall cease and terminate on December 30, 2019. Said rights may also be terminated prior to the above date by STATE upon notice to OWNER.

The bearings and distances used in this description are on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone 5. Divide distances by 0.9999378 to convert to ground distances.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 06-Tul-137-PM 16.5/16.6 PARCEL 87865-1
OWNER: Cynthia C. Gregory, Trustee of the Colleen Gregory Trust, dated January 9, 2003 and Donald D. Gregory, as to an undivided one-half interest, and Paul C. Richter, III and Clara O. Richter, husband and wife as community property, as to an undivided one-half interest

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 102;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

ATTORNEY, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Tulare, State of California, Highway 06-Tul-137 and described as follows:
Parcel 87865-1

For State Highway purposes, those portions of Lots Nine (9) and Ten (10) of Bellevue Tract in the City of Tulare, County of Tulare, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 16, Page 22 of Maps, in the office of the Tulare County Recorder, included within the following described land:

COMMENCING at the Northwest Corner of Section 12, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, according to the Official Government Plat thereof; THENCE (1) along the west line of said Section 12, South 0°16'35" West, 689.57 feet to the center line of East Sierra Avenue; THENCE (2) along said center line North 89°41'03" East, 1314.14 feet; THENCE (3) leaving said center line North 50°14'00" West, 57.46 feet to a point on the south line of Lot 9 in Block 2 of Fish Addition, in the City of Tulare, County of Tulare, State of California, as per Map recorded in Book 19, Page 103 of Maps, in the office of the Tulare County Recorder, said point being the POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE (4) leaving said south line and continuing North 50°14'00" West, 78.00 feet; THENCE (5) South 87°55'00" West, 82.00 feet to the existing easterly Right of Way line of State Route 99; THENCE (6) along said existing easterly Right of Way line South 10°51'23" East, 28.22 feet; THENCE (7) leaving said existing easterly Right of Way line North 89°40'06" East, 45.00 feet; THENCE (8) South 58°11'44" East, 37.54 feet to said south line of said Lot 9 of said Fish Addition; THENCE (9) along said south line North 89°41'03" East, 59.69 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

The bearings and distances used in this description are on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone 4. Divide distances by 0.99995827 to convert to ground distances.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 06-Tul-137-PM 16.5/16.6 PARCEL 88027-1
OWNER: Donald D. Gregory, Trustee of the Donald D. Gregory
Revocable Trust of October 2, 2000, as to an undivided one-half
interest, and Paul C. Richter, III and Clara O. Richter, husband
and wife, as community property, as to an undivided one-half
interest

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of
Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and
empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of
California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is
hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described
real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation
proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the
Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the
Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the
Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to
acquire, is situated in the County of Tulare, State of California,
Highway 06-Tul-137 and described as follows:
Parcel 88027-1

For State Highway purposes, those portions of Lots 8, 9, and 10 in Block 2 of Fish Addition in the City of Tulare, County of Tulare, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 19, Page 103 of Maps, in the office of the Tulare County Recorder, included within the following described land:

COMMENCING at the Northwest Corner of Section 12, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, according to the Official Government Plat thereof; THENCE (1) along the west line of said Section 12, South 0°16'35" West, 689.57 feet to the center line of East Sierra Avenue; THENCE (2) along said center line North 89°41'03" East, 1314.14 feet; THENCE (3) leaving said center line North 50°14'00" West, 57.46 feet to a point on the south line of Lot 9 in Block 2 of Fish Addition, in the City of Tulare, County of Tulare, State of California, as per Map recorded in Book 19, Page 103 of Maps, in the office of the Tulare County Recorder, said point being the POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE (4) leaving said south line and continuing North 50°14'00" West, 78.00 feet; THENCE (5) South 87°55'00" West, 82.00 feet to the existing easterly Right of Way line of State Route 99; THENCE (6) along said existing easterly Right of Way line South 10°51'23" East, 28.22 feet; THENCE (7) leaving said existing easterly Right of Way line North 89°40'06" East, 45.00 feet; THENCE (8) South 58°11'44" East, 37.54 feet to said south line of said Lot 9 of said Fish Addition; THENCE (9) along said south line North 89°41'03" East, 59.69 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

The bearings and distances used in this description are on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone 4. Divide distances by 0.99995827 to convert to ground distances.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 07-LA-71-PM 1.9 PARCEL 78438-1
OWNER: Isauro Velasco and Rosalva Velasco

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is
for a compatible use; and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.610
in that the property is required for a more necessary public use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, Highway 07-LA-71 and described as follows:
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY DESCRIPTION

Parcel 78438-1

For freeway purposes, Lot 33 of Tract 12818, in the City of Pomona, County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 284, Pages 21 through 24 inclusive, of Maps, in the Office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 07-LA-71-PM 1.8 PARCEL 78487-1
OWNER: David Ruiz Perez and Sonia Lozano

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is
for a compatible use; and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.610
in that the property is required for a more necessary public use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and
empowered;
To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is
hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation
proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the
Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;
The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, Highway 07-LA-71 and described as follows:
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY DESCRIPTION

Parcel 78487-1

For freeway purposes, Lot 366 of Tract No. 12818, in the City of Pomona, County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 284, Pages 21 through 24 inclusive, of Maps, in the Office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 07-LA-71-PM 1.9 PARCEL 78495-1
OWNER: Arres I. Gantino

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is
for a compatible use; and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.610
in that the property is required for a more necessary public use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE
APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation
DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, Highway 07-LA-71 and described as follows:
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY DESCRIPTION

Parcel 78495-1

For freeway purposes, Lot 395 of Tract No. 12818, in the City of Pomona, County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 284, Pages 21 through 24 inclusive, of Maps, in the Office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.
C-21681

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 07-LA-71-PM 1.9 PARCEL 80830-1
OWNER: Felix T. Grossman

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is
for a compatible use; and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.610
in that the property is required for a more necessary public use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, Highway 07-LA-71 and described as follows:
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY DESCRIPTION

Parcel 80830-1

For freeway purposes, Lot 470 of Tract 12818, in the City of Pomona, County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 284, Pages 21 through 24 inclusive, of Maps, in the Office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 07-LA-71-PM 1.9 PARCEL 80823-1
OWNER: Rebecca M. Ramos

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is for a compatible use; and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.610 in that the property is required for a more necessary public use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE
APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation
DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, Highway 07-LA-71 and described as follows:
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY DESCRIPTION

Parcel 80823-1

For freeway purposes, Lot 408 of Tract 12818, in the City of Pomona, County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 284, Pages 21 through 24 inclusive, of Maps, in the Office of the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk of said county.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.

C-21683

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 07-LA-101-PM 20.0 PARCEL 80853-1
OWNER: Fadi Shakkour

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is
for a compatible use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, Highway 07-LA-101 and described as follows:
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY DESCRIPTION

Parcel 80853-1 (TCE):

For freeway purposes, a temporary construction easement over and across that portion of Lot 22 in Block 16 of Tract No. 2955, in the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, State of California, as shown on map recorded in Book 31, Pages 62 to 70 inclusive, of Maps, in the Office of the Registrar-recorder/County Clerk of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the easterly terminus of that certain course described as having a bearing and distance of “S 88°54’18” E, 104.72” feet in the northerly boundary of State Parcel D-2038, recorded on August 6, 1963, in Book D2134, page 632 of Official Records in said office, said course having a bearing of S 88°42’41” E for the purpose of this description; thence westerly along said course N 88°42’41” W, 13.46 feet to a non-tangent curve being concentric with and distant southwesterly 10.00 feet, measured radially, from that certain curve having a radius of 20.00 feet in said deed; thence southeasterly and easterly along said concentric curve concave being northeasterly and having a radius of 30.00 feet from a tangent which bears S 31°11’33” E, through a central angle of 75°10’05” an arc distance of 39.36 feet to that certain non-tangent curve having a radius of 34.00 feet in said deed; thence Northwesterly along said non-tangent curve concave southwesterly and having a radius of 34.00 feet from a tangent which bears N 24°54’43” W, through a central angle of 18°14’23”, an arc distance of 10.82 feet to its Northwesterly terminus and that certain non-tangent curve, concave northeasterly and having a radius of 20.00 feet in said deed; thence westerly and northwesterly along said non-tangent curve from a tangent which bears S 83°03’15” W, through a central angle of 44°34’21”, an arc distance of 15.56 feet to the POINT of BEGINNING.
The above described parcel of land is to be used for temporary construction purposes and incidents thereto in connection with the construction of Route 101 freeway project designated 07-LA-101-PM 20.0 on maps in the Office of the Department of Transportation, State of California, at Los Angeles, California, and the rights to the above described temporary easement shall cease and terminate on October 24, 2022. Said rights may also be terminated prior to the above date by STATE upon notice to OWNER.

The bearing and distances in the herein above described lines are based on the California Coordinate System North American Datum (NAD) 1983, Zone 5.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 08-Riv-62-PM 82.00 PARCEL 24109-1
OWNER: The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, a
Public Corporation

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is
for a compatible use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Riverside, State of California, Highway 08-Riv-62 and described as follows:
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

An EASEMENT for highway purposes and incidents thereto, in and to those portions of Sections 25 and 26, Township 1 South, Range 16 East, San Bernardino Meridian, according to the official plat thereof, in the unincorporated area of Riverside County, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the west line of the northeast quarter of said Section 26, distant thereon North 0°41'33" West 359.20 feet from the center-north sixteenth corner of said section marked by a 2" iron pipe tagged "LS 7083" as shown on a map filed in Book 129, pages 20 through 43 of Records of Survey in the office of the County Recorder of said County; thence along said west line North 00°41'33" West 76.35 feet; thence leaving said west line South 76°25'39" East 565.12 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve, concave southwesterly and having a radius of 4,237.00 feet; thence southeasterly 615.83 feet along said curve through a central angle of 8°19'40"; thence South 68°06'00" East 126.27 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve, concave southwesterly and having a radius of 2,537.00 feet; thence southeasterly 40.32 feet along said curve through a central angle of 0°54'38"; thence South 22°48'39" West 12.50 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 2,524.50 feet, a radial line to said curve bears North 22°48'39" East; thence southeasterly 70.69 feet along said curve through a central angle of 1°36'15"; thence North 24° 24' 54" East 12.50 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 2,537.00 feet, a radial line to said curve bears North 24° 24' 54" East; thence southeasterly 172.52 feet along said curve through a central angle of 03°53'46"; thence North 28°18'40" East 5.00 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 2,542.00 feet, a radial line to said curve bears North 28°18'40" East; thence southeasterly 64.70 feet along said curve through a central angle of 1°27'30"; thence South 60°13'50" East 229.63' to the beginning of a tangent curve, concave northeasterly having a radius of 1,158.00 feet; thence southeasterly 122.30 feet along said curve through a central angle of 6°03'05"; thence South 23°43'05" West 5.00 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve, concave northeasterly having a radius of 1,163.00 feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 23°43'05" West; thence southeasterly 219.88 feet along said curve through a central angle of 10°49'57"; thence South 77°06'52" East 45.92 feet; thence
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

South 77° 03' 25" East 437.10 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 12,741.21 feet; thence southeasterly 355.65 feet along said curve through a central angle of 1°35'58" to the beginning of a compound curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 5,219.47 feet; thence southeasterly 152.47 feet along said curve through a central angle of 1°40'26"; thence South 73°47'02" East 169.92 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 52,551.38 feet; thence southeasterly 141.28 feet along said curve through a central angle of 0°09'15" to the easterly line of that certain land described in the Notice of Ownership of Real Property recorded July 28, 2005 as Instrument No. 2005-0607818, of Official Records in the Office of said County Recorder; thence along said easterly line South 0°45'07" East 77.44 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 52,477.38 feet, a radial line to said curve bears North 16° 23' 42" East; thence leaving said easterly line northwesterly 163.87 feet along said curve through a central angle of 0°10'44"; thence North 73°47'02" West 169.92 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 5,145.47 feet; thence northwesterly 150.31 feet along said curve through a central angle of 1°40'26" to the beginning of a compound curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 12,667.21 feet; thence northwesterly 353.59 feet along said curve through a central angle of 1°35'58"; thence North 77°03'25" West 437.02 feet; thence North 77° 06' 52" West 45.92 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve, concave northeasterly having a radius of 1,237.00 feet; thence northwesterly 364.52 feet along said curve through a central angle of 16°53'02"; thence North 60°13'50" West 229.63 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 2,463.00 feet; thence northwesterly 269.59 feet along said curve through a central angle of 6°16'16"; thence South 23°29'54" West 5.00 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 2,458.00 feet, a radial line to said curve bears North 23°29'54" East; thence northwesterly 68.56 feet along said curve through a central angle of 1°35'54"; thence North 68°06'00" West 120.26 feet; thence North 21°54'00" East 5.00 feet; thence North 68°06'00" West 6.01 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve, concave southwesterly having a radius of 4,163.00 feet; thence northwesterly 605.07 feet along said curve through a central angle of 8°19'40"; thence North 76°25'39" West 546.31 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

The distances used in the above description are on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone 6 (Epoch 1991.35). Divide the distances used in the above description by 0.99993117 to obtain ground level distances.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. C-21685

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 08-Riv-74-PM 31.18 PARCEL 24168-1
OWNER: Robert J. Morin, etc., et al.

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code Civil Procedure
Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is for a
compatible use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Riverside, State of California, Highway 08-Riv-74 and described as follows:
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

For highway purposes, this portion of Lot 1669 of Romola Farms No. 15 in the County of Riverside, State of California, as shown on a map filed in Book 15 of Maps, Pages 98 through 100 inclusive, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County, lying northerly and northeasterly of the following described line:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 1669, said point being a point of intersection with a line parallel with and distant southerly 72.00 feet, measured at right angles from the centerline of State Highway 74, said centerline also being the north line of Section 18, Township 5 South, Range 2 West San Bernardino Meridian; thence along said parallel line South 89°44'33" East, 603.50 feet; thence South 44°35'10" East, 32.44 feet to a point on the east line of said Lot 1669, also being the POINT OF TERMINATION of this line.

Excepting therefrom that portion as conveyed to the County of Riverside by Grant Deed, recorded April 7, 1989 as Instrument No. 110174 of Official Records of said county.

The bearings and distances used in the above description are on the California Coordinate System of 1983 (Epoch 2007.00), Zone 6. Divide the above distances by 0.999907263 to obtain ground level distances.

08-Riv-074-PM 31.18-24168 (24168-1)
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.
C-21686

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 09-Iny-6-PM 0.1 PARCEL 3982-1
OWNER: The City of Los Angeles, a municipal corporation

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway; and Code of Civil Procedure
Section 1240.610 in that the property is required for a more
necessary public use;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

Attorney, Department of Transportation

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Inyo, State of California, Highway 09-Iny-6 and described as follows:
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

THAT PORTION OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 6, TOWNSHIP 7 SOUTH, RANGE 33 EAST, M.D.B. & M. LOCATED WITHIN THE INCORPORATED CITY OF BISHOP, COUNTY OF INYO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF PARCEL 2333-1 AS SHOWN ON RECORD OF SURVEY NO. 17-011, RECORDED IN RECORD OF SURVEY MAP BOOK 20, PAGES 3 THROUGH 5, AND AS RECORDED IN THE INYO COUNTY RECORDERS OFFICE AS DOCUMENT NO. 91-3633 OFFICIAL RECORDS OF INYO COUNTY, SAID NORTHEAST CORNER BEING MONUMENTED BY A 2 INCH DIAMETER IRON PIPE WITH BRASS CAP AFFIXED, STAMPED "NE COR PARCEL 2333-1",

THENCE; S 89°48'12" E, ON A PROLONGATION OF THE NORTH LINE OF SAID PARCEL 2333-1, 99.98' TO A ONE INCH IRON PIPE WITH TAG AFFIXED, STAMPED "LA DWP LS 7894",

THENCE; S 00°10'38" W, 899.93' TO A ONE INCH PIPE WITH TAG AFFIXED STAMPED "LA DWP LS 7894",

THENCE; N 89°49'42" W, 400.00' TO A POINT ON THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF SPRUCE STREET, SAID POINT BEING MARKED WITH A LEAD AND TAG STAMPED "LA DWP LS 7894",

THENCE; N 00°10'38" E, ALONG SAID EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE, 300.00' MORE OR LESS TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID PARCEL 2333-1 BEING MARKED BY A 2 INCH DIAMETER IRON PIPE WITH BRASS CAP STAMPED "SW COR PARCEL 2333-1",

THENCE; S 89°49'42" E, ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID PARCEL 2333-1, 299.94' MORE OR LESS TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF PARCEL 2333-1 BEING MARKED BY A 2 INCH IRON PIPE WITH BRASS CAP AFFIXED, STAMPED "SE COR PARCEL 2333-1",

THENCE; N 00°11'04" E, ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID PARCEL 2333-1, 599.97' MORE OR LESS TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING 4.13 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

THE BEARINGS AND DISTANCES USED IN THE ABOVE DESCRIPTION ARE ON THE CALIFORNIA COORDINATE SYSTEM OF 1983 (EPOCH 1991.35), ZONE 4. DIVIDE THE ABOVE DISTANCES BY 0.9998294 TO OBTAIN GROUND LEVEL DISTANCES.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.

C-21687

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 10-SJ-4-PM 17.2 PARCEL 16888-1
OWNER: Iracema T. Larger, an unmarried woman

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of
Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and
empowered;

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE
APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of San Joaquin, State of California, Highway 10-SJ-4 and described as follows:
PARCEL 16888-1

For State highway purposes, that portion of real property conveyed in that Grant Deed recorded November 24, 1997 as Document Number 97116316, San Joaquin County Records, lying southerly of courses (1) and (2) of the following described line:

Commencing at the City of Stockton monument 410, a brass disk stamped ‘14S-23, LS 6670’ in a monument well, as shown on Record of Survey filed December 3, 2001, in Book 35 of Surveys, page 5 in the Office of the Recorder of San Joaquin County, from which the City of Stockton monument 409, a brass disk stamped ‘14S-22’ in a monument well, as shown on said Record of Survey, bears North 73°52’50” East, 1381.00 feet; Thence North 02°50’50” West, 403.89 feet to a point on the easterly Right of Way of Ladd Tract Road and the point of beginning;

Thence (1) along said easterly Right of Way, South 63°04’12” East, 61.15 feet;

Thence (2) leaving said Right of Way, North 57°09’35” East, 254.42 feet to the westerly Right of Way of State Route 99;

Thence (3) South 83°06’50” East, 1086.33 feet to said City of Stockton monument 409.

The bearings and distances used in this description are on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone 3. Divide distances by 0.9999386 to convert to ground distances.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.

C-21688

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 11-SD-5-PM 46.6 PARCEL 35483-1
OWNER: 6125 Paseo Del Norte LLC, a California limited liability company

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of
Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and
empowered;

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE
APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation
DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of San Diego, State of California, Highway 11-SD-5 and described as follows:
PARCEL 35483-1

FOR FREEWAY PURPOSES a temporary easement for construction purposes upon, over, under and across the Southwesterly 20.00 feet of Parcel B of LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT ADJ 15-05 in the City of Carlsbad, County of San Diego, State of California, recorded in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, on January 13, 2016, as Document Number 2016-0014169 of Official Records.

Rights to the above described temporary easement shall cease and terminate on December 31, 2021. Said rights may also be terminated prior to the above date by STATE upon notice to owner.

The bearings and distances used in the above descriptions are based on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone 6, HPGN Epoch 1991.35. Distances are in U.S. Survey Feet unless otherwise noted. Divide all distances in the above description by 0.9999614 to obtain ground level distances.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 12-Ora-5-PM 14.2 PARCEL 202044-1
OWNER: Pacific Bell, a California Corporation and The Pacific
Telephone and Telegraph Company, a California Corporation

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is
for a compatible use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Orange, State of California, Highway 12-Ora-5 and described as follows:
Legal Description

PARCEL 202044-1 Temporary Construction Easement

An easement for temporary construction purposes in and to that certain lot of land situated in the City of Laguna Niguel, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Lot 8, 9, and 10 of Tract No. 6107 as per the map filed in Book 230, Pages 7 through 9 of Miscellaneous Maps, Records of said County, lying easterly of the following described line:

**Beginning** at the southeasterly corner of Lot 2 of said Tract No. 6107;

thence along the easterly line of said Lot 2 North 28°18'36" East 3.30 feet;

thence North 61°41'24" West 10.00 feet to the **True Point of Beginning**;

thence North 28°18'36" East 51.82 feet;

thence North 11°44'48" East 608.94 feet;

thence North 06°52'13" East 1009.75 feet;

thence South 83°07'47" East 1.61 feet;

thence South 27°30'50" West 12.11 feet;

thence North 03°14'29" East 69.34 feet;

thence North 82°44'52" West 4.23 feet;

thence North 07°15'40" East 208.13 feet to the northwesterly line of Lot 10 of said Tract No. 6107;

thence North 38°47'35" East 13.01 feet along said northwesterly line to the northerly most corner of said Lot 10.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.

Rights to the above described temporary easement shall cease and terminate on December 1, 2023. The rights may also be terminated prior to the above date by STATE upon notice to OWNER.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.
C-21690

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 12-Ora-5-PM 13.0 PARCEL 202057-1, 3, 01-01
OWNER: Claire R. Schwan, Trustee, etc., et al.
LESSEE: Global Liquidation Company DBA Mission Rugs

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.410 in that the property being acquired
includes a remnant that would be of little market value; and Code
of Civil Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being
acquired is for a compatible use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Orange, State of California, Highway 12-Ora-5 and described as follows:
Legal Description

PARCEL 202057-1 Fee

For freeway purposes, that certain parcel of land situated in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 36, Page 41 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, lying northerly of the following described line:

Commencing at the centerline intersection of Marguerite Parkway, 100.00 feet wide, and Avery Parkway, formally “Rancho Viejo Road”, 100.00 feet wide, as shown on said map;

thence South 12°18'18" West 79.64 feet along the centerline of said Marguerite Parkway;

thence leaving said centerline North 77°41'42" West 50.00 feet to the northerly terminus of the course shown as “North 12°16'25" East 140.36 feet” in the easterly line of Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 8, page 27 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, said course having a bearing of North 12°18'18" East for the purpose of this description;

thence South 12°18'18" West 85.38 feet along said easterly line to the True Point of Beginning;

thence North 77°41'42" West 0.98 feet;

thence North 11°25'36" East 11.87 feet to a curve concave southwesterly having a radius of 46.00 feet;

thence northwesterly 83.98 feet along said curve through a central angle of 104°36'08";

thence South 86°49'28" West 7.90 feet to a curve concave northerly having a radius of 5031.00 feet;

thence westerly 232.57 feet along said curve through a central angle of 02°38'55" to the southeasterly terminus of the course shown as “North 17°43'03" West 79.38 feet” in the westerly line of said Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 36, Page 41 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, having a bearing of North 17°42'28" West for the purpose of this description and the Point of Termination.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.
Legal Description

PARCEL 202057-3 Access Control

For freeway purposes, the extinguishment of all easement of access appurtenant to that portion of the owner’s remaining property over the following described line:

In the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 2 of the Parcel Map filed in Book 36, Page 41 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, described as follows:

**Beginning** at the northwesterly corner of said Parcel 2;

thence along the westerly line of said Parcel 2 South 17°42’28” East 79.39 feet to an angle point therein and the **True Point of Beginning**, said point also being the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northerly having a radius of 5031.00 feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 00°31’37” East;

thence easterly along said curve a distance of 85.48 feet through a central angle of 00°58’25” to the easterly line of said Parcel 2 and the **Point of Termination**.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.
Legal Description

PARCEL 202057-01-01 Excess Fee

For freeway purposes as excess, in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 36, Page 41 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, lying southerly of the following described line:

Commencing at the centerline intersection of Marguerite Parkway, 100.00 feet wide, and Avery Parkway, formally “Rancho Viejo Road”, 100.00 feet wide, as shown on said map;
thence South 12°18'18" West 79.64 feet along the centerline of said Marguerite Parkway;
thence leaving said centerline North 77°41'42" West 50.00 feet to the northerly terminus of the course shown as “North 12°16'25" East 140.36 feet” in the easterly line of Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 8, page 27 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, said course having a bearing of North 12°18'18" East for the purpose of this description;
thence South 12°18'18" West 85.38 feet along said easterly line to the True Point of Beginning;
thence North 77°41'42" West 0.98 feet;
thence North 11°25'36" East 11.87 feet to a curve concave southwesterly having a radius of 46.00 feet;
thence northwesterly 83.98 feet along said curve through a central angle of 104°36'08";
thence South 86°49'28" West 7.90 feet to a curve concave northerly having a radius of 5031.00 feet;
thence westerly 232.57 feet along said curve through a central angle of 02°38'55" to the southeasterly terminus of the course shown as “North 17°43'03" West 79.38 feet” in the westerly line of said Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 36, Page 41 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, having a bearing of North 17°42'28" West for the purpose of this description and the Point of Termination.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.

C-21691

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 12-Ora-5-PM 13.0 PARCEL 202058-1, 2, 3, 4
OWNER: Tesoro South Coast Company, LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102; and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is
for a compatible use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE                  APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation                        DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Orange, State of California, Highway 12-Ora-5 and described as follows:
Legal Description

PARCEL 202058-1 Fee

For freeway purposes, that certain parcel of land situated in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 2 as per map filed in Book 8, Page 27, of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, lying easterly, northeasterly, and northerly of the following described line:

Commencing at the centerline intersection of Marguerite Parkway, 100.00 feet wide, and Avery Parkway, formally “Rancho Viejo Road”, 100.00 feet wide, as shown on said map;

thence South 12°18'18" West 79.64 feet along the centerline of said Marguerite Parkway;

thence leaving said centerline North 77°41'42" West 50.00 feet to the northerly terminus of the course shown as “North 12°16'25" East 140.36 feet” in the easterly line of Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 8, page 27 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, said course having a bearing of North 12°18'18" East for the purpose of this description;

thence South 12°18'18" West 85.38 feet along said easterly line to the True Point of Beginning;

thence North 77°41'42" West 0.98 feet;

thence North 11°25'36" East 11.87 feet to a curve concave southwesterly having a radius of 46.00 feet;

thence northwesterly 83.98 feet along said curve through a central angle of 104°36'08";

thence South 86°49'28" West 7.90 feet to a curve concave northerly having a radius of 5031.00 feet;

thence westerly 232.57 feet along said curve through a central angle of 02°38'55" to the southeasterly terminus of the course shown as “North 17°43'03" West 79.38 feet” in the westerly line of said Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 36, Page 41 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, having a bearing of North 17°42'28" West for the purpose of this description and the Point of Termination.

Together with all of the existing improvements which are located partially within and partially outside the boundaries of the above described parcel.

Together with a temporary easement, to expire on December 1, 2023, over and across the following described parcel for the purpose of removing existing improvements. The temporary easement will be described as follows:

In the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 8, Page 27 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, lying westerly, southwesterly, and southerly of the following described line:

Commencing at the centerline intersection of Marguerite Parkway, 100.00 feet wide, and Avery Parkway, formally “Rancho Viejo Road”, 100.00 feet wide, as shown on said map;

thence South 12°18'18" West 79.64 feet along the centerline of said Marguerite Parkway;
thence leaving said centerline North 77°41'42" West 50.00 feet to the northerly terminus of the course shown as "North 12°16'25" East 140.36 feet" in the easterly line of Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 8, page 27 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, said course having a bearing of North 12°18'18" East for the purpose of this description;

thence South 12°18'18" West 85.38 feet along said easterly line to the True Point of Beginning;

thence North 77°41'42" West 0.98 feet;

thence North 11°25'36" East 11.87 feet to a curve concave southwesterly having a radius of 46.00 feet;

thence northwesterly 83.98 feet along said curve through a central angle of 104°36'08";

thence South 86°49'28" West 7.90 feet to a curve concave northerly having a radius of 5031.00 feet;

thence westerly 232.57 feet along said curve through a central angle of 02°38'55" to the southeasterly terminus of the course shown as "North 17°43'03" West 79.38 feet" in the westerly line of said Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 36, Page 41 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, having a bearing of North 17°42'28" West for the purpose of this description and the Point of Termination.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.
PARCEL 202058-2 Temporary Construction Easement

An easement for temporary construction purposes, in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 8, Page 27 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, lying westerly, southwesterly, and southerly of the following described line:

Commencing at the centerline intersection of Marguerite Parkway, 100.00 feet wide, and Avery Parkway, formally “Rancho Viejo Road”, 100.00 feet wide, as shown on said map;

thence South 12°18'18" West 79.64 feet along the centerline of said Marguerite Parkway;

thence leaving said centerline North 77°41'42" West 50.00 feet to the northerly terminus of the course shown as “North 12°18'25" East 140.36 feet” in the easterly line of Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 8, page 27 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, said course having a bearing of North 12°18'18" East for the purpose of this description;

thence South 12°18'18" West 85.38 feet along said easterly line to the True Point of Beginning;

thence North 77°41'42" West 0.98 feet;

thence North 11°25'36" East 11.87 feet to a curve concave southwesterly having a radius of 46.00 feet;

thence northwesterly 83.98 feet along said curve through a central angle of 104°36'08";

thence South 86°49'28" West 7.90 feet to a curve concave northerly having a radius of 5031.00 feet;

thence westerly 232.57 feet along said curve through a central angle of 02°38'55" to the southeasterly terminus of the course shown as “North 17°43'03" West 79.38 feet” in the westerly line of said Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 36, Page 41 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, having a bearing of North 17°42'28" West for the purpose of this description and the Point of Termination.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.

Rights to the above described temporary easement shall cease and terminate on December 1, 2023. The rights may also be terminated prior to the above date by STATE upon notice to OWNER.
Legal Description

PARCEL 202058-3 Access Control

For freeway purposes, the extinguishment of all easement of access appurtenant to that portion of the owner's remaining property over the following described line:

In the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 8, Pages 27 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, described as follows:

Beginning at the northwesterly corner of Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 36, Page 41 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County;

thence along the westerly line of said Parcel 2 South 17°42'28" East 79.39 feet to an angle point therein and the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northerly having a radius of 5031.00 feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 00°31'37" East;

thence easterly along said curve a distance of 83.48 feet through a central angle of 00°58'25" to the westerly line of said Parcel 2 filed in Book 8, Page 27 of Parcel Maps and the True Point of Beginning;

thence continuing easterly along said curve a distance of 90.00 feet through a central angle of 01°01'30" to the Point of Termination.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.
Legal Description

PARCEL 202058-4 Access Control "Ingress Only"

For freeway purposes, the extinguishment of all easement of access appurtenant to that portion of
the owner’s remaining property with ingress only, over the following described line:

In the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of
Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 8, Pages 27 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County,
described as follows:

Beginning at the northwesterly corner of said Parcel 2 per the map filed in Book 36, Page 41 of
Parcel Maps, Records of said County;

thence along the westerly line of said Parcel 2 South 17°42’28” East 79.39 feet to an angle point
therein and the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northerly having a radius of 5031.00
feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 00°31’37” East;

thence easterly along said curve a distance of 85.48 feet through a central angle of 00°58’25” to
the westerly line of said Parcel 2 filed in Book 8, Page 27 of Parcel Maps;

thence continuing easterly along said curve a distance of 90.00 feet through a central angle of
01°01’30” to the True Point of Beginning, said point also being the beginning of a non-tangent
curve concave northerly having a radius of 5031.00 feet, a radial line to said curve bears
South 02°31’32” East;

thence easterly along said curve a distance of 57.08 feet through a central angle of 00°39’00”;

thence North 86°49’28” East 7.90 feet to the Point of Termination.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate
locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances.
Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of
0.99995281.
C-21692

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 12-Ora-5-PM 13.0 PARCEL 202062-1, 2, 3, 4
OWNER: Pacific Castle International, LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is
for a compatible use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Orange, State of California, Highway 12-Ora-5 and described as follows:
Legal Description

PARCEL 202062-1 Permanent Highway Easement

An easement for permanent highway purposes in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 3 of Parcel Map 2013-120 as per the map filed in Book 383, Pages 1 through 4, inclusive, of Parcel Maps, Records of said County described as follows:

Commencing at the centerline intersection of Marguerite Parkway, 100.00 feet wide, and Avery Parkway, 100.00 feet wide, as shown on said map;

thence North 12°17'08" East 220.05 feet along the centerline of said Marguerite Parkway;

thence leaving said centerline North 77°42'52" West 50.00 feet to the southeasterly corner of said Parcel 3 and the True Point of Beginning;

thence North 77°42'22" West 3.57 feet along the southerly line of said Parcel 3 to a non-tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 2537.83 feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 77°18'01" East;

thence northeasterly 5.00 feet along said curve through a central angle of 00°06'46", a radial line to said curve bears South 77°24'47" East;

thence non-tangent to said curve South 77°24'47" East 3.54 feet to the easterly line of said Parcel 3;

thence South 12°17'08" West 4.98 along said easterly line to the True Point of Beginning.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.
PARCEL 202062-2 Permanent Highway Easement

An easement for permanent highway purposes in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcels 1 and 3 of Parcel Map 2013-120 as per the map filed in Book 383, Pages 1 through 4, inclusive, of Parcel Maps, Records of said County described as follows:

Commencing at the centerline intersection of Marguerite Parkway, 100.00 feet wide, and Avery Parkway, 100.00 feet wide, as shown on said map;

thence North 12°17'08" East 220.05 feet along the centerline of said Marguerite Parkway;

thence leaving said centerline North 77°42'52" West 50.00 feet to the southeasterly corner of said Parcel 3;

thence North 12°17'08" East 116.80 feet along the easterly line of said Parcels to the True Point of Beginning;

thence North 79°10'50" West 4.33 feet to a non-tangent curve concave westerly having a radius of 2538.00 feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 79°10'50" East;

thence northerly 41.84 feet along said curve through a central angle of 00°56'40";

thence non-tangent to said curve South 80°07'30" East 5.00 feet to a non-tangent curve concave westerly having a radius of 2543.00 feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 80°07'30" East;

thence northerly 15.11 feet along said curve through a central angle of 00°20'25";

thence North 11°56'50" East 10.03 feet;

thence North 16°46'35" East 10.06 feet;

thence North 19°02'58" East 4.35 feet to a non-tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 1549.92 feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 78°36'36" East and the easterly line of said Parcels;

thence along said easterly line the following two courses:

1. southwesterly 24.23 feet along said curve through a central angle of 00°53'45";

2. South 12°17'08" West 57.15 to the True Point of Beginning.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.
Legal Description

PARCEL 202062-3 Temporary Construction Easement

An easement for temporary construction purposes in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcels 1 and 3 of Parcel Map 2013-120 as per the map filed in Book 383, Pages 1 through 4, inclusive, of Parcel Maps, Records of said County described as follows:

Commencing at the centerline intersection of Marguerite Parkway, 100.00 feet wide, and Avery Parkway, 100.00 feet wide, as shown on said map;

thence North 12°17'08" East 220.05 feet along the centerline of said Marguerite Parkway;

thence leaving said centerline North 77°42'52" West 50.00 feet to the southeasterly corner of said Parcel 3;

thence North 77°42'22" West 3.57 feet along the southerly line of said Parcel 3 to a non-tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 2537.83 feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 77°18'01" East and the True Point of Beginning;

thence northeasterly 5.00 feet along said curve through a central angle of 00°06'46";

thence non-tangent to said curve South 77°24'47" East 3.54 feet to the easterly line of said Parcels;

thence North 12°17'08" East 111.83 feet along said easterly line;

thence North 79°10'50" West 4.33 feet to a non-tangent curve concave westerly having a radius of 2538.00 feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 79°10'50" East;

thence northerly 41.84 feet along said curve through a central angle of 00°56'40";

thence non-tangent to said curve South 80°07'30" East 5.00 feet to a non-tangent curve concave westerly having a radius of 2543.00 feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 80°07'30" East;

thence northerly 15.11 feet along said curve through a central angle of 00°20'25";

thence non-tangent to said curve North 11°56'50" East 10.03 feet;

thence North 16°46'35" East 10.06 feet;

thence North 19°02'58" East 4.35 feet to said easterly line and a non-tangent curve concave westerly having a radius of 1549.92 feet, a radial line to said curve bears South 78°36'36" East;

thence northerly 34.20 feet along said curve and easterly line through a central angle of 01°15'52";

thence non-tangent to said curve North 79°52'30" West 2.00 feet;

thence South 23°06'58" West 52.76 feet;
thence North 77°57′29″ West 16.99 feet;
thence South 12°17′08″ West 75.89 feet;
thence South 77°42′52″ East 21.00 feet;
thence South 12°17′08″ West 87.18 feet;
thence North 77°42′52″ West 14.50 feet;
thence South 12°17′08″ West 17.34 feet to the southerly line of said Parcel 3;
thence South 77°42′22″ East 19.93 feet along said southerly line to the True Point of Beginning.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.

Rights to the above described temporary easement shall cease and terminate on December 1, 2023. The rights may also be terminated prior to the above date by STATE upon notice to OWNER.
Legal Description

PARCEL 202062-4 Temporary Construction Easement

An easement for temporary construction purposes in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 4 of Parcel Map 2013-120 as per the map filed in Book 383, Pages 1 through 4, of Parcel Maps, Records of said County described as follows:

Beginning at the most southwesterly corner of said Parcel 4;

thence along the general westerly line of said Parcel 4 North 04°39'58" East 21.43 feet to an angle point therein;

thence continuing along said general westerly line South 85°20'03" East 5.00 feet to a line that is parallel with and 5.00 feet easterly from the westerly line of said Parcel 4 described above having a bearing of North 04°39'58" East;

thence along said parallel line South 04°39'58" West 21.04 feet to the southerly line of said Parcel 4;

thence along said southerly line North 89°48'30" West 5.01 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.

Rights to the above described temporary easement shall cease and terminate on December 1, 2023. The rights may also be terminated prior to the above date by STATE upon notice to OWNER.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.
C-21693

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 12-Ora-5-PM 13.8 PARCEL 202063-1, 2
OWNER: Crown Valley Holdings, LLC a Delaware limited liability
company

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is
for a compatible use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation
DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered:

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Orange, State of California, Highway 12-Ora-5 and described as follows:
Legal Description

PARCEL 202063-1 Temporary Construction Easement

An easement for temporary construction purposes in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 1 of Parcel Map No. 96-117 as per map filed in Book 297, Pages 24 through 27, inclusive, of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, described as follows:

Beginning at the most westerly corner of said Parcel 1;

thence North 14°29'12" East 57.67 feet along westerly line of said Parcel 1;

thence South 09°18'34" East 131.52 feet to the westerly line of said Parcel 1;

thence North 25°46'13" West 82.12 feet along said westerly line to the Point of Beginning.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.

Rights to the above described temporary easement shall cease and terminate on December 1, 2023. The rights may also be terminated prior to the above date by STATE upon notice to OWNER.
Legal Description

PARCEL 202063-2 Soil Nail Easement

An easement for soil nail purposes in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 1 of Parcel Map No. 96-117 as per map filed in Book 297, Pages 24 through 27, inclusive, of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, described as follows:

Beginning at westerly terminus of the course in the northerly line of said Parcel 1 shown as “North 80°45'35" East 251.53 feet”;

thence North 80°48'13" East 38.23 feet along said northerly line;

thence South 03°13'08" West 1.71 feet;

thence South 74°05'01" West 40.02 feet to the course shown as North 07°17'59" East 346.23 feet on said Parcel Map No. 96-117;

thence North 07°20'37" East 6.63 feet along said course to the Point of Beginning.

The State, its successors and assigns, and their respective agents and assigns, shall have the right to directionally drill into the subsurface of said real property hereinabove described for the purposes above set forth, from lands other than said property, without, however, the right to use or drill through the surface of said properly or drill in such manner as to endanger the safety of any improvements that may be constructed on said property. Owner, his successors and assigns, shall retain all surface rights of the above-described easement area and rights to build permanent structures thereon.

All costs incurred for improvements made by the Owner, his successors and assigns, in the use of the rights to the surface and the rights to build permanent structures shall be borne by the Owner, his successors and assigns, and such use shall not unreasonable interfere or act inconsistently with the rights of the State, its successors and assigns, and the design and construction of any and all improvements to the easement area shall be first approved by the State of California, Department of Transportation, whose review will not be unreasonably withheld.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 12-Ora-5-PM 13.8 PARCEL 202064-1
OWNER: Business Properties Partnership No. 6, a California general partnership

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is for a compatible use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE
APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation
DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Orange, State of California, Highway 12-Ora-5 and described as follows:
Legal Description

PARCEL 202064-1 Soil Nail Easement

An easement for soil nail purposes in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel “C” of Parcel Map No. 96-117 as per map filed in Book 297, Pages 24 through 27, inclusive, of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, described as follows:

Beginning at the southwesterly corner of said Parcel “C”;

thence along the westerly and northerly line of said Parcel “C” the following two courses:

1. North 07°20’37” East 200.86 feet;
2. South 82°39’21” East 22.94 feet;

thence South 03°13’08” West 190.47 feet to the southerly line of said Parcel “C”;
thence South 80°48’13” West 38.23 feet along said southerly line to the Point of Beginning.

The State, its successors and assigns, and their respective agents and assigns, shall have the right to directionally drill into the subsurface of said real property hereinabove described for the purposes above set forth, from lands other than said property, without, however, the right to use or drill through the surface of said properly or drill in such manner as to endanger the safety of any improvements that may be constructed on said property. Owner, his successors and assigns, shall retain all surface rights of the above-described easement area and rights to build permanent structures thereon.

All costs incurred for improvements made by the Owner, his successors and assigns, in the use of the rights to the surface and the rights to build permanent structures shall be borne by the Owner, his successors and assigns, and such use shall not unreasonable interfere or act inconsistently with the rights of the State, its successors and assigns, and the design and construction of any and all improvements to the easement area shall be first approved by the State of California, Department of Transportation, whose review will not be unreasonably withheld.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY
TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY
OR INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN
HIGHWAY 12-0ra-5-PM 14.2 PARCEL 202068-1, 2
OWNER: Business Properties Partnership No. 6, a California general
partnership

Resolved by the California Transportation Commission after
notice (and hearing) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
1245.235 that it finds and determines and hereby declares that:

The hereinafter described real property is necessary for State
Highway purposes and is to be acquired by eminent domain pursuant
to Streets and Highways Code Section 102 and Code of Civil
Procedure Section 1240.510 in that the property being acquired is
for a compatible use;

The public interest and necessity require the proposed public
project, namely a State highway;

The proposed project is planned and located in the manner that
will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least
private injury;

The property sought to be acquired and described by this
resolution is necessary for the public project;

The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code
has been made to the owner or owners of record; and be it further

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

Attorney, Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY
RESOLVED by this Commission that the Department of Transportation be and said Department is hereby authorized and empowered;

To acquire, in the name of the People of the State of California, in fee simple absolute, unless a lesser estate is hereinafter expressly described, the said hereinafter described real property, or interests in real property, by condemnation proceeding or proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code, Code of Civil Procedure and of the Constitution of California relating to eminent domain;

The real property or interests in real property, which the Department of Transportation is by this resolution authorized to acquire, is situated in the County of Orange, State of California, Highway 12-Ora-5 and described as follows:
Legal Description

PARCEL 202068-1 Fee

For freeway purposes, that real property in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 2 as per map filed in Book 44, Pages 28 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, described as follows:

Commencing at the northeasterly corner of said Parcel 2;

thence South 80°14'18" West 134.21 feet along the northerly line of said Parcel 2 to the True Point of Beginning;

thence South 06°52'47" West 34.96 feet to the westerly line of said Parcel 2;

thence along the westerly, and northerly lines of said Parcel 2 the following three courses:

1. North 24°04'03" West 12.39 feet;
2. North 06°46'57" East 22.42 feet;
3. North 80°14'18" East 6.69 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Lands abutting the freeway shall have no right or easement of access thereto.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.999995281.
Legal Description

PARCEL 202068-2 Soil Nail Easement

An easement for soil nail purposes in the City of Mission Viejo, County of Orange, State of California, being that portion of Parcel 2 as per map filed in Book 44, Pages 28 of Parcel Maps, Records of said County, described as follows:

Commencing at the northeasterly corner of said Parcel 2;

thence South 80°14'18" West 42.47 feet along the northerly line of said Parcel 2 to the True Point of Beginning;

thence continuing South 80°14'18" West 91.74 feet along said northerly line;

thence South 06°52'47" West 34.96 feet to the westerly line of said Parcel 2;

thence along the westerly, and southerly lines of said Parcel 2 the following ten courses:

1. South 24°04'03" East 45.93 feet;
2. South 18°14'12" West 102.00 feet;
3. South 19°43'33" East 167.73 feet;
4. South 06°50'29" West 50.01 feet;
5. South 23°15'11" West 52.13 feet;
6. South 06°31'15" West 100.07 feet;
7. South 12°34'13" East 132.42 feet;
8. South 12°55'10" East 26.58 feet;
9. South 07°20'37" West 109.91 feet;
10. South 82°39'21" East 22.94 feet;

thence North 03°13'08" East 812.31 to the True Point of Beginning.

The State, its successors and assigns, and their respective agents and assigns, shall have the right to directionally drill into the subsurface of said real property hereinabove described for the purposes above set forth, from lands other than said property, without, however, the right to use or drill through the surface of said property or drill in such manner as to endanger the safety of any improvements that may be constructed on said property. Owner, his successors and assigns, shall retain all surface rights of the above-described easement area and rights to build permanent structures thereon.
All costs incurred for improvements made by the Owner, his successors and assigns, in the use of the rights to the surface and the rights to build permanent structures shall be borne by the Owner, his successors and assigns, and such use shall not unreasonable interfere or act inconsistently with the rights of the State, its successors and assigns, and the design and construction of any and all improvements to the easement area shall be first approved by the State of California, Department of Transportation, whose review will not be unreasonably withheld.

Unless otherwise noted, all bearings and distances are in terms of the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone VI, based on the North American Datum of 1983 Epoch 1991.35 as locally adjusted by the Orange County Surveyor. The distances shown herein are grid distances. Ground distances may be obtained by dividing grid distances by the combination factor of 0.99995281.
M e m o r a n d u m

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
    CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
From: STEVEN KECK
    Chief Financial Officer
Subject: CONVEYANCE OF EXCESS STATE OWNED REAL PROPERTY

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No: 2.4d.
Prepared by: Jennifer S. Lowden, Chief
    Division of Right of Way
    and Land Surveys

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve execution of the following Director’s Deeds?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends the Commission authorize execution of the Director’s Deeds summarized below. The conveyance of excess State owned real property, including exchanges, is pursuant to Section 118 of the Streets and Highways Code.

The Director’s Deeds included in this item involve an estimated current value of $1,014,800. The State will receive a return of $1,405,207 from the sale of these properties. A recapitulation of the items presented and corresponding maps are attached.

DIRECTOR’S DEEDS:

01-02-Plu-89 Post Mile (PM) 40.5
Disposal Units #DK 2447-05-02
    #DK 2447-05-03
Lake Almanor
1.84 acres
$0 Appraisal (Appraisal N/A)
Convey to: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Direct conveyance for no monetary consideration. The property rights were meant to be conveyed to PG&E in 1973; the State’s recorded Director’s Deed in 1973 recorded an incorrect legal description and omitted a portion of the total area purchased by Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E). Conveyance of the deed will correct this error that was made in 1973.
Direct sale. The excess parcel was acquired to relocate the existing frontage road which is no longer a programmed project. The parcel has been under leases to the adjacent owner since 1986. The adjacent property is improved with an office building that utilizes the excess parcel for parking and its only improved vehicle access. The improved access is to the snub end of the frontage road. The parcel is below the average size and shape of properties in the area. The highest and best use of the parcel is its current use as parking/access to the adjoining parcel. Sale of the parcel to another owner would cause undue or unfair hardship to the adjoining owner’s business operations as the property was developed to be accessed from the frontage road. The fair market value of the parcel is highest under the adjoining owner as the City has stated that no other uses of the property would be legally permissible; nor will the City allow a driveway to be installed off Grand Ave., which landlocks the adjoining property owner without the conveyance of DD 002248-01-01. Selling price represents the appraised value received from the adjoining owner.

Direct conveyance for no monetary consideration. Conveyance is 100% State’s obligation pursuant to Utility Agreement No. 06-1398.32 dated January 12, 2016.

Direct sale. Parcel is a small, irregularly-shaped, landlocked parcel that is incapable of independent development. Selling price represents the highest appraised value from the only adjoining owner.
Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability

CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Reference No.: 2.4d.
January 30-31, 2019
Page 3 of 3

06-08-SBd-215-7.1
San Bernardino
Disposal Unit #DD A04200-01-01
Convey to: Arrowhead 66, LLC

34,250 s.f.
$610,000
Public Sale Estimate (PSE $175,000)

Public sale. Selling price represents the highest bid received at the public auction. There were 21 registered bidders and seven active bidders that participated in the auction.

07-10-Ama-49-PM 3.85
Jackson
Disposal Unit #DD 013446-01-01
Convey to: Lee Scundi, A Married Man as
His sole and separate property.

0.16 acre
$19,000 (PSE $8,700)

Public sale. There were three bidders total that participated in the auction. Selling price represents the highest bid received at a public auction.

08-10-Cal-4-PM 21.7
City of Angels
Disposal Unit #DD 14876-01-01
Convey to: K. Shane Avey and Diana J. Avey
Trustees of the Avey 2002 Revocable Trust

0.44 acre
$2,500 (Appraisal $2,500)

Direct sale. Parcel is landlocked. Both adjoining owners were contacted and the parcel was offered for sale to the only interested adjoining owner at the appraised value of $2,500.

09-10-Tuo-108-PM 3.9
Tuolumne County
Disposal Unit #DD 013858-01-01
Convey to: Country Cowboy Church, Inc.,
A California Corporation

3.21 acres
$18,000 (PSE $9,300)

Private Sale. Sales price represents the highest bid received at private auction between adjoining landowners on this landlocked parcel. Three out of five bidders participated in the auction.

10-12-Ora-5 PM 9.6
San Juan Capistrano
Disposal Unit #DD 102492-01-01
Convey to: Capistrano Inn, a Limited Partnership

0.15 acre
$5,007 (PSE $3,600)

Private sale. The selling price represents the highest bid received at the sealed bid auction. Only one of the two adjoining owners participated in the auction.

Attachments
Attachment A - Financial summary spreadsheet
Exhibits 1A-10B - Parcel maps

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
# SUMMARY OF DIRECTOR'S DEEDS - 2.4d.

## PRESENTED TO CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION - January 30-31, 2019

### Table I - Volume by Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Direct Sales</th>
<th>Public Sales</th>
<th>Non-Inventory Conveyances (i.e. Utility Easements)</th>
<th>Other Funded Sales</th>
<th>Total Items</th>
<th>Current Estimated Value</th>
<th>Return From Sales</th>
<th>Recovery %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,014,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,405,207</strong></td>
<td><strong>138.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table II - Analysis by Type of Sale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sale</th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>Current Estimated Value</th>
<th>Return From Sales</th>
<th>Recovery %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Sales</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$568,100</td>
<td>$578,207</td>
<td>101.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$446,700</td>
<td>$827,000</td>
<td>185.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Inventory Sales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,014,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,405,207</strong></td>
<td><strong>138.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funded Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,014,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,405,207</strong></td>
<td><strong>138.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LINE DESCRIPTION 2 PER R709
WALL FOOTING EASE. 102492-2 274 SQ.FT (0.0063 ACRE)
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LINE TABLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIST.</th>
<th>DIST.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L387</td>
<td>90.13'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L395</td>
<td>27.09'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L398</td>
<td>46.58'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L399</td>
<td>6.29'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L400</td>
<td>42.68'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L406</td>
<td>95.24'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L410</td>
<td>7.26'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISION

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION AMENDMENTS FOR PROPOSITION 1B TRAFFIC LIGHT SYNCHRONIZATION PROGRAM PROJECTS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.5g.(7b) – 2.5g.(7g)

Action Item

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION AMENDMENTS FOR PROPOSITION 1B TRAFFIC LIGHT SYNCHRONIZATION PROGRAM PROJECTS

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation (Department) request for 6 de-allocations from 4 projects for a combined total of $1,297,110 in Proposition 1B – Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLSP) funds from the 4 projects listed below, due to cost savings at the completion of each project?

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department recommends that the Commission approve its request for 6 de-allocations from 4 projects for a combined total of $1,297,110 in Proposition 1B – TLSP funding from the 4 projects listed below, due to cost savings at the completion of each project as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLSP Project</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Amending Resolution</th>
<th>Current Project Allocation</th>
<th>Cost Savings</th>
<th>Revised Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 6784: California Boulevard</td>
<td>12000158</td>
<td>TLS1B-AA-1819-15</td>
<td>TLS1B-A-1112-003</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 6787: Hill Avenue</td>
<td>12000157</td>
<td>TLS1B-AA-1819-16</td>
<td>TLS1B-A-1112-003</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 6788: Los Robles Avenue</td>
<td>12000160</td>
<td>TLS1B-AA-1819-17</td>
<td>TLS1B-A-1112-003</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$99,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system
to enhance California’s economy and livability"

BACKGROUND:

The Proposition 1B – TLSP program projects listed above have been completed and have construction cost savings. Each of the implementing agencies for these projects are now requesting that the Commission reduce the currently approved Proposition 1B – TLSP allocations, by the amount of cost savings, for each project. The proposed changes are reflected in strikethrough and bold in accordance with the attached revised vote boxes.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:

Be it Resolved, that the Proposition 1B – TLSP funds currently allocated for each project are hereby amended by its cost savings, in accordance with the attached revised vote boxes.

Attachments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient Agency</th>
<th>Dst-County</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Prgm’d Amt</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5g.(7b)</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>City of Pasadena – California Boulevard. Outcome/Output: Anticipated benefits and results are enhanced traffic signal operation efficiencies and addition of proactive traffic management operations capabilities from the City’s Transportation Management Center (TMC).</td>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>07-Los Angeles</td>
<td>Amend Resolution TLS1B-A-1112-003 to deallocate $16,000 in Proposition 1B TLSP funding to reflect project cost savings upon completion.</td>
<td>Resolution TLS1B-AA-1819-15</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>104-6064</td>
<td>0712000158</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>TLSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TLSP</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>4U470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

#### 2.5g.(7c) Allocation Amendment--Proposition 1B Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLSP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient Agency</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Prgm’d Amt</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Hill Avenue</td>
<td>Anticipated benefits and results are enhanced traffic signal operation efficiencies and addition of proactive traffic management operations capabilities from the City’s Transportation Management Center (TMC).</td>
<td>TLSP</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>0712000157</td>
<td>TLSP</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amend Resolution TLS1B-A-1112-003 to reallocate $10,000 in Proposition 1B TLSP funding to reflect project cost savings upon completion.
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient Agency</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Outcome/Output:</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Prgm’d Amt</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Adv Phase</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5g.(7d)</td>
<td>Allocation Amendment–Proposition 1B Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLSP)</td>
<td>RTPA/MPO</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Anticipated benefits and results are enhanced traffic signal operation efficiencies and addition of proactive traffic management operations capabilities from the City's Transportation Management Center (TMC).</td>
<td>Resolution TLS1B-AA-1819-17</td>
<td>Resolution TLS1B-A-1112-003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>City of Pasadena – Los Robles Avenue.</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>TLSP</td>
<td>104-6064</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>TLSP</td>
<td>$99,000</td>
<td><strong>Amend Resolution TLS1B-A-1112-003 to deallocate $8,000 in Proposition 1B TLSP funding to reflect project cost savings upon completion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$99,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

### Project # 2.5g.(7e) Allocation Amendment—Proposition 1B Traffic Light Synchronization Program TLSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prgm’d Amount</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$27,745,000</td>
<td>RTPA/CTC Dist-Co-Rte</td>
<td>04-2140Q</td>
<td>TLSP/10-11</td>
<td>004-6064</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>CONST ENG</td>
<td>Amend Resolution TLS1B-AA-1819-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,253,087</td>
<td>San Mateo MTC</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>304-6064</td>
<td>304-6058</td>
<td>$4,545,000</td>
<td>$4,428,375</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>Amend Resolution TLS1B-AA-1112-010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In San Mateo County, located within state right of way along SR 82 and at ramps to US 101, from Whipple Avenue to Route 380. This project will construct traffic signal improvements, CCTVs, trailblazer signs, and vehicle detection systems.

Final Project Development Adjustment: N/A

Final Right of Way Share Adjustment: N/A

(CEQA – CE, 01/19/10)

(NEPA – CE, 01/19/10)

Outcome/Output: Provide approximately 150 miles of Traffic Operation System (TOS), communication lines and interconnect traffic signal systems along State Route 82 (El Camino Real) with other TOS projects implemented by local agencies. TOS devices will also be installed at select off-ramps on US-101 within the project limits.

Amend Resolution TLS1B-AA-1112-010 to de-allocate $291,813 in Proposition 1B TLSP funding to reflect project savings upon completion.
### 2.5. Highway Financial Matters

#### 2.5g.(7f) Allocation Amendment–Proposition 1B Traffic Light Synchronization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>04-2140T</td>
<td>TLSP</td>
<td>004-6064</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>304-6064</td>
<td>TLSP</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$696,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0412000425</td>
<td>TLSP</td>
<td>20.20.400.25</td>
<td>4A925</td>
<td>$5,842,964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program:** TLSP

**Recipient Agency:** Department of Transportation

**Project Location:** San Mateo County Smart Corridor – Segment 3 (Project 5)

**Project Description:** In San Mateo County on US 101, SR 82 (El Camino Real), SR 84, 109 and 114 from Whipple Avenue in Redwood City of San Mateo County line. This project will deploy intelligent Transportation system (ITS) elements along state routes.

**Final Project Development Adjustment:** N/A

**Final Right of Way Share Adjustment:** N/A

**Outcome/Output:** Construct TOS, communication lines and interconnection of traffic signal systems along SR 82, SR 84, SR 109 and SR 114 and at select off ramps on US 101.

**Amend Resolution TLS1B-AA-1213-01 for an overall total of $1,127,036; $166,272 of which to be used for a CON ENG Increase, leaving a total of $960,764 de-allocated to reflect project cost savings realized upon completion.
### Allocation Amendment—Proposition 1B Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLSP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient Agency</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
<td>City/County</td>
<td>San Mateo Smart Corridors. Between US 101 and SR 82, from Santa Clara County Line (Menlo Park) to I-380 (San Bruno). Install traffic signal improvements, closed circuit television (CCTV) cameras, trailblazer signs and vehicle detection systems.</td>
<td>Reduce recurring and non-recurring traffic congestion on local streets through proactive traffic management by providing the ability to: collect and disseminate arterial travel times, implement responsive and time-of-day signal timing to improve traffic signal coordination, and reduce delays along major corridors and freeway connectors, effectively manage freeway traffic that utilizes local streets, share traffic information between Caltrans and local agencies to improve coordination.</td>
<td>Amend Resolution TLS1B-A-1112-004 to de-allocate $10,433 in Proposition 1B TLSP funding to reflect project savings upon completion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Prgm’d Amount</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-2140V</td>
<td>TLSP</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>104-6064</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,444,567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,444,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0412000443</td>
<td>20.30.210.400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,455,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M e m o r a n d u m

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISION

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION AMENDMENTS FOR PROPOSITION 1B INTERCITY RAIL IMPROVEMENTS FUND PROGRAM PROJECTS

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation (Department) request to de-allocate savings of $617,000 in Proposition 1B – Intercity Rail (ICR) funds from the two projects listed below, due to cost savings at the completion of each project?

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department recommends that the Commission approve its request to de-allocate a total of $617,000 in Proposition 1B – ICR funding from the two projects listed below, due to cost savings at the completion of each project as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICR Project</th>
<th>District - PPNO</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Amending Resolution</th>
<th>Current Project Allocation</th>
<th>Cost Savings</th>
<th>Revised Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raymer to Bernson Double Track: PS&amp;E Design and</td>
<td>75-2098</td>
<td>ICR1B-AA-1819-02</td>
<td>ICR1B-A-1314-02</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$419,000</td>
<td>$6,081,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering for double track from MP 453.1 to MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446.8 on Ventura subdivision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys North Platform: PS&amp;E Design and</td>
<td>75-2113</td>
<td>ICR1B-AA-1819-01</td>
<td>ICR1B-A-1314-01</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$198,000</td>
<td>$3,802,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering for second platform at the Van Nuys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Savings $617,000

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
BACKGROUND:

The Proposition 1B – ICR program projects listed above have been completed and have cost savings. The implementing agencies for these projects are now requesting that the Commission reduce the currently approved Proposition 1B – ICR allocations, by the amount of cost savings, for each project. The proposed changes are reflected in strikethrough and bold in accordance with the attached revised vote boxes.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:

Be it Resolved, that the Proposition 1B – ICR funds currently allocated for each project is hereby amended by its cost savings, in accordance with the attached revised vote boxes.

Attachments
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

#### 2.5g.(8a) Proposition 1B – Intercity Rail – State-Administered Rail Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>$3,802,000</td>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>75-Los Angeles</td>
<td>The project will complete final design of a north platform at the Van Nuys Amtrak station. Once constructed, this will add platform access to accommodate simultaneous bidirectional passenger rail service at the Van Nuys Amtrak Station. A pedestrian underpass will also be constructed to provide safe passage to the platform. (CEQA – SE; Section 21080 (b)(10): 7/9/13) (NEPA – CE; 6/24/13) (Concurrent programming amendment under Resolution ICR1B-P-1819-03) Outcome/Output: The project will replace the existing single sided platform with a new center platform to better serve and enhance safety for passengers and improve flow of Amtrak and Metrolink trains. Amend Resolution ICR1B-A-1314-01 to reallocate $198,000 of Proposition 1B ICR in PS&amp;E to reflect cost savings at project closeout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program/Year Phase</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75-2113</td>
<td>ICR / 13-14</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>304-6059</td>
<td>PTMISEA</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,802,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>304-6059</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PTMISEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012000136</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30.20.090.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution ICR1B-AA-1819-01</th>
<th>Amending Resolution ICR1B-A-1314-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Amend Resolution ICR1B-A-1314-01 to reallocate $198,000 of Proposition 1B ICR in PS&E to reflect cost savings at project closeout.
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

#### 2.5g.(8b) Proposition 1B – Intercity Rail – State-Administered Rail Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>District-County</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program/Year Phase</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>75-Los Angeles</td>
<td>Raymer to Bernson Double Track Project PS&amp;E.</td>
<td>Raymer (MP 453.1) and CP Bernson (MP 446.8) on through to Northridge Station. Construct 39,000 linear feet of second main line; main line track relocation, relay rail and drainage improvements; four No. 20 turnouts, four bridges and work on the Northridge Station platform.</td>
<td>75-2098</td>
<td>ICR / 13-14</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>PTMISEA</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,081,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,081,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA – SE; Section 15275, 7/22/13)  
(NEPA – CE; 1/14/14)

**Outcome/Output:** Completion of the construction project would add track capacity, improve travel times for Amtrak Pacific Surfliner Intercity passenger rail service, and operational on-time performance along the corridor.

**Amend Resolution ICR1B-A-1314-02 to reallocate $419,000 of Proposition 1B ICR in PS&E to reflect cost savings at project closeout.**
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Prepared by: Ron Sheppard, Chief (Acting)
              Division of Rail and Mass Transportation

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION AMENDMENT FOR LOCALLY–ADMINISTERED SENATE BILL 1 LOCAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM (FORMULAIC) TRANSIT PROJECT RESOLUTION LPP-A-1819-19, AMENDING RESOLUTION LPP-A-1819-07

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.6s.(1) Action Item

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an amendment to amend the “Project Description” for the locally-administered Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) Local Partnership Program (LPP) (Formulaic) Transit Access Pass (TAP) Bus Farebox and Rail Station Validator Upgrades project (PPNO 5510), in Los Angeles County?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends the Commission approve an amendment to amend the “Project Description” for the locally-administered SB 1 LPP TAP Bus Farebox and Rail Station Validator Upgrades project (PPNO 5510), in Los Angeles County as described on the attached vote list.

BACKGROUND:

At its October 2018 meeting, the Commission approved the allocation of $14,299,000 in SB 1 LPP (Formulaic) Funds for the TAP Bus Farebox and Rail Station Validator Upgrades project (PPNO 5510) under Resolution LPP-A-1819-07. However, at the time the project was approved, the “Project Description” was inaccurate in the vote box on the Book Item Attachment. The required changes are reflected in strike through and bold in the revised vote box attachment. There is no change to project’s allocation amount.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:

Be it Resolved, that the requested changes to the “Project Description” for the locally-administered SB 1 LPP TAP Bus Farebox and Rail Station Validator Upgrades project (PPNO 5510), originally approved under Resolution LPP-A-1819-07, be revised in accordance with the attached revised vote list.

Attachment
### 2.6 Mass Transportation Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>District-County</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outputs/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$14,299,000</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
<td>07-Los Angeles</td>
<td>Transit Access Pass (TAP) Bus Farebox and Rail Station Validator Upgrades</td>
<td>Upgrade of bus farebox and rail station validators across LA Metro. and local municipal transit operators in Los Angeles County.</td>
<td>ITS Element(s)</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Contribution from other sources: $14,299,000.)

**Amend Resolution LPP-A-1819-07 to revise the project description to be in compliance with the LPP Program Amendment approved in October 2018 under Resolution G-18-44. There is no change to the originally approved allocation amount.**
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.6b.(1)-2.6b.(2)
Action Item

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer
Prepared by: Ron Sheppard, Chief (Acting)
Division of Rail and Mass Transportation

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION AMENDMENTS FOR PROPOSITION 116 BOND FUND PROGRAM PROJECTS

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation’s (Department) request to de-allocate Proposition 116 Bond funds from the two locally administered projects listed below, due to cost savings at the completion of each project?

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department recommends that the Commission approve its request to de-allocate a total of $2,250,344 in Proposition 116 Bond fund from the two projects listed below, due to cost savings at the completion of each project as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop 116 Project</th>
<th>District-PPNO</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Amending Resolution</th>
<th>Current Project Allocation</th>
<th>Cost Savings</th>
<th>Revised Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon Avenue Grade Separation Project</td>
<td>12-9651</td>
<td>BFA-18-01</td>
<td>BFP-09-06</td>
<td>$22,004,000</td>
<td>$429,778</td>
<td>$21,574,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County Metrolink Fiber Optics Installation Project</td>
<td>12-9523</td>
<td>BFA-18-02</td>
<td>BFP-09-03</td>
<td>$12,300,000</td>
<td>$1,820,566</td>
<td>$10,479,434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND:

The Proposition 116 Bond fund program projects listed above have been completed and have construction cost savings. The implementing agency, Orange County Transportation Authority, is requesting that the Commission reduce the currently approved Proposition 116 Bond fund allocations by the amount of cost savings for each project. The proposed changes are reflected in strikethrough and bold in the attached revised vote boxes.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:

Be it Resolved, that the Proposition 116 Bond fund currently allocated for each project is hereby amended by its cost savings, in accordance with the attached revised vote boxes.

Attachment
### 2.6b.(1) Allocation Amendment – Proposition 116 – Transit Projects
Projects Off the State Highway System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome/Output: Grade separation will eliminate the potential for train versus vehicle accidents, reduce vehicle and train crossing delays, and increase rail service efficiency.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$22,004,000</td>
<td>Orange County Transportation Authority OCTA 12-Orange</td>
<td>Sand Canyon Grade Separation. Lowering of Sand Canyon Avenue under the BNSF railway to provide a grade separation crossing.</td>
<td>12-9651 1990-91 P116/09-10 P116 624-0703 P116 $22,004,000 30.10.070.625 $21,574,222</td>
<td>Amend Resolution BFP-09-06 to de-allocate $429,778 in Proposition 116 funds to reflect Construction Completion Savings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.6b.(2) Allocation Amendment – Proposition 116 – Transit Projects
Projects Off the State Highway System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome/Output: Signal upgrades will result in increased communication reliability and improved railroad safety.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$12,300,000</td>
<td>Orange County Transportation Authority OCTA 12-Orange</td>
<td>Orange County Metrolink Fiber Optics Installation. Upgrade the signal communication system on Orange Subdivision within the existing railroad right-of-way.</td>
<td>12-9523 1990-91 P116/09-10 P116 624-0703 P116 $12,300,000 30.10.070.625 $10,479,434</td>
<td>Amend Resolution BFP-09-03 to de-allocate $1,820,566 in Proposition 116 funds to reflect Construction Completion Savings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Subject: APPROVAL OF PROJECTS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.2c.(6)
Action Item

Prepared by: Jeremy Ketchum, Chief (Acting)
Division of Environmental Analysis

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission), as a responsible agency, approve the attached Resolution E-19-14?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends that the California Transportation Commission (Commission), as a responsible agency, approve the attached Resolution E-19-14.

BACKGROUND:

05-SCR-1, PM R7.24/16.13
RESOLUTION E-19-14

The attached resolution proposes to approve for future consideration of funding the following project for which a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) has been completed:

- State Route (SR) 1 in Santa Cruz County. Construct roadway improvements including HOV lanes on a portion of SR 1 in the city of Santa Cruz. (PPNO 0073A)

This project is located on SR 1 in the city of Santa Cruz in Santa Cruz County. The project proposes to add High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, pedestrian and bicycle overcrossings, and reconstruct interchanges. The proposed project involves a Tier I component from the San Andreas-Larkin Valley Road interchange to the Morrissey Boulevard interchange and a Tier II component from 41st Avenue to Soquel Avenue/Drive. The purpose of this project proposes to reduce congestion, improve safety, promote alternative transportation modes and encourage carpooling and ridesharing. The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Regional Transportation Plan proposes this project for the Senate Bill 1 Solutions for Congested

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
Corridors Program Cycle 2 funds. The total cost of this proposed Tier II is estimated to be approximately $36.4 million. Construction is estimated to begin in fiscal year 2021-22.

A copy of the FEIR has been provided to Commission staff. Resources that may be impacted by the project include visual/aesthetics, community impacts, emergency services, traffic and transportation, cultural, water quality, hazardous material, and biological resources.

Potential impacts associated with the project can all be mitigated to below significance with the exception of visual/aesthetics for which a Statement of Overriding Considerations was prepared. As a result, an FEIR was prepared for the project.

Attachments
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Resolution for Future Consideration of Funding
05-SCr-1, PM R7.24/16.13
Resolution E-19-14

1.1 WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Department) has completed a Final Environmental Impact Report pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines for the following project:

- State Route (SR) 1 in Santa Cruz County. Construct roadway improvements including HOV lanes on a portion of SR 1 in the city of Santa Cruz. (PPNO 0073A)

1.2 WHEREAS, the Department has certified that a Final Environmental Impact Report has been completed pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines for its implementation; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a responsible agency, has considered the information contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

1.4 WHEREAS, the project will have a significant effect on the environment.

1.5 WHEREAS, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was prepared.

1.6 WHEREAS, Findings were made pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines.

2.1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby support approval of the above referenced project to allow for consideration of funding.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Transportation Commission
Attention: Jose Oseguera
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-2094

Project Title: Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier 1 Project

2004032147   Lara Bertania   (805) 542-4610
State Clearinghouse Number   Lead Agency Contact Person   Area Code/Telephone

Project Location (include county): State Route (SR) 1 in Santa Cruz County.

Project Description: Widen existing four lane facility to a six lane facility including an HOV lane in each direction on a portion SR 1 near the city of Santa Cruz.

This is to advise that the California Transportation Commission has approved the above described project on January 30-31, 2019, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project (X will / _will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. X An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
   __A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures (X were / _were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan (X was / _was not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations (X was / _was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings (X were / _were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

The above identified document with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at: Caltrans Dist. 5, 50 Higuera St., San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Susan Bransen   Executive Director
Signature (Public Agency)   Date   Title
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Date received for filing at OPR:
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR

IMPROVEMENTS TO STATE ROUTE 1 IN SANTA CRUZ COUNTY, INCLUDING MAINLINE HIGH-OCCUPANCY VEHICLE (HOV) LANES, HOV ON-RAMP BYPASS LANES, AUXILIARY LANES, PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE OVERCROSSINGS, AND RECONSTRUCTED INTERCHANGES WITHIN THE TIER I CORRIDOR FROM APPROXIMATELY 0.4 MILE SOUTH OF THE SAN ANDREAS-LARKIN VALLEY ROAD INTERCHANGE TO 0.3 MILE NORTH OF THE MORRISSEY BOULEVARD INTERCHANGE (TIER 1 PROGRAMMATIC LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS); AND INCLUDING AUXILIARY LANES AND THE CHANTICLEER AVENUE PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE OVERCROSSING WITHIN THE TIER II CORRIDOR FROM 41ST AVENUE TO SOQUEL AVENUE/DRIVE (TIER II BUILD PROJECT LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS).

The following information is presented to comply with State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15093), and the Department of Transportation and California Transportation Commission Environmental Regulations (Title 21 California Code of Regulations, Division 2, Chapter 11, Section 1501 et seq.). Reference is made to the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the project, which is the basic source for the information.

The following impacts have been identified as significant and not fully mitigable:

Tier I Corridor Project

Aesthetics/Visual – Route 1 is listed within the State Scenic Highways system as eligible for listing, but it has not been officially designated by the state, although it has been identified as a Scenic Road in the Santa Cruz County General Plan. The Tier I Project would create significant visual changes within the 8.9-mile-long Tier I Corridor as a result of highway widening, construction of retaining and soundwalls, removal of mature trees and other vegetation, and construction of new roadway structures. Viewer groups are expected to be sensitive to these
changes, and these impacts are unavoidable and considered potentially significant under CEQA, even with implementation of the mitigation measures described in the FEIR.

Overriding considerations that support approval of this recommended project are as follows:

Route 1 is the primary route connecting communities in the southern and central areas of Santa Cruz County and is the only continuous commuter route linking Watsonville, Capitola, Aptos, Cabrillo College, Santa Cruz, and the University of California at Santa Cruz. Approximately 25 percent of commuters using Route 1 continue on Route 17 to jobs in Santa Clara County. Route 1 also is the southern terminus for Route 9 and Route 17, which bring heavy tourist traffic to coastal destinations in Santa Cruz and Monterey counties.

Within the Tier I Corridor, Route 1 is subject to recurrent congestion that affects highway operations, such as difficulties entering the Route 1 mainline from on-ramps and exiting to off-ramps. The purpose of the proposed Tier I Project on Route 1 within the project limits is to achieve the following:

- Reduce congestion.
- Promote the use of alternative transportation modes as means to increase transportation system capacity.
- Encourage carpooling and ridesharing.

The Tier I Project addresses the following needs resulting from deficiencies on Route 1 within the Tier I project limits:

- Several bottlenecks along Route 1 in the southbound and northbound directions cause recurrent congestion during peak hours.
- Travel time delays due to congestion are experienced by commuters, commerce, and emergency vehicles.
- "Cut-through" traffic, or traffic on local streets, occurs and is increasing because drivers seek to avoid congestion on the highway.
- Limited opportunities exist for pedestrians and bicyclists to safely get across Route 1 within the project corridor.
- Insufficient incentives to increase transit service in the Route 1 corridor because congestion threatens reliability and cost-effective transit service delivery.
- Inadequate facilities to support carpool and rideshare vehicles over single-occupant vehicles, reducing travel time savings and reliability.

After comparing and weighing the benefits and impacts of all feasible alternatives, Caltrans identified the Tier I Corridor HOV Lane Alternative as the preferred Tier I alternative because it best meets the Tier I Project purpose and need and provides the most options for future Tier II projects to respond to any changes in future travel patterns. The Tier I Project will reduce congestion and cut-through traffic on local streets while providing incentives for carpooling, travel time savings, and efficiencies in providing transit services, as well as supporting bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation.
FINDINGS

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FINDINGS FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO STATE ROUTE 1 IN SANTA CRUZ COUNTY, INCLUDING MAINLINE HIGH-OCCUPANCY VEHICLE (HOV) LANES, HOV ON-RAMP BYPASS LANES, AUXILIARY LANES, PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE OVERCROSSINGS, AND RECONSTRUCTED INTERCHANGES WITHIN THE TIER I CORRIDOR FROM APPROXIMATELY 0.4 MILE SOUTH OF THE SAN ANDREAS-LARKIN VALLEY ROAD INTERCHANGE TO 0.3 MILE NORTH OF THE MORRISSEY BOULEVARD INTERCHANGE (TIER I PROGRAMMATIC LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS); AND INCLUDING AUXILIARY LANES AND THE CHANTICLEER AVENUE PEDESTRIAN/ BICYCLE OVERCROSSING WITHIN THE TIER II CORRIDOR FROM 41ST AVENUE TO SOQUEL AVENUE/DRIVE (TIER II BUILD PROJECT LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS).

The following information is presented to comply with State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15091) and the Department of Transportation and California Transportation Commission Environmental Regulations (Title 21, California Code of Regulations, Division 2, Chapter 11, Section 1501 et seq.). Reference is made to the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the project, which is the basic source for the information.

The following effects have been identified in the EIR as resulting from the project. Effects found not to be significant have not been included.

Tier I Project

Aesthetics/Visual

Adverse Environmental Effects:

Route 1 is listed within the State Scenic Highways system as eligible for listing, but it has not been officially designated by the State, although it has been identified as a Scenic Road in the Santa Cruz
County General Plan. The Tier I Project would create significant visual changes and a significant contribution to cumulative visual changes within the 8.9-mile-long Tier I Corridor as a result of highway widening, construction of retaining and soundwalls, removal of mature trees and other vegetation, and construction of new roadway structures. Viewer groups are expected to be sensitive to these changes.

Findings:

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

Statement of Facts:

As the Tier I Project is implemented by programming future Tier II projects, each future Tier II project will be subject to separate environmental review. Site-specific aesthetic treatments will be developed as part of future Tier II projects through a formalized structure that allows for community input and will incorporate the measures described in the Corridor Aesthetic Guidelines included in Appendix N of the final EIR, including:

- Measures for Corridor Continuity and Community Identity – including an iterative process in which the landscape design incorporates visual elements that reference the other Tier II projects, other existing visual elements along the corridor and/or designs or images organized around a theme or set of compatible thematic approaches that have been developed in conjunction with the community.
- Measures to Preserve Existing Vegetation – including landscape plans that will save and protect as much existing vegetation in the corridor as determined by a qualified landscape architect to be feasible, especially eucalyptus and other skyline trees;
- Measures for Noise Barriers – including aesthetic treatments to the soundwalls such as vine plantings and/or bands of color or vertical “columns” of color or concrete pilasters.
- Measures for Retaining Walls – including aesthetic treatments to the retaining walls that incorporate textures that can form designs or images that may be selected by the community (“community-based textures”).
- Measures for Bridge Aesthetics – including the incorporation of community-based textures.
- Measures for Fencing and Barriers – including aesthetic treatment on concrete median barrier consistent with the visual character of the corridor and the adjacent community.
- Measures for Landscape Plantings – including landscape plans that will landscape and revegetate disturbed areas to the greatest extent feasible as determined by a qualified landscape architect; and an extended 3-year maintenance period to provide a single source of maintenance through the establishment period.
- Measures for Stormwater Treatment Facilities – including the use of drainage and water quality elements that maximize the allowable landscape as determined by a qualified landscape architect or civil engineer.

Other Impacts Resulting from the Tier I Project

As the Tier I Project is implemented by programming future Tier II projects, each future Tier II project will be subject to separate environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Impacts will be evaluated for each future Tier II project through the CEQA process. The avoidance, minimization, and/or minimization measures that have been identified for the Tier I Project in the Final EIR will be incorporated in future environmental documents for future Tier II projects and may be subject to updating and revision depending upon current regulations and environmental conditions identified during future environmental
review. In the event that significant impacts result from a future Tier II project that cannot be mitigated, an environmental impact report will be prepared along with findings specific to the applicable future Tier II project.

**Tier II Project**

**Biological Resources/ Threatened and Endangered Species**

**Adverse Environmental Effects:**

The Tier II Project would result in impacts to wetlands and other waters subject to the jurisdiction of the regulatory agencies, as identified below:

- Army Corps of Engineers:
  - 0.02 acre of permanent impact and 0.06 acre of temporary impact to other waters

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife:
  - 0.15 acre of permanent impact and 0.15 acre of temporary impact

Construction or dewatering activities in aquatic habitats within the biological study area could result in direct impacts to tidewater goby and California red-legged frog, which could result in injury or death to individuals. Temporary and permanent loss of habitat for each species would also occur.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

**Statement of Facts:**

General measures will be implemented to provide onsite biological monitoring of mitigation measures; pre-construction flagging/fencing of limits of disturbance; preparation and implementation of an Erosion Control Plan and a Hazardous Materials Response Plan; implementation of Caltrans standard Best Management Practices; limiting work within stream channels to the dry season (April 15 – October 15); preparation and implementation of a Diversion and Dewatering Plan for in-stream work; limiting vehicle and equipment cleaning/refueling to a designated area 20 meters (~66 feet) away from aquatic habitats; immediate clean-up of hazardous materials and maintenance of spill clean-up materials onsite; proper removal and disposal of invasive exotic plant species; containment, removal, and proper disposal of trash; and restriction of pets from the construction site.

Measures addressing riparian habitat will be implemented, including replacement planting onsite using a 3:1 ratio for each individual riparian tree removed that is greater than 6 inches in diameter at breast height; replacement planting shall achieve a 75% success ratio at the end of a 5-year period within the watershed that is being impacted. Compensatory mitigation plantings shall be monitored and maintained as required by regulatory permits.

In-kind, onsite replacement planting of wetlands and other waters will be provided onsite within or as close as possible to the affected watershed immediately following project completion, with a 1:1 restoration ratio for temporary impacts and a 3:1 enhancement ratio for permanent impacts. A minimum 75 percent success rate shall be attained at the end of a 5-year period, and monitoring and

---

1 California Department of Fish and Wildlife jurisdiction includes U.S. Army Corps of Engineers areas.
maintenance will be conducted as required by regulatory permits. If mitigation is not successful, an adaptive management strategy will be prepared and implemented as approved by the applicable regulatory agencies.

Impacts to tidewater goby will be addressed by measures included in the Biological Opinion #08EVEN00-2018-F-0421, as stated below:

1. Timing construction in Rodeo Gulch will occur during the driest portion of the year.
2. Before any construction activities begin, a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("Service")-approved biologist will conduct a training session for all construction personnel. A description of tidewater goby, its ecology, and the specific measures to avoid or minimize impacts to tidewater goby will be included in the worker environmental training program.
3. Prior to in-water work and stream diversion/dewatering in Rodeo Gulch, a Service-approved biologist will conduct a pre-construction survey for tidewater goby and use seining, dip-nets, or other approved methods to capture and relocate tidewater gobies from the areas to be dewatered to suitable habitat outside of the area of proposed disturbance.
4. If dewatering/stream diversion is necessary, a Diversion and Dewatering Plan will be prepared and implemented to allow for passage of aquatic species through the site during construction. The form and function of all pumps used during the dewatering activities will be checked twice daily, at a minimum, by the Service-approved biological monitor to ensure a dry work environment and minimize adverse effects to aquatic species and habitats.
5. If pumps are incorporated to assist in temporarily dewatering the site during project activities, intakes will be completely screened with no larger than 0.2-inch wire mesh to prevent tidewater gobies and other sensitive aquatic species from entering the pump system. Pumps will release the additional water to a settling basin to allow suspended sediment to settle out prior to re-entering the gulch outside of the isolated area.
6. During dewatering/diversion activities, the Service-approved biological monitor or Service-approved biologist(s) will supervise site dewatering and relocation of any tidewater goby and other stranded species.
7. If it is determined by the Service-approved biological monitor or the Service-approved biologist that impacts to tidewater goby have the potential to exceed the levels authorized by the Service, they will notify the resident engineer (the engineer that is directly overseeing and in command of construction activities) immediately. The resident engineer will either resolve the situation immediately by eliminating the cause of the identified effect to the species or halt all actions that are causing these effects until coordination with the Service and CDFW is completed. No work will resume until the issue is resolved.
8. Following construction, temporary impacts to streamside vegetation or streambed substrate will be restored to their pre-construction conditions, at a minimum.

To prevent a net loss of habitat for any potential impacts to aquatic, freshwater marsh or riparian habitat, including tidewater goby and California red-legged frog habitat, the following compensatory measure is identified:

1. Compensation for affected aquatic, freshwater marsh or riparian habitats will be at a 1:1 restoration ratio for temporary impacts and a 3:1 enhancement ratio for permanent impacts. Compensation for project impacts will include in-kind, onsite restoration of vegetation and will be implemented immediately following project completion. Plantings will be monitored and maintained as required by regulatory permits. Maintenance activities may include weeding, debris removal, replanting (if necessary to meet success criteria), repair of any vandalism, fertilizing, and/or pest control. Monitoring reports will be submitted to the Caltrans, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, the Service, and CDFW.
Impacts to California red-legged frog will be addressed by compensatory mitigation of freshwater marsh/wetlands and riparian forest, and by additional measures included in the Biological Opinion #08EVEN00-2018-F-0421, as stated below:

1. Only U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (“Service”) approved biologist(s) will participate in activities associated with the capture, handling, and monitoring of California red-legged frogs.

2. Ground disturbance will not begin until written approval is received from the Service that the biologist is qualified to conduct the work.

3. A Service-approved biologist will survey the project site no more than 48 hours before the onset of work activities. If any life stage of the California red-legged frog is found and these individuals are likely to be killed or injured by work activities, the approved biologist will be allowed sufficient time to move them from the site before work begins. The Service-approved biologist will relocate the California red-legged frogs the shortest distance possible to a location that contains suitable habitat and that will not be affected by activities associated with the proposed project. The relocation site should be in the same drainage to the extent practicable. FHWA will coordinate with the Service on the relocation site prior to the capture of any California red-legged frogs.

4. Before any activities begin on a project, a Service-approved biologist will conduct a training session for all construction personnel. At a minimum, the training will include a description of the California red-legged frog and its habitat, the specific measures that are being implemented to conserve the California red-legged frog for the current project, and the boundaries within which the project may be accomplished. Brochures, books, and briefings may be used in the training session, provided that a qualified person is on hand to answer any questions.

5. A Service-approved biologist will be present at the work site until all California red-legged frogs have been relocated out of harm’s way, workers have been instructed, and disturbance of habitat has been completed. After this time, the State or local sponsoring agency will designate a person to monitor on-site compliance with all minimization measures. The Service-approved biologist will ensure that this monitor receives the training outlined in measure 4 above and in the identification of California red-legged frogs. If the monitor or the Service approved biologist recommends that work be stopped because California red-legged frogs would be affected in a manner not anticipated by FHWA and the Service during review of the proposed action, they will notify the resident engineer (the engineer that is directly overseeing and in command of construction activities) immediately. The resident engineer will either resolve the situation by eliminating the adverse effect immediately or require that all actions causing these effects be halted. If work is stopped, the Service will be notified as soon as possible.

6. During project activities, all trash that may attract predators will be properly contained, removed from the work site, and disposed of regularly. Following construction, all trash and construction debris will be removed from work areas.

7. All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles will occur at least 60 feet from riparian habitat or water bodies and in a location from where a spill would not drain directly toward aquatic habitat (e.g., on a slope that drains away from the water). The monitor will ensure contamination of habitat does not occur during such operations. Prior to the onset of work, FHWA will ensure that a plan is in place for prompt and effective response to any accidental spills: All workers will be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should a spill occur.
8. Habitat contours will be returned to their original configuration at the end of project activities. This measure will be implemented in all areas disturbed by activities associated with the project, unless the Service and FHWA determine that it is not feasible, or modification of original contours would benefit the California red-legged frog.

9. The number of access routes, size of staging areas, and the total area of the activity will be limited to the minimum necessary to achieve the project goals. Environmentally Sensitive Areas will be delineated to confine access routes and construction areas to the minimum area necessary to complete construction and minimize the impact to California red-legged frog habitat; this goal includes locating access routes and construction areas outside of wetlands and riparian areas to the maximum extent practicable.

10. FHWA will attempt to schedule work activities for times of the year when impacts to the California red-legged frog would be minimal. For example, work that would affect large pools that may support breeding would be avoided, to the maximum degree practicable, during the breeding season (November through May). Isolated pools that are important to maintain California red-legged frogs through the driest portions of the year will be avoided, to the maximum degree practicable, during the late summer and early fall. Habitat assessments, surveys, and coordination between FHWA and the Service during project planning will be used to assist in scheduling work activities to avoid sensitive habitats during key times of the year.

11. To control sedimentation during and after project implementation, FHWA will implement best management practices outlined in any authorizations or permits issued under the authorities of the Clean Water Act that it receives for the specific project. If best management practices are ineffective, FHWA will attempt to remedy the situation immediately, in coordination with the Service.

12. If a work site is to be temporarily dewatered by pumping, intakes will be completely screened with wire mesh not larger than 0.2 inch to prevent California red-legged frogs from entering the pump system. Water will be released or pumped downstream at an appropriate rate to maintain downstream flows during construction. Upon completion of construction activities, any diversions or barriers to flow will be removed in a manner that would allow flow to resume with the least disturbance to the substrate. Alteration of the streambed will be minimized to the maximum extent possible; any imported material will be removed from the streambed upon completion of the project.

13. Unless approved by the Service, water will not be impounded in a manner that could attract California red-legged frogs.

14. A Service-approved biologist will permanently remove any individuals of non-native species, such as bullfrogs (Rana catesbeiana), signal and red swamp crayfish (Pacifastacus leniusculus; Procambarus clarkii), and centrarchid fishes from the project area, to the maximum extent possible. The Service-approved biologist will be responsible for ensuring his or her activities are in compliance with the California Fish and Game Code.

15. If FHWA demonstrates that disturbed areas have been restored to conditions that allow them to function as habitat for the California red-legged frog, these areas will not be included in the amount of total habitat permanently disturbed.

16. To ensure that diseases are not conveyed between work sites by the Service-approved biologist, the fieldwork code of practice developed by the Declining Amphibian Populations Task Force will be followed at all times.
17. Project sites will be revegetated with an assemblage of native riparian, wetlands, and upland vegetation suitable for the area. Locally collected plant materials will be used to the extent practicable. Invasive, exotic plants will be controlled to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will be implemented in all areas disturbed by activities associated with the project, unless the Service and FHWA determine that it is not feasible or practical.

18. FHWA will not use herbicides as the primary method to control invasive, exotic plants. However, if FHWA determines that the use of herbicides is the only feasible method for controlling invasive plants at a specific project site, it will implement the following additional protective measures for the California red-legged frog:

a. FHWA will not use herbicides during the breeding season for the California red-legged frog.

b. FHWA will conduct surveys for the California red-legged frog immediately prior to the start of any herbicide use. If found, California red-legged frogs will be relocated to suitable habitat far enough from the project area that no direct contract with herbicides would occur.

c. Giant reed and other invasive plants will be cut and hauled out by hand and the stems painted with glyphosate or glyphosate-based products, such as Aquamaster® or Rodeo®.

d. Licensed and experienced FHWA staff or a licensed and experienced contractor will use a hand-held sprayer for foliar application of Aquamaster® or Rodeo where large monoculture stands occur at an individual project site.

e. All precautions will be taken to ensure that no herbicide is applied to native vegetation.

f. Herbicides will not be applied on or near open water surfaces (no closer than 60 feet from open water).

g. Foliar applications of herbicide will not occur when wind speeds are in excess of 3 miles per hour.

h. No herbicides will be applied within 24 hours of forecasted rain.

i. Application of all herbicides will be done by qualified FHWA staff or contractors to ensure that overspray is minimized, that all application is made in accordance with label recommendations, and with implementation of all required and reasonable safety measures. A safe dye will be added to the mixture to visually denote treated sites. Application of herbicides will be consistent with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Office of Pesticide Programs, Endangered Species Protection Program county bulletins.

j. All herbicides, fuels, lubricants, and equipment will be stored, poured, or refilled at least 60 feet from riparian habitat or water bodies in a location where a spill would not drain directly toward aquatic habitat. FHWA will ensure that contamination of habitat does not occur during such operations. Prior to the onset of work, FHWA will ensure that a plan is in place for a prompt and effective response to accidental spills. All workers will be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should a spill occur.

Paleontology

Adverse Environmental Effects:
The presence of fossils in the Pliocene Purisima Formation, Plio Pleistocene Aromas Sand, and Pleistocene terrace deposits suggests a high potential for fossil remains to be uncovered by excavations during construction of the Tier II Project.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

**Statement of Facts:**

A Paleontological Mitigation Plan will be prepared prior to and implemented during construction. The plan will require preconstruction actions to prevent damage to paleontological resources, such as conducting a field survey to delimit the specific boundaries of sensitive areas; construction monitoring by a qualified project paleontologist; temporary halting or redirecting of excavation equipment away from the fossils to be salvaged; appropriate methods for recovery, preservation, identification, and stabilization of specimens. Specimens will be identified by competent qualified specialists and analyzed by stratigraphic occurrence and by size, taxa, or taphonomic conditions. Specimens will be cataloged and stored in a fashion that allows future retrieval. A report will be prepared by the project paleontologist including a summary of the field and laboratory methods, site geology and stratigraphy, faunal list, and a brief statement of the significance and relationship of the site to similar fossil localities. Full copies of the Final Report will be deposited with the Lead Agency and the repository institution.

**Hazardous Waste/Materials**

**Adverse Environmental Effects:**

There is potential for asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint coatings in structures that would be demolished to accommodate the proposed Chanticlear Avenue pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing, and lead-based paint may be present in highway paint striping. Aerially deposited lead may be present in soil areas along the shoulders and median of Route 1, and wooden utility poles within the project footprint that may require removal or relocation may be coated with creosote. In addition, the project footprint has the potential for presence of petroleum products in soil and groundwater. Two Recognized Environmental Conditions sites are adjacent to the project area and would not be acquired for the project, located at

- Redtree Properties, located at 819 Bay Avenue in Capitola;
- BP 11240 facility, located at 2178 41st Avenue in Capitola.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

**Statement of Facts:**

During the final design phase, coordination with regulatory agencies and property owners will be conducted to determine the presence of hazardous substances, soil and groundwater contaminants,
and the status of any applicable site assessments and monitoring activities. Remediation monitoring will be conducted at the Recognized Environmental Conditions sites noted above, under Adverse Environmental Impacts. An asbestos-containing materials investigation will be conducted, and groundwater sampling for petroleum products and heavy metals will be performed along the Recognized Environmental Condition sites’ borders with the project area. Final design specifications will require the proper management, removal and disposal of wooden utility poles containing creosote. Soil sampling will be conducted for aerially deposited lead along the shoulders and median of Route 1; soil and groundwater sampling for petroleum products will be conducted within the project area. Surveys for lead-based paint will be conducted, and lead-based paint will be abated. A work plan for investigation of aerially deposited lead will be prepared for characterizing the extent of aerially deposited lead, if present, and investigative sampling work will be performed.

During construction, the contractor will prepare and implement a Worker Health and Safety Plan; treatment and disposal of water from dewatering will be as directed by regulatory agencies; groundwater pumped from the subsurface shall be contained onsite in a safe manner prior to treatment and disposal; paint used in the existing roadway will be tested for lead prior to removal; materials exceeding hazardous waste criteria will be disposed of in a Class I disposal site; if hazardous wastes are encountered all appropriate measures shall be taken to protect human health and the environment.

Aesthetics/Visual

Adverse Environmental Effects:

Route 1 is listed within the State Scenic Highways system as eligible for listing, but it has not been officially designated by the state, although it has been identified as a Scenic Road in the Santa Cruz County General Plan. The proposed Tier II Auxiliary Lane Alternative would create visual changes as a result of highway widening, removal of mature trees and other vegetation, and construction of the Chanticler pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing. The Tier II Project would contribute to a cumulative impact to visual changes. For the Tier II Project, these visual changes would be limited to the Capitola-Soquel Landscape Unit.

Findings:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

Statement of Facts:

To address the adverse visual changes associated with the proposed Tier II Auxiliary Lane Alternative, site-specific aesthetic treatments will be implemented consistent with the Corridor Aesthetic Guidelines in Appendix N of the final EIR, incorporating the following measures:

- Measures for Corridor Continuity and Community Identity – including an iterative process in which the landscape design incorporates visual elements that reference the other Tier II projects, other existing visual elements along the corridor and/or designs or images that are organized around a theme or set of compatible thematic approaches that have been developed in conjunction with the community.
- Measures to Preserve Existing Vegetation – including landscape plans that will save and protect as much existing vegetation in the corridor as determined by a qualified landscape architect to be feasible, especially eucalyptus and other skyline trees;
• Measures for Noise Barriers – including aesthetic treatments to the soundwalls such as vine plantings and/or bands of color or vertical "columns" of color or concrete pilasters.
• Measures for Retaining Walls – including aesthetic treatments to the retaining walls that incorporate textures that can form designs or images that may be selected by the community ("community-based textures").
• Measures for Bridge Aesthetics – including the incorporation of community-based textures.
• Measures for Fencing and Barriers – including aesthetic treatment on concrete median barrier consistent with the visual character of the corridor and the adjacent community.
• Measures for Landscape Plantings – including landscape plans that will landscape and revegetate disturbed areas to the greatest extent feasible as determined by a qualified landscape architect; and an extended 3-year maintenance period to provide a single source of maintenance through the establishment period.
• Measures for Stormwater Treatment Facilities – including the use of drainage and water quality elements that maximize the allowable landscape as determined by a qualified landscape architect or civil engineer.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Reference No: 4.18
   Action Item

Subject: WIRELESS PROGRAM RENEWAL – APPROVE RENEWAL OF THE CALTRANS’ WIRELESS PROGRAM WITH MINOR AMENDMENT TO THE MASTER LICENSE AGREEMENT AND UPDATE THE PRICING MATRIX.
   RESOLUTION G-19-04, AMENDING G-18-25

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the renewal of the Wireless Program with the minor amendment to the Master License Agreement (MLA) and the Annual Base License Fee Matrix (Matrix) to remove the definition and rates for wireless small cells?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends the Commission amend the MLA and Matrix by removing the definition and rates for wireless small cells.

SUMMARY:

In May of 2018, the Commission approved amending the 2014 MLA. The Department’s MLA entered its fifth renewal cycle. Up to the 2014 MLA, the only changes had been administrative in nature. Upon a multi-divisional review, the Department recommended several articles within the 2014 MLA be updated. The clauses for the hazardous materials description and requirements, stormwater requirements, insurance / indemnification requirements, clarifications for term/rate agreements, wording for assignments / transfers, and descriptions for co-location were all updated to reflect current Federal Regulations, State Statutes and Departmental policy. On September 26, 2018, the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) adopted a declaratory ruling, third report and order that requires wireless small cell development in public right of way be at cost incurred only. This essentially prevents the Department from charging a vacant land rent for the placement of wireless small cell facilities in the State’s right of way. Without the ability to charge a land rent, it is not in the State’s best interest to maintain and manage a lease. With Commission approval, the references to small cells will be removed from the approved May 2018 MLA, and all reviews and approvals for future small cell site development and construction will be solely through the Department’s Division of Traffic Operations; Encroachment Permits.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system
to enhance California’s economy and livability”
BACKGROUND:

From the Department’s MLA inception in 1997, the Department has worked closely with the telecommunications industry, making every effort to keep up with changing technologies. In the 1990’s radio frequency use was in its infancy and mainly involved voice and text transmissions. Today, the wireless industry has evolved by going from analog to digital and re-packaging data thus increasing the amount and speed of data transmitted. Voice and text transmissions are now only a small portion of total data transmitted. Movies and music are currently streamed, news is provided in real time and, in the not-so distant future, autonomous vehicles (AV) will be controlled through the same network. For AV’s, small cell technology systems will be crucial to the implementation. “Small cell” is the term used for low wattage, single antenna, single frequency systems. The current standard towers have service areas several miles in diameter whereas the small cells’ service radius areas measures in the hundreds of yards. The advantage is the ability to have better coverage and reduced transmission time from sender to receiver (latency). Wireless carriers have provided estimates of 10,000 to 20,000 new small cell sites per urbanized county.

CURRENT STATUS:

The Department has met its goal of assisting the telecommunications industry in meeting the communication needs of the public. The Department currently has 197 active wireless leased sites with a yearly revenue of over $5.5 million returned to the State Transportation Debt Service Fund.

Each Site License Agreement (SLA) issued has a 10-year initial term with three consecutive (5-year) option periods. A fair market lease rate re-evaluation occurs after the initial 10 years of the SLA term, and every 5 years thereafter.

The pricing of individual cell sites is updated based on a survey of telecommunications leases and licenses statewide. It is presented in a matrix format that categorizes location (rural, urban, and prime urban), size of the facility, and number of antenna. The updated Matrix (removing the small cell category) is attached as an addendum for reference (Attachment A).

The Department, as well as representatives at the industry, have reviewed the amended MLA and are satisfied that it adequately addresses all issues. Based on the FCC ruling, we propose removing the small cell category from the existing program, the MLA and Fee Matrix.

Attachments:
Attachment A - Amended Annual Base License Fee Matrix
Attachment B - Amended 2018 Master License Agreement
Attachment C - Site License Agreement
Attachment D - Resolution G-19-04
## ANNUAL BASE LICENSE FEE MATRIX

Adjustment is 3.5 percent per year.
(Rounded to the nearest whole dollar and divisible by 12)
(For use with Master License Agreements in effect after July 1, 2014)

### Statewide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-Jul-14</th>
<th>1-Jul-15</th>
<th>1-Jul-16</th>
<th>1-Jul-17</th>
<th>1-Jul-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MACROCELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Urban (Cat 1)*</td>
<td>$43,704</td>
<td>$45,228</td>
<td>$46,812</td>
<td>$48,456</td>
<td>$50,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Cat 2)</td>
<td>$33,708</td>
<td>$34,884</td>
<td>$36,108</td>
<td>$37,368</td>
<td>$38,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (Cat 3)</td>
<td>$21,528</td>
<td>$22,264</td>
<td>$23,064</td>
<td>$23,868</td>
<td>$24,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINICELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Urban (Cat 1)*</td>
<td>$37,452</td>
<td>$38,760</td>
<td>$40,116</td>
<td>$41,520</td>
<td>$42,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Cat 2)</td>
<td>$31,212</td>
<td>$32,304</td>
<td>$33,432</td>
<td>$34,608</td>
<td>$35,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (Cat 3)</td>
<td>$21,528</td>
<td>$22,264</td>
<td>$23,064</td>
<td>$23,868</td>
<td>$24,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MICROCELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Urban (Cat 1)*</td>
<td>$31,212</td>
<td>$32,304</td>
<td>$33,432</td>
<td>$34,608</td>
<td>$35,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Cat 2)</td>
<td>$24,960</td>
<td>$25,836</td>
<td>$26,736</td>
<td>$27,672</td>
<td>$28,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (Cat 3)</td>
<td>$18,384</td>
<td>$19,032</td>
<td>$19,704</td>
<td>$20,388</td>
<td>$21,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ultra Urban Prime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-Jul-14</th>
<th>1-Jul-15</th>
<th>1-Jul-16</th>
<th>1-Jul-17</th>
<th>1-Jul-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MACROCELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultra-Prime Urban (Cat 1)*</td>
<td>$52,776</td>
<td>$54,624</td>
<td>$56,532</td>
<td>$58,512</td>
<td>$60,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINICELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultra-Prime Urban (Cat 1)*</td>
<td>$45,276</td>
<td>$46,860</td>
<td>$48,504</td>
<td>$50,196</td>
<td>$51,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MICROCELL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultra-Prime Urban (Cat 1)*</td>
<td>$37,716</td>
<td>$39,036</td>
<td>$40,404</td>
<td>$41,820</td>
<td>$43,284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-Jul-14</th>
<th>1-Jul-15</th>
<th>1-Jul-16</th>
<th>1-Jul-17</th>
<th>1-Jul-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAS($/antenna)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Urban (Cat 1)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,356</td>
<td>$10,716</td>
<td>$11,088</td>
<td>$11,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Cat 2)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,032</td>
<td>$1,068</td>
<td>$1,104</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (Cat 3)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$516</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>$564</td>
<td>$588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Designated urbanized areas (Population of 50,000 or more) within Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego counties pursuant to the U.S. Bureau of the Census:
[https://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/maps/2010ua.html](https://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/maps/2010ua.html)
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DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
2018 WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS MASTER LICENSE AGREEMENT

Licensee: ________________________________

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS MASTER LICENSE AGREEMENT

This Master License Agreement is made and entered into by and between the State of California, acting by and through its Department of Transportation, hereinafter called Licensor, and the previous named Master Licensee, hereinafter called Licensee.

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS Licensee seeks to construct, install, operate and maintain and manage wireless communications and data transmission facilities, including tower structures, equipment shelters, cabinets, meter boards, utilities, antennas, equipment, any related improvements and structures and uses incidental thereto, in the State of California; and

WHEREAS Licensor has properties well suited for the facilities needed for wireless communications systems and data transmission because they are extensive and located throughout the State, and because often they are adjacent to populated areas but not located in the heart of residential areas; and

WHEREAS Licensor desires to improve services available to the traveling public, to enhance communications systems within the State, and to add to its revenues by making state properties available for wireless communications infrastructure consistent with other public uses of its property; and

WHEREAS Licensee proposes that the use of State properties can be an important option for the placement of wireless communications and data transmission facilities if the cost is competitive and the process of establishing sites is expedited; and

WHEREAS Licensor has determined to make certain of its properties available to wireless communications and data transmission companies, on a fair and equitable basis, for use as wireless communications and data transmission facility sites; and

WHEREAS Licensor may seek to provide the traveling public with wireless communication and data access to traffic information lines and if Licensor does so, Licensee shall cooperate in developing a program to provide the traveling public with wireless communications and data transmission facility access to information lines, and to create an emergency access line subject to Licensee's operational capacity;
WHEREAS Licensor and Licensee agree that any previous Master License Agreement shall not be utilized for future sites and that only this agreement be utilized for future wireless communications and data transmission sites as provided for herein; and

WHEREAS Licensor and Licensee agree that the Site License Agreements governed by any previous Master License Agreement shall be governed only by those previous Master License Agreements under for which they were signed.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and benefits stated herein, and in further consideration of the obligations, terms and considerations hereinafter set forth and recited; Licensor and Licensee agree as follows:

ARTICLE 1. Master License Agreement

This Master License Agreement (hereinafter, "Agreement") sets forth the basic terms and conditions upon which each Site (defined in Article 2) is licensed by Licensor to Licensee. Upon agreement between the parties with respect to the particular terms of a Site, the parties shall execute a completed "Site License" in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by this reference (the Site License form may be modified in the future without amending this Agreement). The Site License may have special clauses specific to that individual Site. In the event of a discrepancy or inconsistency between the terms and conditions of a particular Site License and this Agreement, the terms and conditions of this Agreement shall govern and control.

ARTICLE 2. Site License

Section 2.1: Site License

Licensor owns highway and freeway right of way, including appurtenant airspace rights, fixtures and signs, buildings, yards, park and ride lots, excess land, and other real property acquired for, or to support, the State's transportation system. Licensor intends to license use of certain portions of such locations, together with access and utility permits (if applicable), to Licensee (each referred to as a "Site"), as will be further described in the particular Site License, all located within certain property owned and controlled by Licensor ("Licensor's Property"). Subject to the terms and conditions contained in this Agreement, and in the Site License relating to a particular Site, Licensor hereby licenses the Site to Licensee, and Licensee licenses the Site from Licensor, upon the terms, covenants and conditions set forth in the particular Site License. The Site License Agreement includes access to and from the Site, and to and from the closest public right-of-way and on and over the land of which the Site is a part (subject to terms and conditions of each Site License, with special limitations for access from access-controlled highways and freeways) and access to appropriate utilities as set forth in Article 7. Each Site License Agreement shall act as a separate and independent agreement for each Site, the express intent of the parties being to use this Agreement to facilitate each of the independent transactions. It is understood and agreed that Licensee's right and license to place unmanned wireless communications and data facilities on the Site is non-exclusive, but that the Site shall be exclusive for Licensee's equipment for a specific area or space at the Site, subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, including but not
limited to collocation requirements contained herein. Further, Licensee's license and rights granted under this Agreement and the particular Site License are irrevocable until the expiration or sooner termination of this Agreement and/or the Site License, by their respective terms. The "Commencement Date" for each Site License shall be either the date that Licensee receives all permits and approvals necessary to construct and operate its facility at the Site (at which time Licensor shall issue an Encroachment Permit allowing construction/installation at the Site), or six (6) months from the date the Site License Agreement is executed ("Execution Date"), whichever occurs first. The period between the Execution Date and the Commencement Date shall be referred to herein as the "Local Permitting Period".

Section 2.2: Cancellation before Commencement

Licensee may cancel a Site License at any time prior to the Commencement Date. Site Licensor is not obligated to refund any review fees if Licensee cancels its application. Under special circumstances where the delay in obtaining permits and/or commencing construction is beyond the reasonable control of Licensee, Licensor may grant extensions to the Local Permitting Period, upon payment of the Annual License Fee (defined in Article 5).

ARTICLE 3. Use

Section 3.1: Specified Use

A Site may be used by Licensee only for the construction, installation, operation, replacement, removal, maintenance and repair (collectively "Operations") of an unmanned wireless communications facility, and/or management of the same, including required antennas and antenna support structures (as the same may be modified, added to and/or substituted from time to time), in accordance with the terms herein. Each such antenna and/or antenna support structure shall be configured as required by Licensee from time to time provided that Licensee obtains all permits and approvals required by applicable jurisdictions relative to any such desired configuration. Licensee shall have the right to park its vehicles on the Site when Licensee is servicing its wireless communications facility, subject to any conditions in the Site License. All operations by Licensee on the Site shall be conducted in a lawful manner and in compliance with all applicable Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") requirements. Licensee shall, at its sole expense, comply with (and obtain and maintain such licenses, permits or other governmental approvals necessary to comply with) all laws, orders, ordinances, and regulations of federal, state, county, and municipal authorities applicable to its Operations or use of the Site. Licensee shall comply with the directive of any public officer or officers applicable to its Operations or its use of the Site (collectively "Laws"), which shall, with respect to Licensee's Operations, impose any violation, order or duty upon Licensor or Licensee arising solely from Licensee's use of the Site subject, however, to Licensee's right to contest, in good faith, any such violation, order or duty. Licensee's Operations shall not interfere with the operations of Licensor, the traveling public, or any other users existing on the Commencement Date on the Site. Licensor agrees to reasonably cooperate with Licensee, at Licensee's expense, in executing such documents or applications necessary or appropriate in order for Licensee to obtain and maintain, at Licensee's expense, such licenses, permits and other governmental approvals needed for Licensee's Operations. Licensor authorizes Licensee to make and prosecute applications for all such approvals. If Licensee is unable to obtain
and maintain such licenses, permits or approvals (notwithstanding reasonable efforts to do so), Licensee shall so notify Licensor and the particular Site License shall immediately terminate.

Section 3.2: Conditions of Use

Licensee agrees to install, maintain, and operate its wireless communications equipment, and/or manage the same, in accordance with the specific Site standards more particularly described in each Site License and any other applicable statutes pertaining to the use of wireless communications and/or electronic equipment. In the event Licensee’s installation, or operation, in any way hinders, obstructs, or interferes with, the radio or electronic equipment of Licensor, or any tenant operating at the Site as of the Execution Date of the applicable Site License, Licensee shall, at its sole cost and expense, upon receipt of written notification, immediately cease the interfering operation, except for brief tests necessary for the elimination of the interference. Licensee shall conduct its Operations in compliance with all laws, orders, ordinances, and regulations of all federal, state, county, and municipal authorities. Licensor may execute any Site License upon the condition that Licensee’s equipment shall be installed in such a manner to facilitate Licensor’s wireless communication needs as set forth in Article 21.

If such hindrance, interference or obstruction cited above, is not eliminated or does not fully cease within thirty (30) days after written notice to Licensee by Licensor or any appropriate regulatory agency, Licensor shall have the right (at any time) to order cessation of Licensee’s Operations at the Site as may be necessary to continuously eliminate said interference by giving ten (10) days prior written notice to Licensee. In the event of Licensee’s inability or refusal to eliminate such interference within sixty (60) days after receipt of written notice from Licensor, Licensor may, at its sole option, terminate the affected Site License and evict Licensee. The sixty (60) day deadline may, at Licensor’s sole discretion, be extended if both parties are diligently cooperating and working to eliminate the interference. Once Licensee has more than ten (10) Site Licenses in effect, if such un-eliminated interferences occur at over twenty percent (20%) of Licensee’s Sites occupied under this Agreement for more than sixty (60) days following Licensee’s receipt of written notice from Licensor, Licensor may terminate this Agreement and evict Licensee from all its Sites on thirty (30) days written notice.

Any interference and compatibility testing required hereunder for radio interference with other equipment located at the Site as of the Commencement Date, or Licensor’s equipment installed at any time shall at the sole and reasonable cost of Licensee, be made by a qualified technical person representing Licensee and a representative designated by Licensor. If the test is satisfactory to both the technical person and the Licensor representative, a certification of such test signed by both the technical person and the Licensor representative shall be forwarded to Licensor at locations indicated in Article 16. Any reasonable costs incurred by Licensor to conduct compatibility testing shall be reimbursed to Licensor within thirty (30) days after receipt of billing and reasonable supporting documentation.

Any interference with Licensor’s electronic equipment during an emergency incident shall require immediate cessation of operation, transmission or further use of Licensee’s equipment provided Licensee is given notice of such incident and is afforded the opportunity to cure such interference.
Failure to do so promptly after notification of such interference shall be grounds for immediate termination of the particular Site License and eviction of Licensee.

Licensee is responsible for the acts and omissions of itself, and its employees, subcontractors, agents and invitees.

Section 3.3  Condition of Site

Licensee hereby accepts the Site in the condition existing as of the date of the execution hereof, subject to all applicable zoning, municipal, county, state, and federal laws, ordinances and regulations governing and regulating the use of the Site, and terms, covenants and conditions of this Agreement. Licensee acknowledges that neither Licensor, nor any agent of Licensor, has made any representation or warranty with respect to the condition of the Site or the suitability thereof for the conduct of Licensee. Further Licensor has not agreed to undertake any modification, alteration or improvement to the Site except as provided in this Agreement.

As a condition of possession and use of the Site, the Licensee shall obtain and maintain a valid Encroachment Permit from the Traffic Operations Division of the Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this Agreement, the taking of possession of the Site by Licensee shall in itself constitute acknowledgement that the Site is in good condition and repair and in useable condition, and Licensee agrees to accept the Site in its presently existing “as is” “where is” condition, and that the Licensor shall not be obligated to make any improvements, modifications or repairs thereto except to the extent that may otherwise be expressly provided in this Agreement.

Licensee represents and warrants that it has made a sufficient investigation of the conditions of the Site existing immediately prior to the execution of this Agreement, including but not limited to investigation of the surface, subsurface, and groundwater for contamination and hazardous materials) and is satisfied that the Site will safely support the project type to be constructed by Licensee upon the Site, that the Site is otherwise fully fit (physically and lawfully) for the uses required and permitted by this Agreement and that Licensee accepts all risks, losses and expenses associated the foregoing provisions.

Licensee acknowledges that (1) Licensor has informed Licensee prior to the commencement of the term of this Agreement that the Licensor does not know of any release of any hazardous material that has come to be located on or beneath the Site; (2) prior to the commencement of the term of this Agreement, the Licensor has made available to Licensee, for review and inspection, records in the possession or control of the Licensor which might reflect the potential existence of hazardous materials on or beneath the Site; (3) Licensor has provided Licensee access to the Site for a reasonable time and upon reasonable terms and conditions for purposes of providing to Licensee the opportunity to investigate, sample, and analyze the soil and groundwater on the Site for the presence of hazardous materials; (4) by signing this Agreement, Licensee represents and warrants to Licensor that Licensee does not know nor has reasonable cause to believe that any release of hazardous material has come to be located on or beneath the Site; and (5) with respect to any
hazardous material which Licensee knows or has reasonable cause to believe has come or will come to be located on or beneath the Site, Licensee and agrees promptly to commence and complete the removal of or other appropriate remedial action regarding the hazardous material introduced to the Site during Licensee’s period of use at no cost or expense to Licensor and in full compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, permits, approvals, and authorizations. The phrase "hazardous material," as used herein, has the same meaning as that phrase has in Section 5.6 of this Agreement.

In the event Licensee breaches any of the provisions of this Section 3.3, this Agreement may be terminated by Licensor subject to any applicable cure periods.

Licensee agrees that, except as otherwise expressly provided in this Agreement, Licensee is solely responsible, without any cost or expense to the Licensor, to take all actions necessary to continuously use the Site as provided by this Agreement and in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

Section 3.4 Compliance with Law

Licensee shall not use the Site or permit anything to be done in or about the Site which will in any way conflict with any law, statute, zoning restriction, ordinance, or governmental rule or regulation or requirements of duly constituted public authorities now in force or which may hereafter be in force, or with the requirements of the State Fire Marshal or other similar body now or hereafter constituted, relating to or affecting the condition, use or occupancy of the Site. Licensee shall not allow the Site to be used for any unlawful purpose, nor shall Licensee cause, maintain or permit any nuisance in, on or about the Site. Licensee shall not commit or suffer to be committed any waste in or upon the Site.

Section 3.5 Explosives and Flammable Materials

The Site shall not be used for the storage of flammable materials, explosives, or other materials or other purposes deemed by Licensor to be a potential fire or other hazard to the transportation facility, except those permitted in Section 3.6 below. The operation and maintenance of the Site shall be subject to regulation by Licensor so as to protect against fire or other hazard impairing the use, safety and/or appearance of the transportation facility. The occupancy and use of the Site by Licensee shall not be such as will permit hazardous or unreasonably objectionable smoke, fumes, vapors or odors to rise above the surface of the traveled way of the transportation facility.

Section 3.6 Hazardous Materials

Code section 25249.5, et seq.), other applicable provisions of the California Health and Safety Code (section 25100, et seq., and section 39000, et seq.), California Water Code (section 13000, et seq.), and other comparable state laws, regulations, and local ordinances relating to industrial hygiene, environmental protection or the use, analysis, generation, manufacture, storage, disposal, or transportation of any oil, flammable explosives, asbestos, urea formaldehyde, radioactive materials, or waste, or other hazardous, toxic, contaminated or polluting materials, substances or wastes, including, without limitation, any "hazardous substances" under any such laws, ordinances or regulations (collectively "Hazardous Materials Laws"). As used in the provisions of this Agreement, "hazardous materials" include any "hazardous substance" as that term is defined in section 25316 of the California Health and Safety Code and any other material or substance listed or regulated by any Hazardous Materials Law or posing a hazard to health or the environment. Except as otherwise expressly permitted in this Agreement, Licensee shall not use, create, store or allow any hazardous materials on the Site, except fuel stored in a motor vehicle for the exclusive use in such vehicle. Back-up generators and the storage of fuel for such generators shall only be allowed if provided in a particular Site License under the conditions of that Site License or in a specific encroachment permit.

In no case shall Licensee cause or allow the deposit or disposal of any hazardous materials of any kind on the Site, in any manner prohibited by law. Licensor, or its agents or contractors, shall upon seventy-two hours' prior notice to Licensee and accompanied by an escort designated by Licensee, have the right to go upon and inspect the Site and the operations thereon to assure compliance with the requirements herein stated. In the event of emergency, where Licensor cannot reasonably comply with the foregoing notice requirement, Licensor shall have the right to access the Site and Licensor shall, within forty-eight (48) hours following actual notice of emergency access, inform Licensee of (i) the date and time of emergency access and (ii) the nature of the event requiring emergency access. This inspection may include taking samples of substances and materials present for testing, and/or the testing of surface soils and sub-surface soils. In the event Licensee breaches any of the provisions of this Section, this Agreement may be terminated by Licensor, subject to any applicable cure periods.

Licensee shall be responsible for and bear the entire cost of removal and disposal of any and all hazardous materials introduced to the Site during Licensee's period of use of the Site, regardless of whether such hazardous material is introduced by Licensee or by any other person acting under Licensee. Licensee shall also be responsible for any clean-up and decontamination on or off the Site necessitated by the introduction of such hazardous materials within the Site or any surface below the Site. Licensee shall not be responsible for or bear the cost of removal or disposal of hazardous materials introduced to the Site by any party other than Licensee during any period prior to commencement of Licensee's period of use of the Site.

Licensee shall further defend, indemnify, and hold harmless Licensor, and Licensor's directors, officers, and employees, from any and all responsibilities, liabilities, penalties, and claims for damages resulting from the presence or use of hazardous materials within the Site arising from Licensee's use of the Site, as required under Article 9.
Section 3.7  Encroachment Permit and License

Prior to each Site’s Commencement Date (after the DARC approval and before the Licensee enters the Site and starts construction), Licensee shall apply for and be issued an Encroachment Permit from Licensor’s District Permits Office in the Division of Traffic Operations specifically permitting Licensee to enter the Site upon satisfaction of the herein-required conditions. If the Site is on conventional highway, Licensee shall maintain a valid encroachment permit for the entire term of each separate Site License Agreement. If the Site is on access controlled freeway or highway the Licensee shall apply for a separate encroachment permit for each entry onto the State’s right of way in order to maintain the wireless facility.

Any act by Licensee that causes the suspension, termination or revocation of the issued Encroachment Permit for any reason shall be a material breach of this Agreement as provided in Article 4 of this Agreement. The Agreement shall be terminated immediately upon revocation of Encroachment Permit by Licensor, subject to any applicable cure periods.

If the Encroachment Permit and this Agreement conflict, the requirements of the Encroachment Permit shall prevail.

Section 3.8  Signs

No advertising signs or banners of any size may be erected on the Site, except as required by law. Licensee shall not place, construct or maintain upon the Site, and shall not allow others to place, construct, or maintain upon the Site, any advertising media that include moving or rotating parts, searchlights, flashing lights, loudspeakers, phonographs or other similar visual or audio media. The term "sign" means any card, cloth, paper, metal, painted, or wooden sign of any character placed for any purpose on or to the ground or any tree, wall, bush, rock, fence, building, structure, trailer, or thing. Licensor may remove any sign, banner or flag existing on the Site, and Licensee shall be liable to and shall reimburse Licensor for the cost of such removal plus interest.

Section 3.9  Licensor’s Rules and Regulations

Licensee shall faithfully observe and comply with the rules and regulations that Licensor shall from time to time promulgate for the protection of the transportation facility and the safety of the traveling public. Licensor reserves the right to make modifications to said rules and regulations at any time without prior notice to Licensee and without Licensee’s consent. The additions and modifications to those rules and regulations shall be binding upon Licensee upon advance notification of such rules and regulations to Licensee (see Article 15).

Section 3.10  Water Pollution Control / Stormwater

Licensee shall comply with all applicable State and Federal water pollution control requirements regarding storm water and non-storm water discharges from the Licensee’s area and shall be responsible for all applicable permits including but not limited to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Industrial Activities (Excluding Construction), the NPDES
General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, and the Caltrans Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System NPDES Permit, and permits and ordinances issued to and promulgated by municipalities, counties, drainage districts, and other local agencies regarding discharges of storm water and non-storm water to sewer systems, storm drain systems, or any watercourses under the jurisdiction of the above agencies. Copies of the current storm water related NPDES permits are available on the State Water Resources Control Board’s website at www.swrcb.ca.gov under Stormwater.

Licensee understands the discharge of non-storm water into the storm sewer system is prohibited unless specifically authorized by one of the permits or ordinances listed above. In order to prevent the discharge of non-storm water into the storm sewer system, vehicle or equipment washing, fueling, maintenance and repair on the Site is prohibited.

In order to prevent the discharge of pollutants to storm water resulting from contact with hazardous material, the storage or stockpile of hazardous material on Site is strictly prohibited. Licensee shall implement and maintain the Best Management Practices (BMPs) shown in the attached Stormwater Pollution Prevention Fact Sheet(s) for: General Land Use. Licensee shall identify any other potential sources of storm water and non-storm water pollution resulting from Licensee’s activities on the Site, which are not addressed by the BMPs, contained in the attached Fact Sheet(s), and shall implement additional BMPs to prevent pollution from those sources. Additional BMPs may be obtained from 2 other manuals, (1) Right of Way Property Management and Airspace Storm Water Guidance Manual (RW Storm Water Manual) available for review at the Licensor’s District Right of Way office or online at www.dot.ca.gov/hq/row/rwstormwater and (2) Construction Site Best Management Practices (BMPs) Manual, which is available online at www.dot.ca.gov/hq/construc/stormwater/manuals.htm. In the event of conflict between the attached Fact Sheet(s), the manuals and this Agreement, this Agreement shall control.

Licensee shall provide Licensor with the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code applicable to Licensee’s facilities and activities on the licensed Site. A list of SIC codes regulated under the General Industrial Permit SIC codes may be found at the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) website at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/gen_indus.shtml. Other SIC codes may be found at www.osha.gov/pls/imis/sicsearch.html.

Licensor, or its agents or contractors, shall at all times have the right to enter and inspect the Site and the operations thereon to assure compliance with the applicable permits, and ordinances listed above. Inspection may include taking samples of substances and materials present for testing Site.

ARTICLE 4. Term and Termination:

Section 4.1: Term

Upon approval by the California Transportation Commission (CTC), this Agreement shall govern and be incorporated into each Site License entered into on or after the Effective Date of this Agreement until June 30, 2029 or until such other time that the CTC approves a subsequent
Agreement which is signed and executed by both the Licensor and Licensee. In the event the CTC approves a subsequent agreement and the parties enter into said agreement, each Site License governed by this Agreement shall continue to be governed by this Agreement and this Agreement shall remain in effect until the expiration or earlier termination of each Site License it governs. Each new Site License entered into on or after the effective date of the new agreement shall be governed by the new agreement.

The initial term of each Site License governed by this Agreement shall be 10 (ten) years from the June 30 following the Commencement Date of the Site License Agreement (Initial Term). Licensee shall have the option to renew each Site License for three (3) consecutive five (5) year terms on the same terms and conditions as the Initial 10 year Term, except that the License Fee (defined in Article 5) shall be adjusted to the then-current Pricing Matrix (defined in Article 5). The Site License shall automatically be terminated at the expiration of a Renewal Term unless Licensee notifies Licensor of its intention to renew at least sixty (60) days prior to the expiration of the then current five-year term.

Licensee agrees to begin the process of gaining the approvals necessary to the initiation of Site construction immediately after the Site License Execution Date. If, however, Licensee does not, in good faith, actively pursue a building permit within the "Local Permitting Period" (including extension pursuant to Article 2), Licensor may terminate the individual Site License subject to any applicable cure periods.

Section 4.2: Termination

Licensee: If, at any time during the initial term or option period of an individual Site License, it becomes commercially inadvisable in Licensee’s business judgment for Licensee to utilize that particular Site, or if any required certificate, permit, license or approval is denied, canceled or otherwise terminated so that Licensee is unable to use the Site for its intended purpose, Licensee may terminate the individual Site License after it provides the herein specified prior written notice (see Article 15). If Licensee elects to terminate a Site License pursuant to this Section, Licensee shall provide Licensor with a minimum of one hundred eighty (180) days written notice of its intention to terminate the individual Site License and shall, in the case of business judgment termination only, compensate Licensor an amount equivalent to the then annual License Fee as of the effective date of the Notice as liquidated damages for the early termination. In the event that less than one (1) year remains in the Initial Term or option period of the individual Site License terminated by Licensee, Licensee shall pay to Licensor such liquidated damages in the amount equal to only the License Fee due or to become due during the remainder of the then current initial term or option period of the individual Site License.

Licensor: If Licensor's use of a Site makes it necessary for Licensee to remove or relocate its equipment and facilities to another location on Licensor’s property, or if there is interference to or involving Licensee's Operations which cannot be resolved as set forth in Article 6, Licensee may elect to terminate the Site License for that Site, without penalty.

Licensor may terminate an individual Site License if its own need for or use of a Site requires relocation of Licensee's facilities because of state transportation purposes, economic necessity or
the best interests of the traveling public. To the extent practicable, Licensor shall provide Licensee with as much notice as possible but no less than three hundred and sixty five (365) days prior written notice of the termination of an individual Site License due to Licensor's required need for or use of the Site. In the case of a transportation construction project where the Licensor's own need for or use of a Site due to state transportation purposes, economic necessity or the best interests of the traveling public requires it to terminate an individual Site within the first five (5) years of the Site License, Licensor shall pay to Licensee an amount equal to the construction costs and expenses actually incurred by Licensee in installing facilities on the Site, which amount shall be equal to the cost of the tower and ancillary improvements retained by Licensor, based on their initial installation cost, amortized over a ten (10) year period (straight-line amortization, e. g., 1/120th per month); provided however that the amount shall not exceed Sixty Thousand and 00/100 Dollars ($60,000.00) for a Macrocell site, Forty Thousand and 00/100 ($40,000.00) for a Minicell site or Thirty Thousand and 00/100 Dollars ($30,000.00) for a Microcell site or Twenty-Five Thousand and 00/100 Dollars ($25,000.00) for a DAS site (as those terms are defined in Article 5). These payments shall be paid to the Licensee from the Caltrans project that initiates the termination. Licensor shall use its best efforts to find another suitable location for Licensee's facilities in the event that Licensor's need for or use of a Site requires Site License termination. Licensee's obligation to pay a fee for the use of an individual Site shall cease, and a prorated (as described in Section 5.3) portion of any advanced payment made by Licensee shall be returned to Licensee by Licensor upon the date that Licensee removes its equipment and restores the Site, as set forth in this Section.

After five (5) years of the Site License Commencement Date, upon termination or other expiration of an individual Site License, Licensor shall have the option of keeping the tower(s) or monopole(s) and ancillary improvements, such as buildings, vaults, equipment sheds and pads, in place that are owned by Licensee (except for Licensee's equipment and antennas) by providing written notice to Licensee at least ninety (90) days prior to the expiration or earlier termination of a Site License. In the event Licensor does not notify Licensee of its election to obtain ownership of said Licensee property, or if Licensor provides written notice of not intending to retain said improvements, Licensee shall within sixty (60) days after the expiration of the Site license, remove the tower(s), hardware, building(s) and ancillary improvements (above and below ground) made by Licensee, and to return the Site to the condition existing on the Commencement Date, normal wear and tear and damage not caused by Licensee excepted, to the satisfaction of Licensor, at Licensee's sole cost and expense. If Licensor exercises its option to keep the tower and ancillary improvements in place on an individual Site, Licensor shall accept the tower and ancillary improvements in their then existing condition, "AS-IS," without any representation or warranty, and Licensee shall have no further obligation with respect to the Site or such equipment and or property. The parties shall work in good faith to execute a mutually acceptable agreement transferring ownership of Licensee's equipment and property to Licensor in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement. To the extent reasonably practicable, Licensor shall advise Licensee in writing prior to entering into a Site License of Licensor's desire to retain Licensee's Tower or ancillary improvements pursuant to this Section. The cost of the tower and ancillary improvements and Licensor's reimbursement obligation for the cost thereof may be modified in the individual Site Licenses.
If Licensor advises Licensee to remove its facilities, and Licensee refuses to do so, Licensor may, at its discretion, remove the facilities and charge the cost and expense of removal to Licensee or deduct the costs and expenses from monies due Licensee under this Agreement, individual Site Licenses or any other agreements. Licensor, in its sole discretion, may allow some or all of Licensee's equipment to remain on Licensor's property. If no such monies are owed, Licensor may invoke any remedies provided herein or at law or equity to recover all monies owed. Except as otherwise provided herein, the fee for use of a Site terminated before the end of the term for that Site License shall not terminate until the later of the effective date of the early termination or the date on which Licensee has removed its equipment and restored the Site in accordance with Section 12 or the date on which Licensor notifies Licensee of its election to exercise its option to accept transfer of Licensee's facilities.

ARTICLE 5. License Fee

Section 5.1: Annual Base License Fee

Licensee shall pay Licensor an annual fee ("Annual Base License Fee") for the use of each Site that is the subject of an individual Site License, which fee shall be calculated in accordance with this Section. The Annual License Fee of the individual Site License for each Site shall be calculated on the basis of the following two factors: (1) its geographic location and (2) the equipment and building space utilized.

Geographic Areas: Statewide geographic areas consist of three (3) types and are as follows:
- Category 1: "Prime Urban" - means the "Urbanized" (as defined below) portions of the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Marin, Orange, Santa Clara, San Diego, San Francisco and San Mateo.

- Category 2: "Urbanized" - means all areas defined as "Urbanized" as described in 23 U.S.C. 101 (i.e. "... an area with population of 50,000 or more designated by the Bureau of the Census, within boundaries to be fixed by responsible State and local officials in cooperation with each other, subject to the approval by the Secretary"). Areas that meet the definition of both "Prime Urban" and "Urbanized" shall be considered to be a "Prime Urban" area. For reference purposes, currently designated Urbanized areas are shown on the Bureau of the Census webpage (as may be amended from time to time by a future census): https://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/maps/2010ua.html
- Category 3: “Rural” – means any and all areas within the State of California not Prime Urban or Urbanized, as defined above.

Equipment types: The equipment and building space utilized shall be determined by the following definitions of Macrocell, Minicell, Microcell and DAS, which shall be used to determine the second factor necessary to the calculation of the Annual Base License Fee. (Note: Only transmitting/receiving antennas are included in the count)

- Macrocell: Facility of nine (9) or more antennas and/or with equipment building or concrete pad space and space required for the foundation of the monopole or tower when
combined exceeds five hundred (500) square feet, not to exceed sixteen (16) antennas or a total area of two thousand five hundred (2,500) square feet. A standard communications facility with a vault or enclosed building is an example of a Macrocell site.

- Minicell: A facility with four (4) to eight (8) antennas and/or with equipment building or concrete pad space and space required for the foundation of the monopole or tower, when combined is in excess of three hundred (300) square feet but less than five hundred (500) square feet. A standard communications facility with free-standing cabinets on a pad is an example of a Minicell site.

- Microcell: Facility with one (1) to three (3) antennas and/or with equipment building or concrete equipment pad space and space required for the foundation of the monopole or tower, when combined is between thirty seven (37) square feet to three hundred (300) square feet.

- DAS: Distributed Antenna System (DAS): A wireless facility (network nodes) of low wattage, with a single antennae operating in geographic confines such as a building, a tunnel or a bridge. DAS are attached to a single stand-alone pole or a building structure and operate in limited distances. DAS are often multi-frequency and more than one carrier can collocate. The fee matrix for DAS is based on an annual per antenna fee.

Section 5.2: Annual Base License Fee Matrix Calculation

Based on the geographic location and equipment and building space factors detailed above, the Annual Base License Fee Matrix shall be determined by using the Annual Base License Fee Matrix attached as Exhibit C. Exhibit C is also known as the “Fee Matrix”. The Fee Matrix shall be determined by the Licensor, and it shall reflect the fair market value of the License Fee under this Agreement and the fair market license value for each Site Agreement.

The license fee for any facility which includes equipment or building space dimensions different from those set forth in the definitions in this Section, shall be negotiated by the parties in good faith. The amount of space licensed shall include the total area fenced by Licensee or used by a specific pole. The building space dimensions shall not include (a) space required by Licensor or any third party for collocation or co-use of the Site and (b) provided such party is separately paying a fee to Licensor for this space. If Licensor requires, or if there are other circumstances caused by geographic, security or other concerns, which requires that Licensee utilize space on the Site in excess of its customary needs or the size limitations specified in this Agreement, the individual Site License may provide for an alteration of the Site designation as a Macrocell, Minicell Microcell, DAS.

Section 5.3: License Fee Payment Schedule:

The first annual payment for each Site shall be paid to Licensor within ten (10) days after the issuance of the Encroachment Permit to Construct. The prorated annual payment for the period shall be calculated from the Commencement Date (or six (6) months after Site License Agreement
is signed, whichever occurs first) through the next occurring June 30 and shall be calculated by dividing a full annual fee payment as indicated in the Annual Base Fee Matrix by 12, calculated to the nearest dollar and multiplying that number by the number of remaining full months in the year with the days of the month rounded to the closest first day of the month. If the Commencement Date (tenancy date) is the 15th of a 30 or 31 day month, the prorated annual rate is rounded to the 1st of the current month. Alternately, if the Commencement Date is the 16th or after of a 30 or 31 day month, the prorated annual rate is rounded to the beginning of the next month. If the month is February the 14th and the 15th will be deciding days. Thereafter, Licensee shall make annual fee payments on July 1 of each year under the applicable Site License. Payments with the Department’s Site’s tenancy number shall be mailed to: Department of Transportation, Attention: Cashier, P.O. Box 168019, Sacramento, CA 95816-8019.

Section 5.4: Annual Base License Fee Adjustments

Beginning on the first July 1 after the Site License Agreement Commencement Date and on each July 1 thereafter during the initial term of each Site License and any exercised options, the Annual License Fee shall automatically increase by three and one half percent (3.5%). Licensee shall automatically pay the Annual License Fee, payable under the applicable Site License in accordance with the Pricing Matrix attached hereto as Exhibit C.

In the event Licensee fails to pay the annual License Fee within ten (10) days of when due, the past-due License Fees shall bear interest from (but excluding) the date due until paid at the lesser of eighteen percent (18%) per annum (1.5% per month), or the maximum rate permitted under California or federal law, if the aforesaid rate exceeds such maximum.

At the end of the initial term and each option period exercise, the Annual License Fee shall be readjusted to the Annual License Fee for the geographic area and/or equipment type then applicable to the Site approved by the CTC at the time of renewal (Section 5). At such times, the Site shall be reevaluated for geographic area and/or equipment type by Caltrans. If there is a change as to the geographic area and/or equipment types as of the first day of the new period, the Annual Base License Fee shall increase by the greater of (A) the new Annual Base License Fee based upon the new geographic area or equipment type or (B) three and one-half percent (3.5%).

On July 1 of each year thereafter, the Annual License Fee shall automatically increase by three and one-half percent (3.5%) during the next five (5) year option period.

Adjustments in the rate will occur whenever equipment area or the number of antennas changes and will be based on the Annual Base License Fee Matrix in place at the time of the change. The date of increase/decrease shall be based on Encroachment Permit Approval Date and shall be prorated (see Section 5.3).

ARTICLE 6. Improvements and Construction

Prior to commencing any installation, construction, alteration or improvement at any Site, Licensee shall obtain Licensor’s prior written approval of Licensee’s plans for the installation or alteration work which plans shall be attached to the Site License upon execution. Licensor shall use
commercially reasonable efforts to provide a response (approval, denial, request for modification or additional information), including Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and environmental clearances, shall be made within forty-five (45) days of submittal of such plans ("Licensor Plan Response Period"); and, if a response is not forwarded within forty-five (45) days, Licensee shall be entitled to an extension of the Local Permitting Period. Licensee's plans shall include information on the length, width, weight, and cable routing, of and between equipment cabinets and/or shelters, antennas and equipment technical specifications, so as to permit Licensor to reasonably verify their placement on the Site, potential interference and proper structural loading and Licensee shall provide Licensor with any other information as Licensor may reasonably request with respect to such plans. Notwithstanding the foregoing or anything to the contrary set forth in this Agreement or any Site License, Licensee may replace, exchange, substitute or modify its equipment or antennas installed at any Site with equipment or antennas substantially similar to the equipment and antennas previously approved by Licensor (per 47 C.F.R. 1.40001) provided such replacement (I) operates at the same or substantially similar frequencies, power levels, emissions, gain, bandwidth and beamwidth, (II), have a tower and tower attachments that are substantially similar in physical dimensions (not larger than 10%) (III) not heavier in weight, (IV) does not enlarge the physical size of the Site area, subject to Licensor's having at least thirty (30) days' notice to ensure there will be no interference with Licensor's operations.

If construction is proposed, Licensee shall, prior to any construction or reconstruction, apply for an encroachment permit and submit seven (7) complete sets of plans, specifications, and structural calculations, stamped by a California NIA registered Engineer, to Licensor, and construction is not to proceed prior to approval of said plans by Licensor, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed. A minimum of one set of plans must be standard size. Licensor shall respond (approval, denial, request for modification, or additional information) within forty-five (45) days of Licensor's receipt of Licensee's plans. If Licensor does not provide such approval or request for changes within the Licensor Plan Response Period, then Licensor and Licensee shall meet and confer to determine a mutually acceptable additional extension to the Local Permitting Period. Licensor shall not be entitled to receive any additional consideration in exchange for giving its approval of Licensee's plans. If the appropriate local entity declines to inspect Licensee's construction, Licensee shall provide written confirmation by a qualified individual, such as a current or former building inspector or registered engineer, that the construction conforms to plans and all appropriate building standards, prior to issuance of a Department of Transportation Notice of Completion by Licensor.

All of Licensee's installation and alteration work shall be performed in accordance with applicable building codes and shall not adversely affect the structural integrity or maintenance of Licensor's property or improvements. Any structural work or reinforcement on an improvement shall be approved by a licensed structural engineer at Licensee's sole cost and expense. During construction, Licensee shall perform work in such a manner as will not hamper Licensor's operations or the needs of the traveling public.

Licensee shall keep the Site free from any liens arising from any work performed, materials furnished, or obligations incurred by or at the request of Licensee. If any lien is filed against the Site as a result of the acts or omissions of Licensee, or Licensee's employees, agents, or contractors,
Licensee shall discharge, bond or otherwise secure same to Licensors' reasonable satisfaction within thirty (30) days after Licensee has notice that the lien has been filed. If Licensee fails to commence steps to discharge, bond or secure any lien within such thirty (30) day period, then, in addition to any other right or remedy of Licensors, Licensors may, at its election, upon five (5) days prior written notice to Licensee, discharge the lien by either paying the amount claimed to be due or obtaining the discharge by deposit with a court or a title company or by bonding. Licensee shall pay on demand any amount so paid by Licensors for the discharge or satisfaction of any lien, and all reasonable attorney's fees and other legal expenses of Licensors incurred in defending any such action or in obtaining the discharge of such lien, together with all necessary reasonable disbursements in connection therewith.

Except as otherwise expressly set forth in this Agreement, Licensee agrees that each Site and every part and appurtenance thereof is offered in its "AS IS" and "WHERE IS" condition. Based upon information supplied by Licensors on each Site Licensee, Licensee will evaluate the possibility based on Licensors' contemplated operations of interference from, or to, existing wireless communication or other uses on the Site. Licensee will then determine if interference will occur assuming the other user's equipment and Licensee's equipment is properly and lawfully installed and operated. If Licensee determines that any such existing user would interfere with Licensee's operations but that such interference can be reasonably eliminated, Licensee shall so notify Licensors and both parties shall diligently cooperate and work together and shall use reasonable efforts to remedy the condition deemed to be the Licensee's responsibility for such potential interference; provided, however, Licensors' failure to remedy such condition shall in no event result in any liability of Licensors hereunder or under any Site License. Any physical change to Licensors' existing equipment requested by Licensee shall be at Licensee's sole cost. At such time as Licensee determines that interference shall occur, such determination by Licensee shall be binding on Licensee, and subject to Licensees' rights under Article 4, no subsequent determination with respect thereto shall excuse Licensee from liability hereunder or with respect to any Site License; provided, however, that if Licensee's Operations are adversely affected in any material way as a result of the improper or unlawful operation of any equipment located on the Site at the time of Licensee's evaluation or as a result of modifications to equipment and/or additional equipment being installed and operated on the Site by either Licensors or any other user of the Site under the control of Licensors, Licensors shall use its best efforts (with the cooperation of Licensee) to promptly resolve such interference. In no event shall Licensors' inability to resolve such interference entitle Licensee to terminate any Site License unless after thirty (30) days following the commencement of such efforts at resolution, such interference has not been resolved to the reasonable satisfaction of Licensee. Nothing in this Agreement shall be deemed to waive any rights Licensee may have pursuant to applicable FCC regulations to enjoin such interference or pursue any other remedies available to Licensee at law or in equity after expiration of the thirty (30) day period referred to in the preceding sentence.

Notwithstanding anything in this Section to the contrary, Licensee acknowledges that Licensors may not have control over equipment located on or adjoining the Site which would interfere with Licensee's use of the Site and shall not be liable for such lack of control. In the event of such interference, Licensors and Licensee shall use all reasonable efforts within their control to obtain the cooperation of the equipment owner to resolve such interference; provided, however, that if the parties shall not succeed in obtaining the cooperation of the equipment owner to resolve such
interference within thirty (30) days following such interference, Licensee may immediately terminate any Site License so affected (and/or this Agreement if no Site Licenses remain subject hereto), and neither party shall have any further liability with respect to such Site License. Any prepaid Annual License Fee shall be credited or returned to Licensee on a pro-rated basis.

All portions of the communications facilities or other property or improvements attached to or otherwise brought onto the Site by Licensee shall, at all times and for all purposes, be the personal property of Licensee and at Licensee's option, may be removed by Licensee at any time during the term, subject to the provisions of Article 4, and shall be removed no later than within sixty (60) days after expiration of the term or termination of the applicable Site License.

Upon execution of a Site License Agreement, Licensor shall not thereafter grant to any third party any license, or other permission to use (in this Section collectively, a "Grant") the Licensor's property, Site or area surrounding the Site under Licensor's reasonable control, if the use permitted under such Grant would cause interference with Licensee's Operations. Any such Grant shall expressly prohibit the user thereunder from interfering with Licensee's Operations. Licensee shall reasonably cooperate with Licensor and/or any subsequent third party user to eliminate any interference and to allow collocation, if possible.

ARTICLE 7. Utilities and Access

Licensee shall have the right at its sole cost and expense to obtain and connect to telephone and electrical service from any utility company that provides or is willing to provide such service to the Site, subject to Licensor's right to approve proposed utility routes and the manner of installation, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed. Licensee shall timely pay all of Licensee's utility costs. Licensee shall either obtain electric power directly from the local utility or under special circumstances from Licensor's power source and shall pay for installation of a sub meter and any reasonable additional costs of service to the Licensor due to the added utility requirements. Licensee shall pay all local utility company charges directly to the provider. Licensor is under no obligation to provide power or allow Licensee to use its power source, but shall cooperate with Licensee in its efforts to bring electrical power to the Site.

The following provisions shall govern access to the Site by Licensee, unless otherwise modified on a particular Site License. Access for construction, routine maintenance and repair, conducting feasibility studies and other non-emergency visits shall be stated in each Site License and require a minimum of one (1) business days prior written notice to Licensor at Licensor's address stated in the Site License (no Site License shall have more than one address of record in each Region or District of Licensor). Some Site Licenses may allow non-written notice for non-emergency visits and/or routine maintenance and repair visits. In the event of an unscheduled repair or other emergency, Licensee shall be entitled to access to the Site twenty-four (24) hours per day, seven (7) days a week subject to any special conditions in the Site License. If Sites are allowed that could affect traffic flow, named maintenance and contractors may be restricted to non-peak flow hours. Licensee shall endeavor to provide written (but in any event shall attempt to provide oral) notice of an emergency repair prior to accessing the Site. Any such access by Licensee shall be subject to any other or superseding access requirements as may be specified in a Site License.
ARTICLE 8. Improvement Fees/Taxes

Licensee shall pay all real estate taxes, possessory interest taxes and other taxes and fees caused by Licensee’s use and/or equipment placed on the Site or other improvements constructed by Licensee on the Site.

ARTICLE 9. Indemnity and Insurance

Section 9.1 Indemnification

Neither Licensor nor any of Licensor’s officers or employees shall be responsible for any injury, damage, or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by Licensee under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction conferred upon Licensee or arising under this Agreement excluding those arising by reason of the negligence of Licensor, its officers, employees, and agents.

It is understood and agreed Licensee shall fully defend, indemnify, and save harmless Licensor and all of its officers and employees from all claims, suits, or actions of every kind brought forth under any theory of liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by Licensee under this Agreement. Licensee’s obligations to defend, indemnify, and save harmless Licensor extends to any and all claims, suits, or actions of every kind brought forth under any theory of liability occurring due to the use of the Site and Licensee’s operations under this Agreement, any accompanying agreement with Licensor, and any encroachment permit issued by Licensor.

If the Site License is terminated for any reason, Licensee also agrees to indemnify, defend, and save harmless Licensor from any third party claims for damages arising out of the termination of the License due to Licensee’s failure to comply with the requirements of this Agreement that occur prior to termination of this agreement. Such third party claims include any claims from any contractors retained by Licensee or its successors in interest.

Furthermore, Licensee agrees it controls the Site. As such, Licensee agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless Licensor, its officers, agents, and employees for any and all claims arising out of any allegedly dangerous condition of public property based upon the condition of the Site.

Licensee agrees to defend, indemnify and save harmless Licensor, its officers, employees, and agents from any and all claims, suits or actions of every kind brought forth under any theory of liability with respect to the Site or the activities of Licensee or its officers, employees, and agents at the Site, excluding those arising by reason of the negligence of Licensor, its officers, employees, and agents.

Licensee’s obligations to defend and indemnify Licensor is not excused because of Licensee’s inability to evaluate liability or because Licensee evaluates liability and determines Licensee is not liable. Licensee must respond within thirty (30) days to the tender of any defense and indemnity by Licensor, unless this time has been extended by Licensor.
Section 9.2 Liability Insurance

Nothing in this Agreement is intended to establish a standard of care owed to any member of the public or to extend to the public the status of a third-party beneficiary for any of these insurance specifications.

A. Workers' Compensation and Employer's Liability Insurance
Licensee shall provide workers' compensation and employer's liability insurance as required under the Labor Code. The Licensee shall also provide Licensor certified proof of insurance within thirty (30) days of signing the Site License Agreement and before performing any work (Labor Code § 1861) in connection with this Agreement. Insurance certification shall provide that Licensee is aware of the provisions of Section 3700 of the Labor Code which require every employer to be insured against liability for workers' compensation or to undertake self-insurance in accordance with the provisions of that code, and shall comply with such provisions before commencing the performance of the work of this contract.

Licensee shall provide Employer's Liability Insurance in amounts not less than:
1. $1,000,000 for each accident for bodily injury by accident
2. $1,000,000 policy limit for bodily injury by disease
3. $1,000,000 for each employee for bodily injury by disease

B. Commercial General Liability Insurance
Licensee shall procure Commercial General Liability Insurance, which limits may be met by a combination of primary and excess or umbrella insurance, with $5 million per occurrence and aggregate limits covering all operations by or on behalf of Licensee, providing insurance for bodily injury liability and property damage liability, and including coverage for:
1. Site operations
2. Products and completed operations
3. Broad form property damage (including completed operations)
4. Explosion, collapse, and underground hazards
5. Personal injury
6. Contractual liability meeting the indemnification obligations herein

The Commercial General Liability insurance procured by Licensee shall also comply with the following:

1. Shall extend to all of Licensee’s operations and remain in full force and effect during the term of this Agreement.
2. Must be with an insurance company with a rating from A.M. Best Financial Strength Rating of A- or better and a Financial Size Category of VII or better.
3. Shall be on Commercial General Liability policy form no. CG0001 as published by the Insurance Services Office (ISO) or under a policy form at least as broad as policy form no. CG0001.
4. Shall contain completed operations coverage with a carrier reasonably acceptable to LICENSOR through the expiration of the latent and patent deficiency in construction statutes of repose set forth in Code of Civil Procedure section 337.15.
5. Shall name Licensor, including its officers, directors, agents (excluding agents who are design professionals), and employees, as additional insureds under the required General Liability and/or Umbrella Liability Policies with respect to liability arising out of or connected with work or operations performed in connection with this Agreement. Coverage for such additional insureds does not extend to liability to the extent prohibited by Insurance Code section 11580.04.
6. Shall provide additional insured coverage by a policy provision or by an endorsement providing coverage at least as broad as Additional Insured (Form B) endorsement form CG 2010, as published by the Insurance Services Office (ISO), or other form designated by Licensor.
7. Shall state the insurance afforded the additional insureds applies as primary insurance. Any other insurance or self-insurance maintained by Licensor is excess only and must not be called upon to contribute with this insurance.

Licensee shall carry automobile liability insurance, including coverage for all owned, hired, and non-owned automobiles. The primary limits of liability must be not less than $1,000,000 combined single limit for each accident for bodily injury and property damage. The umbrella or excess liability coverage required under this Article shall also apply to automobile liability.

Licensor allows reasonable deductible clauses not overly broad, exceeding $250,000, or harmful to Licensor. Licensee agrees by executing this Agreement it shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless Licensor until such deductible is paid or applied to any claim arising out of this Agreement, regardless of Licensee’s evaluation of liability, as discussed in Section 9.1.

Licensor may assure Licensee’s compliance with Licensee’s insurance obligations. Seven (7) days before an insurance policy lapses or is canceled during the term of this Agreement, Licensee shall submit evidence of renewal or replacement of the policy. Licensee is not relieved of its duties and responsibilities to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless Licensor, its officers,
agents, and employees by Licensor’s acceptance of insurance certificates. The minimum insurance coverage amounts do not relieve Licensee from liability in excess of such coverage.

C. Self-Insurance

Reasonable self-insurance programs and self-insured retentions in insurance policies are permitted by Licensor. If Licensee uses a self-insurance program or self-insured retention, Licensee must provide Licensor with the same protection from liability and defense of suits as would be afforded by first-dollar insurance. Further, execution of this Agreement is Licensee’s acknowledgment Licensee shall be bound by all laws as if Licensee were an insurer as defined under Insurance Code section 23 and Licensee’s self-insurance program or self-insured retention shall operate as insurance as defined under Insurance Code section 22.

Section 9.3 Failure to Procure and Maintain Insurance

If Licensee fails to procure, or maintain the insurance required by this Article in full force and effect, this Agreement may be terminated immediately by Licensor. In addition, if Licensee fails to procure or maintain the insurance required by this Article, Licensee shall cease and desist from operating any business on the Site and the improvements erected thereon and shall prevent members of the public from gaining access to the Site during any period in which such insurance policies are not in full force and effect.

ARTICLE 10. Transfer or Assignment

This Agreement and the Site Licenses granted hereunder are exclusive and personal to Licensee. Except as hereinafter provided, Licensee shall not, without Licensor’s and the Federal Highway Administration’s (“FHWA”) prior written consent (which consent may be withheld at Licensor’s and FHWA’s sole and absolute discretion) sell, transfer, assign, sublicense, or otherwise convey and assign (in whole or part) their rights, duties, obligations or interests under this Agreement, a Site License, or its interest in any particular Site or Site License or any part thereof. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Licensee may transfer or assign their rights, duties, obligations or interests this Agreement, a Site License or its interest in a particular Site or any part thereof without Licensor’s or FHWA’s consent to any person or business entity which is a one-hundred percent parent company. Any proposed transfer or assignment that is submitted to the Licensor and FHWA for their respective prior written consent shall state that the proposed transferee or assignee shall assume, perform and be responsible for all terms, covenants and conditions of the Licensee under the transferred or assigned interest, and describe the proposed transaction. Any request for a transfer or assignment shall require the payment of Two Thousand Five Hundred and 00/100 Dollars ($2,500) (per Article 17) to Licensor as a processing fee.

ARTICLE 11. Repairs

Licensee shall, at all times during the term of any particular Site License and at Licensee’s sole cost and expense, keep its facilities and equipment located on or about the Licensor’s property Site and every part thereof in good condition and repair, reasonable wear and tear excepted, including making replacements when necessary. If Licensee fails to promptly make any repairs that are
necessary to remedy a dangerous condition on the Site caused by Licensee, its agents, employees or contractors, or other condition caused by Licensee, its agents, employees or contractors which is materially adverse to the quiet enjoyment by Licensor or any other user of the Site, Licensor shall give Licensee written notice of its intention to make such repairs and the date on which such repairs shall commence. Except for emergencies, Licensee shall be given at least fifteen (15) days from the day the letter is sent to commence the repairs. If Licensee does not, prior to the date set forth in such notice, commence to make such repairs, Licensor may make such repairs and shall be reimbursed by Licensee for any and all reasonable costs incurred by Licensor in performing (or contracting to have performed) such repairs, including any overhead costs reasonably allocable to the performance thereof. Licensor shall provide Licensee reasonably detailed supporting documentation of such costs concurrently with any demand for reimbursement.

Licensee shall, at all times, during the term of any particular Site License and at Licensee's sole cost and expense, keep Licensee's equipment at the Site and any access roads constructed by Licensee for its sole use at the Site in good condition and repair, except for any access roads or improvements installed by Licensor or other third parties.

Licensee, at its sole cost and expense, shall restore all Licensor property which is destroyed or damaged by Licensee's activities on a Site subject to an individual Site License. Licensee agrees to commence performance of any remedial work within thirty (30) days of written notice by Licensor, or as soon thereafter as is reasonably practicable, and to complete remedial work required in the reasonable opinion of Licensor to restore the Site to its original condition, reasonable wear and tear excepted, within the number of days specified in the written notice. The number of days specified in the written notice shall be reasonable. If remedial work is not undertaken and completed within the specified time, Licensor may, on ten (10) days prior written notice to Licensee, undertake and complete the remedial work with its own forces and/or independent contractors, and Licensee shall pay all actual costs or charges incurred by Licensor by reason of such work. Licensor shall provide Licensee reasonably detailed supporting documentation for such costs and charges.

**ARTICLE 12. Surrender of Site; Holding Over**

Upon the Agreement expiration, end of option or other termination of a Site License, Licensee shall peacefully vacate the Site in as good order and condition as the same were on the Commencement Date, reasonable wear and tear, and damage not caused by Licensee excepted. If Licensee fails to promptly remove all of its facilities and equipment from the Site within sixty (60) days after expiration or earlier termination of the Site License, Licensor may, after five (5) days prior written notice to Licensee, remove the same (without any liability to Licensee for any damage to such equipment and/or facilities which may result from reasonable efforts at removal), and Licensee shall pay to Licensor on demand any and all reasonable costs incurred by Licensor in removing and storing such improvements and equipment prior to retrieval of same by Licensee. Licensor has no obligation to store such equipment, and Licensee shall have no claim if Licensor destroys the equipment if it is not removed by Licensee as provided herein. Any improvements Licensor desires to remain shall be governed by the provisions of Article 4.
Should Licensee continue to hold the Site after the termination of a Site License, whether the termination occurs by lapse of time or otherwise, such holding over shall, unless otherwise agreed to by Licensor in writing, constitute and be construed as a tenancy at will with an annual rent equal to the current Annual License fee plus an additional Annual License Fee equal to 18.0% (eighteen percent) of the current Annual License Fee., subject to all of the other terms set forth herein including the annual percentage increase.

ARTICLE 13. Default and Remedies

The occurrence of any one or more of the following events shall constitute an "event of default" or "default" under the particular Site License(s) to which it applies:

a) if Licensee fails to pay any Annual License Fee or other sums payable by Licensee under the Site License as and when the Annual License Fee or other sums become due and payable and such failure continues for more than ten (10) days after written notice thereof from Licensor is received pursuant to Article 15;

b) if Licensee upon actual receipt of any formal written order or directives relating to the Site from any governmental entity fails to comply with such order or directive within the time limits set forth in such order or directive and any applicable administrative or judicial appeal rights having been exhausted;

c) if Licensee fails to perform or observe any other term of the applicable Site License(s), and such failure continues for more than thirty (30) days after written notice thereof from Licensor provided that in the event of a default which cannot with due diligence be cured within a period of thirty (30) days, Licensee shall have such extended periods as may be required beyond such thirty (30) day cure period to cure any non-monetary default if the nature of the cure is such that it reasonably requires more than thirty (30) days to cure, and Licensee commences the cure within the thirty (30) day period and thereafter continuously and diligently pursues the cure to completion, or such longer period as mutually agreed by the parties hereto;

d) if any petition is filed by or against Licensee, under any section or chapter of the present or any future federal Bankruptcy Code or under any similar law or statute of the United States or any state thereof (and with respect to any petition filed against Licensee and such petition is not dismissed within ninety (90) days after the filing thereof), or Licensee shall be adjudged bankrupt or insolvent in proceedings filed under any section or chapter of the present or any future federal Bankruptcy Code or under any similar law or statute of the United States or any state thereof;

e) if Licensee becomes insolvent or makes a transfer in fraud of creditors; or

f) if a receiver, custodian, or trustee is appointed by Licensee or for any of the assets of Licensee which appointment is not vacated within ninety (90) days of the date of the appointment;

In any notice of an alleged default by Licensee from Licensor, Licensor shall specify the nature of the default and the Site License(s) potentially affected thereby. After applicable notice and grace periods have expired, at any time thereafter that Licensee remains in default, Licensor may
terminate the Site License(s) directly affected by such default and, if all Site Licenses shall be affected, this Agreement, without notice or demand. Upon the applicable termination, Licensee shall immediately surrender all applicable Sites then licensed to Licensee under the affected Site License to Licensor and, subject to Article 4 remove all of its facilities and equipment therefrom. If Licensee fails to promptly remove all of its facilities and equipment from the Site as required under this Agreement, Licensor may remove the same (without any liability to Licensee for any damage to such equipment and/or facilities which may result from reasonable efforts at removal), and Licensee shall pay to Licensor on demand any and all costs incurred by Licensor in removing and storing such facilities and equipment prior to retrieval of same by Licensee.

If either Licensor or Licensee shall be delayed or prevented from the performance of any act required hereunder by reason of acts of God, governmental restrictions, regulations or controls (except those reasonably foreseeable in connection with the uses contemplated by this License), or other cause without fault and beyond the control of the party obligated (except financial inability), performance of such act shall be excused for the period of the delay and the period for the performance of any such act shall be extended for a period equivalent to the period of such delay. Nothing in this clause shall excuse Licensee from prompt payment of any rent, taxes, insurance or any other charges required of Licensee.

In the event of a termination of a Site License, it shall be lawful for Licensor, after not less than thirty (30) days prior written notice, to reenter into and upon the Site, and every part thereof, and to remove at Licensee’s expense all of Licensee’s property therefrom and to repossess and occupy the Site. In the event Licensor terminates a Site License pursuant to this Section, Licensor shall not be required to pay Licensee any sum or sums whatsoever related to that Site License.

ARTICLE 14. Covenants/Disclaimer

Licensor agrees that:
• With respect to each particular Site, Licensor owns or has control of the land on which the Licensor’s property and Site is located and has the right to enter into the Site License with Licensee with respect thereto and if Licensor is leasing a particular Site, a copy of the underlying agreement, License, Right-of-Way deed or other instrument will be attached to the individual Site License.
• Except as otherwise disclosed to Licensee in writing prior to the execution of any Site License, there are, to Licensor’s actual knowledge (without any independent investigation), no known liens, restrictions, mortgages, covenants, conditions, easements, licenses, agreements of record or not of record, which would adversely affect or prohibit Licensee’s use and enjoyment of the Site under a Site License.
• Licensor has the full authority to enter into and execute this Agreement and any Site License pursuant to this Agreement.
• Licensee shall have access to the Site and the quiet and peaceful use, enjoyment and possession of the Site during the term for its permitted uses.
• Except as specifically set forth in an individual Site License, to the best of its knowledge, no Hazardous Substances are present on, in, or under the Site in violation of applicable law, and, to the best of Licensor’s knowledge all operations on the Site are and have been in substantial compliance with all laws regulating such Hazardous Substances, no litigation has been brought or threatened, nor any settlements reached with any governmental, quasi-governmental entity or
private party concerning the actual or alleged presence, disposal, release or threatened release of such Hazardous Substances in, on, about or under the Site, and Licensor has not received notice of any violation, or any alleged violation of any law related to Hazardous Substances and relating to the Site. "Hazardous Substances" includes substances, chemicals or wastes that are identified as hazardous, toxic or dangerous in any applicable federal or state law.

Nothing herein shall be construed or interpreted to require that Licensor remEDIATE any Hazardous Substance at any Site. If Licensee discovers hazardous substances on the Site during the Local Permitting Period, its sole remedy shall be to cancel the Site License. Any work needed to remove or remediate any Hazardous Substance or other Environmental Hazard that requires the removal or relocation of Licensee's equipment shall be treated as "Licensor's use of a Site" pursuant to Article 4.

Licensor and Licensee each respectively agree that:

- it has full right to make this Agreement;
- the making of this Agreement and the performance thereof will not violate any laws, ordinances, restrictive covenants, or other agreements under which it is bound;
- it is fully organized/formed, validly existing and in good standing and has all rights, power and authority to make this Agreement and bind itself hereto through the party set forth as signatory set forth below; and,
- neither party has liability for any brokerage commission due to any broker in connection with this Agreement or any Site License.

Except as expressly provided herein, Licensor does not agree or covenant:

- whether particular Site is suitable for the purposes contemplated hereunder, including without limitation the adequacy of such Site's location, its condition, or the condition of any structure or appurtenances thereto; or,
- whether Licensee will be required to obtain (or will be able to obtain) any licenses, permits or approvals or any applicable governmental authority necessary for Licensee's Operations at any particular Site.

ARTICLE 15: Notices

Unless otherwise provided herein, any notice or demand required or permitted to be given hereunder shall be given in writing by hand delivery, first class certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, or by recognized overnight mail, in a sealed envelope, postage prepaid, to be effective when received or refused. Notice shall be addressed to the parties at the addresses set forth on the signature pages. Either party hereto may change the place for the giving of notice to it by like written notice to the other as provided herein.

ARTICLE 16: General Provisions

This Agreement and the Site Licenses entered into by the parties constitute the entire agreement and understanding between the parties, and supersede all offers, negotiations and other agreements concerning the subject matter contained herein. Any amendments to this Agreement or any Site License must be in writing and executed by both parties.
If any provision of this Agreement is held invalid or unenforceable by any court of final jurisdiction, the provision shall be reconstrued in a manner that will eliminate only the part of the provision that is invalid or unenforceable; the remainder of the provision shall remain in full force and effect; and all other provisions of this Agreement be construed to remain fully valid, enforceable, and binding on the parties. To the extent any provisions of this Agreement are in conflict with, or inconsistent with regulations or rules promulgated by the California Public Utilities Commission such provisions shall be null and void.

This Agreement and the Site Licenses shall be binding on and inure to the benefit of the successors and permitted assignees of the respective parties.

This Agreement and each Site License shall be governed by the laws of the State of California without regard to any conflict of laws doctrine. Licensor and Licensee agree that any dispute, action or proceeding arising out of this Agreement or any Site License shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Superior Courts of the State of California, shall be subject to venue in the County of Sacramento with respect to disputes arising out of this Agreement, and shall be subject to venue in the county in which the Site is located for disputes arising out of an individual Site License.

Licensee may record an appropriate Notice or Memorandum of any Site License.

In any case where the approval or consent of one party hereto is required, requested or otherwise to be given under this Agreement or any individual Site License, such party shall not unreasonably delay, withhold or condition its approval or consent.

All riders and Exhibits annexed hereto form material parts of this Agreement.

This Agreement may be executed in duplicate counterparts each of which shall be deemed an original.

Licensee shall not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, ancestry, sex, age, national origin, or physical handicap. Licensee shall take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, ancestry, sex, age, national origin or physical handicap. (See California Government Code Sections 12920-12994 for further details.)

Licensee shall not commit, suffer, or permit any waste on the licensed Site or any acts to be done thereon in violation of any laws or ordinances, and shall not use or permit the use of the licensed Site for any illegal or immoral purposes.

**ARTICLE 17: Administrative Fee**

Licensee shall pay a one-time charge of Five Thousand and 00/100 Dollars ($5,000.00) when applying for a Site License to cover the costs associated with the preparation and the engineering and technical analysis of the Site License to assure complete compatibility of operations at the Site. This payment will entitle Licensee to the Local Permitting Period without additional charge. This amount may be periodically adjusted to reflect an actual change in the costs incurred by Licensor with the preparation and the engineering and technical analysis for the Site. This is in
addition to general permits required by any party entering Licensor’s property, especially if entry is sought for an access-controlled roadway, such as annual district survey permit, encroachment permits, or maintenance permits.

Subsequent documents requiring approval including assignments, and sublicenses require an administrative fee of Two thousand Five Hundred and 00/100 Dollars ($2,500.00) to cover cost of review. Minor requests for Site modification requiring no review fee. Modifications requiring District Airspace Review Committee review shall require an administrative fee of Two thousand Five Hundred and 00/100 Dollars ($2,500.00).

ARTICLE 18: Casualty Responsibilities

Neither party will keep improvements which are constructed or installed by the other party under the provisions of this Agreement insured against fire or casualty, and neither party will make a claim of any nature against the other party by reason of any damage to the business or property of the other party in the event of damage or destruction by fire or other cause. Each party is solely responsible for insuring, or self-paying, all expenses caused by the destruction or damage of its facilities regardless of cause or fault.

ARTICLE 19: Relocation Assistance

Licensee acknowledges it is not entitled to any relocation assistance payments at the conclusion of this Agreement or any Site License under State (Government Code Section 7260 et seq.) or federal law (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.), and Licensee further agrees it will not file or pursue any such claim.

ARTICLE 20: Collocation - Licensor

Unless otherwise specified in a Site License, the facility to be constructed by Licensee at that particular Site shall be built to include the following specifications below to allow for Licensor’s possible use, to the extent reasonably feasible and approved by the appropriate permitting agencies, at no cost to Licensor, subject to Licensee’s consent, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed. Licensee shall not be required to modify any portion of Licensee’s Equipment or Site to accommodate Licensor’s installation of additional equipment or modification of existing equipment, as determined within the sole discretion of Licensee.

• If Licensee will be constructing a monopole or other tower at the Site for its use, such tower/monopole shall, upon completion of construction, be available to Licensor to use for one 800 MHZ omni-antenna approximately 90" long, 2.6" in diameter, with a weight not to exceed twenty pounds, to be mounted at a height designated by Licensee, not less than twenty (20) feet high. In lieu of said antenna, Licensor may install another antenna of similar size and capability for Licensor’s possible use.
• If Licensee will be constructing a vault at the Site, Licensee shall make available, upon completion of initial construction, a 2’ x 2’ x 7’ space for Licensor’s equipment; if Licensee will be constructing an equipment pad, Licensee shall make available, upon completion of initial construction, at least 2.5’ x 2.5’ of space for Licensor’s equipment cabinet.
• Conduit or a cable tray for transmission from equipment area to antenna.
• Cable access to phone and electrical lines.

If Licensor chooses to occupy a tower/monopole built by Licensee, it may engage a contractor to install its equipment on Licensee's facilities. Licensee reserves the right to approve Licensor's list of contractors prequalified to perform the equipment installation. Contractors utilized by Licensor must all provide proof of adequate insurance coverage and must name Licensee as an additional insured. Licensee shall inspect the installation and advise Licensor of any deficiencies noted. Alternatively, Licensor may request that Licensee install Licensor's equipment. All expenses that Licensee actually incurs for ancillary equipment purchased or installed for the benefit of Licensor, or for radio tower work performed by Licensee for the benefit of Licensor, shall be at Licensor's expense, provided that such costs are commercially competitive and documented in reasonable detail.

When Licensor occupies a tower/monopole constructed by Licensee, the parties agree to negotiate in good faith issues concerning such occupation by Licensor, including but not limited to issues relating to site access, insurance, maintenance, interference and indemnity. If parties other than Licensee will co-use a Site with Licensee, it shall be Licensor's responsibility to ensure, through the use of its approval rights set forth in Article 22 that any space reserved for Licensor pursuant to this article remains available and technically feasible with respect to structural and technical interference issues.

ARTICLE 21. Collocation

This Agreement is non-exclusive. Licensee shall allow collocation with other carriers (each a collocatee) at the Site if the collocation is reasonably feasible, the project does not interfere with Licensee's current use of the Site, the project is compliant with this Agreement, the project is approved by Licensor and the project is approved by the appropriate permitting entities. These collocation covenants apply to requests by Caltrans to share facilities at a later date. Collocation requests shall follow the same standard of review/approval process as the original Site License.

Each collocatee shall have a separate Site License subject to this Agreement with the term(s) running coterminous (all starting and expiring on the same date) with the primary or original Licensee Site License. There are two types of collocatees pursuant to this Agreement, Sub-Users and Direct-Users. A Sub-User is a collocatee that uses Licensee’s antenna mount and Licensee’s equipment area to mount the Sub-User’s antennas and house the sub-User’s equipment within the existing Site maximum footprint area (contiguous equipment improvement, but may be fenced off from other collocatees). A Direct-User is a collocatee that only uses the Licensee’s antenna mount but requires separate ground space from Licensee’s on Licensor’s property for the Direct Users equipment area. The separate area is not contiguous (has own ingress/egress and equipment pad) to the original Site License footprint area. The annual base license fee for a Sub-User shall be the greater of:

(i) 50% of the Licensee’s annual payment,
(ii) 50% of the payment the collocatee pays the Licensee.

The annual base license fee for a Direct-User shall be the greater of

(i) the full annual base license fee based on the number of antennas,
(ii) the full annual base license fee based square footage of the enclosed equipment area (Article 5.1).

The administration fee payable to the Licensor for collocations on an existing facility is Five thousand and 00/100 Dollars ($5,000.00) and the Licensor’s review/approval cannot be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed. However, if the collocation is submitted as one proposal with Licensee’s the submission, or as multiple collocatees, only one administration fee for the entire review shall be required.

ARTICLE 22: Business Summary Affidavit

Once per calendar year, Licensor, may submit a written request (see Article 15) to Licensee for a business summary affidavit pertaining to Licensee’s collocator fee agreements for the prior twelve (12) month period, and Licensee shall provide such written accounting to Licensor within sixty (60) days after Licensee’s receipt of such written request.

Licensor, at its sole discretion, may elect to not enter, renew or exercise any Site License option if, based on a review of the business summary affidavit, Licensor determines, in its sole opinion, that Licensee is not in compliance with Article 21 of this Agreement. Copies of annual financial statements filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) may fulfill this requirement if Licensee is a publicly traded corporation. If Licensee desires to fulfill this requirement by submitting the Annual Financial Statement of a parent or affiliated corporation, then that parent or affiliated corporation shall guarantee Licensee’s performance of all obligations required by this Agreement and the applicable Site License.
LICENSEE DBA: __________________________________________________________

By: ____________________________________________ (Signature) (Title)

__________________________________________________________
(Print Name) (Date)

Address: __________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Phone Number: ______________________________________________________

LICENSOR: State of California, Department of Transportation

By: ____________________________________________ (Signature) Office Chief, Real Property Services

__________________________________________________________
(Print Name) Date

Address: Department of Transportation
Division of Right of Way and Land Surveys
Office of Real Property Services
1120 "N" Street, MS 37
Sacramento, CA 95814
Stormwater Pollution Prevention

General Land Use

Illicit Connections/Illegal Discharge
- Locate solid waste storage areas away from drainage facilities and watercourses and not in areas prone to flooding or ponding. Prevent storm water run-on from contacting stored solid waste through the use of ditches, berms, dikes and swales. Use dry cleanup techniques (e.g., vacuuming, sweeping, dry rags) to remove solid waste from the site when practicable. Use wet cleaning techniques only when dry cleanup techniques are not practicable. Periodically inspect the solid waste storage areas and review the disposal procedures.

- Non-storm water discharges to drainage paths, drain systems and watercourses are prohibited. Fluids should be collected by vacuum or other methods and contained and recycled, evaporated or discharged to the sanitary sewer system with approval from the publicly-owned treatment works.

- Store, transport and dispose of all hazardous waste in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. Follow label instructions regarding the proper handling, mixing and application of materials which could generate hazardous waste and a discharge to waterways.

- Train employees in proper waste disposal and cleaning, maintenance and good housekeeping procedures.

General Maintenance and Repair

Properly collect and dispose of water when pressure washing buildings, rooftops, and other large objects. Properly prepare work area before conducting building maintenance. Properly clean and dispose of equipment and wastes used and generated during building maintenance.

Recycle residual paints, solvents, lumber, and other materials to the maximum extent practical. Buy recycled products to the maximum extent practical.

Do not dump waste liquids down the storm drain. Make sure that nearby storm drains are well marked to minimize the chance of inadvertent disposal of residual paints and other liquids.

Keep the work site clean and orderly. Remove debris in a timely fashion. Sweep the area. Cover materials of particular concern that must be left outside, particularly during the rainy season. Use drip pans or absorbent material under leaking vehicles and equipment to capture fluids.

All maintenance activities should practice water conservation. Keep water application equipment in good working condition. Use the minimum amount of water needed to complete each maintenance activity.
Stormwater Pollution Prevention

General Housekeeping
- Purchase only the amount of material that will be needed for foreseeable use. Choose products that do the same job with less environmental risk.
- Keep work sites clean and orderly. Remove debris in a timely fashion. Sweep the area. Dispose of wash water, sweepings, and sediments, properly. Recycle or dispose of fluids properly.
- Specific employees should be assigned specific inspection responsibilities at the work site and given the authority to remedy any problems found.
- Prohibit littering by employees, subcontractors, and visitors.
- Keep lids on dumpsters closed. Arrange for larger dumpsters or more frequent collection of trash from dumpsters to prevent overflow. Do not conduct dumpster washout on the work site. Notify trash hauling contractors that only watertight dumpsters are acceptable for use on-site.
SITE LICENSE AGREEMENT

Subject to the terms and conditions of the Master License Agreement ("MLA") between the undersigned Licensee and Licensor, Department of Transportation, the following described location is licensed to Licensee for unmanned telecommunications purposes:

1. Licensee:________________________________________

2. Site Address/Description:________________________________________

3. Geographic Area Category: Prime Urban Urbanized Rural

4. Equipment Classification: Macrocell Minicell Microcell

5. Base Annual License Fee: ____________________________
   (Fee based upon current Pricing Matrix in effect when Site License Agreement is executed. Annual License Fee is due by June 30 each year. The initial License Fee will be prorated to the next June 30, and will be past due after ten days of the Commencement Date.)

6. Effective Dates: The "Execution Date" is the date Licensor signs this Agreement. The "Commencement Date" is the date of the Encroachment Permit for construction, not to be later than six months after the Execution Date, unless extended per the terms of the MLA).

7. Local Licensor Contacts for access or emergencies (names, titles, phone, pagers, etc.)

   __________________________________________

   (Licensee will be responsible for all overtime charges)

8. Local Licensee Contacts for access or emergencies (names, titles, phone, pagers, etc.)

   __________________________________________

9. Term/Renewals Ten years with three 5-year options, unless a shorter term or number of renewals is specified as a special term or condition.

10. Pursuant to MLA Section 4 (g), Licensor advises it is (likely) (unknown if) Licensor will desire to retain the tower/ancillary improvements at the conclusion of this Site License.

Attachment C
11. Special terms, conditions or other notes are attached and initialed by the parties. Examples include any Licensore use, known hazardous substances, special access, maintenance responsibilities, permit requirements, or co-location requests.

___ Check here if there are special terms or conditions to this agreement.

SITE LICENSE AGREEMENT – SPECIAL CLAUSES
ATTACHMENTS

For Preliminary Approval of this Site License Agreement, the following documents must be attached:

A. Preliminary description and/or map(s) of premises and site licensed, including location of equipment, access and utility routes.

B. Estimated Equipment Technical Specifications.

For Issuance of the Encroachment Permit to allow construction, the following documents will be needed in addition to approval of the final copies of A and B above:

C. Copy of Local Building Permit and/or local governmental approvals.

D. Environmental Approvals from FHWA.

E. Any legal description of the site developed by Licensee or submitted to the PUC.

F. Recording: if Licensee requires recorded notice, Licensee should submit a complete form, a copy of which will be included as an exhibit to this Site License. Licensee is responsible for obtaining any necessary legal description.

G. Planned regular maintenance schedule.

DATED:___________________________

LICENSEE:________________________

BY:______________________________

ITS:______________________________

DATED:___________________________

("Execution Date")

LICENSOR: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

BY:______________________________

ITS: DISTRICT AIRSPACE MANAGER
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Reauthorization of the Departments Wireless Telecommunication Program

Resolution G-19-04
Amending G-18-25

1.1 WHEREAS, Section 104.12 of the Streets and Highways Code authorizes the Department of Transportation (Department) to lease the use of airspace above or below State highways to private entities in accordance with procedures to be prescribed by the California Transportation Commission (Commission); and

1.2 WHEREAS, Section 30410 of the Streets and Highways Code authorizes the Director, upon such terms and subject to such reservations as are first approved by the Commission, to lease, sell, exchange or otherwise dispose of property acquired whenever it is for any other reason in the public interest to do so; and .

1.3 WHEREAS, Section 21636 of the Public Utilities Code authorizes the Department to dispose of any property, airport, air navigation facility, or portion or interest, acquired pursuant to the State Aeronautics Act (PUC S21001 et seq.), by sale, lease or otherwise; and

1.4 WHEREAS, statutes referenced in 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 above provide the authority to license telecommunications sites under the Department's Wireless Telecommunication Licensing Program through Master License and Site License agreements; and

1.5 WHEREAS, The Commission finds such licensing agreements are in the best interest of the State; and

1.6 WHEREAS, the Department’s legal division has reviewed the Master License and Site License agreements and is satisfied that they adequately address all issues.

2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Director of Transportation is authorized to directly negotiate and execute long term development agreements for any location for which a telecommunications (wireless) carrier has indicated an interest, provided that those agreements only involve cash payments and no "in-kind" payments, and that all agreements involving "in-kind" payments will be individually reviewed and approved by the Commission; and

Attachment D
2.2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Department has the authority to enter into revenue sharing agreements with any underlying fee owner, which would require that all telecommunication sites comply with the terms of the Department's Master License Agreement and that the Base License Fee would be split on a 50-50 basis. The Base License Fee must be no less than the rate established by the Master License Agreement unless the underlying fee owner requires a higher rate. The fee would only be shared with the underlying fee owner if they submitted a specific request for a portion of the fee, and only if the easement document is for highway purposes only; and

2.3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Director of Transportation is authorized to establish policies and procedures setting forth the specific terms and guidelines within which to administer the development of airspace as prescribed in this resolution and the law; and

2.4 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Commission has reviewed and reauthorizes the Department's Wireless Telecommunication Licensing Program to amend the ten-year term, from July 1, 2018 and ending June 30, 2029 to February 1, 2019 to June 30, 2029; and

2.5 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that this Resolution supersedes and replaces Resolution G-18-15.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FISCAL YEAR 2018-19 – FIRST QUARTER – PROJECT DELIVERY REPORT

SUMMARY:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) will present the Division of Project Management’s Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-19 Project Delivery Report, for the first quarter, to the California Transportation Commission (Commission) at its January 30-31, 2019 meeting, as an informational item.

BACKGROUND:

The purpose of the quarterly Project Delivery Report is to provide the Commission with project delivery information on transportation projects for which the Department was fully responsible for development and construction management. This report is intended to cover the reporting requirements specified by Government Code Section 14526.6.

Attachment
First Quarter
Fiscal Year 2018-19
Project Delivery Report

Quarterly Report to the
California Transportation Commission
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Executive Summary

Introduction
The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) delivers transportation capital programs that preserve, protect, and enhance performance of the state highway system. Operational improvement projects help the existing highway system function more efficiently. System preservation projects, such as bridge rehabilitation and pavement rehabilitation, help the highway system last longer and decrease maintenance costs. Safety projects reduce fatalities and serious injuries resulting from traffic accidents. System expansion projects reduce congestion by adding lanes or constructing new highways.

Purpose
This report provides project delivery information on transportation projects for which Caltrans was fully responsible for development and construction management.

Performance Measures
Measuring and reporting performance on project milestones shows how well Caltrans is meeting its commitments to deliver projects as promised in its primary work programs: the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), and for locally funded projects where Caltrans is the implementing agency.
## Contract for Delivery Performance Measure Summary – 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Year-To-Date thru 1st Quarter</th>
<th>Annual Commitment</th>
<th>Year-End Projection</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Approval, Environmental Documents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Environmental Documents Completed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Approved</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right of Way: Projects Certified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Certified</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Funds Committed (millions)</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery: Projects Designed and Ready for Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Designed and Ready for Construction</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>127%</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Value Ready for Allocation (millions)</td>
<td>$441</td>
<td>$473</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>$2,566</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction: Projects Constructed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Constructed</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>190%</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closeout Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program Costs (millions)</td>
<td>$35.6</td>
<td>$32.5</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operation and Protection Program Costs (millions)</td>
<td>$587.9</td>
<td>$658.9</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend
- ✔ It is expected that Caltrans will meet the delivery goal
Project Watch List

The Project Watch List identifies projects deemed "at risk" for budget overruns or schedule delays. Projects are continuously monitored and brought to the attention of managers and transportation stakeholders to resolve or minimize issues affecting the budget, scope, or schedule.

The project watch list will change from one quarter to another (projects dropped or added) as supplemental funds are approved, budget risks are mitigated, and schedule risks are resolved. Since the report is prepared quarterly, and in order to keep projects on track to award, projects that have not been included on the watch list may require supplemental funds requests between reports. While this report is intended to reflect information at the end of the reporting period, information for narratives is updated up to the time the report is published to provide the most accurate information possible.

Budget (Supplemental Funds) and Delivery Risks

Caltrans balances risk in project budgeting with the need to ensure that an appropriate mix of projects are brought forward in sufficient quantities to use its annual federal obligation authority and other available transportation funding effectively. Complete and reasonable estimates are necessary to avoid undesired consequences, including loss of federal or local funds. Before presenting capital or capital outlay support (COS) budget change requests to the Commission, Caltrans thoroughly examines each request to validate costs and evaluate options. A summary of current budget risks is provided in the table below.

Summary of Potential Supplemental Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Risk Type</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Programmed Budget (millions)</th>
<th>Estimated Risk $ (millions)</th>
<th>Potential Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Construction – 37 of 1,351 Total Projects or 3%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS Supplementals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Than 120% Allocations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemenitals to Award</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>During Construction – 33 of 793 Total Projects or 4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS Supplementals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemenitals to Complete Construction</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Projects - Local Agency Implementing Agency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>After completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Construction – 7 of 859 Total Projects or &lt;1%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS Supplementals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$272</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Adjustments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>After completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$2,585</td>
<td>$307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Risks Versus Active Projects: 77 of 3,003\(^1\) or 2.6%

\(^1\) 3,003 is the total number of active projects at the time of this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Risk Component</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Risk Trend</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Corridor Bridge Rails</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>13,655</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Involves wetland delineation and coordination with the permitting agencies; there is a significant decrease in available acreage for wetland creation than originally anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Eureka/Arcata Corridor MBGR</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>9,715</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Involves wetland delineation and coordination with the permitting agencies; there is a significant decrease in available acreage for wetland creation than originally anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAK</td>
<td>029</td>
<td>Lake 29 Expressway - Safety</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>66,050</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>7 of 21 parcels are going to condemnation. RTL is at risk since Caltrans might not have possession of all the parcels in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4th Street Safety</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>10,016</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Scope increase due to the addition of driveway replacements to the project has increased the RW lead-time from 12 months to 21 months. The team is taking a risk to deliver the project based on its current schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>HUM-101 Strengthen 3 Bridges</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>10,109</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves strategy change; due to traffic management plan, work needs to be done from under the OH bridge as opposed to bridge deck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>CAMP 20 SAFETY PROJECT</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves challenging Environmental Permits and RW acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Arcata Acceleration/Deceleration Lanes</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>12,027</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Involves wetland delineation and coordination with the permitting agencies; there is a significant decrease in the available acreage for wetland creation than originally anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Pudding Creek CAPM</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>15,113</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves a coastal highway with bike route requiring additional construction support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Pudding Creek CAPM</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>15,113</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves Coastal Permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</td>
<td>Risk Component</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Risk Trend</td>
<td>Risk Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAK</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>LAKE 20 SHOULDER</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>7,675</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves Geotech drilling and confirmation regarding the 1:1 cut slope; if the test results show flatter slope, the project scope will be increased resulting in RTL delivery risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>North Canyon TMS Improvement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>6,246</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves challenging RW acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>North Canyon TMS Improvement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Right of Way Capital</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>RW acquisition issues; potential damage to access road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEH</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>Los Molinos ADA</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>7,131</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Right of Way Cert Delay due to Carr Fires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUB</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>Browns Valley Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>62,610</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Right of way acquisition, involves potential condemnation of 4 parcels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUT</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>Sutter Bypass Widening &amp; Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>30,765</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Permits, right of way condemnation, utility relocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>Paintersville &amp; Mokelumne Seismic Retrofit</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>38,681</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUB</td>
<td>070</td>
<td>Simmerly Slough (SHOPP)</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>82,900</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves the Army Corp of Engineers 408 Permit and potential RW condemnation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEV</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>Farad Ditch Slope Stabilization</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>12,520</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Right of way acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>070</td>
<td>BUT 70 Four Lane Widening (Seg 1 STIP)</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves Section 7 consultation with USFWS and several permits including Army Corp of Engineers USFW permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUB</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>Timbuctoo</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>67,321</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Utility Relocation challenges; Approval is needed from the Public Utility Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>Lagoon Creek and American River Bridge</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>26,792</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves 408 permit from the Army Corp of Engineers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>050</td>
<td>Camino Safety Project</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>PAED involves investigation of cultural resources. Native American consultation is needed. The delay in PAED will also result in PS&amp;E delay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>Cottonwood Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>11,964</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves 408 permit from the Army Corp of Engineers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEV</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>SR-174 Safety Improvement Project</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>28,803</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves right of way acquisition, utility relocation, and environmental permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</td>
<td>Risk Component</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Risk Trend</td>
<td>Risk Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Maxwell SRRA</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,616</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Needs to address sludge removal problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Elkhorn SRRA</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>4,614</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Needs to address sludge removal problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>032</td>
<td>Chico ADA Infrastructure</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Right of way acquisition challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>RHMA Overlay</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>45,012</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves ADA issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>070</td>
<td>Ophir Palermo Safety, (Seg 1 SHOPP)</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>32,720</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves Section 7 consultation with UFWS and Army Corps of Engineers 401 and 404 permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Gleason Realignment</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>46,800</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Visual mitigation requirements and possible condemnation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>084</td>
<td>NILES CANYON ALAMEDA CREEK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>42,074</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>The environmental document is being challenged legally by the Alameda Creek Alliance impacting environmental permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Lake Merritt Railroad Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Right of way acquisition challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>084</td>
<td>NILES CANYON SAFETY PROJECT (MEDIUM TERM IMPROVEMENTS)</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>39,800</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>The environmental document is being challenged legally by the Alameda Creek Alliance impacting environmental permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Gaviota Rest Area Water Systems Upgrade</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,295</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Additional requirements are introduced for Coastal Development Permit, Zoning Clearance, and Conditional Use Permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>041</td>
<td>Route 41 Atascadero ADA Project</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>8,612</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Addition of bike lanes introduced and designed by the city will be incorporated into the state's plans, which will result in additional reviews that were unaccounted for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Big Sur CAPM</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>29,520</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves utility relocation and needs utility agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Piedras Blancas Offsite Mitigation Project</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right of Way Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves mitigation of the State Park's land and RW issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KER</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Derby Street Signalization</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves complex RW issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>033</td>
<td>Scour Mitigation &amp; Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>10,022</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>The project involves fish passage and 1602 permit challenges with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## County Route Description Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Risk Component</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Risk Trend</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>19,066</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves RW issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>040</td>
<td>SBD 40 REGRADE MEDIAN CROSS SLOPE (NEAR ARIZONA)</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>35,088</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>The project is at risk regarding four permits: 1602 and 2081 with the Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife; 401 for California Water Quality Control Board and 404 for Army Corps of Engineers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIV</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>RIV 10 REHAB SUBSTRUCTURE</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>17,325</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>The project is at risk regarding four permits: 1602 for California Department of Fish and Wildlife; 401 for California Water Quality Control Board; and 404 for Army Corps of Engineers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>MER-99 PAVEMENT REHABILITATION</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>81,819</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves complex RW issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>DRAINAGE RESTORATION</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Project was accelerated, resulting in shorter RW lead time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>008</td>
<td>BUCKMAN SPRINGS SRRA WATER SYSTEMS</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>6,278</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>The project needs the concurrence of the US Forest Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>008</td>
<td>I-8 IMPERIAL AVENUE</td>
<td>STIP-RIP</td>
<td>39,098</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Involves Utility Relocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>008</td>
<td>SD-008-R25.1/R40.1 - REHABILATE CULVERTS</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>The culverts are within the Tribal Reservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>12-ON870 Extend #2 lane to allow proper lane drop signage.</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Needs coastal zone permit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pre-Construction-COS Supplementals:** 9 projects with a programmed budget of $20M and risks between $3M to $12M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Risk Component</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Risk Trend</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Dr. Fine Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>10,942</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves three challenging alternatives that are being evaluated regarding the Environmental Document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Capell Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>A landslide has changed construction duration from one to two seasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRE</td>
<td>033</td>
<td>Firebaugh ADA</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Right of Way Support</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Additional ROW support will be required for work related to acquiring additional temporary construction easements not identified in the PID and at the time of programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</td>
<td>Risk Component</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Risk Trend</td>
<td>Risk Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>033</td>
<td>Scour Mitigation &amp; Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves new fish passage requirements and coordination with the regulatory agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>066</td>
<td>Upgrade Americans with Disabilities Act Ramps &amp; Accessibility</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Right of Way Support</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves additional potholing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>SBD 15 RECONSTRUCT SB CAJON SCALE HOUSE</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>It has been discovered lately that the new facility will require new water, sewer, and power connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KER</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>Rosamond-Mojave Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Environmental issues; sensitive species discovered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>SJ BRIDGE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>Utilities and permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>075</td>
<td>SR-75 CORONADO BRIDGE-PIERS</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>The project involves a seismic retrofit study that currently forecasts a $2M increase in the total funding needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Construction-Greater Than 120% Allocation: 16 projects with a programmed budget of $111M and risks between $45M to $79M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Risk Component</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Risk Trend</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Rodeo Creek Slide II</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>7,630</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Geotech data revealed larger than anticipated slope failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUT</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>Sutter Bypass Widening &amp; Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>21,614</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Permits and RW Cert complexity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>050</td>
<td>ED 50 MBGR Upgrade</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Elevated unit prices and changes in the MGBR standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>050</td>
<td>Cameron Park Safety</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Elevated unit prices and additional scope regarding an ADA curb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Capell Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>12,710</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>A landslide at the project site has increased the scope of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>SCR-1 CAPM</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>14,952</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>The final BEES is 35% over the programmed construction funds due to the current economic trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>033</td>
<td>Scour Mitigation &amp; Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Unclear design strategy at the early stages; issues are being worked out. Current structure costs exceed the estimates in the Advance Planning Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</td>
<td>Risk Component</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Risk Trend</td>
<td>Risk Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Drainage Rehabilitation</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>A late discovery revealed that the existing soil cannot be reused, requiring additional construction capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Tunnel Lighting</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>The number of light fixtures for the tunnel has increased, resulting in an increase in the construction capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Upgrade Pumps</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>The project needs electrical supply upgrades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIV</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>RIV 10 REHAB SUBSTRUCTURE</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>12,399</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Deeper piles than expected caused the estimates to go up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNO</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>Aspen Fales Shoulders</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>7,352</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High bids are expected due to current trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNO</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>Little Walker Shoulders</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>The project is being combined with another shoulder widening project in the same area. High bids are expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>MERCED SEISMIC RESTORATION</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Analysis of super-structure found liquefaction at two of seven bridges; the soil settlement challenges is expected to result in cost increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>STA 99 MVP/EXTENDED GORES/SLOPE PAVING</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High bids are expected due to current trends. At 95% Constructability Review, the current estimates show a 34% increase in the project cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KER</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Derby Street Signalization</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>High bids are expected due to current trends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Construction-Supplementals to Award: 12 projects with a programmed budget of $101M and risks between $8M to $18M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIS</th>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>263 Klamath River Bridge</th>
<th>SHOPP</th>
<th>15,359</th>
<th>Construction Capital</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Same as Previous</th>
<th>Bids came higher than expected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Butte &amp; Ash Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Bids came higher than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>Pave Chain Control Areas Various Locations</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Bids came higher than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>096</td>
<td>96 Culverts</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Bids came higher than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLU</td>
<td>070</td>
<td>Opapee Curve Improvement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bids came higher than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOL</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Yol-275 Tower Br Fender Replc</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>10,710</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bids came higher than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</td>
<td>Risk Component</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Risk Trend</td>
<td>Risk Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>SALSIPUEDES CREEK BRIDGE SCOUR MITIGATION</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bids came higher than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUL</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Bridge Widening</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>9,371</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Involves repackaging of the PS&amp;E and re-advertising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>Chowchilla 2R Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bids came higher than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>SR99 STANISLAUS CAPM RAMPS</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>21,344</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bids came higher than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUN</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>TUN, STA, MPA Rumble Strips</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Bids came higher than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>SR 4 and SR 26 in Calaveras, Amador, and Alpine Co.</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bids came higher than expected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**During Construction-COS Supplementals: 14 projects with a programmed budget of $76M and risks between $9M to $14M**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOL</th>
<th>080</th>
<th>ICP SHOPP</th>
<th>10,793</th>
<th>Construction Support</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Same as Previous</th>
<th>Construction Claims.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KER</td>
<td>058</td>
<td>Gap Closure Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>4,055</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>047</td>
<td>Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>SHOPP MAJOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>5 its upgrade</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>1 amber alert</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>SBd 15 phase 2 &amp; Enhancements (Const Only)</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>BIG TREES STATE PARK WALL</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>SR 4 CROSSTOWN RAMP EXTENSION</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>SOUTH STOCKTON 6-LANE WIDENING</td>
<td>BOND</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Right of Way Support</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>SOUTH STOCKTON 6-LANE WIDENING</td>
<td>BOND</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</td>
<td>Risk Component</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Risk Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>Tree Pruning and Removal</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>Tree Pruning and Removal</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>ALP, CAL, AMA TREE PRUNING</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUO</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>TUO &amp; MPA TREE PRUNNING</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During Construction-Supplementals to Complete Construction: 16 projects with a programmed budget of $1B and risks between $42M to $80M

<p>| SHA    | 005   | Antlers Br Replacement | SHOPP | 134,150 | Construction Capital | High | Same as Previous | Claims. |
| NEV    | 080   | Nev 80, Near Truckee, Relocate Floriston Sand House | SHOPP | 2,478 | Construction Capital | Medium | New | Involves construction claim disputes regarding &quot;Buy America&quot; steel. |
| SOL    | 080   | ICP | SHOPP | 55,247 | Construction Capital | High | Same as Previous | Claims. |
| ALA    | 080   | 01410_SF 80_MC Phase 2 - SFOBB WAREHOUSE | SHOPP | 16,500 | Construction Capital | Medium | Same as Previous | Delay and additional requirements from State Fire Marshall. District and BATA have a tentative agreement to address increases. |
| KER    | 119   | 119/43 Roundabout | SHOPP | 4,200 | Construction Capital | Medium | New | Involves potential construction claims to address utility relocation and endangered species. |
| LA     | 047   | Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement | SHOPP | 428,421 | Construction Capital | Medium | Same as Previous | Additional funds may be needed based on the latest Risk Management and Exposure (RME) Report regarding removal of the old bridge foundations and potential undiscovered site conditions. |
| LA     | 018   | Replace bridge deck LA-18 | SHOPP | 3,732 | Construction Capital | High | Same as Previous | Repairs to damaged local road caused by traffic detour. |
| LA     | 710   | LA-710 Rehab Phase 1 | SHOPP | 217,000 | Construction Capital | High | Increased | Construction Claims. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Risk Component</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Risk Trend</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Malibu Roadway Stabilization</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>10,432</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Per the city’s request the project involves a CCO to accommodate for a pedestrian/bicycle path.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>Sbd 15 phase 2 &amp; Enhancements</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>74,690</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Delays due to constructability issues, environmental concerns, and utility relocation; rail road flagging cost increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>Bishop ADA</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Unforeseen site condition: Thicker concrete than what had been expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>Bishop ADA</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Out of compliance slabs and implementation of new ADA requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>BIG TREES STATE PARK WALL</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>7,167</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Involves mitigation of high groundwater level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>SR 4 CROSSTOWN RAMP EXTENSION</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>67,084</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Utility Relocation issues, claims, and arbitration are expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>088</td>
<td>CLEMENTS CAPM</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>6,343</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Project was underestimated at the time of vote. The majority of the G-12 capacity was used to award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUO</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>SR108 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Contract was awarded with all G-12 funds; might need additional funds for construction contingencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During Construction-Partnership Projects-Local Agency Implementing Agency: 3 project components with a programmed budget of $1B and risks between $19M to $90M

| SF     | 101   | Presidio Parkway P3 | SHOPP  | 37,392 | Construction Support | High | Same as Previous | Landscape commitments. |
| SF     | 101   | Presidio Parkway P3 | SHOPP  | 966,500 | Construction Capital | High | Same as Previous | Landscape commitments in the Presidio. |
| LA     | 710   | Gerald Desmond Bridge | SHOPP  | 45,000 | Construction Support | Low | Same as Previous | The oversight support budget is based on the duration of the design-built contract that is 540 days behind schedual. Caltrans needs to provided additional oversight. |

Post-Construction-COS Supplementals to Closeout: 6 projects with a programmed budget of $272M and risks between $0.1M to $10M

<p>| SAC    | 080   | I-80 Across the Top | Bond   | 107,088 | Construction Capital | Medium | New | Construction Claims. |
| MON    | VAR   | Roadside Safety improvements, MON County | SHOPP  | 2,209 | Construction Capital | Medium | Same as Previous | Construction Claims. |
| TUL    | 099   | Goshen to Kingsburg 6-lane | Bond   | 75,863 | Construction Capital | Very High | Same as Previous | Construction Claims. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programmed Budget ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Risk Component</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Risk Trend</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>NORTH I-5 REHAB</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>53,056</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Construction Claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>Installation of fiber optic cable in Arch Road Interchange</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Construction Claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA</td>
<td>074</td>
<td>12-0E310 - I5/SR74 Interchange</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>30,231</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Same as Previous</td>
<td>Construction Claims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post Construction: Right of Way Adjustment: 1 project with programmed budget of $5M and risks between $0.1M to $4M**

| SB     | 101   | Linden & Casitas Pass Interchanges | STIP | 5,394 | Right of Way Capital | High | Same as Previous | Involves utility companies and local's share adjustments. |
The project team conducts environmental studies to analyze the effect of various project alternatives. The result of the studies is an environmental document. The type of environmental document depends on the significance of the impacts.

In fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans committed to deliver 94 draft environmental documents. Through the end of the first quarter, fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans completed a total of 12, or 13 percent of the annual commitment.

Measure: Draft Environmental Documents Completed – 1st Quarter FY 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018-19</th>
<th>Year-to-Date thru 1st Quarter</th>
<th>Annual Commitment</th>
<th>Year-End Projection</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Annual Commitment at the End of 1st Quarter By FY

- FY 14-15: 19%
- FY 15-16: 10%
- FY 16-17: 11%
- FY 17-18: 14%
- FY 18-19: 13%
Project Approval Summary

Project approval is also commonly referred to as "PA&ED," which is an abbreviation for the Project Approval and Environmental Document project milestone. Project approval is achieved when the Project Report has been signed. The Project Report includes the selection of the preferred project alternative and includes the project's environmental document.

*In fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans committed to deliver 262 project approvals and environmental documents. Through the end of the first quarter, fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans approved a total of 67, or 26 percent of the annual commitment.*

### Measure: Projects Approved, Environmental Documents – 1st Quarter FY 2018-19

#### Fiscal Year 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date thru 1st Quarter</th>
<th>Annual Commitment</th>
<th>Year-End Projection</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage of Annual Commitment at the End of 1st Quarter By FY

- FY 13-14: 31%
- FY 14-15: 23%
- FY 15-16: 17%
- FY 17-18: 18%
- FY 18-19: 26%
Right of Way: Projects Certified

Projects Certifications Summary

Right of way certification is achieved when all needed properties have been obtained, either by easement or acquisition, and all railroad and utility constraints are cleared.

In fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans committed to certify right of way for 257 projects. Through the end of the first quarter, fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans certified a total of 36 projects, or 14 percent of the annual commitment.

Measure: Projects Certified – 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018-19</th>
<th>Year-to-Date thru 1st Quarter</th>
<th>Annual Commitment</th>
<th>Year-End Projection</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Plan Percent</td>
<td>Plan Percent</td>
<td>Forecast Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>29 124%</td>
<td>257 14%</td>
<td>256 99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Annual Commitment at the End of 1st Quarter By FY

- FY 14-15: 6%
- FY 15-16: 17%
- FY 16-17: 7%
- FY 17-18: 11%
- FY 18-19: 14%
Allocated Funds Committed

The Division of Right of Way prepares an annual right of way capital plan and receives an annual allocation approved by the California Transportation Commission. Caltrans reports quarterly how funds have been committed against the plan and prepares a report for the Commission after the year has closed.

For fiscal year 2018-19, the Right of Way Capital Plan outlines funding needed to keep programmed projects on track for delivery as planned. Caltrans requested and received an allocation of $170 million. Through the end of the first quarter, fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans committed $28 million, or 16 percent of the annual right of way allocation approved by the Commission.

Measure: Allocated Funds Committed – 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2018-19

Fiscal Year 2018-19 (millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th>Year-End Projection</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Annual Commitment at the End of 1st Quarter By FY

- FY 14-15: 40%
- FY 15-16: 33%
- FY 16-17: 29%
- FY 17-18: 36%
- FY 18-19: 16%
Right of Way Capital Plan

The table below shows different categories of planned right of way capital expenditures for fiscal year 2018-19. The table shows the allocation and the actual funds committed by category.

**Right of Way Capital Funding (millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allocated (millions)</th>
<th>Committed (millions)</th>
<th>Committed Percent Per Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</td>
<td>$ 26.2</td>
<td>$ 10.9</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>$ 95.2</td>
<td>$ 11.0</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Capital Projects</td>
<td>$ 121.4</td>
<td>$ 21.9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-certification</td>
<td>$ 20.6</td>
<td>$ 0.3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Fees</td>
<td>$ 1.0</td>
<td>$ 0.2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to Property (Inverse)</td>
<td>$ 1.5</td>
<td>$ 0.6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program (CBI)</td>
<td>$ 25.5</td>
<td>$ 4.6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Other Categories</td>
<td>$ 48.6</td>
<td>$ 5.7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 170.0</td>
<td>$ 27.6</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delivery: Projects Designed and Ready for Construction

**Contract to Deliver Summary**

Each year, the Caltrans Director signs a Contract for Delivery with each of our 12 District Directors committing to deliver projects ready for construction. The Contract for Delivery includes a list of major state highway projects for which Caltrans will complete project plans, specifications and estimates and secure rights-of-way and permits in that fiscal year. This allows Caltrans to advertise and award construction contracts and begin construction.

In fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans committed in the Contract for Delivery to deliver 263 projects ready for construction, valued at $2.56 billion. Through the end of the first quarter, Caltrans delivered 19 projects, or 7 percent of the annual commitment, with an estimated value of $441 million.

**Measure: Projects Designed and Ready for Construction – 1st Quarter FY 2018-19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year-to-Date thru 1st Quarter</th>
<th>Annual Commitment</th>
<th>Year-End Projection</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>127%</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Annual Commitment at the End of 1st Quarter By FY

- FY 14-15: 5%
- FY 15-16: 7%
- FY 16-17: 12%
- FY 17-18: 9%
- FY 18-19: 7%
 Measure: Contract Value Delivered – 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2018-19

Fiscal Year 2018-19 Contract for Delivery (millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year-to-Date thru 1st Quarter</th>
<th>Annual Commitment</th>
<th>Year-End Projection</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$441</td>
<td>$473</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>$2,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Annual Commitment at the End of 1st Quarter By FY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 14-15</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 15-16</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 16-17</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 17-18</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 18-19</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract For Delivery Support Costs

FY 2018-19 Year to Date Contract for Delivery Support Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Completed</th>
<th>Programmed Support Budget (millions)(^1)</th>
<th>Expended (millions)</th>
<th>Percent Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Programmed Support is the total support (excluding Con Sup) to RTL the Contract for Delivery projects as of Q1, 18/19. It consists of PAED, PS&E, and RW Support from the PAED phase through RTL.
Construction entails building improvements as shown on the contract plans. Caltrans oversees the contractor’s work and administers the contract by authorizing payments to the contractor for completed work. The contract is complete when the contract has been accepted by the state resident engineer.

- In fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans committed to complete construction of 178 projects. Through the end of the first quarter, fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans has completed 57, or 32 percent of the annual commitment.
- At the end of the first quarter, fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans had 793 projects valued at $8.50 billion under construction.

### Measure: Projects Constructed – 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018-19</th>
<th>Year-to-Date thru 1st Quarter</th>
<th>Annual Commitment</th>
<th>Year-End Projection</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>190%</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Annual Commitment at the End of 1st Quarter By FY

- FY 14-15: 18%
- FY 15-16: 28%
- FY 16-17: 11%
- FY 17-18: 13%
- FY 18-19: 32%
Program Delivery

Program Delivery Summary

Program delivery includes the Contract for Delivery and additional projects not in the Contract for Delivery. Additional projects include: Program amendments, projects advanced from a future program year, Minor, Maintenance, and Emergency projects.

Through the end of the first quarter, fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans has:
- Delivered 19 Contract for Delivery Projects with an estimated value of $441 million
- Delivered 36 additional projects with an estimated value of $412 million
- The sum of all projects delivered from all program funding sources is 55 projects, valued at $853 million

Program Delivery by Capital Funding Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Committed 18/19 CFD</th>
<th>Delivered Project 18/19 CFD</th>
<th>Values (millions)</th>
<th>Values (%)</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Delivered Year-To-Date 18/19 CFD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Funded1,2</td>
<td>$ 302.9</td>
<td>$ 166.5</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended Multi-Funded</td>
<td>$ 241.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Multi-Funded</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal – Multi-Funded</td>
<td>$ 302.9</td>
<td>$ 407.5</td>
<td>134%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operation and Protection Program2 (SHOPP)</td>
<td>$ 1,956.6</td>
<td>$ 46.0</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended SHOPP</td>
<td>$ 68.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year SHOPP CFD</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>$ 2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response – G-11 (SHOPP)</td>
<td>$ 75.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal – SHOPP</td>
<td>$ 192.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership (Local and regional funding contributions)2</td>
<td>$ 306.1</td>
<td>$ 228.2</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Partnership (not in CFD)</td>
<td>$ 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Program</td>
<td>$ 24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Delivery All Program Funds</td>
<td>$ 852.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Multi-Funded projects have programmed funds from any combination of STIP, local, SHOPP, P1B, and/or federal funds.
2 Programs that are included in the Director’s Contract for Delivery.
The table and chart below provide a distribution of transportation program dollars on projects that have been delivered to construction in the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2018-19. The projects include planned projects as well as additional projects for emergency response, program amendments, Maintenance Program, and Minor Program contracts.

### Projects Designed and Ready for Construction
**Contract Value by Program Funding to Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Programs</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Program Dollars (millions)</th>
<th>Percent of Major Programs</th>
<th>Percent of All Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operation &amp; Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$114.4</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response – G-11 (SHOPP)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$75.2</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Preservation Programs (SHOPP)</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$192.3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Programs (Local &amp; local federal funds)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$229.1</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Funded Improvements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$217.9</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Improvement Programs</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$447.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Funded Preservation and Improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$189.5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$24.1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$852.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Multi-Funded Improvements have programmed funds from any combination of STIP, local, P1B, and/or federal funds.

2 Multi-Funded Preservation and Improvements have programmed funds from any combination of STIP, SHOPP, local, P1B, and/or federal funds.

Year-to-Date Distribution of Transportation Program Dollars on Designed Projects Ready for Construction-Q1, 18/19

![Year-to-Date Distribution of Transportation Program Dollars on Designed Projects Ready for Construction-Q1, 18/19](image)
The bar chart below shows the distribution by percentage of construction contract values for categories of project improvements (outcomes) on projects delivered to construction in the first quarter of fiscal year 2018-19.

- **Mainline Improvements**: 52%
- **Mainline Preservation and Improvements**: 22%
- **Emergency Response - Major Damage Restoration**: 9%
- **Pavement Preservation**: 9%
- **Maintenance Program**: 3%
- **Traffic Safety - Collision Reduction**: 2%
- **Bridge Preservation**: 1%
- **Other Preservation**: 1%
- **STIP Mitigation, Landscape Improvements**: 1%

**Projects**: 55

**Capital Value**: $852.9 Million
Contractor Payments: $1.1 billion has been paid to contractors in fiscal year 2018-19.
Under Construction: 793 construction contracts valued at $8.50 billion are under construction.
Claims: Caltrans has 29 construction contracts in post-contract acceptance with notice of potential claims in the amount of $28.1 million.
Arbitration: Caltrans has 23 contracts in arbitration with claims valued at $56.8 million.
*As of October 1, 2018

### Arbitration – Five Year Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Filed</th>
<th>FY 14-15</th>
<th>FY 15-16</th>
<th>FY 16-17</th>
<th>FY 17-18</th>
<th>FY 18-19 End of Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Construction Outcomes

The table and chart below provide a distribution of transportation program dollars on projects for which construction contracts have been accepted in the first quarter of fiscal year 2018-19. The contracts include planned projects as well as additional projects for emergency response, program amendments, major maintenance program, and minor program contracts.

### Year-to-Date Projects Constructed, Q1 18/19

#### Contract Value by Program Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Programs</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Program Dollars (millions)</th>
<th>Percent of Major Programs</th>
<th>Percent of All Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operation &amp; Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$410.4</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response – Major Damage Restoration (SHOPP)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$67.7</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$9.9</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Preservation Programs (SHOPP)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$488.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Funded Improvements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$49.3</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Programs (Local &amp; local federal funds)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$156.7</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Improvement Programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$206.1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Program</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$108.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Funded Preservation and Improvement Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$802.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Multi-Funded Improvements have programmed funds from any combination of STIP, local, P1B, and/or federal funds.
2. Multi-Funded Preservation and Improvements have programmed funds from any combination of STIP, SHOPP, local, P1B, and/or federal funds.
Year-to-Date Projects Constructed, Q1 18/19
Outcomes (Percent) by Contract Value

The bar chart below shows the distribution by percentage of construction contract values for categories of project improvements (outcomes) on construction contracts completed in the first quarter of fiscal year 2018-19.

Projects: 147  
Capital Value: $802.6 Million
STIP and SHOPP Closeout Costs

Closeout Costs Summary

Pursuant to State Transportation Improvement Program guidelines and statutory requirements, Caltrans is reporting project closeout by comparing actual costs to final approved budgets. In consultation with Commission staff, project closeout reporting reflects projects where the construction contract was accepted (completed) two quarters ago.

- **Through the end of the first quarter, fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans has closed out 5 State Transportation Improvement Program projects.** The final approved budget for these projects was $32.5 million. The actual cost to complete these projects was $35.6 million, or 110 percent of the final approved budget.
- **Through the end of the first quarter, fiscal year 2018-19, Caltrans has closed out 81 State Highway Operation and Protection Program projects.** The final approved budget for these projects was $658.9 million. The actual cost to complete these projects was $587.9 million, or 89 percent of the final approved budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Budget (millions)</th>
<th>Expended (millions)</th>
<th>Savings (millions)</th>
<th>Percent Expended</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>$32.5</td>
<td>$35.6</td>
<td>-$3.1</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>&lt; 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>$658.9</td>
<td>$587.9</td>
<td>$71</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>&lt; 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Transportation Improvement Program Closeout – Program Costs (millions)

- Projects: 5
- Expenditures: $36
- Budget: $33

State Highway Operation and Protection Program Closeout – Program Costs (millions)

- Projects: 81
- Expenditures: $588
- Budget: $659
Commission Initial Allocation, Final Approved Costs, and Expended Costs for Allocated Construction Components

SHOPP

Pursuant to Sections 57(b) through (d) of the adopted Interim SHOPP Guidelines and consistent with the California Transportation Commission’s action in October 2017 (Tab 80, Reference No. 4.7), Appendices B1, and B2 of this quarterly report provide the following:

- A summary by phase of SHOPP funds programmed, allocated, and expended at the time the construction contract was accepted for projects with a total cost of $50 million or greater or a total SHOPP programmed amount (in right-of-way and/or construction) of $15 million or greater.

- An aggregated summary by phase of SHOPP funds programmed, allocated, and expended at the time the construction contract was accepted for projects with a total cost of less than $50 million and a total SHOPP programmed amount (in right-of-way and/or construction) of less than $15 million.

STIP

As required by Government Code 14525.6, the table below provides a comparison between the Commission's initial allocation, final approved state only costs and expended costs for STIP projects that completed construction in the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2018-19. This provides an indication of how adjustments subsequently made after the initial vote (Commission approved supplemental funds or Caltrans delegated funding authority) compare to the initial allocated amounts for each program. The costs in this table do not include non-state funds. The table below is generated from the projects listed in Appendix A of this report. Construction costs are calculated six months after the end of construction.

### STIP Program Closeout – Construction Costs ($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Construction Support¹</th>
<th></th>
<th>Construction Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Allocation</td>
<td>Final Approved Budget²</td>
<td>Expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER³</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Construction Support totals reported: Government Code 14525.5 requires the Commission to allocate construction support for STIP funds, and requires Caltrans to report on allocated construction components.

² Final Approved Budget is the sum of all approved commission allocations plus delegated G-12 adjustments.

³ OTHER includes Locally Generated (i.e., measure funds...) and Federal Discretionary funds.
Appendix

(A) Caltrans Fiscal Year 2018-19 State Transportation Improvement Program Project Closeout. Construction costs are calculated six months after the end of construction.

(B) Caltrans Fiscal Year 2018-19 State Highway Operation and Protection Program Project Closeout. Construction costs are calculated six months after the end of construction.

(B1) A summary by phase of SHOPP funds programmed, allocated, and expended at the time the construction contract was accepted for projects with a total cost of $50 million or greater or a total SHOPP programmed amount (in right-of-way and/or construction) of $15 million or greater.

(B2) An aggregated summary by phase of SHOPP funds programmed, allocated, and expended at the time the construction contract was accepted for projects with a total cost of less than $50 million and a total SHOPP programmed amount (in right-of-way and/or construction) of less than $15 million.

(C) Caltrans Fiscal Year 2018-19 Capital Outlay Support G-12 Request Summary

(D) Caltrans Fourth Quarter, Fiscal Year 2018-19 Watch List: Retired Risks

(E) Construction Contracts Awarded vs Supplemental to Award

(F) Construction Contracts Completed vs Supplemental to Complete Construction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Support ($1,000's)</th>
<th>Capital ($1,000's)</th>
<th>Total ($1,000's)</th>
<th>Delivery Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original Budget²</td>
<td>Approved Budget²</td>
<td>Actual Costs</td>
<td>Approved Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA 91</td>
<td>$339</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>$658</td>
<td>$2,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM 1</td>
<td>$1,025</td>
<td>$3,625</td>
<td>$5,090</td>
<td>$8,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 98</td>
<td>$4,336</td>
<td>$4,336</td>
<td>$6,402</td>
<td>$8,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIV 215</td>
<td>$1,520</td>
<td>$1,520</td>
<td>$974</td>
<td>$1,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 78</td>
<td>$341</td>
<td>$341</td>
<td>$1,283</td>
<td>$1,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,407</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,143</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,213</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. State Transportation Improvement Program includes projects with one or more components funded from State Transportation Improvement Program funds. Includes all contributor funds on all project components.
2. Budget information includes only budget information if expenditures are reflected in State data systems. Excludes local budgets for work implemented by local agencies.
3. New project in 2014 Program Document or later.
(A) Caltrans Fiscal Year 2018-19
State Transportation Improvement Program
Project Closeout

FY 18-19 STIP Closeout Delivery Year Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>On-Time</th>
<th>Delayed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Capital Budget ($1,000's)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 20,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 2018-19 First Quarter
Project Delivery Report

Caltrans
(B) Caltrans Fiscal Year 2018‐19
State Highway Operation and Protection
Program Project Closeout
Support ($1,000's)
Project Description

Capital ($1,000's)

Total ($1,000's)
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Construction Output

Years Early,
Delayed, or
On‐time

Primary
Original Actual

Unit

1st Quarter
LA
LA
ORA
RIV
SD
ALA
SBD
VEN
VAR
DN
MON
FRE
MEN
PLU
GLE
SBD
STA
SLO
SBT
RIV
SBD
SM
CAL
MER
SB
SBD
SIS
ALA
SHA
VEN
SBD
SD
RIV
ED
SBD
SCR
SON
ALA
ED
ORA
CAL
BUT
LA
SD
ORA
VAR
DN
ALA
MEN
ALA
SBD
ORA
SBD
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005
110
073
015
VAR
580
173
101
VAR
199
198
168
101
070
005
060
099
041
156
215
040
001
026
165
154
010
005
880
299
101
018
VAR
243
049
040
017
001
013
050
091
004
099
138
078
039
101
101
880
101
080
060
261
015
152
101

New assign
110 @ 101
Rt 73 Stormwater Source Control Project
Riv 15 Place Shoulder Rumble Strips
SD‐VAR STORMWATER TMDL CHOLLAS CR #2
Nickname Required
SBD 173 REPAIR FIRE DAMAGE
VEN 101 ADA
North Valley Shoulder Backing Repair
Smith River Curve Improvement
198 Centerline Rumble Strip
Auberry Road Roundabout
Slope Repair CCA 3‐19‐18
Historic Rock Wall Failure
HMA Overlay ‐ Glenn 005
SBd 60 Chino Relocate Irrigation facilities, Etc.
SR99 SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS
RTE 41 HOMESTEAD MCMILLAN CAPM
San Juan Bautista Route 156 CAPM
Riv 215 TMS Elements
SBD 40 Haller, Rojo, Clipper Bridges Replacements
Surfer's Beach
VISTA DEL LAGO SIGNAL
FOWLER AVE LEFT TURN
Cachuma Pass Cap‐M
SBD 10 LANE REPLACEMENT IN REDLANDS
South Weed 2R
Storm Water Mitigation Project on I880 near West Oakland BART
BGI Capstone
101 Far North Pavement
SBD 18 BIG BEAR ADA IMPROVEMENTS
UPGR BR RAIL END TRTMNTS VAR LOCS
RIV 243 REPLACE CULVERT
ED49 Slipout Repair
RIV 40 REPAIR PAVEMENT
Hwy 17 SHOULDER WIDENING & CONCRETE GUARDRAIL
Nickname Required
STORM DAMAGE, RETAINING WALL MORAGA AVE. SLIDE
ED 50 Temp Rdwy Stabilization
Modify signals, lighting at Valley view and St College
CAL & MPA ADA Curb Ramps
East Ave Off‐Ramp Widening
Rte 138 Safety Improvements
LIGHTING STRIPING MBGR UPGR I‐5 TO I‐15
12‐0N590 Signal & ADA RTE 39 Ball to Lincoln
Exit Retrofit signs
Log Crossing Repair
Nickname Required
Willits Sidewalks
MBGR REPLACEMENT IN BERKELEY
SBd 60 Chino ‐ Relocation of irrigation facilities
Rt 261 Stormwater Source Control Project ‐ RW
SBD 15 REMOVE AND REPLACE DAMAGED BRIDGE DECK
SR152 MERCED MEDIAN BARRIERS
SW MITIGATION
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6,770
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922
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3,954
581
2,091
2,188
1,425
3,097
10,653
1,184
2,138
2,425
2,353
5,751
5,076
1,155
10,173
1,753
4,594
2,900
712
415
52
3,262
1,258
4,247
141
1,954
1,866
816
6,125
3,362
906
1,389
1,961
524
1,156
1,533
642
1,602
354
962
2,230

$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$

1,500
1,575
12,861
495
5,159
2,000
480
417
760
3,053
607
3,955
6,010
7,710
23,893
945
3,575
12,566
5,726
6,682
22,680
899
1,866
2,590
13,669
27,851
28,781
1,813
40,433
4,303
3,882
4,835
1,930
3,000
410
6,920
5,210
4,177
1,540
1,544
1,732
1,264
11,574
5,663
748
6,578
3,603
700
2,241
2,037
1,149
1,903
2,000
2,175
2,049

$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$

1,326
1,477
11,836
366
5,052
1,936
176
339
326
2,825
544
3,168
4,158
353
23,311
804
2,918
11,535
5,312
5,903
22,286
856
1,857
1,752
12,982
26,679
25,860
1,632
35,398
3,633
2,730
4,621
1,670
745
340
6,176
3,460
4,016
1,248
1,381
1,747
1,093
8,456
5,259
717
5,813
3,474
678
1,916
1,880
804
1,720
1,980
2,055
1,805

$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$

2,425
2,757
19,041
1,714
9,650
2,900
740
1,884
910
6,489
1,340
6,957
6,425
8,220
30,463
1,681
7,147
15,711
7,605
9,766
35,586
1,399
3,817
4,568
17,018
33,224
35,551
2,696
48,523
6,799
7,004
7,480
2,440
3,600
530
11,261
7,710
6,169
1,710
3,010
2,989
1,814
20,772
9,040
1,635
8,348
7,593
880
3,913
3,385
1,881
3,607
2,470
3,264
6,703

$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$

2,601
2,399
18,544
1,220
9,601
3,021
553
1,512
386
5,407
769
7,080
4,526
520
27,266
1,384
5,008
13,723
6,737
9,001
32,939
2,040
3,995
4,177
15,335
32,430
30,936
2,787
45,571
5,386
7,324
7,522
2,382
1,159
392
9,438
4,717
8,263
1,389
3,335
3,613
1,909
14,582
8,621
1,623
7,202
5,435
1,202
3,072
3,413
1,446
3,323
2,334
3,017
4,035

No
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
No
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
No
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
No
No
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
No
Yes
Yes
No
No
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
No
Yes
No
No
No
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
No
Yes
No
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes

0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
1
0
0
0
1
0
0
0
2
0
0
0
0
(1)
0
0
0
0
0
0
(2)
0
0
0
0
0
0
(2)
0
0
0
0
0
0
1
0
(2)
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0

On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
Early
On Time
On Time
On Time
Early
On Time
On Time
On Time
Early
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
Delayed
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
Delayed
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
Delayed
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
Early
On Time
Delayed
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time
On Time

50
0.3
95
187
95
1
1
4
5
52
25
23
1
1
80
128
39
42.9
14.8
80

50
0.3
94.5
267.4
1
1
1
5
52
25
23
2
1
80
128
39
44.7
12.1
79

Acre(s)
Lane mile(s)
Acre(s) treated/pollutant
Collision(s) reduced
Acre(s) treated/pollutant
Location(s)
Location(s)
Structure(s)
Location(s)
Collision(s) reduced
Collision(s) reduced
Collision(s) reduced
Location(s)
Location(s)
Lane mile(s)
Location(s)
Collision(s) reduced
Lane mile(s)
Lane mile(s)
Field element(s)

1
12
3
42.6
12.5
27
12
64
9
55
174
6
3
1
9
1
1
1
77
4
24
20.4
284
72
866
1
1
10
4.5
120
38
1
36
24.6

1
12
3
33.5
12.5
27
12
64
4
27
177
6
3
1
9
1
1
1
77
4
24
20.4
284
72
915
1
1
17
4.5
120
16.2
1
36
26.7

Location(s)
Collision(s) reduced
Collision(s) reduced
Lane mile(s)
Lane mile(s)
Lane mile(s)
Acres Treated/Pollutant
1,000 vehicle hour(s)/yr
Lane mile(s)
Structure(s)
Collision(s) reduced
Location(s)
Location(s)
Location(s)
Collision(s) reduced
Location(s)
Location(s)
Location(s)
Collision(s) reduced
Location(s)
Collision(s) reduced
Lane mile(s)
Collision(s) reduced
Collision(s) reduced
Sign(s)
Location(s)
Location(s)
Curb ramp(s)
Collision(s) reduced
Location(s)
Acre(s) treated/pollutant
Location(s)
Collision(s) reduced
Acre(s) treated/pollutant
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## Project Delivery Report

**State Highway Operation and Protection**

**Program Project Closeout**

### Support ($1,000's) vs. Capital ($1,000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Original Budget1</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Actual Costs</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Actual Costs</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Actual Costs</th>
<th>Completed Within Approved Budget?</th>
<th>Years Early, Delayed, or On-time</th>
<th>Construction Output2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPA 140 MARISPOS TALLUS REMOVAL</td>
<td>$ 1,700</td>
<td>$ 2,224</td>
<td>$ 17,200</td>
<td>$ 15,829</td>
<td>$ 18,900</td>
<td>$ 18,052</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>Early 1 Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI 299 Helena Fire Wall</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ 415</td>
<td>$ 2,630</td>
<td>$ 2,592</td>
<td>$ 3,130</td>
<td>$ 3,007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>On Time 1 Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIV 010 RIV 10 REHAB</td>
<td>$ 7,250</td>
<td>$ 7,250</td>
<td>$ 5,703</td>
<td>$ 70,424</td>
<td>$ 65,003</td>
<td>$ 77,674</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>Lane mile(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL 120 TOLUAMNE RIVER BRIDGE REHAB</td>
<td>$ 5,784</td>
<td>$ 5,819</td>
<td>$ 19,942</td>
<td>$ 22,024</td>
<td>$ 24,726</td>
<td>$ 24,412</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>Structure(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLU 070 Butte Rogers Flat DO</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ 73</td>
<td>$ 3,410</td>
<td>$ 2,371</td>
<td>$ 3,910</td>
<td>$ 2,443</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUB 225 Marysville Operational Improvement</td>
<td>$ 3,136</td>
<td>$ 3,247</td>
<td>$ 4,433</td>
<td>$ 7,569</td>
<td>$ 7,356</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM 299 HUM-299 REPAIR STORM DAMAGE</td>
<td>$ 190</td>
<td>$ 190</td>
<td>$ 102</td>
<td>$ 660</td>
<td>$ 163</td>
<td>$ 850</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAK 029 Lakeport GC ADA CCA 3-12-18</td>
<td>$ 762</td>
<td>$ 791</td>
<td>$ 844</td>
<td>$ 970</td>
<td>$ 901</td>
<td>$ 1,761</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUT 032 i2y Street Signals</td>
<td>$ 1,260</td>
<td>$ 1,467</td>
<td>$ 1,350</td>
<td>$ 1,511</td>
<td>$ 551</td>
<td>$ 2,978</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR 172 Teh 32 and Plu 36 Pavement Repairs</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td>$ 215</td>
<td>$ 1,600</td>
<td>$ 1,404</td>
<td>$ 1,900</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR 173 South East Drop offs</td>
<td>$ 700</td>
<td>$ 700</td>
<td>$ 690</td>
<td>$ 5,200</td>
<td>$ 4,372</td>
<td>$ 5,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD 094 SD-94 SAIL UPGRADE</td>
<td>$ 2,249</td>
<td>$ 2,448</td>
<td>$ 2,299</td>
<td>$ 1,149</td>
<td>$ 1,081</td>
<td>$ 3,597</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA 080 STORM WATER MITIGATION PROJECT IN BERKELEY</td>
<td>$ 413</td>
<td>$ 780</td>
<td>$ 368</td>
<td>$ 781</td>
<td>$ 1,085</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>On Time 74.8 74.8 Acres Treated/Pollutant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD 210 HOV BUFFER STRIPING SBD-210</td>
<td>$ 302</td>
<td>$ 337</td>
<td>$ 424</td>
<td>$ 311</td>
<td>$ 726</td>
<td>$ 647</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>On Time 14 Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLU 070 The Gauntlet</td>
<td>$ 510</td>
<td>$ 510</td>
<td>$ 262</td>
<td>$ 2,510</td>
<td>$ 2,440</td>
<td>$ 3,020</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR 173 Nickname Required</td>
<td>$ 1,020</td>
<td>$ 1,020</td>
<td>$ 769</td>
<td>$ 3,420</td>
<td>$ 3,237</td>
<td>$ 4,440</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER 099 MER 99 ROADSIDE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>$ 1,089</td>
<td>$ 1,089</td>
<td>$ 1,404</td>
<td>$ 1,686</td>
<td>$ 1,564</td>
<td>$ 2,775</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN 103 South Hamilton Slipout</td>
<td>$ 2,075</td>
<td>$ 2,135</td>
<td>$ 3,864</td>
<td>$ 3,692</td>
<td>$ 5,939</td>
<td>$ 5,827</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLU 147 Plumas Emergency Pavement Repair</td>
<td>$ 210</td>
<td>$ 210</td>
<td>$ 120</td>
<td>$ 1,620</td>
<td>$ 1,589</td>
<td>$ 1,708</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 050 Roadway Settlement Structure Failure</td>
<td>$ 570</td>
<td>$ 570</td>
<td>$ 297</td>
<td>$ 600</td>
<td>$ 508</td>
<td>$ 1,170</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM 084 SM-84 Storm-Damage Repair at 280 NB on Ramp</td>
<td>$ 2,760</td>
<td>$ 3,297</td>
<td>$ 4,075</td>
<td>$ 3,815</td>
<td>$ 6,535</td>
<td>$ 7,116</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN 020 LANDSCAPE REPAIR</td>
<td>$ 190</td>
<td>$ 190</td>
<td>$ 175</td>
<td>$ 1,315</td>
<td>$ 1,300</td>
<td>$ 1,505</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAK 175 LAK-17S storm repairs</td>
<td>$ 425</td>
<td>$ 425</td>
<td>$ 1,232</td>
<td>$ 5,225</td>
<td>$ 4,584</td>
<td>$ 5,650</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA 073 12-0M340 Rte 73/133 El Toro-Wilden Rdwy</td>
<td>$ 1,627</td>
<td>$ 2,334</td>
<td>$ 2,514</td>
<td>$ 2,409</td>
<td>$ 4,141</td>
<td>$ 4,743</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN 101 Last Chance Siphon</td>
<td>$ 2,736</td>
<td>$ 1,065</td>
<td>$ 20</td>
<td>$ 2,756</td>
<td>$ 1,066</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>2 Delayed 2 Location(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN 101 Last Chance Wall</td>
<td>$ 1,870</td>
<td>$ 772</td>
<td>$ 15</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,885</td>
<td>$ 772</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$ 179,059</td>
<td>$ 163,173</td>
<td>$ 479,800</td>
<td>$ 424,812</td>
<td>$ 658,859</td>
<td>$ 587,985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 New project in 2014 Program Document or later.
2 New project in 2016 Program Document or later.

---

### FY 2018-19 SHOPP Project Closeout Support Expenditure Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Budget Expended</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Percentage of Projects</th>
<th>Approved Support Budget ($1,000's)</th>
<th>Actual Support Cost ($1,000's)</th>
<th>Over (Under) Budget ($1,000's)</th>
<th>% Over (Under) Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 60%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>96,860</td>
<td>92,987</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% to 100%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>85,505</td>
<td>80,921</td>
<td>4,584</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 120%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30,869</td>
<td>34,271</td>
<td>3,402</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>179,059</td>
<td>163,173</td>
<td>15,886</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(B) Caltrans Fiscal Year 2018-19
State Highway Operation and Protection
Program Project Closeout

FY 18-19 SHOPP Closeout Delivery Year Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Year</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>On-Time</th>
<th>Delayed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Approved Capital Budget ($1,000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$42,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>$413,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$6,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$11,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of FY 18-19 SHOPP Closeout Delivery Year
## Project Delivery Report

### State Highway Operation and Protection

#### Program Closeout - Large Projects (Total Project Cost Greater than $50 million or Total SHOPP programmed amount (R/W and/or Construction) of $15 Million or greater)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Initial Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Initial Allocated Amount</th>
<th>Supplemental Allocated Amount</th>
<th>Initial Programmed vs Allocated Variance Amount</th>
<th>Expended Amount</th>
<th>Total Allocated vs Expended Variance Amount</th>
<th>Delivery Year</th>
<th>Construction Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Years Early, Delayed, or On-time</td>
<td>Primary Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Early</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>On Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SHOPP R/W and PS&E support as well as construction support were not allocated by the Commission until June 2017 and July 2016, respectively. Since there were no allocations prior to these dates, the initial allocated amount is shown as "0" resulting in a negative number in the total Allocated vs Expended Variance.*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Initial Programmed Amount ($)</th>
<th>Initial Allocated Amount ($)</th>
<th>Supplemental Allocated Amount ($)</th>
<th>Initial Programmed vs Allocated Variance Amount ($)</th>
<th>Expended Amount ($)</th>
<th>Total Allocated vs Expended Variance Amount ($)</th>
<th>Delivery Year</th>
<th>Construction Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA 138 Rte 138 Safety Improvements</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-990</td>
<td>$1,196</td>
<td>-$1,196</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,070</td>
<td>$1,712</td>
<td>-$1,712</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$508</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>-$4</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Sup</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,630</td>
<td>$3,162</td>
<td>-$518</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Cap</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>-$84</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Cap</td>
<td>10,774</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,774</td>
<td>$8,372</td>
<td>-$2,402</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,772</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20,772</td>
<td>$14,582</td>
<td>-$6,190</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA 140</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$398</td>
<td>-$2</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Sup</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,480</td>
<td>$1,480</td>
<td>-$99</td>
<td>1 Early</td>
<td>52 52 Lane mile(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Cap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Cap</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>-$2,500</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,480</td>
<td>$18,052</td>
<td>-$2,572</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIV 010</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1,380</td>
<td>$1,438</td>
<td>-$48</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,340</td>
<td>$352</td>
<td>-$1,988</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>-$10</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Sup</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,907</td>
<td>-$407</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Cap</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-$50</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Cap</td>
<td>70,374</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$87,579</td>
<td>$65,003</td>
<td>-$22,576</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77,674</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$87,579</td>
<td>$70,705</td>
<td>-$6,874</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUO 120</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1,629</td>
<td>$2,038</td>
<td>-$309</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>4,151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,151</td>
<td>$3,781</td>
<td>-$370</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-$50</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Sup</td>
<td>4,151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,151</td>
<td>$3,781</td>
<td>-$370</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Cap</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-$50</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Cap</td>
<td>19,942</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20,827</td>
<td>$18,294</td>
<td>-$2,533</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,726</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20,827</td>
<td>$24,112</td>
<td>-$3,285</td>
<td>0 On Time</td>
<td>0 45.2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SHOPP PA&ED and PS&E support as well as construction support were not allocated by the Commission until June 2017 and July 2016, respectively. Since there were no allocations prior to these dates, the initial allocated amount is shown as "0" resulting in a negative number in the total Allocated vs Expended Variance.
### Quarterly Aggregated Report for Projects that Complete Construction: FY 18/19 - Q1

Number of Projects in this Aggregated Summary: 70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund-Type</th>
<th>Initial Programmed Amount ($1000)</th>
<th>Initial Allocated Amount ($1000)</th>
<th>Supplemental Allocated Amount ($1000)</th>
<th>Initial Programmed vs Allocated Variance Amount ($1000)</th>
<th>Expended Amount ($1000)</th>
<th>Total Allocated vs Expended Variance Amount ($1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PA&amp;E Support</strong></td>
<td>SHOHP</td>
<td>$13,247</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,247</td>
<td>$13,036</td>
<td>-$13,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$13,247</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,247</td>
<td>$13,036</td>
<td>-$13,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PS&amp;E Support</strong></td>
<td>SHOHP</td>
<td>$38,312</td>
<td>$3,674</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$34,638</td>
<td>$37,911</td>
<td>-$34,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$38,312</td>
<td>$3,674</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$34,638</td>
<td>$37,911</td>
<td>-$34,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right of Way Support</strong></td>
<td>SHOHP</td>
<td>$5,628</td>
<td>$647</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,981</td>
<td>$3,566</td>
<td>-$2,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,628</td>
<td>$647</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,981</td>
<td>$3,566</td>
<td>-$2,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Support</strong></td>
<td>SHOHP</td>
<td>$48,702</td>
<td>$4,294</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$44,408</td>
<td>$44,121</td>
<td>-$39,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$48,702</td>
<td>$4,294</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$44,408</td>
<td>$44,121</td>
<td>-$39,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right of Way Capital</strong></td>
<td>SHOHP</td>
<td>$4,301</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,301</td>
<td>$1,324</td>
<td>-$1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,301</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,301</td>
<td>$1,324</td>
<td>-$1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Capital</strong></td>
<td>SHOHP</td>
<td>$186,190</td>
<td>$175,222</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,968</td>
<td>$157,555</td>
<td>$17,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$186,190</td>
<td>$175,222</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,968</td>
<td>$157,555</td>
<td>$17,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>SHOHP</td>
<td>$296,380</td>
<td>$183,837</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$112,543</td>
<td>$257,513</td>
<td>$73,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$296,380</td>
<td>$183,837</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$112,543</td>
<td>$257,513</td>
<td>$73,676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SHOHP PAED and PS&E support as well as construction support were not allocated by the Commission until June 2017 and July 2016, respectively. Since there were no allocations prior to these dates, the initial allocated amount is shown as "0" resulting in a negative number in the total Allocated vs Expended Variance.
### (C) Caltrans Fiscal Year 2018-19, First Quarter
Capital Outlay Support G-12 Request Summary

The table below summarizes G-12 funding requests for the Capital Outlay Support program through the end of Q1, FY 2018-19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>SHOPP No. of Projects</th>
<th>Increase ($1,000's)</th>
<th>STIP No. of Projects</th>
<th>Increase ($1,000's)</th>
<th>Total No. of Projects</th>
<th>Increase ($1,000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$3,622</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$3,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$7,256</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$7,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$4,502</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$5,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-12 Year-to-Date</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$15,380</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>$15,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS Increase¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>($15,886)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($11,884)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net G-12 Plus COS Increase²</td>
<td>$ (506)</td>
<td>$4,002</td>
<td>$4,552</td>
<td>$4,046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Appendix A and B, Approved COS budget minus Actual Costs
² Represents Year to Date G-12 plus COS Increase
## (D) Watch List: First Quarter Retired Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programed Budget ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Risk Component</th>
<th>Risk Trend</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAK</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Lak 175 -Middletown Shoulders</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAK</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Lak 175 -Middletown Shoulders</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>Right of Way Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Wabash-Fairfield Safety</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,382</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Little Lost Man Fish Passage</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Completed PAED in June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>096</td>
<td>Willow Creek Charging Station</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Butte &amp; Ash Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>10,086</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>049</td>
<td>Pla-49 Rehab Project</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>38,805</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>Colusa Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>SON 116 ADA Ped Infrastructure</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>SR 128 CONN CREEK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>17,903</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>SON 116/Llano Rd LT</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>10,668</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>Intersection Improvement - Roundabout-route 12 and 113</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>7,122</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Bridge replacement San Rafael harbor creek</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>14,787</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Capell Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>18,885</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>CRANDALL CREEK SEISMIC RETROFIT BRIDGE #33-0273</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>04-3E602_SF 001-LOMBARD CAPM</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,261</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Ramp Metering</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>12,960</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>MRN-101 Storm damage restoration</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>3,995</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>SON-1 soldier pile wall and RSP</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>8,310</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (D) Watch List: First Quarter Retired Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programed Budget ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Risk Component</th>
<th>Risk Trend</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Storm Damage Adjacent to Capell Creek</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>04-4K110_SF 001 19th AVE. CAPM AND INTERCONNECT SIGNALS</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>27,379</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>068</td>
<td>Pacific Grove Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>La Gloria Rd Curve Correction</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>7,069</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Pismo Creek Scour Repair Project</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,794</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>Hwy 9 Shoulder Widening, MBGR Upgrades, Ctr Rumble Strip, Super Imp</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>13,208</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>PASATIEMPO SHOULDER WIDENING</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>10,057</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>SCR-1 CAPM</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>17,699</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Salinas Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>52,179</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Salinas River bridge seismic retrofit</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>44,855</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Scr 152 ADA</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>3,768</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>Rte Deficiency Corrections</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>9,235</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>KING CITY REHAB</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>56,260</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>North King City Barrier</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>9,815</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>BAY CLUB DRIVE</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>13,351</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>Pavement Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,368</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>060</td>
<td>Pavement Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>94,588</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Paint LA River Bridge</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>7,664</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>Widen Bridge, Modified Ramp</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Completed PAED in June 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (D) Watch List: First Quarter Retired Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programed Budget ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Risk Component</th>
<th>Risk Trend</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Ven 126 TMDL</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>9,185</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>ITS Restoration Work in Hassan Mana'a's area</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>26,091</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIV</td>
<td>074</td>
<td>Riv 74 Hemet Raised Median Curb</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>40,916</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>SBD 18 ADELANTO SHOULDER WIDENING</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>48,538</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>SBD 18 VICTORVILLE CONSTRUCT MEDIAN CURB</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>15,279</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>060</td>
<td>SBD 60 - REPLACE PIPELINE, MONTE VISTA AND BENSON BRIDGES</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>35,230</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>SBD 10 Santa Ana River Br Seismic Retrofit</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>31,233</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>SBD 127 Near Baker Widen Shoulder and Rumble Strips</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>SBD 247 Near Lucerne Valley Widen Shoulder and Rumble Strips</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,859</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>062</td>
<td>SBD 62 Widen shoulders, add Rumble Strips &amp; Signals</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>6,164</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>SBD 395 CONSTRUCT 4' MEDIAN BUFFER</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>24,895</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>095</td>
<td>SBD 95 Shoulder Widening &amp; Rumble Strips Installation</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>WESTLEY REST AREA</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,477</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUO</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>SR108 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>6,672</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>094</td>
<td>SD 94 REALIGN NEAR FREEZER RD</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>7,876</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>DVMS PANELS</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>6,446</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>I-805 SWEETWATER RIVER BRIDGE UPGRADE</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fiscal Year Delivery</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Project Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KER</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Buttonwillow SRRA Sewer Upgrade</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pre-Construction-COS Supplementals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programed Budget ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Risk Component</th>
<th>Risk Trend</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KER</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Buttonwillow SRRA Sewer Upgrade</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Programed Budget ($1,000s)</td>
<td>Risk Component</td>
<td>Risk Trend</td>
<td>Risk Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRE</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Shaver to Huntington CAPM &amp; Culvert Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Restore Truck Weight Station</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>4,872</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Funds Approved-CTC Action in June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Restore Truck Weight Station</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Funds Approved-CTC Action in June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>Annual Element Project</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>088</td>
<td>CLEMENTS CAPM</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>6,343</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>049</td>
<td>Rumble Strip Installation</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMA</td>
<td>088</td>
<td>Rumble Strip Installation</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>Colusa Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>Pavement Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>3,646</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Funds Approved-CTC Action in August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>Pavement Rehab</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Funds Approved-CTC Action in August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Paint LA River Bridge</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>5,631</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Funds Approved-CTC Action in August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Paint LA River Bridge</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Funds Approved-CTC Action in August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>ERRECA REST AREA WASTEWATER SYSTEM</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Latest Estimates Within 120%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuo</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>TUO, STA, MPA Rumble Strips</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Latest Estimates Within 120%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>SR 108 &amp; 132 ADA IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>096</td>
<td>Willow Creek Charging Station</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>NO COS Supplemental was Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>096</td>
<td>Willow Creek Charging Station</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>NO COS Supplemental was Needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(D) Watch List: First Quarter Retired Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programed Budget ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Risk Component</th>
<th>Risk Trend</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>068</td>
<td>Pacific Grove Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Supplemental Allocation Granted-June 2018 CTC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>SCr 152 ADA</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Supplemental Allocation Granted-June 2018 CTC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INY</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Towne Pass Curves</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>No Need for Supplemental; ETC Was Reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>SBd 138 Widening (West of 15)(PHASE 1a)</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Completed CCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>SBd 138 Realignment (East of 15)</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>31,968</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Within Budget-Potential Creation of a New Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMA</td>
<td>088</td>
<td>AMADOR 88 CAPM</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Completed CCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMA</td>
<td>088</td>
<td>SILVER LAKE CAMPGROUND CAPM</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Completed CCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Sidehill &amp; Dog Creek Seismic Retrofit</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>29,646</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Funds Approved-CTC Action in June 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>033</td>
<td>Slope Repair</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>4,906</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Funds Approved-CTC Action in August 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>BOULDIN ISLAND REHAB</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Funds Approved-CTC Action in August 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(E) Projects Awarded vs Supplemental to Award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Awarded¹ (Millions)</th>
<th>Supplemental to Award² (Millions)</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250.76</td>
<td>$6.72</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Contract Allocations of the Statewide Delivery Plan Projects Awarded in Q1, FY18/19. Excludes None-Conventional and/or Special Funded Pilot Projects (CMGC, Design Built, ...).

2 Supplemental to Award for the Projects. CTC Actions: August 2018. Projects: 07-31330, 06-0U09U, 08-1G460, 10-1C430.
### (F) Construction Contracts Completed vs Supplemental to Complete Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Contracts Completed&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (Millions)</th>
<th>Supplemental to Complete Construction&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (Millions)</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$623.60</td>
<td>$4.32</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1, FY18/19 ($Millions)**

- **86 Projects Completed Construction**
- **1 Supplemental To Complete Construction (Ratio: 1.16%)**

---

1. Appendix A and B, SHOPP and STIP projects. The Actual Total Cost of Completed Construction Contracts, Q1, 18/19 FY. Construction costs are calculated 6 months after the end of construction.

2. Supplemental to Complete Construction Contract for the Projects. CTC Action Item: June 2016; Project 02-3E410.
M e m o r a n d u m

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
   Chief Financial Officer

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Subject: ALLOCATION FOR PROJECT WITH COSTS THAT EXCEED THE PROGRAMMED AMOUNT BY MORE THAN 20 PERCENT
   (PPNO 03-8132/EA 1A920 – SUTTER COUNTY – STATE ROUTE 20)
   RESOLUTION FP-18-43

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.5d (1)
Action Item

Prepared By: Amarjeet Benipal
   District 03 - Director

 ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation’s (Department) allocation request for $30,790,000 for the State Highway Operation Protection Program (SHOPP) Pavement Rehabilitation project (PPNO 8132) on State Route (SR) 20 in Sutter County?

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $30,790,000 for the SHOPP Pavement Rehabilitation project (PPNO 03-8132) on SR-20 in Sutter County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Construction Component</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Program Adjustment</th>
<th>Requested Funds</th>
<th>% Over Programmed Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-SUT-20</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$21,614,000</td>
<td>$6,186,000</td>
<td>$27,800,000</td>
<td>29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$2,771,000</td>
<td>$219,000</td>
<td>$2,990,000</td>
<td>8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$24,385,000</td>
<td>$6,405,000</td>
<td>$30,790,000</td>
<td>26 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project is located on SR 20, between the Sutter Bypass and Lytle Road and near Yuba City, in Sutter County. The project will rehabilitate a section of the roadway by widening the shoulders to 8 feet, rehabilitating the pavement, performing drainage improvements, and replacing the existing bridge over the Wadsworth canal. The new bridge will be built on a new alignment, parallel to and north of, the existing bridge.

The project is consistent with the performance measures, goals, and objectives in the Commission-adopted Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP). This project includes the following performance measures:

1. Replace the 98-year old Wadsworth Bridge and provide a bridge with a service life of 50 years. The new bridge will replace 6,189 square feet of “poor” condition bridge deck and add an additional 3,171 square feet of new bridge deck, for a total of 9,360 square feet of good quality bridge deck.
2. Rehabilitate a total of 13.5 lane-miles of pavement, including 0.5 lane-mile of “poor” quality pavement, 12.8 lane-miles of “fair” quality pavement and 0.2 lane-miles of “good” quality pavement.
3. Widen a section of existing shoulders and provide 12 lane-miles of standard shoulders.

PROGRAMMING STATUS:

The project was programmed in the 2016 SHOPP for a Construction allocation in fiscal year 2017-18; which is from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018. The Department was not able to deliver the project within that time period and requested a 9-month time extension, which was granted by the Commission, on June 27, 2018.

Furthermore, the Commission’s adopted Interim SHOPP Guidelines do not allow for changes in the programmed costs after a project’s programmed fiscal year of delivery has begun. Subsequently, the only opportunity to make any changes is at the time of construction allocation request.

REASON FOR COST INCREASE:

This project was initially a contingency project consistent with Commission Guidelines, with no funds programmed for the Construction phase. The Project Approval & Environmental Document (PA&ED) was completed on December 1, 2016, with an updated estimate of $21,614000. In June 2017, the Department re-evaluated the Engineer’s Estimate (EE) to fully program construction phases in the 2016 SHOPP for delivery in 2017-18. The EE was found to be within acceptable tolerances of the proposed programmed amount identified during the PA&ED in December 2016, and no change was needed. However, the re-evaluation of the EE in 2017 was based on the best information available in the early stages of design and increased to the anticipated year of construction.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
Construction Capital
During the development of the Plans, Specifications and Estimate (PS&E), additional roadway items (such as safety lighting and replacing existing culverts) were added per safety and constructability review recommendations. In addition, storm-water requirements (biofiltration devices inside the roadside ditches to improve water quality) and US Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) levee requirements (reconstruction of a portion of levee) were revealed, which increased the construction cost.

The Department worked with the USACE to obtain the Section 408 permit but were not able to finalize the terms in time to deliver the project in 2017-18. This delay in obtaining the permit, also affected the project’s right-of-way schedule. Because of these two issues, construction of the project was delayed for nine months. In December 2018, the PS&E and the EE were finalized. The final “Certified” EE included an evaluation of the current bidding environment and escalation costs based on the current year of construction.

Construction Support
Although the Construction Support increase is less than 20 percent of the programmed amount, there was an increase to the original programmed amount. This increase in Construction Support is due to the additional effort required under current permit conditions with USACE within the levee and canal, and the anticipation of having to hire a biologist for the high probability of encountering Giant Gartner snakes within the project work limits. These items contributed to an increase of 8 percent over the programmed amount.

CONSEQUENCES:

SR 20 is mainly a two-lane conventional highway that serves regional, interregional, commute, commercial, agricultural, and recreational traffic. It also serves as a major east-west connector between Interstate 5 and SR 99, and interconnects with other major routes, including SR 70 and Interstate 80. SR 20 is part of the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan.

The Department investigated reducing the scope of 13.5 lane-miles, but that option was not feasible because of the constant deterioration of the pavement.

The Department has determined that if this allocation request for $30,790,000 is not approved, this roadway rehabilitation project will not be advertised, and construction will be delayed.

RESOLUTION:

Resolved, that $27,800,000 in Construction Capital be allocated from the Budget Acts of 2017 and 2018, Budget Act Items 2660-302-0890 and 2660-802-3290, and $2,990,000 in Construction Support be allocated from Budget Act Items 2660-302-0890 and 2660-505-3290, to provide funds to advertise the project.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

#### Allocations for Projects with Cost Increase Greater than 20 Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$433,000</td>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>03-Sut-20</td>
<td>5.0/11.3</td>
<td>Near Yuba City, from east end of Sutter Bypass to Lytle Road. Outcome/Output: Rehabilitate pavement, widen shoulders to 8.0 feet, and replace Wadsworth Canal Bridge No.18-0003.</td>
<td>Preliminary</td>
<td>SHOPP/17-18</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>302-0890 FTF</td>
<td>$2,641,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA - MND, 11/18/2017; Re-validation 6/14/2018)
(NEPA - CE, 7/5/2017; Re-validation 6/14/2018)

(Future consideration of funding approved under Resolution E-17-11; March 2017.)
(Time Extension FY 17-18 CONST and CON ENG expires on 3/31/2019.)

#### Performance Measures: Pavement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Condition</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Condition</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
   Chief Financial Officer

Subject: ALLOCATION FOR PROJECT WITH COSTS THAT EXCEED THE PROGRAMMED
        AMOUNT BY MORE THAN 20 PERCENT
        (PPNO 07-4847/EA 313601 – LOS ANGELES COUNTY – INTERSTATE 5)
        RESOLUTION FP-18-44

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California
Department of Transportation’s (Department) allocation request for $2,787,000 for the State
Highway Operation Protection Program (SHOPP) Drainage Culvert Replacement project
(PPNO 07-4847) on Interstate 5 (I-5) in Los Angeles County?

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $2,787,000 for the
SHOPP Drainage Culvert Replacement project (PPNO 07-4847) on I-5 in Los Angeles County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Construction Component</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Program Adjustment</th>
<th>Requested Funds</th>
<th>% Over Programmed Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-LA-5</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,384,000</td>
<td>$433,000</td>
<td>$1,817,000</td>
<td>31.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$970,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$970,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,354,000</td>
<td>$433,000</td>
<td>$2,787,000</td>
<td>18.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system
to enhance California’s economy and livability”
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is on I-5, approximately 4.4 miles north of the Templin Highway Undercrossing bridge near Pyramid Lake, in Los Angeles County. The purpose of the project is to restore the function of two sections of highway drainage culverts, constructed in 1969, which have been compromised over the years due to compression, misalignment, joint separation, significant cracking and spalling, and accumulation of debris and sediments. To restore proper drainage and improve the drainage system, the project proposes to replace 268 feet of 30-inch diameter asbestos cement pipe (ACP) and 296 feet of 24-inch diameter ACP with the same respective diameter reinforced concrete drainage pipe.

The project will rehabilitate 564 feet of “poor” condition drainage culvert to a “good” condition to advance the SHOPP pavement project. The project is consistent with the Commission-adopted Transportation Asset Management Plan.

PROGRAMMING STATUS:

The project is programmed in the 2018 SHOPP for a Construction allocation in fiscal year 2018-19; which is from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019. If the Department does not obtain an allocation during this programmed fiscal year, a time extension for the Construction allocation will be required to keep the project programming active.

Furthermore, the Commission’s adopted Interim SHOPP Guidelines do not allow for changes in the programmed costs after a project’s programmed fiscal year of delivery has begun. Subsequently, the only opportunity to make any changes is at the time of construction allocation request.

REASON FOR COST INCREASE:

The increase in the Engineer’s Estimate (EE) for this project is a result of the recent determination that the drainage culverts are composed of cement containing asbestos. Although a hazardous waste assessment was performed, and video inspection of the culverts were conducted as part of the development of the project initiation document for initial programming in the SHOPP, the presence of asbestos in the culvert was not expected nor identified. The currently programmed capital construction cost estimate in the SHOPP is based on removal and disposal of non-asbestos containing plain reinforced concrete culverts.

The presence of asbestos was determined in January 2018, early in the design phase, when the Department’s project delivery team conducted further reviews of the 1969 original as-built drawings. The Hazardous Waste Assessment, which detailed the material handling and disposal requirements, was completed April 28, 2018, which was after the Commission’s adoption of the 2018 SHOPP at the March 16, 2018 Commission meeting.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
The estimated cost for removal and disposal of the asbestos cement pipe is significantly higher than reinforced concrete pipe removal, due to required asbestos mitigation work plans. California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA) regulations, require construction site containment and transportation of the removed pipes to a dedicated disposal site, which is located approximately 150-miles from the construction site.

The Department has evaluated the possibility of rehabilitating the culverts with a plastic lining, but mis-alignment, compression, and joint separation of the 50-year-old culverts preclude the plastic lining alternative. In addition, abandoning the existing culvert in place and construction of a new drainage system at an alternative location is cost prohibitive because of the mountainous terrain.

The Department has updated the estimated cost of all other contract items in the EE to reflect current market conditions.

The current Construction Support allocation has been determined to be adequate, and the Department is not requesting an increase over the programmed amount.

**CONSEQUENCES:**

The Department has determined that if this allocation request for $2,787,000 is not approved, the Department will not be able to construct this drainage culvert replacement project to enable the advancement of a programmed SHOPP pavement project covering the same section of I-5.

Furthermore, Department Maintenance personnel will be required to continue to monitor the condition of these poor condition culverts until such a time as they are replaced.

**RESOLUTION:**

Resolved, that $1,817,000 in Construction Capital be allocated from the Budget Act of 2018, Budget Act Item 2660-302-0042 and $970,000 in Construction Support be allocated from Budget Act Item 2660-001-0042 to provide funds to advertise the project.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>Project Support Expenditures</th>
<th>Resolution FP-18-44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles 07-LA-5 R70.4</td>
<td>$2,787,000</td>
<td>Near Pyramid Lake, 4.4 miles north of Templin Highway.</td>
<td>This project will restore the function of two sections of a highway drainage system, which have been compromised over the years due to compression, misalignment, joint separation, and accumulation of sediment and debris. The existing asbestos cement pipe will be replaced with a reinforced concrete pipe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measure: Culverts (1 each)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Condition</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>564.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Condition</td>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td>564.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Vote List

**2.5d.(2) Allocations for Projects with Cost Increase Greater than 20 Percent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Adv Phase</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-4847</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>001-0042 SHA</td>
<td>20.10.201.151</td>
<td>$970,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-4847</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>302-0042 SHA</td>
<td>20.20.201.151</td>
<td>$1,817,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preliminary Engineering Budget Expended**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$101,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$368,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$8,462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA - CE, 12/30/2016; Re-validation 9/12/2018)
(NEPA - CE, 12/30/2016; Re-validation 9/12/2018)
To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS  
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019  
Reference No.: 2.5e.(1)  
Action Item  

From: STEVEN KECK  
Chief Financial Officer  
Prepared by: Tim Gubbins  
District 05 - Director  

Subject: SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS ALLOCATION FOR PREVIOUSLY VOTED PROJECT  
(PPNO 05-2378/EA 05-1C250 – MONTEREY COUNTY - STATE ROUTE 68)  
RESOLUTION FA-18-35  

ISSUE  

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation’s (Department) request for an additional $952,000 for the State Highway Operation Protection Program (SHOPP) Collision Severity Reduction project (PPNO 2378) on State Route (SR) 68, in Monterey County, to award the construction contract?  

RECOMMENDATION  

The Department recommends that the Commission allocate an additional $952,000 for the previously approved SHOPP Collision Severity Reduction project (PPNO 2378) on SR 68, in Monterey County, to award the construction contract.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Component</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
<th>% Allocation Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed</td>
<td>Allocated</td>
<td>Supplemental FundsRequested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
<td>$3,753,000</td>
<td>$952,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$ 786,000</td>
<td>$ 904,000</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,657,000</td>
<td>$952,000</td>
<td>$5,609,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT LOCATION, DESCRIPTION, AND CONTRACT STATUS:

This project is located on SR 68, near the town of Pacific Grove, in Monterey County. The project will widen shoulders, install rumble strips, upgrade guardrails, and install new concrete barriers. Lane closures of travel lanes and shoulders on this project will be limited to night hours only. During the design phase, it was determined that the cost of relocating and re-constructing an existing fiber optic cable vault would be very expensive and would require the acquisition of land. The Department decided to modify the bridge foundation design to accommodate and keep the existing fiber optic cable vault, thus eliminating the need for Right-of-Way programming dollars.

Currently, the contract award status is pending approval of this request for supplemental funds. If the Commission approves this request, construction would begin in March 2019 and would take 100 working days and be completed in two construction seasons.

FUNDING STATUS:

The project was programmed in the 2018 SHOPP for $3,600,000 for Construction Capital and $786,000 for Construction Support. The Engineer’s Estimate (EE) was completed in June 2018, using available historical and current market trend data at that time and resulted in a higher estimated construction cost. In June 2018, the Commission approved the project based on the higher EE and allocated $3,753,000 for Construction Capital and $904,000 for Construction Support. The project was advertised on September 10, 2018 and bids were opened on October 16, 2018. Three bids were submitted. The lowest bidder was non-responsive, so the Department plans on awarding to the 2nd lowest bidder, who is 22 percent higher than the allocated funds. Therefore, the total amount needed to award the contract, based on the 2nd lowest bidder, is $4,705,000 for Construction Capital.

REASON(S) FOR COST INCREASE:

The project’s location includes an existing fiber optic cable vault where the bridge foundations were also located. Initially, the Department based its bridge design on relocating the vault away from the bridge, as identified in the Project Approval Environmental Document. During the design phase, and upon further analysis, the Department determined that relocating the vault would be very expensive due to the cost of land acquisition, and the risk and high cost of relocating advanced communication equipment. The Department decided to modify the bridge foundation design and accommodate and keep the existing fiber optic cable vault by designing around it. The Department was aware of the difficult task to construct the bridge foundations around the existing vault given the limited access due to the narrow width of SR 68 at the bridge site, and project work restriction to night time only. The Department’s June 2018 updated EE included factors to account for these construction complications and the additional bridge cost due to foundation design modifications.

The request for larger than the previously allocated amount also accounts for the higher bidding environment and the higher construction costs throughout the region. However; by keeping the vault in its current location, the Department would not have to spend funds programmed to acquire Right of Way land, and the vault relocation cost.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
The Department discussed the bid results and compared bid prices with the contractors, including several who opted out of participating in the bid process. The Department concluded that, considering the current regional market trends, the EE undervalued the cost of the following:

1. **Concrete Barrier:** The contractor stated the bid was higher for this item due to the difficulty of construction of the required concrete barrier footing along the entire length of the barrier and between bridge columns. Also, to avoid the utility vault, items would need to be specially made, and the required designed footing would cost more to construct.

2. **Pavement Items, Modifying Electrical System and Structural Drainage Inlet:** The contractor stated the bid was higher because of night work. In addition, SR 68 has little to no shoulders, and there is limited staging area at most work locations. These factors result in a slower pace for the contractor’s operation and therefore increased the cost for these items as compared to the EE.

3. **Construction Market:** The contractor stated that the high bid can also be attributed to the overwhelmingly busy construction market. There are many ongoing projects in the area, and there is a noticeable shortage of contractors and specialty sub-contractors in the region.

Although there were only two eligible bidders, the Department has reviewed the bid results for possible mathematical or material unbalancing in accordance with 23 CFR 635.102, and 23CFR 635.114. The bids appear to be mathematically balanced and there is no evidence of material unbalancing of the low bid.

**CONSEQUENCES:**

If additional funds are not approved, this safety project would be delayed, and may need to be reprogrammed. Considering the current bidding environment, re-advertising the contract will delay the delivery of this project and is not expected to result in lower bids.

The Department has determined that the additional funds requested are in the best interest of the State to avoid delays in implementing this important SHOOPP Collision Severity Reduction project consistent with the Commission-adopted goals and objectives of the Transportation Asset Management Plan.

**RESOLUTION:**

Resolved, that $952,000 be allocated from the Budget Act of 2018, Budget Act Item 2660-302-0890 to provide funds to award the construction contract for the SHOOPP Collision Severity Reduction project on SR 68 in Monterey County.
# 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Support Expenditures</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Program Codes</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Additional</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTPA/CTC</td>
<td>$952,000</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>TAMC</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>05-Mon-68</td>
<td>Near Pacific Grove, from Piedmont Avenue to Scenic Drive. Widen shoulders, install rumble strips, and upgrade guardrail. Outcome/Output: Widen shoulders, install rumble strips, and upgrade guardrail to current standards to reduce the severity and number of collisions.</td>
<td>05-2378</td>
<td>SHOPP/2018-19</td>
<td>302-0042</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>302-0890</td>
<td>$3,678,000</td>
<td>$3,678,000</td>
<td>20.20.201.015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1C250</td>
<td>$952,000</td>
<td>$952,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1C250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS  
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK  
Chief Financial Officer

Reference No.: 2.5e.(2)  
Action Item

Subject: SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS ALLOCATION FOR PREVIOUSLY VOTED PROJECT  
(PPNO 09-0615/EA 09-35780 – MONO COUNTY - STATE ROUTE 395)  
RESOLUTION FA-18-36

ISSUE

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation’s (Department) request for an additional $2,985,000 for the State Highway Operation Protection Program (SHOPP) Collision Severity Reduction project (PPNO 0615) on United States Highway (US) 395, in Mono County, to re-advertise and award the construction contract?

RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends that the Commission allocate an additional $2,985,000 for the previously approved SHOPP Collision Severity Reduction project (PPNO 0615) on US 395, in Mono County, to re-advertise and award the construction contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Component</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
<th>% Allocation Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed</td>
<td>Allocated</td>
<td>Supplemental Funds Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$5,455,000</td>
<td>$6,512,000</td>
<td>$2,985,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$1,310,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,822,000</td>
<td>$2,985,000</td>
<td>$10,807,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT LOCATION, DESCRIPTION, AND CONTRACT STATUS:

This project is located on US 395, near the town of Bridgeport, in Mono County. The project will widen shoulders, install rumble strips, replace and upgrade guardrails, install new concrete barriers, improve roadway cross-slope and stopping sight distance, and install rock-fall protection to reduce the severity and number of collisions.

The performance measure goal is to reduce collisions by 28 collisions and improve 2.9 lane miles from “fair” to “good” condition and improve one census station from “poor” to “good” condition. The improvement is consistent with the Commission-adopted goals and objectives of the Transportation Asset Management Plan.

At this time, all contract bids have been rejected. The Department will re-advertise the contract upon approval of this supplemental funds request.

FUNDING STATUS:

The project was programmed in the 2016 SHOPP for $5,455,000 for Construction Capital and $1,100,000 for Construction Support. In January 2018, the Commission approved the project allocating $6,512,000 for Construction Capital and $1,310,000 for Construction Support. An updated Engineer’s Estimate (EE) was recently completed, which increased the Construction Capital cost by $2,985,000 over the allocated funds. The updated cost of Construction Capital for this project is $9,497,000.

This project was previously advertised, and bids were opened on April 25, 2018, and after analyzing the two bids received by the Department, both bids were rejected. The Department determined that both bids reflected unreasonable cost of material and labor above the Engineer’s Estimate (EE), as the two bids were almost double the estimated project cost. The Department also learned that both bidders were concurrently working on projects immediately adjacent to the north and south of the proposed project, which may have deterred other contractors from bidding on this project.

Non-bidding contractors, whom the Department typically expect to bid on local projects, stated there was too much risk of potential conflicts from other construction projects occurring or scheduled to occur at and near the same location. The construction on either side of this project could cause haul trucks to be delayed for up to a half-an-hour. One non-bidding contractor said at this time they were having a problem with material quality issues associated with the long haul. In addition, construction markets were competitive in all regions; Nevada DOT had several large projects out for bid at the same time. Non-bidding contractors that were contacted stated that they would be interested in bidding the project if it were re-advertised with these items addressed.

Because of the feedback from bidding and non-bidding contractors, and with consideration of bids of similar projects in the area, the Department determined that the bids should be rejected because the results were over-inflated for the work to be performed. Subsequently, the Department was granted a 12-month time extension at the June 2018 Commission meeting to allow for the project to be re-advertised, and subsequently awarded.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
REASON(S) FOR COST INCREASE:

The main reason for the cost increase, over the approved amount, is due to the current escalation of material and labor prices and the uptrend of the bidding environment. The updated certified EE and adjusted project cost is expected to attract more bidders when the project is re-advertised in February 2019 if this supplemental fund request is approved. Over the last half year, the Department has seen a trend that shows a significant increase in the cost of materials and significant decrease of available contractors and subcontractors in a busy construction market.

Based on the discussion with several non-bidding contractors, the Department believes that re-advertising the project is in the best interest of the State, as the Department is combining this project with the Aspen Fales Shoulder Widening Project, for construction. This will help decrease the overall costs and allow the contractor to control the entire operations of both projects, therefore eliminate dueling prime contractors and subcontractors working adjacent to each other. The Department will also perform contractors outreach events during the advertisement period. The Department will also make available a site near the city of Lee Vining for contractors use as the Baseline Material Site.

In addition, both projects to the north and south, have since been completed so the project is no longer “land-locked” between ongoing construction or competing contractors. Based on conversations with those non-bidding contractors, this could also provide a more favorable bidding environment upon re-advertising the project.

CONSEQUENCES:

The Department has determined that additional funds of $2,985,000 are needed to re-advertise and award the construction contract. The additional funds being requested are in the best interest of the State. The Department has exercised all feasible measures to minimize costs in carrying out work related to this project and has determined that this request is well-supported and is the only viable alternative available.

The Department has determined that the additional funds requested are in the best interest of the State to avoid delays in implementing this important SHOPP Collision Severity Reduction project which is consistent with the Commission-adopted goals and objectives of the Transportation Asset Management Plan.

RESOLUTION:

Resolved, that $2,985,000 be allocated from the Budget Act of 2017, Budget Act Items 2660-302-0890 to provide funds to advertise and award the construction contract for the SHOPP Collision Severity Reduction project on SR 395 in Mono County.

Attachment
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Support Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTPA/CTC</td>
<td>$2,985,000</td>
<td>Near Bridgeport, from 0.3 mile south of Route 108 to 2 miles north of Route 108. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Widen shoulders, install rumble strips, replace guardrail, improve roadway cross-slope and stopping sight distance, and install rock-fall protection to reduce the severity and number of collisions.</td>
<td>09-Mno-395</td>
<td>93.4/95.7</td>
<td>SHOPP/2017-18</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$342,000</td>
<td>$2,643,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Resolution FA-18-36**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Program Codes</th>
<th>State Federal</th>
<th>Additional Amount by Fund Type</th>
<th>State Federal</th>
<th>Revised Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5e.(2)</td>
<td>Supplemental Funds For Previously Voted Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total revised amount $9,497,000**
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS ALLOCATION FOR PREVIOUSLY VOTED PROJECT
(PPNO 02-3477/EA 02-4E680 – SISKIYOU COUNTY - STATE ROUTE 97)
RESOLUTION FA-18-37

ISSUE

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation’s (Department) request for an additional $400,000 for the State Highway Operation Protection Program (SHOPP) Roadway Safety Improvement project (PPNO 3477) on State Route (SR) 97, in Siskiyou County, to complete construction?

RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends that the Commission allocate an additional $400,000 for the previously approved SHOPP Roadway Safety Improvement project (PPNO 3477) on SR 97, in Siskiyou County, to complete construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Component</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
<th>% Allocation Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed</td>
<td>Allocated</td>
<td>G-12 Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$3,005,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$ 630,000</td>
<td>$ 630,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,635,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT LOCATION, DESCRIPTION, AND CONTRACT STATUS:

This project is located on SR 97, 19 miles south of Macdoel at the Grass Lake Safety Roadside Rest Area (SRRA), in Siskiyou County. The project will upgrade the water, wastewater, and electrical systems.

The contract was awarded in March 2018 for $3,005,000 in Construction Capital. The contract is currently suspended. Construction approximately 94 percent completed.

FUNDING STATUS:

The project was programmed in the 2016 SHOPP for $2,100,000 for Construction Capital and $630,000 for Construction Support. At the December 2017 Commission meeting, the Department received supplemental funds to award the project contract, and in March 2018, the project contract was awarded. The current Construction Capital allotment is $3,005,000.

REASON(S) FOR COST INCREASE:

The additional funds are needed to enable this project to satisfy the original need and purpose of restoring the SRRA to meet current ADA standards. To date, the Department has issued four change orders (COs) that have occurred since construction began. Though not completely exhausted, the current project allotment will need additional funding to complete construction and adequately replenish expended funds. The funds expended to date have been used to compensate contractors for changes needed to preserve the original SRRA restoration goals. These contract changes are described below:

1. Parking area pavement: The existing pavement thickness was inadequate in some areas and had to be regraded and compacted before repaving. Existing water lines under the parking lot also had to be extended to conform with the new plans. This extra work was not anticipated.

2. ADA: An existing curb ramp was found to be non-ADA compliant, and portions of the existing sidewalk were broken and in poor condition. A corrective work that was not included in the original contract was needed, and CO was executed to direct the contractor to implement a revised design to correct this issue and rebuild the ramp to conform to ADA standards.

3. Well: A major component of the project was to replace the existing spring-fed water supply with a new well. The new well was unable to supply the water amount as required by the project plans, and the water flow rate was not adequate to meet the specified, new pumping equipment installed per the project plans. The Department incurred additional cost to revise the plans, and to purchase and install new equipment.

4. Delays: The issues described above resulted in cost increase due to time delay, work stoppage, and re-mobilization to allow for design modifications. This cost increase is a significant portion of the amount outlined in this request.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
5. **Differing Site Conditions:** When the parking lot subgrade was exposed, diesel-contamination was discovered in the soil. Although this hazardous waste was removed and disposed, this work was not anticipated and was not included in the original contract.

The Department has pending COs related to some of the ongoing work for the categories described above, including work intended to re-commission an auxiliary comfort station moved to this site by a previous project. The total amount needed to address these issues is $400,000.

**RISK ANALYSIS:**

The Department conducted constructability reviews at various project milestones and identified several project potential risks that could impact the construction phase. However, the identified risks have not contributed to the cost increase for this project. All cost increases stem from unrecognized or unknown risks.

**CONSEQUENCES:**

The Department has determined that additional funds are needed to complete this construction contract and the additional funds requested are in the best interest of the State.

The Department has exercised all feasible measures to minimize costs in carrying out work related to this project and has determined that this request is well-supported and is the only viable alternative available.

If this request for an additional $400,000 is not approved, this contract will not be completed. The Department will be unable to re-open the Grass Lake SRRA to the public due to the lack of a fresh water supply, incomplete re-commissioning of the auxiliary comfort station, and potential liability of non-standard ADA ramps and sidewalks. The rest area would remain closed and become a liability for field maintenance crews responsible to prevent vandalism and the unauthorized use by the public.

**RESOLUTION:**

Resolved, that $400,000 be allocated from the Budget Act of 2017, Budget Act Item 2660-302-0890 to provide funds for the SHOPP Roadway Safety Improvement project on SR 97 in Siskiyou County, to complete construction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Suplemental funds are needed to Complete Construction.</th>
<th>Total revised amount $3,404,400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near Macdoel, at Grass Lake Safety Roadside Rest Area (SRRA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct well, upgrade water, wastewater, and electrical systems, install relocated modular comfort station, and improve parking area. Work will reduce maintenance requirements, improve SRRA operations, and ensure facility remains compliant with State regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution FA-18-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5e.(3) **Supplemental Funds For Previously Voted Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Program Codes</th>
<th>State Fund Type</th>
<th>Federal Fund Type</th>
<th>Additional Amount by Fund Type</th>
<th>Revised Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302-0042</td>
<td>SHOPP/2017-18</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302-0890</td>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>$900,800</td>
<td>$900,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.20.201.235</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 4.12

Information

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN

Executive Director

Prepared By: Garth Hopkins

Deputy Director

Subject: USE OF SENATE BILL 1 FUNDS FOR WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

SUMMARY:
Tim Rainey, Executive Director of the California Workforce Development Board will provide an overview of their efforts to develop statutorily required workforce pre-apprenticeship program guidelines for public agencies receiving Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account funds.

BACKGROUND:
Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Beall, 2017) requires the California Workforce Development Board to establish a pre-apprenticeship development and training grant program beginning January 1, 2019. SB 1 also dedicated $25 million from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account over a five-year period to the Board for the grant program. Grant funding will support multi-craft training and supportive services to help disadvantaged and under-represented Californians access high-quality construction careers, including the construction of transportation projects that receive SB 1 funding.

Streets and Highways Code Section 2038 requires the California Workforce Development Board to develop guidelines for public agencies receiving Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account funds to participate in, invest in, or partner with, new or existing pre-apprenticeship training programs.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Subject: HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE 2019 STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM MANAGEMENT PLAN

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) will be presenting to the California Transportation Commission (Commission) highlights from the 2019 State Highway System Management Plan (SHSMP).

California Streets and Highway Code Section 164.6 (recently amended by AB 515) requires Caltrans to publish a 10-year State Highway System Management Plan (SHSMP) as part of an overall asset management implementation. A draft of the SHSMP is required to be submitted to the Commission by February 15th of odd numbered years for comment. The SHSMP is required to be submitted to the Governor and Legislative members by June 1st of odd numbered years.

The SHSMP integrates the maintenance, rehabilitation and operation of the State Highway System (SHS) into a single management plan that implements a number of key Federal and State asset management requirements. The SHSMP utilizes national performance measures for pavement and bridges as required by federal law, presents performance targets approved under provisions of California Senate Bill 486, includes asset classes and their performance targets as adopted by the Commission, and implements ongoing asset management improvements into a single plan. The SHSMP includes the following key components:

- Listing of system assets and their current condition
- Performance measures and targets
- A performance gap analysis
- A goal constrained needs assessment (fiscally unconstrained)
- A fiscally constrained investment plan
- Performance projections at current funding levels

This plan implements fundamental changes in the way Caltrans manages available funding, by placing the focus on measured condition and performance objectives, which allows Caltrans to better integrate multimodal transportation options into traditional highway rehabilitation work to provide a cost effective way to expand mode choice and reduce transportation related emissions.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
   Chief Financial Officer

Subject: QUARTERLY REPORT - FISCAL YEAR 2018-19 - SENATE BILL 1 (SB 1) PROGRAM-

SUMMARY:

At its December 2018 meeting, the California Department of Transportation (Department) presented its Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) Quarterly Program Progress Report to the California Transportation Commission (Commission), in accordance with the SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines (Guidelines) adopted by the Commission on March 21, 2018 and amended on August 15, 2018. This report was presented to the Commission in December; however the report was not delivered timely to the Commissioners to allow for adequate time to review. Therefore, Department will be returning to the Commission’s January 2019 meeting to answer any comments from the Commission on this report.

The report, in its entirety, can be found using the following link:

This quarterly report covers the period of July 1, 2018, through September 30, 2018, for the following programs:

- State Highway Operation and Protection Program
- Trade Corridor Enhancement Program
- Solutions for Congested Corridors Program
- Local Partnership Program – Competitive Program
- Active Transportation Program

BACKGROUND:

SB 1 increased the Commission’s oversight role in several existing programs and created new programs for the Commission to oversee. The Guidelines require that the Department prepare and submit to the Commission progress reports for each SB 1 program at specified timelines. The progress report includes a summary of the five programs and individual program reports with an assessment of each program’s current status in cost, schedule, scope and benefits.

As required by the Guidelines, the first progress report was presented to the Commission at its October 2018 meeting and covered the period of March 2018 through August 2018. The Guidelines require that subsequent reports are presented to the commission on a quarterly basis in December, March, June and October. The attached report includes program information for the first quarter of fiscal year 2018-19.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 4.5
Information Item

From: STEVEN KECK
       Chief Financial Officer

Prepared by: Rihui Zhang, Chief
       Division of Local Assistance

Subject: ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM REPORT

SUMMARY:

At its December 2018 meeting, the California Department of Transportation’s (Department) Division of Local Assistance presented to the California Transportation Commission (Commission) a program status report of the Active Transportation Program. The Department will be returning to the Commission’s January 2019 meeting to address any comments from the Commission on this report.

The report, in its entirety, can be found using the following link:

BACKGROUND:

The Active Transportation Program Report, submitted by the Department’s Division of Local Assistance, included the following:

- Summary of ATP Program through first 3 cycles
- Program Progress as reported by project sponsors
- Preliminary report on completed ATP projects

HISTORY:

In 2013, the Active Transportation Program (ATP), was created with the passage of Senate Bill (SB) 99 and Assembly Bill (AB) 101, with the intent to encourage increased use of active transportation modes of transportation such as increased bike lanes or number of sidewalk available for walking. The ATP was originally funded for approximately $123 million per year in both State and federal funds. In 2017, with the passage of SB 1, the ATP has received an additional $100 million per year, nearly doubling the funding available to local agencies from the ATP.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system
to enhance California’s economy and livability”
TO: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS  

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 4.22
Action
Published Date: January 18, 2019

FROM: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director
Prepared By: Anja Aulenbacher
Assistant Deputy Director


ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the County of San Bernardino’s (County) request to amend the Santa Ana River Trail Reaches B & C project scope programmed in the 2015 Active Transportation Program?

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission deny the County’s request to amend the Santa Ana River Trail Phase IV, Reaches B & C project scope programmed in the 2015 Active Transportation Program.

BACKGROUND:

On October 23, 2018, San Bernardino County submitted a scope change request for the Santa Ana River Trail Phase IV, Reaches B & C Project (PPNO 1202). The proposed scope change would eliminate the Class I bike path on the south bank of the Santa Ana River, and instead provide a buffered Class II bike path along surface streets (San Bernardino Avenue) that currently have a Class III bike designation. The original proposed alignment for Reach C falls in an area of the FAA Airport Safety Zoning for the Redlands Municipal Airport. The request for the scope change is due to San Bernardino County’s assessment that it is highly unlikely that the reviews for development within this particular zoning area would be approved by the FAA. The scope for Reach B would remain unchanged.

The 2019 Active Transportation Program Guidelines state that:

“Commission staff will present recommended scope changes deemed by staff to be minor changes, such as those with little or no impact to project benefits or which increase the benefits of the project, to the Commission as a part of the project allocation request. Staff will present recommendations to disapprove minor scope changes and recommendations to approve or
Commission staff has determined that the proposed scope change will significantly decrease the project benefits included in the project application at the time of programming. The new scope will result in a substantial drop in benefits to the Santa Ana River Trail Phase IV project. Class I bikeways, also known as bike paths or shared-use paths, are facilities with exclusive right of way for bicyclists and pedestrians, away from the roadway with cross flows to minimize motor traffic. Class II bikeways are bike lanes established along streets and are defined by pavement striping to delineate a portion of the roadway for bicycle travel. Class II bike lanes are one-way facilities, typically striped adjacent to motor traffic travelling the same direction. Buffered bike lanes provide greater separation from adjacent traffic lanes by using chevron or diagonal markings on the roadway.

While Commission staff agrees that a buffered Class II bike lane does provide additional safety when compared to the existing Class III facility, it provides less safety benefit when compared to the Class I bikeway specified in the original project application. The project programmed by the Commission would benefit both bicyclists and pedestrians and allow for two-way access. Moreover, while there has been some outreach to the public on the changes to the project, there is no documentation of strong support from the community including the local bike coalitions.

Additionally, the nature of the project will change significantly. This project with the proposed scope changes would have scored lower in the competitive review process because evaluators are asked to consider the need for the proposed facility, the safety benefits, public input and whether walking and bicycling will be increased. The information provided in the scope change request does not demonstrate that the level of public support, the degree to which the project will increase walking and bicycling or increase safety is equal to or greater than described in the original application.

The Department of Transportation (Department) considers this scope modification a minor change and recommends approval. In their analysis and recommendations, the Department states that the new scope will have the same or similar safety benefits and a potential for increased walking and bicycling as compared to the project scope contained in the awarded Active Transportation Program project application. The Department’s recommendation states:

“This request is a Minor scope change, as the proposed changes will potentially have a little to no impact to project benefits.

The proposed scope change to reach C will be a downgrade in bike facility type from a CL I [Class I] to a buffered CLII [Class II]. But this change should not negatively impact the increase in walking or bicycling. It is Caltrans’ belief that the proposed location will have higher utilitarian usage, as the users will be coming from the adjacent neighborhoods, and using the new facility to access schools, parks and other destinations that were not as easily accessible from the river trail.
Safety for pedestrians and bicyclists along the new proposed alignment would be similar to the original scope. A CL I [Class I] facility removes the non-motorized/motorized conflicts; but at the same time the facility allows the bicyclists to travel much faster, and the both directions of travel are immediately adjacent to each other, with slower moving pedestrians also utilizing the same facility. Non-motorized travel on the proposed facility will generally be travelling more slowly, the opposing non-motorized traffic is on the other side of the street and the pedestrians will have a separate sidewalk available for their use.”

The San Bernardino County – Santa Ana River Trail Phase IV, Reaches B & C Project was adopted into the Metropolitan Planning Organization Component of the Cycle II Active Transportation Program on January 21, 2016. The original project application requested and resulted in a commitment of Active Transportation Program funds totaling $3,800,000 towards the $5,000,000 project to design and construct Phase IV Reaches B and C of the Santa Ana River Trail, a Class I bikeway in San Bernardino County.

The Active Transportation Program is a competitive program and applicants are awarded funding based on the promised scope of work and project benefits set forth in the project application. The integrity of the Active Transportation Program cannot be assured if applicants are subsequently permitted to significantly change the promised scope of work and benefits. In this case, the County of San Bernardino’s Santa Ana River Trail Reaches B & C Project was evaluated and scored based on the scope of work and project benefits stated in the County’s Active Transportation Program application.

The project was selected from more than 617 project applications seeking in excess of $1 billion. Ultimately, this project was one of 206 projects programmed by the Commission in Cycle 2. Since only $359.1 million was available for the 2015 Cycle 2 Active Transportation Program, more than 400 project applicants seeking Active Transportation Program funds were not awarded funding.

Attachments:
- Attachment B: Department Analysis and Recommendations
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Active Transportation Program Amendment
County of San Bernardino Santa Ana River Trail Reaches B & C (PPNO 1202) Project

Resolution No. ATP-A-18-07

1.1 WHEREAS, Streets and Highways Code Section 2384 requires the California Transportation Commission (Commission) to adopt a program of projects to receive allocations under the Active Transportation Program; and

1.2 WHEREAS, the Commission adopted the Metropolitan Planning Organization Component of the 2015 Active Transportation Program (Cycle 2) on January 21, 2016, which included the County of San Bernardino’s Santa Ana River Trail Reaches B & C project; and

1.3 WHEREAS, Active Transportation Program Guidelines state that Commission staff will present recommendations to disapprove minor scope changes and recommendations to approve or disapprove more significant scope changes to the Commission as project amendments; and

1.4 WHEREAS, on October 23, 2018, San Bernardino County submitted a request to change the scope for the Santa Ana River Trail Phase IV, Reaches B & C Project (PPNO 1202), eliminating the Class I bike path on the south bank of the Santa Ana River, and instead installing a buffered Class II bike path along surface streets (San Bernardino Avenue) that currently have a Class III bike designation; and

1.5 WHEREAS, Commission staff recommends denying the scope change since the project would provide less benefit than the project programmed by the Commission; and

1.6 WHEREAS, an application for San Bernardino County’s Santa Ana River Trail Reaches B & C project with the proposed scope change would score lower in the competitive review process given the reduced safety benefits, limited public input and uncertainty of increases in walking and biking compared to the Class I facility programmed by the Commission; and

1.7 WHEREAS, the Active Transportation Program is a competitive program and applicants are awarded funding based on a promised scope of work and project benefits. The integrity of the Active Transportation Program cannot be assured if applicants are subsequently permitted to significantly change the promised scope of work and benefits; and

1.8 WHEREAS, the Santa Ana River Trail Reaches B & C Project was selected from more than 617 project applications seeking in excess of $1 billion. Ultimately, this project was one of 206 projects programmed by the Commission in Cycle 2. Since only $359.1 million was available for the 2015 Cycle 2 Active Transportation Program, more than 400 project applicants seeking Active Transportation Program funds were not awarded funding.

2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the California Transportation Commission hereby denies the County of San Bernardino’s scope change for the Santa Ana River Trail Phase IV, Reaches B & C Project.
Project Scope Change Request  
Caltrans Analysis and Recommendations  
Revision #3 Date: November 30, 2018

Implementing Agency: San Bernardino County  
ATP ID: ATP02-08-182M  
Federal Project No.: 5954(146)  
PPNO: 1202

**Project Name:** Santa Ana River Trail Phase IV, Reaches B and C

**Existing Project Description (ATP Database):** Design and construction of Phase IV Reaches B, and C of the Santa Ana River Trail, a class I bikeway in San Bernardino County.

**Existing Project Limits (ATP Database):** The Proposed Project is adjacent to the Santa Ana River and reaches from Orange Street in Redlands to Opal Street in Mentone.

**Summary of Caltrans’ Recommendations:**  
- **Level of Scope Change:** Minor  
- **Recommendation:** Approve

**Attachments:**
1. 5954(146) 22D_Request for scope change 10.23.18.pdf  
2. MPO approval ATPL-5949(146) req. for scope change.pdf  
3. SART IV B and C Newspaper Notice 9.28.18.pdf  
4. Re Revised Minor scope change (PPNO 1202) ….msg  
5. FW SART River Phase IV-Redlands Muni Airport.msg  
6. Enviro No Comment letter.pdf  
7. Engr-Est-v1-Attach G.xlsx

**Summary of Agency Request**
1. **Explanation of the proposed scope change:**
   - **Reach B:** no change  
   - **Reach C:** the original scope was to provide a CL I bike path on the south bank of the Santa Ana River. The proposed scope is buffered CL II bike lanes along both side of the surface streets.

2. **Explanation of the reason for the proposed scope change:**
   - The project’s original alignment was located in a critical area of FAA Airport Safety Zoning for the Redlands Municipal Airport. Processing FAA reviews for development within this particular zoning area would be timely and it is highly unlikely that it would be approved by the FAA.
3. **The impact the proposed scope change would have on the overall cost of the project:**
   - The project funding will not change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Original Cost</th>
<th>Current Cost</th>
<th>Proposed Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>Non-ATP</td>
<td>ATP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$307,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$307,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>$614,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$614,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>$2,420,000</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
<td>$2,420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,801,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,801,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **An estimate of the impact the proposed scope change would have on the potential of the project to increase walking and bicycling as compared to the benefits identified in the project application (increase or decrease in benefit):**
   - The new proposed alignment would create no change in bicycling, as the scope would still provide a bike path from Orange Street to Opal Avenue. There would be no change to walking as there is concrete sidewalk and/or graded trails throughout the new alignment.

5. **An estimate of the impact the proposed scope change would have on the potential of the project to increase the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists as compared to the benefits identified in the project application (increase or decrease in benefit):**
   - Safety for pedestrians and bicyclists along the new proposed alignment would be similar to the original scope. A CL I facility removes the non-motorized/motorized conflicts; but at the same time the facility allows the bicyclists to travel much faster, and the both directions of travel are immediately adjacent to each other, with slower moving pedestrians also utilizing the same facility. Non-motorized travel on the proposed facility will generally be travelling more slowly, the opposing non-motorized traffic is on the other side of the street and the pedestrians will have a separate sidewalk available for their use.

6. **An explanation of the methodology used to develop the aforementioned estimates:**
   - The methodology for this scope change is similar to that used in the original application. The proposed change in alignment would still accommodate the same types of users, improvement to and encouraging the use of existing routes while improving safety in the community.

7. **For projects programmed in the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) component, evidence of MPO approval and the MPO rationale for their approval:**
   - MPO approval ATPL-5954(146) req. for scope change.pdf

**Additional Elements:**

8. **Does this scope change require revalidation of your environmental document?**  N (see Enviro No Comment Letter.pdf (attached)

   If yes, what is the actual/estimated date of revalidation?  ____N/A_____

9. **Explain the additional public outreach efforts you have made with respect to this proposed scope change, and provide a summary of the public response to these efforts.**

   a) County met with City of Redlands staff from Municipal and Engineering Department, and Airport Department on August 27, 2018 regarding Alternative Alignment Routes and were agreeable on the Alternative A (Preferred) alignment (see attached)
b) During our environment process with the proposed scope change is the NOI and newspaper publication for the SART IV, Reaches B and C Project (see attached). The public comment period started on October 1 and ended on October 30. No comments were received either at our office or through the State Clearinghouse. Also Attached the Clearinghouse CEQAnet posting and confirmed verbally that no comments were received; however, the “no comment letter” has not arrived at our office yet.

Proposed changes to the Project Description:
Design and construction of Class I, buffered II and III Bike Paths and Pedestrian Trails for the Santa Ana River Trail Phase IV, Reaches B & C.

Proposed changes to the Project Limits:
N/A

Summary of Caltrans’ Analysis

The following is a summary of Caltrans’ analysis and comments based on our review of the agency formal Project Scope Change Request. This summary represents Caltrans’ assessment of the accuracy and breadth of the agency’s documentation. It also may include additional details on the explanation, reason, impacts, and/or net benefits of the agency’s proposed scope changes that should be consider as part of the overall analysis and approval process.

1. Scope Comparison of Original Application Proposal to Scope Change Request:
   - Caltrans agrees with the explanation of the scope change. In the project’s application Reach B starts at the end of the existing Reach A - a Class I (CL I) facility located on the south bank of the Santa Ana river. Reach B is proposed to continue as a CL I facility between the south bank of the river and Riverview Dr. When Riverview Dr turns and becomes River Bend Dr the application shows the facility turning into a CL III on-street facility. River Bend Dr is a 40’ wide, two lane residential road with low traffic volumes. The River Bend Dr (1100 ft) section ends in a T-intersection at East Pioneer Ave. This is the beginning of Reach D, which is also a low traffic volume two-lane street, and will become a buffered CL II facility (5450 ft) to the intersection with Dearborn Street. On Dearborn street the facility will remain a buffered CL II facility. Dearborn Street is also a two-lane low volume street with Redlands Sports Park located on it. Prior to the proposed scope change, this facility would have been accessed by biking on-street without the benefit of any bike signage or striping. The project will then turn West onto E. San Bernardino Ave, and will end at the intersection with Opal Ave; which is now the proposed start of the unfunded Reach D. With the end of Reach B being a CL III the connection to a buffered CL II route will meet user expectations and will connect local residents/users to local destinations.
     o Page 6 of Part B & C of the application mentions parks, schools, etc. being within a reasonable catchment area of the trail. The scope change will move the local users closer to these facilities instead of moving them to the far side of the Redlands airport.

2. Agency reason for the proposed scope change:
   - Caltrans accepts this reason as valid.

3. The impact the proposed scope change would have on the overall cost of the project:
   - Caltrans accepts the new costs.
4. An estimate of the impact the proposed scope change would have on the potential of the project to increase walking and bicycling as compared to the benefits identified in the project application (increase or decrease in benefit):

- The proposed scope change to reach C will be a downgrade in bike facility type from a CL I to a buffered CLII. But this change should not negatively impact the increase in walking or biking. It is Caltrans belief that the proposed location will have higher utilitarian usage, as the users will be coming from the adjacent neighborhoods, and using the new facility to access schools, parks and other destinations that were not as easily accessible from the river trail. This is reflected on page 4- Part B & C of the application where the current Santa Ana River Trail (SART) sections (Phase I & II) have twice as many weekend users as week day users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Element</th>
<th>Application description</th>
<th>Scope change</th>
<th>Impact to increasing AT use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reach B</td>
<td>Class I &amp; III bike facilities</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach C</td>
<td>Class I bikeway- 1.18 miles</td>
<td>Class II bike lanes- 1.57 miles (both directions)</td>
<td>No Change to possible increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. An estimate of the impact the proposed scope change would have on the potential of the project to increase the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists as compared to the benefits identified in the project application (increase or decrease in benefit):

The chart below shows Caltrans’ opinion of the scope change effect on the safety benefits from the original application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Element</th>
<th>Application description</th>
<th>Scope change</th>
<th>Impact to increasing safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reach B</td>
<td>Class I &amp; III bike facilities</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach C</td>
<td>Class I bikeway- 1.18 miles</td>
<td>Buffered Class II bike lanes- 1.57 miles (both directions)</td>
<td>Similar AT safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. An explanation of the methodology used to develop the aforementioned estimates:

- The agency did not make any estimates in their responses to the previous questions.

6. For projects programmed in the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) component, evidence of MPO approval and the MPO rationale for their approval:

- Approve
  - See- MPO approval ATPL-5954(146) req. for scope change.pdf

**Caltrans comments regarding this recommendation**

Per Caltrans Scope Change Analysis guidance. This guidance states:

A. Minor vs. Major
i. Minor scope changes are those with little or no impact to project benefits, or which increase the project benefits.

ii. Major scope changes are those with potentially significant negative impacts to project benefits. Proposed scope changes that significantly change the nature of the original application may be considered “Major” even if they are not expected to have negative impacts to the overall project benefits.

B. Approve vs. Not approve
i. Caltrans staff will recommend approving scope change requests that are expected to increase or have no impact on the project benefits. Caltrans will also recommend approving requests that may have a significant reduction in benefits as long as the following criteria are met:
   a. Due to cost increases and/or existing project constraints, the full original project scope is not feasible for the agency to construct.
   b. The proposed scope change is considered to reasonably maximize the original/net project benefits within the currently identified project constraints.
   c. The propose scope, as compared to the original scope, would be expected to receive a similar or higher evaluation score as the original application.

ii. Caltrans staff will not recommend approving requests that are expected to significantly decrease the project benefits while any of the following criteria are met:
   a. The original project scope appears to be feasible for the agency to construct.
   b. The propose scope change does not appear to reasonably maximize the net project benefits within the currently identified project constraints.
   c. The propose scope, as compared to the original scope, would be expected to receive a lower evaluation score than the original application.

Per guidance A.i. this request is a Minor scope change, as the proposed changes will potentially have a little to no impact to project benefits and B.i. all of the criteria were met.

**Proposed changes to the Project Description:**
Caltrans recommends that current description be revised to:

Design and construction of Class I, buffered II and III Bike Paths and Pedestrian Trails for the Santa Ana River Trail Phase IV, Reaches B & C.

**Proposed changes to the Project Limits:**
N/A
Proposed Changes to FTIP/FSTIP if applicable:
Caltrans recommends that current description be revised to:

Design and construction of Class I, buffered II and III Bike Paths and Pedestrian Trails for the Santa Ana River Trail Phase IV, Reaches B & C.

Communication with the Agency Summary

Date of Caltrans/Agency Teleconference: 10/5/18

Attendees: Teresa McWillaim (Caltrans-HQ), David Lee (Caltrans District 8), Enrique Gonzalez (Caltrans District 8)

Summary of Discussion: District staff had the agency correct their response to questions 4 and 5 to reflect changes to the approved scope instead of existing conditions.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Subject: APPROVAL OF SHOPP PROJECT BASELINE AGREEMENTS – RESOLUTION SHOPP-P-1819-10B

-issue:
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve six State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Project Baseline Agreements submitted in accordance with the Commission’s SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines and establish these baseline agreements as the basis for project delivery and monitoring?

Recommendation:
Commission staff recommends that the Commission approve the following six SHOPP Baseline Agreements and establish these agreements as the basis for project delivery and monitoring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>0B090</td>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Hunter/Panther Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>3J060</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>SM-101 Pavement CAPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>0U420</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Selma to Fowler Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>0V780</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>FRE--41,99,168,180 - Fiber Optics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1C040</td>
<td>Mariposa</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mariposa SR-49 CAPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>41930</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>SR-78 Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background:
The Commission adopted the SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines at its March 21, 2018 meeting and directed agencies to provide executed Baseline Agreements that set forth the agreed upon expected benefits, delivery schedule, project cost, and funding plan. The Baseline Agreement provides a benchmark for comparison to the current status of a project for subsequent reporting purposes. The Baseline Agreement must be signed by the District Director and Director of the Department of Transportation (Department), and the Commission’s Executive Director.

Commission staff has reviewed these Baseline Agreements and determined the project’s expected benefits, delivery schedule, project cost, and funding plan are consistent with the project the Commission approved at the time of programming and the requirements set forth in the Interim SHOPP Guidelines.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS  
CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 4.23  
Information

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN  
Executive Director

Prepared By: Dawn Cheser  
Associate Deputy Director

Subject: STATUS OF BASELINE AGREEMENTS FOR THE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION, LOCAL PARTNERSHIP, SOLUTIONS FOR CONGESTED CORRIDORS, AND TRADE CORRIDOR ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMS

SUMMARY:
The California Transportation Commission (Commission), at its December 2018 meeting, approved the Benefits Form as an attachment to the Baseline Agreements for the Active Transportation Program, the Local Partnership Program, the Solutions for Congested Corridors, and the Trade Corridor Enhancement Program. Additionally, the Commission required the Benefits Form be completed and submitted by December 31, 2018.

BACKGROUND:
In accordance with the SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines, Baseline Agreements were approved by the Commission for the Active Transportation Program, the Local Partnership Program, the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, and the Trade Corridor Enhancement Program projects as identified in Attachment A.

The Benefits Form will document the expected quantifiable benefits and help standardized the reporting of these benefits. Commission staff has received all Benefit Forms for projects listed in Attachment A. The Benefit Forms that have been reviewed by Commission staff and identified as meeting all Baseline Agreement requirements are provided in Attachment B. Commission staff will present the remaining Benefit Forms at the March 2019 Commission meeting.

A listing of projects that have not yet met the Baseline Agreement requirements is provided in Attachment C along with a status as to when the Baseline Agreement is expected to be received.

Attachments:
- Attachment A: Projects with approved Baseline Agreements
- Attachment B: Completed Benefit Forms
- Attachment C: Status of projects with no Baseline Agreement
### California Transportation Commission

**Projects With Approved Baseline Agreements**

Reference Item No.: 4.23

January 30-31, 2019

**ATTACHMENT A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coachella Valley Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Las Positas and Modoc Roads Class I Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Partnership Program - Competitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vista Canyon Metrolink Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I-15/Railroad Canyon Road Interchange Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ranchero Road Widening Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital SouthEast Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathilda Avenue Improvements at SR 237 and US 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citracado Parkway Transportation Connections Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multi-Funded: Local Partnership Program/State Highway Operation and Protection Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Multi-Funded: Solutions for Congested Corridors/Local Partnership Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redlands Passenger Rail Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo/Santa Clara</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>San Mateo and Santa Clara US 101 Managed Lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multi-Funded: Trade Corridor Enhancement/State Highway Operation and Protection Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rt 10 Corridor Contract 1 (Express Lanes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego/Imperial</td>
<td></td>
<td>California-Mexico Border System Network Improvement Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rt 5 Redding to Anderson Widening, Phase 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multi-Funded: Solutions for Congested Corridors/Trade Corridor Enhancement/State Highway Operation and Protection Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Rt 101 Multimodal Corridor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multi-Funded: Solutions for Congested Corridors/State Highway Operation and Protection Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-5 Corridor Enhancement Project/I-5 HOV Lanes - Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>US 50 Multimodal Corridor Enhancement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-5 North Coast Corridor HOV Extension Phase 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Solutions for Congested Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Airport Metro Connector (AMC) 96th Street Transit Station Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Marin Sonoma Narrows Segment CZ - HOV Lanes Gap Closure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trade Corridor Enhancement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td>7th Street Grade Separation (East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freight Intelligent Transportation System (FITS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>58/99</td>
<td>Rt 58 / 99 Bakersfield Freeway Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rt 5 Golden State Chokepoint Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Rt 71 Freeway Conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>57/60</td>
<td>Rt 57 / 60 Confluence: Chokepoint Relief Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern California Rail Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Rt 99 Livingston Widening, North Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Rt 57 / Lambert Road Interchange Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Rt 60 Truck Safety and Efficiency, Phase 1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Otay Mesa Truck Route, Phase 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>Route 395 Widening from SR 18 to Chamberlaine Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Elitawanda Avenue Grade Separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>101/25</td>
<td>Route 101/25 Interchange Improvements Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solona</td>
<td>80/12</td>
<td>Rt 80/680/12 Interchange, Package 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Rt 132 West Freeway / Expressway Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rice Avenue and Fifth Street Grade Separation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CVLink is a proposed multi-modal transportation corridor for pedestrians, bicyclists, and low-speed electric vehicles that roughly follows the Whitewater River through the heart of the Coachella Valley, utilizing existing storm water levees. Since there is no existing facilities, there are no current counts. The anticipated bicycle counts for the 50-mile stretch of the CVLink from Palm Springs to Coachella (Phase 1) is 252,783 per year and 327,810 for pedestrians per year (Source: baseline agreement 10/1/2018).

Future non-motorized travel demand estimates have been developed using the RivTAM 2040 Plus TPPS – CVAG Model (RivTAM) tool. A brief overview of the RivTAM travel demand forecasting process and key input (population) driving travel demand is provided, followed by a more detailed discussion of the mode choice component of the model. The mode choice component determines the share of non-motorized transport compared to other (motorized) modes of travel. Therefore, an understanding of this component of the model is useful in understanding how the resulting non-motorized travel data is used in this analysis. The RivTAM data has been summarized for districts which generally correspond to the areas encompassing the segments documented in Chapter 4.0 of this document. Exhibit 6.0-A shows the CV Link corridor demand districts used in this evaluation.

The RivTAM 2040 Plus TPPS – CVAG Model (RivTAM) has been used to determine the demand for non-motorized (pedestrian and bicycle) travel in the Coachella Valley. The RivTAM tool includes the following steps / processes:

- Socio-economic data (SED) based trip generation
- Trip distribution
- Mode choice (split)
- Time of day factoring
- Traffic assignment

The SED that drives the RivTAM trip generation, trip distribution, and mode choice processes includes a number of variables. Data is required regarding population, number of households, household income (stratified into 3 generalized levels), vehicle ownership, and employment (disaggregated into a total of 12 different categories) for existing (2008) and future (RivTAM 2040 Plus TPPS – CVAG Model) conditions.
## Project Information

**Project Title:** Citracado Parkway Transportation Connections Project  
**Date:** 12/28/2018  
**PPNO:** 1333

### Contact Information

**Nominating Agency:** City of Escondido  
**Agency Completing Form:** City of Escondido  
**Contact Person:** Julie Procopio  
**Phone:** (760) 839-4001  
**Email Address:** jprocopio@escondido.org

### Suggested Measures/Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Projected Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughput</td>
<td>Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Daily Vehicle Trips (ADT)</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>##</td>
<td>19,050</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily VMT per capita</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Daily Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24,765</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Hour</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Mile</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Mile per Train Mile (Intercity Rail)</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boardings per capita</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPP Indicator</th>
<th>Benefit/Cost Ratio</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Benefit/Cost Ratio</th>
<th>Projected Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs created</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit/Cost Ratio</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes


2. Roadway does not exist in this scenario. Figures for alternative routes available in Figure 2-3 & 2-4 (Page 2).

3. Roadway does not exist in this scenario. Figures for alternative routes available in Figure 2-3 & 2-4 (Page 2).

4. The anticipated number of lives saved can be predicted based on the mean mortality rate and data showing the relative increase in mortality rates relative to response time/distance. Rates were calculated based on a mean mortality rate of 9.6% and benefitting emergency medical services trips: Escondido Fire: 434 and Palomar Medical Center: 3,083.

5. This project will provide North County Transit District with the opportunity to improve the mobility of Americans with transportation disadvantage by creating a bus route to directly connect underserved residential areas with employment centers, the hospital and the Nordahl Road Sprinter Station.

6. The proposed Project supports a complete street with bike lanes and pedestrian walkways with direct access to industrial and residential areas, and therefore balances the needs of motorists, transit riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists.
### Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>4,936</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organize Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOx)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxide (NOx)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### System Preservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement lane miles</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of pavement - percentage</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of bridge - percentage</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Variability (buffer index)</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily vehicle hours of delay per capita</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>949.8</td>
<td>244.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily congested highway VMT per capita</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Hours of Delay / Year</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Peak Period Travel Time</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Non-Peak Period Travel Time</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Person-Hours of Time Saved (annual average over 20 yrs)</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>750,981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Person-Hours of time saved based on an annual average of a twenty year total (15,019,620 person-hours) provided in the SB1 Cost Benefit Analysis Cal-BC62. This project provides a more direct route for more than 19,050 motorists per day.
**Project Information**

**Project Title:** Ranchero Road Widening Project  
**Date:** 12-31-2018  
**Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc):** PPNO 1244

**Contact Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominating Agency:</th>
<th>City of Hesperia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>Tina Souza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>(760) 947-1474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tsouza@cityofhesperia.us">tsouza@cityofhesperia.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agency Completing Form:** City of Hesperia  
**Contact Person:** Tina Souza  
**Phone:** (760) 947-1474  
**Email Address:** tsouza@cityofhesperia.us

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LPP Indicator</strong></th>
<th><strong>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcome</strong></th>
<th><strong>Projected</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Throughput</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>6,379</td>
<td>9,552</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Daily Vehicle Trips (ADT)</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>15,829</td>
<td>23,700</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily VMT per capita</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>13,613</td>
<td>11,850</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Daily Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Hour</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Mile</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Mile per Train Mile (Intercity Rail)</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boardings per capita</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcome</strong></th>
<th><strong>Projected</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities per Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and per capita</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Collisions per VMT and per capita</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Collisions per VMT and per capita</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accessibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcome</strong></th>
<th><strong>Projected</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population within 1/2 mile of a rail station or bus route.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average travel time to jobs or school.</td>
<td>Time (minutes)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcome</strong></th>
<th><strong>Projected</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs created</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit/Cost Ratio</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Benefit/Cost Ratio was obtained using the Cal-B/C 6.2 Benefit/Cost Analysis Model.

*In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed throughput outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

The projected throughput outcome for the Average Daily Vehicle Trips was obtained per Harper Verma, LLC Project Traffic Impact Analysis, January 2017. The Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips was calculated using the model inputs for peak period non-HOV and peak period truck volumes from the Cal-B/C 6.2 Benefit/Cost Analysis Model. The Reduction in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay was also calculated using the Average Travel Time in the "No Build" and "Build" scenarios from the Cal-B/C 6.2 Benefit/Cost Analysis Model under the Travel Time Section. The Daily VMT per capita was obtained using the Senate Bill 1 Grant Programs Emissions Calculator.

*In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed safety outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

Accident injury history was taken from both TIMS and CHP for 2015 through 2017 for the current fatal collisions and injury collisions. For projected safety outcomes, each type of collision was reduced by 47%. In "Safety Evaluation of installing Center Two-Way Left Turn Lanes on Two-Lane Roads" by the Federal Highway Administration in 2008, the estimated collision reduction factor for installing such improvements on California (rural) roads was 50.8%. In a Traffic Signal Brief, issue by the Federal Highway Administration in 2009, a collision reduction factor after implementing traffic signals in a rural environment, for an existing 4-leg configuration and all-way stop control, was 44%. For this analysis, the collision reduction factor is the average of the two (47%), as both traffic safety improvement measures are being utilized.

*In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed accessibility outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed economic development outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.
### Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tons per year</th>
<th>2042</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organize Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxide (NOx)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes.

The reduction in Carbon Dioxide, Carbon Monoxide, and Nitrogen Oxide were obtained using the Senate Bill 1 Grant Programs Emissions Calculator.

### System Preservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>2042</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement lane miles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50% poor condition, 50% moderate condition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of pavement - percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of bridge - percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>100% excellent condition</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed System Preservation outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

Based on the current evaluation of pavement condition, 50% of Ranchero Road is in poor condition, while the rest is in moderate condition. Projected pavement condition in the year 2042 is estimated to be between moderate and good condition. Once the bridge to the aqueduct is widened, the bridge will be in excellent condition. Then, after 20 years of use, the condition of the bridge will be moderate.

### Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Variability (buffer index)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily vehicle hours of delay per capita</td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily congested highway VMT per capita</td>
<td>Each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed Reliability outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

The Daily vehicle hours of delay per capita was calculated using the Average Travel Time in the "No Build" and "Build" scenarios from the Cal-B/C 6.2 Benefit/Cost Analysis Model under the Travel Time Section. The Daily congested highway VMT per capita were obtained using the Senate Bill 1 Grant Programs Emissions Calculator.

### Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Hours of Delay / Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Peak Period Travel Time</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Non-Peak Period Travel Time</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed Mobility outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

The Average Peak Period Travel Time and Average Non-Peak Period Travel Time was calculated using the Average Travel Time in the "No Build" and "Build" scenarios from the Cal-B/C 6.2 Benefit/Cost Analysis Model under the Travel Time Section.
## Project Information

**Project Title:** I-680/SR4 - Phase 3  
**Date:** 12/20/2018  
**Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc):** PPNO 0298E, EA 22910

## Contact Information

**Nominating Agency:** Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
**Agency Completing Form:** Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
**Hisham Noeimi**  
**Phone:** 925-256-4731

## LPP Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>38,925</td>
<td>89,775</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Vehicle Trips (ADT)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>155,700</td>
<td>187,500</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>33,961</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily VMT per capita</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>64,929</td>
<td>89,797</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>284,010</td>
<td>353,623</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Hour</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Mile</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Mile per Train Mile (Intercity Rail)</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardings per capita</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Throughput

Peak hour count taken at SR4 segment between Port Chicago and Willow Pass based on actual count and adjusted for ramp on/off volumes in 2013/14. Volume includes EB and WB. ADT assumed to be ten time Peak hour volume. "Capita" assumed to be population of Contra Costa County in 2014 (1,111 million). Data based on CalBC model output. EB and WB modeled separately due to different types of improvements, and then combined.

## Safety

Data taken from Caltrans District 4 TASIS covering 4/1/2010 and 3/31/2013.

## Accessibility

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed accessibility outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

## Economic Development

Result was taken from CalBC model runs for EB and WB and then combined.
## Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tons per year</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2)</td>
<td>943170</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organize Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOx)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>2912</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxide (NOx)</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes. Result was taken from CalBC model runs for EB and WB and then combined.

## System Preservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement lane miles</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of pavement - percentage</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of bridge - percentage</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed System Preservation outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

## Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Variability (buffer index)</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily vehicle hours of delay per capita</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily congested highway VMT per capita</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed Reliability outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

## Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Hours of Delay / Year</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Peak Period Travel Time</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Non-Peak Period Travel Time</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed Mobility outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.
### Project Information

**Project Title:** Airport Metro Connector 96th Street Transit Station - A Solution for the Congested I-405 Corridor  
**Date:** 12/31/2018  
**Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc):** EA R399GA

### Contact Information

**Nominating Agency:** Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
**Agency Completing Form:** Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
**Contact Person:** Cory Zelmer  
**Phone:** 213-922-1079

**Email Address:** zelmerc@metro.net

### SCCP Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person throughput by mode</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>173,555</td>
<td>45,909</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode choices</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated rights of way for bike and transit</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>1,575,518</td>
<td>961,066</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>6,643,459</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Congestion/Throughput

- **Person throughput by mode:** Overall, it is estimated that the Project will result in 14.5 million total annual transit boardings at this station by 2035. Total daily boardings by rail line includes: 1) Metro Green Line-LAX Branch from 2016 (3,000 to 2023); 2) Metro Green Line at 14,000; 3) Metro Crenshaw/LAX Line at 31,264; 4) APM at 26,071; 5) Metro Bus at 24,260; and 6) Other at 12,735.

- **Mode choices:** Current mode choices include rabbit tired vehicles and transit (buses). Mode choices will include 1) Metro Crenshaw/LAX Line; 2) Metro Green Line; 3) APM; 4) Metro Bus; and 5) Other bus.

- **Dedicated ROW for bike and transit:** Proposed project includes a new bicycle hub that would accommodate up to 150 bicyclists in a secure, indoor environment and additional space for up to 50 bicyclists provided for short-term parking (Draft EIR, Page 6-8) and a bus plazlar/terminal facility for Metro and municipal bus operators that would include up to 20 active bus bays, with six reserved for articulated busses as well as up to 18 parking spaces for buses to park on outside of the bus bays (Draft EIR, Page 2-16).

- **VMT:** Based on information provided in the Airport Metro Connector Ridership Forecasting Report (May 27, 2017), the changes in VMT were estimated based on an increase in transit trips due to the Project. VMT data under "current" assumes "No Build" daily conditions, while Projected figures assume "Build" daily conditions. VMT numbers refer to air passengers who drive with and without the Project in place.

- **Reduction in vehicle-hours of delay:** According to Caltrans data, the vehicle hours of delay (VHD) on the I-405 near LAX totaled nearly 6,643,459 hours in 2017. (SB1 Baseline Agreement, PDF Page 17, SCCP Page 21)

### Safety

- **Reduction in vehicle-involved incidents:**

- **Reduction in train-involved incidents:**

### Accessibility

- **First/last mile improvements:**

### Economic Development

- **Benefits Forms**

- **Improvements to freight throughput:**

By encouraging a mode shift from automobile to transit, the Project will reduce congestion on the streets and highways around LAX which will benefit the major air freight lines that use LAX to facilitate trade (SB1 Baseline Agreement, PDF Pg 60, SCCP Page 21).
In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes.

Estimates of emission reductions in tons per year and dollars per year were conducted using Caltrans’ Life-Cycle Benefit-Cost Analysis Model 6.2 (see Table 5-5 in the SB1 Baseline Agreement, PDF Page 72, SCCP Page 22). The values shown represent the total benefit for 30 years of project operation. The increased transit ridership and decreased VMT due to the Project will result in the reduction of emissions of GHG and criteria pollutants, and no mitigation is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions</th>
<th>Table 5-5 in the SB1 Baseline Agreement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.250</td>
<td>2,407,497</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>9,647</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively describe how the project supports transportation-efficient land use principles, entailing the following concepts:

- Supports mixed-use development with multimodal choices
- Supports in-fill development
- Supports interconnected streets and corridor access management policies
- Addresses climate adaptation

The FTA has implemented a Climate Change Adaptation Initiative program to investigate potential strategies for reducing climate impacts from transit. The program conducted seven climate adaptation pilot studies to increase knowledge of how transit agencies can adapt to climate change, advance the state of the practice in adapting transit assets and operations to the impacts of climate change, and build strategic partnerships between transit agencies and climate adaptation experts. The approach of the pilot projects involved identification of climate hazards and potential climatic events, characterization of risks on transit projects and operations, development of initial adaptation strategies and linking strategies to organizational structures.

Additionally, in 2015 Metro released a Resiliency Indicator Framework report to help prioritize and evaluate climate adaptation implementation priorities to ensure infrastructure resilience and maintain a good state of repair.

The Metro Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (Metro, 2012) provides a baseline 2010 GHG emissions inventory for the Metro system and outline strategies for achieving GHG emissions reductions in future operations. This plan identifies 11 strategies to reduce GHG emissions throughout the system from 2012 to 2020, and then analyzes each for cost effectiveness and feasibility of implementation. Table 3.2.6 shows that the proposed project would be consistent with applicable Metro Countywide planning policies. The Climate Action and Adaptation Plan also includes a discussion of climate adaptation designed to identify some of the most important Metro services and assets that are likely to be affected by climate impacts. The discussion generally focuses on sea level rise and flooding. Figure 15 of the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan shows that the project site is not located within 100-year flood inundation areas identified as locations at risk to sea level rise and flooding.
### Project Information

**Project Title:** San Diego North Coast Corridor: Build NCC phase 1 Project  
**Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc.):** EA 2T212, PPNO 0615G, PI 1114000060  
**Date:** 12/10/2018

**Nominating Agency:** Caltrans, SANDAG  
**Agency Completing Form:** Caltrans  
**Contact Person:** Arturo Jacobo  
**Phone:** 619-688-6816

**Email Address:** arturo.jacobob@dot.ca.gov

**Project Information**

**Contact Information**

**SCCP Indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person throughput by mode</td>
<td>Persons per Day</td>
<td>218,254</td>
<td>290,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode choices</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>8 lane freeway; limited pedestrian coastal access across I-5 not available in certain locations</td>
<td>8 lane freeway +2 Managed lanes; Bicycle Trail Improvements; Improved Coastal Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated rights of way for bike and transit</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1.3 miles of dedicated bike trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>VMT per Day</td>
<td>721,797</td>
<td>992,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay</td>
<td>VHD per Day</td>
<td>4,797</td>
<td>1906 hours VHD reduction; comparing 2040 build to 2040 no-build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Congestion/Throughput

- **In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed congestion and throughput outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.**

  The SANDAG regional transportation model was used to develop the quantified benefit values provided above. Project specific models were for the current/existing facility, the I-5 NCC 2040 no-build alternative, and the 2040 8+2 and 8+4 build alternatives, and used to develop the project specific measures.

- **Prioritizing HOV & Bus Travel.** Faster travel times and less congestion will provide an incentive for HOVs and buses over single-occupancy vehicles, as well as the potential for future transit services.

- **Closing Active Transportation Gaps.** Bicycle and pedestrian improvements will create new routes both across and along the corridor, closing vital gaps in regional bicycle and pedestrian networks. This includes protected right-of-way for multi-use trails, and added bike and pedestrian connectivity across existing freeway undercrossings and overcrossings.

- **Creating Connections to Transit & Recreation.** The addition of bicycle/pedestrian facilities along and across I-5 will create new opportunities to access coastal and recreational resources.

- **Maximizing Future Flexibility.** The managed lanes will create a transportation system that can adapt to future shifts in travel patterns, technology, or economic conditions. This additional capacity can be tailored to suit current needs, including requiring higher vehicle occupancy, operating dedicated bus rapid transit, or creating a truck route during certain times of day.

#### Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in vehicle-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>207 Vehicle Incidents/Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in train-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Accessibility

- **In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed accessibility outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.**

  The SANDAG regional transportation model was used to develop the quantified benefit values provided above. Project specific models were for the current/existing facility, the I-5 NCC 2040 no-build alternative, and the 2040 8+2 and 8+4 build alternatives, and used to develop the project specific measures.

- **Reliability.** On average, a user needs to budget an additional 3.3–6.7 minutes above average travel times to guarantee on-time arrival. The Project improves reliability for all users of the freeway, and provides particular benefits for buses and HOVs by prioritizing their movement over general-purpose lanes.

  Based on the project's models, VHD and PHD both show significant reductions (reductions), by approximately 1,000 hours per day while ADT would increase. Travel time reliability will improve significantly for managed lane trips, which will enjoy a free-flow option for all 4.3 miles of freeway. This diversion of traffic into the new lanes will also benefit the reliability of general-purpose lanes compared to the No-Build scenario.

#### Other

**Enhancements to the reliability of the system**

| Buffer time needed for on-time arrival | 3-7 minutes maintained with 2040 build alternative; significant increase in buffer time expected for 2040 no-build alternative | 2040 |

| First/last mile improvements | Each | n.a. | n.a. | 2030-2040 |

| Other | | | | |
### Benefits Forms

#### Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Each</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs created</td>
<td>400,000*</td>
<td>2,640-5,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to freight throughput (truck trips)</td>
<td>Percent of truck trips per day</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit/Cost Ratio</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Total Emissions</th>
<th>Emission Reduction</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td>Kg per year</td>
<td>68.98</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td>Kg per year</td>
<td>127.93</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2)</td>
<td>Kg per year</td>
<td>804,290.94</td>
<td>1,675.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organize Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>Kg per year</td>
<td>369.30</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOx)</td>
<td>Kg per year</td>
<td>431.04</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Kg per year</td>
<td>4,959.52</td>
<td>16.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxide (NOx)</td>
<td>Kg per year</td>
<td>1,571.95</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tourism Access/Coastal Accessibility

The NCC is a critical corridor for San Diego's tourism industry—the region's second-largest traded economic sector—with over 15 million annual visitors to its beaches alone. The I-5 NCC program includes significant improvements to both pedestrian and vehicular coastal access, across I-5. New pedestrian facilities will be built in compliance with Caltrans Accessibility Guidelines. The I-5 NCC Project Work Program/Transportation and Resource Enhancement Program (PWP/TREP) economic analysis projected that, for tourism alone, the NCC Program improvements would result in a cumulative economic benefit of over $950 million through 2040 compared to the No-Build scenario.

### In the space below, qualitatively describe how the project supports transportation-efficient land use principles, entailing the following concepts:

- Supports mixed-use development with multimodal choices
- Supports in-fill development
- Supports interconnected streets and corridor access management policies
- Addresses climate adaptation

### In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed economic development outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

*see discussion below; **percentages derived from 2014 analysis of truck trips/freight throughput for the I-5 NCC, which compared truck trips for year 2030 no-build and 2030 8+2 build, since the 2030 traffic volumes projected at that time are now forecasted to more likely occur in 2040, the percentages from that analysis are used here as a proxy for 2040.

### In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes.

- For existing total emissions, the results are direct outputs of the CT-EMFAC program.
- For projected year emission reduction, the results are also based on outputs of CT-EMFAC, with reduced values derived from comparison of the project's 2040 no-build versus the 2040 build scenarios.
- Incremental 5 mile-per-hour vehicle speed bin data (for use in CT-EMFAC) was developed using project specific information from the project's transportation model outputs.
| Efficient Land Use         | Limiting Sprawl and Multi-modal choices. By improving infrastructure in the existing NCC, the Project will facilitate infill development and discourage sprawl into undeveloped areas. The Project’s investment in managed lanes, active transportation facilities, and new connections to transit will emphasize mobility through the movement of people and provision of viable transportation choices. This will accommodate the region’s projected growth more efficiently than new development at the urban fringes or in rural areas. The I-5 NCC plan includes significant improvements for active transportation modes, including improvements to sidewalks and ramp intersections, adding 10.2 miles of the I-5 North Coast Bike Trail. The I-5 NCC project also includes a new Manchester Avenue Park & Ride/Multi-Use Facility offering parking, lagoon access, electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, and trail connections. Providing Smart Growth Incentives. In conjunction with the Project’s infrastructure improvements, SANDAG and local jurisdictions have also committed to focusing projected growth in identified Smart Growth areas. SANDAG’s $280 million Smart Growth Incentive Program funds transportation and related infrastructure that supports compact, mixed-use development closer to the region’s job centers and multimodal networks. Addresses Climate adaptation, Cal B/C benefits. Estimating that the Project would construct approximately one-twelfth of the lane-miles of managed lanes proposed for the larger NCC Program, approximately one-twelfth of the emissions savings between the 2040 Build and No-Build scenarios was allocated to the Project. The results, shown in detail in the table below, found: • All pollutants and GHGs associated with vehicle emissions are shown to decrease when comparing the 2040 Build and No-Build scenarios. • Notably, carbon dioxide (CO2)—the primary compound that causes GHG effects—is shown to reduce by over 1.8 tons annually. |

| | |
| | |
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- **Project Title:** San Diego North Coast Corridor: Build NCC phase 1 Project
- **Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc.):** EA 2T218, PPNO 0615F, PI 1116050174
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**Solutions for Congested Corridors Program**

**Benefits Forms**

### SCCP Indicator

**Person throughput by mode**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218,254</td>
<td>Persons per Day</td>
<td>290,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mode choices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 lane freeway; very limited bike trail; pedestrian coastal access across 1-5 not available in certain locations</td>
<td>8 lane freeway +2 Managed lanes; enhanced coastal access; significant bike trail improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dedicated rights of way for bike and transit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only limited locations</td>
<td>8.9 miles of dedicated bike trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vehicle miles traveled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT per Day</td>
<td>1,465,467</td>
<td>1,831,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reduction in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHD per Day</td>
<td>9,740</td>
<td>2042 hours VHD reduction; comparing 2040 build to 2040 no-build</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed congestion and throughput outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

The SANDAG regional transportation model was used to develop the quantified benefit values provided above. Project specific models were for the current/existing facility, the I-5 NCC 2040 no-build alternative, and the 2040 8+2 and 8+4 build alternatives, and used to develop the project specific measures.

- **Mode choices**
  - 8 lane freeway; very limited bike trail; pedestrian coastal access across I-5 not available in certain locations.
  - 8 lane freeway +2 Managed lanes; enhanced coastal access; significant bike trail improvements.

- **Vehicle miles traveled**
  - Only limited locations.
  - 8.9 miles of dedicated bike trail.

- **Reduction in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay**
  - 9,740 VHD per day for 2040 build to 2040 no-build alternative.

### Safety

**Reduction in vehicle-involved incidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,2% Reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reduction in train-involved incidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed safety outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

Much of the I-5 existing facility was constructed to 1960 safety standards. The project will modernize and enhance safety via upgrading to current safety standards including the following upgrades: enhanced pavement markings, concrete barriers, lighting of ramp ingress and egress areas, overhead signs and changeable message signs, squaring up ramps for improved bicycle and pedestrian safety, enforcement and incident management, and managed lanes standard design treatment.

An analysis using the Interchange Safety Analysis Tool (ISAT) estimated that fatal and injury collisions could increase by 1.0% due to the additional lanes, but property damage collisions would decrease by 2.2%. Per SCCP guidance, the collision analysis used ISTe predictive method algorithms, which are not specifically designed for non-barrier separated manage lanes and should be used for comparative purposes only.

The accident data comes from the Transportation System Network (TSN). TSN covers all highways/freeways, ramps and intersections by post mile. The TSN input data originates from CHP reports.

- **Reduction in vehicle-involved incidents**
  - 2,2% Reduction for 2040 build to 2040 no-build alternative.

- **Reduction in train-involved incidents**
  - n.a. for 2040 build to 2040 no-build alternative.

### Accessibility

**Enhancements to the reliability of the system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer time needed for on-time arrival</td>
<td>6.7-13.4 minutes maintained with 2040 build alternative; significant increase in buffer time expected for 2040 no-build alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First/last mile improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2030-2040</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9 miles of bike/pedestrian improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed accessibility outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used.

The SANDAG regional transportation model was used to develop the quantified benefit values provided above. Project specific models were for the current/existing facility, the I-5 NCC 2040 no-build alternative, and the 2040 8+2 and 8+4 build alternatives, and used to develop the project specific measures.

Reliability. On average, a user needs to budget an additional 6.7–13.4 minutes above average travel times to guarantee on-time arrival. The Project improves reliability for all users of the freeway, and provides particular benefits for buses and HOVs by prioritizing their movement over general-purpose lanes. Based on the project’s models, VHD and PHD both show improvements (reductions), by approximately 2,000 hours per day while ADT would increase. Travel time reliability will improve significantly for managed lane trips, which will enjoy a free-flow option for all 8.9 miles of freeway. This diversion of traffic into the new lanes will also benefit the reliability of general-purpose lanes compared to the No-Build scenario.
**Tourism Access/Coastal Accessibility**

The NCC is a critical corridor for San Diego’s tourism industry—the region’s second-largest traded economic sector—with over 15 million annual visitors to its beaches alone. The I-5 NCC project includes significant improvements to both pedestrian and vehicular coastal access, across I-5. New pedestrian facilities will be built in compliance with Caltrans Accessibility Guidelines. The I-5 NCC Project Work Program/Transportation and Resource Enhancement Program (PWP/TREP) economic analysis projected that, for tourism alone, the NCC Program improvements would result in a cumulative economic benefit of over $950 million through 2040 compared to the No-Build scenario.

**Economic Development**

- **Jobs created**
  - Each: 400,000*
  - Encinitas segment: 1.9
  - 2040

- **Improvements to freight throughput (truck trips)**
  - Percent of truck trips per day: n.a.
  - 2040

- **Benefit/Cost Ratio**
  - Ratio: n.a.
  - Encinitas segment: 1.9
  - 2040

- **Other**

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for economic development outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other", describe the measure and why other suggested measure(s) were not used. (* see discussion below; ** percentages derived from 2014 analysis of truck trips/freight throughput for the I-5 NCC, which compared truck trips for year 2030 no-build and 2030 8+4 build, since the 2030 traffic volumes projected at that time are now forecasted to more likely to occur in 2040, the percentages from that analysis are used here as a proxy for 2040.

In 2016 alone, San Diego’s innovation economy accounted for more than $55 billion (26%) in regional economic activity and more than 400,000 (30%) private-sector jobs. Much of this effort focused on the NCC from La Jolla/Sorrento Valley to Carlsbad. The Golden Triangle—located in the south end of the NCC—is a state-designated industry cluster in the biotechnology and life sciences featuring leading names such as Qualcomm, Illumina, Scripps Research Institute, Salk Institute, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, Burnham Institute’s General Atomics, and UC San Diego. San Diego leads the State of California in life sciences startups, and the largest concentrations are located along the NCC. Between 2014 and 2016 alone, more than 400 startups were established along the I-5 NCC:

- Job Access & Creation. San Diego’s economy depends upon mobility in the NCC. The Project area provides access to 22% of the San Diego region’s total jobs. An economic analysis conducted for the I-5 NCC PWP/TREP found that the NCC Program can result in 5,360–10,720 more permanent jobs across the region. The construction of the Project would also create approximately 8,700 short-term jobs, generating an estimated $1 billion for the regional economy.

- Freight Access. The two main ports of entry for freight trucks between California and Mexico—Otay Mesa East and Calexico East—use the Project segment of I-5 as one of two primary freight routes. The Project therefore will support not only San Diego’s $142 billion economy, but also the interstate and international commerce critical to California’s and America’s economic success.

**Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Description</th>
<th>Existing Emissions</th>
<th>Emission Reduction</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5) Kg per year</td>
<td>140.05</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10) Kg per year</td>
<td>259.74</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2) Kg per year</td>
<td>1,632,548.28</td>
<td>3,401.44</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organize Compounds (VOC) Kg per year</td>
<td>749.89</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOx) Kg per year</td>
<td>875.15</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO) Kg per year</td>
<td>10,969.13</td>
<td>34.12</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) Kg per year</td>
<td>3,191.53</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes.

- For existing total emissions, the results are direct outputs of the CT-EMFAC program.
- For projected year emission reduction, the results are also based on outputs of CT-EMFAC, with reduced values derived from comparison of the project’s 2040 no-build versus the 2040 build scenarios.
- Incremental 5 mile-per-hour vehicle speed bin data (for use in CT-EMFAC) was developed using project specific information from the project’s transportation model outputs.

In the space below, qualitatively describe how the project supports transportation-efficient land use principles, entailing the following concepts:

- Supports mixed-use development with multimodal choices
- Supports in-fill development
- Supports interconnected streets and corridor access management policies
- Addresses climate adaptation
### Efficient Land Use

**Limiting Sprawl and Multi-modal choices.** By improving infrastructure in the existing NCC, the Project will facilitate infill development and discourage sprawl into undeveloped areas. The Project’s investment in managed lanes, active transportation facilities, and new connections to transit will emphasize mobility through the movement of people and provision of viable transportation choices. This will accommodate the region’s projected growth more efficiently than new development at the urban fringes or in rural areas. The I-5 NCC plan includes significant improvements for active transportation modes, including improvements to sidewalks and ramp intersections, adding 10.2 miles of the I-5 North Coast Bike Trail. The I-5 NCC project also includes a new Manchester Avenue Park & Ride/Multi-Use Facility offering parking, lagoon access, electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, and trail connections.

**Providing Smart Growth Incentives.** In conjunction with the Project’s infrastructure improvements, SANDAG and local jurisdictions have also committed to focusing projected growth in identified Smart Growth areas. SANDAG’s $280 million Smart Growth Incentive Program funds transportation and related infrastructure that supports compact, mixed-use development closer to the region’s job centers and multimodal networks.

**Addresses Climate adaptation, Cal B/C benefits.** Estimating that the Project would construct approximately one-sixth of the lane-miles of managed lanes proposed for the larger NCC Program, approximately one-sixth of the emissions savings between the 2040 Build and No-Build scenarios was allocated to the Project. The results, shown in detail in the table below, found:

- All pollutants and GHGs associated with vehicle emissions are shown to decrease when comparing the 2040 Build and No-Build scenarios.
- Notably, carbon dioxide (CO2)—the primary compound that causes GHG effects—is shown to reduce by over 3.7 tons annually.
## Project Information

**Project Title:** I-80/680/SR12 Interchange Construction Package 2A  
**Date:** December 2018

## Contact Information

**Nominating Agency:** Solano Transportation Authority  
**Agency Completing Form:** Solano Transportation Authority  
**Contact Person:** Janet Adams  
**Phone:** (707) 424-6010  
**Email Address:** jadams@sta-snci.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCEP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td>Accident Rate (Statewide average 0.78 accidents/million vehicle-miles-traveled)</td>
<td>accid/mvmt</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crash Reduction Factor (per million vehicle miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed safety outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Accident rates within the project area are higher than the statewide average for similar facilities. According to data provided by Caltrans, I-80 within the project limits experienced a total accident rate (including fatal and injury accidents) of 0.79 accidents/million vehicle-miles traveled. This exceeds the statewide average for similar facilities of 0.78 accidents/million vehicle-miles traveled. After the construction of Construction Package 1 and related facilities within the project vicinity, the collision rate has been reduced to 0.51. This is attributed to the improved safety from these projects.

Initial collision rate of 0.79 was calculated using Caltrans TASAS data from 2006 to 2009. The rate was calculated using the FHWA method (accidents/million vehicle miles). This was included in the Project Report. The updated collision rate after construction of Construction Package 1 (or ICP) was calculated using UC Berkeley TIMS and SWITRS data from 2013 and 2016. The rate was calculated using the previously described method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCEP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in average PM peak period speed</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in average AM peak period speed</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed velocity outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Due to current congestion within the project area, velocity of freight moving through the system is impacted. Travel speeds on SR 12W routinely drop below 10 miles per hour during the afternoon peak period, and queuing extends for at least 2.5 hours each weekday afternoon. With the project velocity through the network would increase by 6% in the AM peak period and up to 25% in the PM peak period.

Speeds were calculated for the Revised 2010 Traffic Operations Report (TOR) and a traffic model was prepared. Alternative C Phase I, the selected alternative, would improve corridor-wide mobility by increasing VMT approximately 1 percent, while decreasing VHD by 18 percent. Average network travel speeds would increase 6 percent (from 41.8 mph under No Project conditions to approximately 44.2 mph).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCEP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in Truck Volumes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-80 (typical daily volume) truck #</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Route 12 (typical daily volume) truck #</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCEP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in rail volume/Level of Service (LOS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of trains Each</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of containers Each</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in tonnage Tons per year</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Trade Corridor Enhancement Program

### Benefits Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Throughput</th>
<th>Change in port volume</th>
<th>Number of containers</th>
<th>Each</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in tonnage</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in value</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed throughput outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The I-80 corridor is expected to see freight increase by 70 percent in 2025. The project reduces congestion and increases capacity, which affects freight throughput. I-80 currently carries about 6.6% truck traffic on a typical day, or approximately 10,900 trucks. Travel demand along I-80 is projected to double by the year 2035. The SR 12W corridor is also an important freight connection allowing the agricultural and viticultural products of Napa Valley to reach markets in the rest of California and throughout the nation.

The existing truck counts shown (10,900 trucks on I-80 and 3,800 on SR 12) come from the Caltrans 2016 Truck Volume spreadsheet. Truck AADT Total for I-80 is from Post Mile 12.839, Leg B. Truck AADT Total for SR 12 is from Post Mile R2.794, Leg B. The projection of growth is from the TOR, in particular from the comparison of existing volumes and projected demand volumes for eastbound SR 12 and eastbound I-80 as shown in Existing Conditions (1,020 AM and 1,350 PM) and Year 2035 Alt C Phase 1 (825 AM and 2,365 PM).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Travel Time Reduction (SR12W to Fairfield)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>-28%</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed reliability outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The I-80 corridor experiences unreliability in travel times and freight delivery on weekdays. The corridor experiences significant reliability problems during the PM peak period in the eastbound direction. Travel time reliability is a major concern for freight movers, who must use inefficient and costly delivery schedules in order to adapt to unreliable travel corridors. The SR 12 corridor experiences similar eastbound impacts in travel time reliability and impacts to freight delivery. Due to the bottleneck and volumes along the corridor, the PM peak is severe.

The 28% reduction in travel time is from SR 12W to Fairfield as described in the TOR. For the travel route from SR 12W to the I-80/Air Base Parkway Interchange, which under no project conditions was shown at 99:20 minutes and under year 2035 Alt C Phase 1 conditions was shown at 71:40 minutes (a 28% reduction).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congestion Reduction</th>
<th>Average Travel Speed PM peak period in 2035 (mph)</th>
<th>MPH</th>
<th>15.9</th>
<th>19.8</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay - AM (All vehicles)</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>3,695</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay - PM (All vehicles)</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>19,065</td>
<td>16,095</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed congestion reduction outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Current traffic volumes along segments of I-80, I-680, and SR 12 in the project area create heavy traffic congestion with an average travel speed of 46 mph during the morning peak period and 33 mph during the afternoon peak period. These average speeds are well below the threshold of 59.7 mph identified by the Highway Capacity Manual as the minimum operating speed associated with acceptable mainline freeway operations. The project improvements reduce congestion through increasing capacity, eliminating merge/weave constraints, and alleviating bottleneck locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions</th>
<th>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</th>
<th>Tons per year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>101,353</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOX)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxides (NOX)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based upon the benefit-cost analysis (BCA) for the I-80/I-680/SR-12 Interchange project analyzed the project over a 20-year period of operation. This Construction Package 2A is expected to reduce CO2 emissions by more than 100,000 tons, saving $2.9 million in emissions costs, and NOX emissions by more than 100 tons, saving $3.5 million in emissions costs.

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed economic development outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Economic Development

The STA I-80 Corridor Project Analyses, completed in 2017, analyzed the economic impacts of the I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange and two other projects on the economy. The study estimates that the over $740 million in combined construction spending will create over $1.003 billion in economic impacts in the local and statewide economy. This includes over 5,700 jobs and $35 million in state and local tax revenues. The study also finds that reducing congestion for trucking will generate another $93.8 million in savings, on an annual basis, for the five (5) years after project completion. In addition, reduced congestion as a result of the projects will provide over 600 more jobs supported from these savings, and almost $5 million in state and local revenues. The project’s main benefit is travel time savings and this phase will save almost 1 million person-hours of travel time annually over the 20-year period of operation. In addition, the improved safety in the project area is expected to generate $15.2 million in benefits during the 20-year period of analysis. The slightly higher speeds along the corridor are expected to generate vehicle operating costs and emissions cost savings totaling $23.3 million for this phase. This phase would result in a net present value of $138.2 million and generate a benefit-cost ratio of 3.21.
**Project Information**

**Project Title:** Alameda Corridor Southern Terminus Gap Closure  
**Date:** 1/14/2019

**Contact Information**

- **Nominating Agency:** Port of Los Angeles  
- **Agency Completing Form:** Port of Los Angeles  
- **Contact Person:** Kerry Cartwright, P.E  
- **Phone:** 310-732-7702  
- **Email Address:** kcartwright@portla.org

**TCEP Indicator** | **Suggested Measures/Outcomes** | **Unit** | **Year 2020 (opening day) Reduction** | **Projected Outcome** | **Year**
---|---|---|---|---|---
Safety | Reduction in truck-involved incidents | Each |  |  | 
| Reduction in train-involved incidents | Each | | | | 
| Other | | | | | 

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed safety outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

- The train delay reductions will also have the following safety benefits not monetized in the benefit-cost analysis (BCA):
  - Because the project will provide double tracking for access to two terminals, potential for collisions will be eliminated
  - Because overall system delay will be reduced, the potential for human error in train dispatching due to attempts to decrease headways should be diminished
  - Because of reduced hours of operation, the potential for human error in all train operations possibly attributable to crew fatigue should be diminished
  - The new double track segment will also reduce moving train blockages at two immediately adjacent rail crossings on roadways, which also reduces the potential for train-vehicular and train-pedestrian collisions

Velocity | Change in a average weekday speed - roadway | MPH |  |  | 
| Change in a average weekday speed - train | MPH | | | | 
| Other | | | | | 

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed velocity outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Throughput | Change in highway volume/Level of Service (LOS) | | | | 
| Number of 5+ axle trucks | Each | | | | 
| Number of trailers | Each | | | | 
| Number of containers | Each | | | | 
| Increase in tonnage | Tons per year | | | | 
| Increase in on-dock railyard capacity | | | | | 
| Change in rail volume/Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | 
| Number of trains | Each | | | | 
| Number of containers | Each | | | | 
| Increase in tonnage | Tons per year | | | | 
| Other | | | | | 
| Change in port volume | | | | | 
| Number of containers | Each | | | | 
| Increase in tonnage | Tons per year | | | | 
| Increase in value | Dollar | | | | 
| Other | | | | | 

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed throughput outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

- Reduction in variability in travel time, typical origin/destination pairs | Minutes |  |  |  | 
- Person Minutes Saved During Peak Hour | Minutes | | | | 
| Other | | | | |
### Trade Corridor Enhancement Program

#### Benefits Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed reliability outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under &quot;Other&quot; describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability improved due to potential for accident reduction due to projected reduction in truck trips; reliability not quantified in benefit-cost calculation, and not viable for post-project performance monitoring due to infeasibility of isolating the attribution of truck trip reductions on freeways and streets with volumes from other sources of traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congestion Reduction</th>
<th>In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed congestion reduction outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under &quot;Other&quot; describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Port has conducted a detailed rail simulation using the RTC model to quantify the benefits of eliminating the track gap. The latest Port’s estimates of on-dock rail yard capacities were used to compute train volumes and used in the simulation. The capacity computation is based upon various factors including: physical infrastructure characteristics (length and number of tracks), hours of operation; and loading equipment productivity rate. The Gap Closure project is estimated to reduce cumulative train delays (moving and idling, in aggregate) inside and outside the POLA/POLB by about 21 and 36 train-hours per day, under year 2020 and 2039 conditions, respectively. This delay reduction will reduce the potential for train collisions throughout the POLA/POLB rail system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions</th>
<th>In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the POLA/POLB rail projects, the BCR emissions have been calculated using detailed models that are being, and have been, used in CEQA environmental documents. As such, they are computed using CARB and AQMD approved protocols. Port rail volumes are produced using the Ports’ detailed trip generation mode split model (see attachment).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development</th>
<th>In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed economic development outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under &quot;Other&quot; describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>see attachment for b/C methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Information

**Project Title:** Terminal Island (TI) Railyard Enhancement  
**Date:** 1/14/2019

**Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc):**

## Contact Information

**Nominating Agency:** Port of Los Angeles  
**Agency Completing Form:** Port of Los Angeles

**Contact Person:** Kerry Cartwright, P.E  
**Phone:** 310-732-7702

**Email Address:** kcartwright@portla.org

## TCEP Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Year 2021 (opening day) Reduction</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in truck-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in train-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed safety outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under &quot;Other&quot; describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadway safety improved due to potential for accident reduction due to projected reduction in truck trips; accident reduction estimated in benefit-cost calculation, but not viable for post-project performance monitoring due to infeasibility of isolating the attribution of truck trip reductions on freeways and streets with volumes from other sources of traffic.

| **Velocity**                |      |                                  |                   |      |
| Change in a average weekday speed - roadway | MPH |                                  |                   |      |
| Change in a average weekday speed - train | MPH |                                  |                   |      |
| Other                        |      |                                  |                   |      |
| In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed velocity outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used. |

Reduction in average speed of truck trips due to shifting of containers from off-dock to on-dock railyards; i.e.; elimination of some truck trips; not viable for post-project performance monitoring due to mere fact of eliminating some container truck trips.

| **Throughput**              |      |                                  |                   |      |
| Change in highway volume/Level of Service (LOS) |      |                                  |                   |      |
| Number of 5+ axle trucks | Each |                                  |                   |      |
| Number of trailers | Each |                                  |                   |      |
| Number of containers | Each |                                  |                   |      |
| Increase in tonnage | Tons per year |                                  |                   |      |
| Increase in on-dock railyard capacity | containers (FEU) | 89,280; opening day reduction | 291,800 | 2040 |
| Change in rail volume/Level of Service (LOS) |      |                                  |                   |      |
| Number of trains | Each |                                  |                   |      |
| Number of containers | Each |                                  |                   |      |
| Increase in tonnage | Tons per year |                                  |                   |      |
| Change in port volume |      |                                  |                   |      |
| Number of containers | Each |                                  |                   |      |
| Increase in tonnage | Tons per year |                                  |                   |      |
| Increase in value | Dollar |                                  |                   |      |
| Other                        |      |                                  |                   |      |
| In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed throughput outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used. |

Based upon detailed capacity modeling and intermodal analysis, the expanded TI Railyard would provide an increase in on-dock capacity and commensurate use of 525,275 TEU/year (291,800 FEU), under year 2040 conditions.

| **Reliability**             |      |                                  |                   |      |
| Reduction in variability in travel time, typical origin/destination pairs | Minutes |                                  |                   |      |
| Person Minutes Saved During Peak Hour | Minutes |                                  |                   |      |
| Other                        |      |                                  |                   |      |
| In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed reliability outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used. |

Reliability improved due to potential for accident reduction due to projected reduction in truck trips; reliability not quantified in benefit-cost calculation, and not viable for post-project performance monitoring due to infeasibility of isolating the attribution of truck trip reductions on freeways and streets with volumes from other sources of traffic.
### Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2021 (opening day)</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>2609</td>
<td>8376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOx)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes.

For the POLA/POLB rail projects, the B/C ratio emissions have been calculated using detailed models that are being, and have been, used in CEQA environmental documents. As such, they are computed using CARB and AQMD approved protocols, including use of the CARB EMFAC2014 model. Moreover, these protocols employed by the POLA/POLB were also used to generate POLA/POLB emissions for use in the SCAQMD 2016 AQMP. The truck emissions account for the future truck mix (truck age distribution), accounting for turnover of existing trucks over 20 years, as estimated by the Ports and their consultants. These detailed truck mix forecasts account for actual, existing truck information collected via the Ports' annual emissions inventory (EI) work (https://www.portoflosangeles.org/pdf/2016_Air_Emissions_Inventory.pdf) and these emission calculation methodologies were also used in the POLA/POLB's recently approved 2017 Clean Air Action Plan (http://www.cleanairactionplan.org). Such fleet forecasts were developed in concert with the Ports' EI working group that includes EPA, CARB, and SCAQMD. The emission calculations employ standard and detailed methodologies for producing truck-miles traveled (TMT) and stopped delay, which are more precise and accurate than those that would be computed in Caltrans' Benefit-Cost model. Port rail project TMT reductions are produced using the Ports' detailed trip generation and travel demand models (TDM). The Ports' TDM is a focus model of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan model. Moreover, the SCAG incorporates the Ports' estimates of POLA/POLB truck and auto trips directly into the SCAG RTP, which by definition, is incorporated into the mobile emissions of AQMD's AQMP.

### Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs created</th>
<th>Each</th>
<th>Benefit/Cost Ratio</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>from TCEP application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>420 direct, indirect, induced construction phase jobs created</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed economic development outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

see attachment for b/C methodology
Trade Corridor Enhancement Program
Benefits Form

Project Information
Project Title: Quiet Zone Safety Engineering Measures
Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc): TC0004
Date: 12/20/2018

Contact Information
Nominating Agency: MTC
Agency Completing Form: City of Emeryville

Contact Person: Karl Anderson
Phone: 510-596-4346
Email Address: kanderson@bayareametro.gov

Contact Person: Ryan O’Connell
Phone: 510-596-4346
Email Address: roconnell@emeryville.org

---

Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCEP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in truck-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>100-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in train-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>55,762</td>
<td>5,467</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>QZRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed safety outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under “Other” describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The City used the Federal Railroad Administration’s (FRA) WEB Accident Prediction System (WBAPS) to see the accident reduction benefits of this project. Applying the 90% reduction in risk to the average predicted collision rates from the WBAPS, the 100-year number of collisions is expected to decrease by 3-5 collisions, from 4-5 collisions (with no improvements) to 0-1 collisions (with proposed improvements). The City also calculated the Quiet Zone Risk Index (QZRI) before and after the installation of the proposed safety improvements, from 55,762 (with no improvements) to 5,467 (with proposed improvements).

---

Velocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCEP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in a average weekday speed - roadway</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in a average weekday speed - train</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed velocity outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under “Other” describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The Project is not expected to affect the Velocity of the trains or vehicles.

---

Throughput

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCEP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in highway volume/Level of Service (LOS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of 5+ axle trucks</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of trailers</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of containers</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in tonnage</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in rail volume/Level of Service (LOS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of trains</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of containers</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in tonnage</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in port volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of containers</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in tonnage</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in value</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed throughput outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under “Other” describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The Project is not expected to affect the Throughput of trains or vehicles.

---

Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCEP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in variability in travel time, typical origin/destination pairs</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person Minutes Saved During Peak Hour</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed reliability outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under “Other” describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The Project is not expected to affect the Reliability of trains or vehicles.

---
### Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Tons per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes.

Since emissions are calculated based on additional vehicle-miles traveled, the results in the Cal LCBC v6.2 model analysis show no impact to diesel particulates, nitrogen oxides, greenhouse gases, or other pollutant emissions. The proposed safety improvements are not expected to impact traffic volumes along adjacent routes.

### Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Each</th>
<th>Benefit/Cost Ratio</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Created</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed economic development outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The total social costs of the three crossings in Emeryville were studied with a projected year of 2035. The total accident social cost for the three crossings is a combined $1,141,205. Applying a 90% reduction in accident costs based on the QZRI values, the safety benefits of this project can be quantified in a single-year valuation for 2035 at $1,027,085. With the estimated cost of this project at $6,480,000, we can assume an annualized cost of $216,000 using a 30-year useful life. The annualized benefit/cost ratio for this project in 2035 is $1,027,085 divided by $216,000, which is **4.76**. These favorable numbers do not include additional benefits such as reduced construction costs for new developments associated with mitigating rail horn noises, increased property values due to lack of noise concerns, and additional development occurring in proximity to the track due to reduced impacts.
Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title: State Route 132 West Freeway/Expressway Phase 1</th>
<th>Date: 12/26/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc): EA:40350 PPNO:0944M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominating Agency: Stanislaus Council of Governments</th>
<th>Agency Completing Form: City of Modesto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person: Rosa De Leon Park</td>
<td>Contact Person: John Rawles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: (209)525-4600</td>
<td>Phone: (209)232-9078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address: <a href="mailto:rpark@stancog.org">rpark@stancog.org</a></td>
<td>Email Address: <a href="mailto:jrawles@modestogov.com">jrawles@modestogov.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCEP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Reduction in truck-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in train-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other - Crash Cost Savings</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$224,791,111 2021-2040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed safety outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The Highway Safety Manual estimate property damage as only (PDO) and fatal and injury (FI) crashes. Fehr and Peers recommend monetized values for six categories of crashes based on the severity of the injury from "Minor" to "Not survivable". The Serious category is in the middle (the third of six categories) and corresponds to about 10 percent of the cost of a fatality. Each crash can have more than one injury or fatality. Given that most crashes involve two vehicles, two injuries was chosen as a reasonable estimate of the average number of injuries per crash. F&P studies show a recommended monetized value for a PDO crash as $4,252 per vehicle. For this evaluation, a PDO crash was estimated to involve two vehicles for a cost equivalent of $8,504 per crash. These 2016 dollar values were used to estimate cost in all future years.

Velocity

| Change in a average weekday speed - roadway | MPH |
| Change in a average weekday speed - train | MPH |
| Other | |

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed velocity outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Please see "Congestion Reduction" section for travel time reduction benefits of this project.

Throughput

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in highway volume/Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of 5+ axle trucks</td>
<td>Each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trailers</td>
<td>Each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of containers</td>
<td>Each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in tonnage</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Value of Vehicle Distance Traveled</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in rail volume/Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of trains</td>
<td>Each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of containers</td>
<td>Each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in tonnage</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in port volume</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of containers</td>
<td>Each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in tonnage</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in value</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed throughput outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The total vehicles traveling the Project corridor and the No Build route distances were used to calculate vehicle distance traveled for a typical weekday. Daily average truck volumes (20% average on local roads and 30% on the Project facility) from the TOR combined with the auto travel cost ($0.37/mile) and truck travel costs ($0.85/mile) to calculate change in total vehicle operating cost. The vehicle operating costs are based on California fuel efficiency and non-fuel operating cost values. Unlike the value of time savings, the cost is based on per mile, so the passenger occupancy and split between personal and business travel for passenger vehicles were not needed. The annualized benefits was calculated using 250 weekdays and 115 weekends for 2040.
### Trade Corridor Enhancement Program

#### Benefits Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Reduction in Variability in Travel Time, Typical Origin/Destination Pairs</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person Minutes Saved During Peak Hour</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$59,504,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Vehicle Travel Time Savings</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$467,926,117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed reliability outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

For travel time savings, F&P studies show that benefits be evaluated for existing and additional users separately and to discount by half the benefit of additional users. The reason for the discount is that existing users do not change their route to save travel time and receive the full benefit, while additional users only change their route if the previous route has a higher travel time. The volume for each segment for each direction and time period for the No Project was subtracted from the Alternative to separate the existing vehicles from the additional vehicles. Value of time assumptions are $13.65/hour per person for personal travel, $25.40/hour per person for business travel, and $31.40/hour for commercial truck. For auto travel, 55% is assumed to be business travel. Peak period is assumed at 1hrs and daily truck percentage is 20%.

VTTS= Value of Travel Time Savings (undiscounted 2016 dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congestion Reduction</th>
<th>Reduction in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Annual Truck Trips (due to mode shift)</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Annual Truck Miles Traveled (due to mode shift)</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Travel Time Cost Savings</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$467,926,117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed congestion reduction outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The value of time recommended by the Fehr & Peers of $13.65/hour per person for personal travel, $25.40/hour per person for business travel, and $31.40/hour for commercial truck were used. Based on traffic counts and field observations, the peak AM is assumed to be congested for 1 hour and the peak PM is assumed to be congested for 1 hour. However, the peak congestion is growing in the area and other areas are currently experiencing multiple hours of congestion. In 2040 future conditions 2hrs of congestion was used for each peak period. The AM and PM factors were used to convert the individual hour travel time benefits to reflect the entire peak period. No travel time savings were assumed during the off-peak hours. The travel time savings for an individual day (AM peak period plus PM peak period) we annualized using a factor of 250 for weekdays and 115 for weekends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions</th>
<th>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</th>
<th>Tons per year</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>26386</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOx)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes.

The total VMT by speed range for a typical weekday from the regional forecasting model used to produce the roadway volumes was used for the No Build Alternative and Alternative 2. Due to congestion and speed varying across the day, the daily VMT by speed range was calculated by adding the AM and PM peak period, mid-day, and off-peak VMT by the associated congestion for the time of day. Emission factors that represent the vehicle fleet, speeds, and environmental conditions (EMFAC) within Stanislaus County were used for 2020 and 2035 due to the changes in vehicle fleet and fuel mix being county and year specific.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development</th>
<th>Jobs Created</th>
<th>Each</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit/Cost Ratio</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>2021-2040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed economic development outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The Benefit/Cost Ratio of 7.09 was calculated using a total project cost of $108.6 million vs a project 20 year lifecycle benefit of $780 million. Do note that this value is the undiscounted cost analysis.
7th Street Grade Separation (East) Date: 12/27/2018

Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc): PPNO: 2103D

### Contact Information
- **Nominating Agency:** Caltrans/MTC/Alameda CTC
- **Agency Completing Form:** Alameda CTC
- **Contact Person:** Trinity Nguyen
  - **Phone:** 510-208-7441

### Project Information
- **Project Title:** 7th Street Grade Separation (East)
- **Contact Person:** Trinity Nguyen
  - **Email Address:** tnguyen@alamedactc.org

### Benefits Form

#### Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCEP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td>Reduction in truck-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>178.3 / 7.3 / 7.5</td>
<td>0 / 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in train-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>-15.7 / -0.8 / -0.8</td>
<td>0 / 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Safety

- **Change in average weekday speed - roadway**
  - MPH
- **Change in average weekday speed - train**
  - MPH

#### Velocity

- **Change in highway volume/Level of Service (LOS)**
  - Each
  - 211,297 / 144,491 / 148,210
  - 0 / 2023

#### Throughput

- **Change in rail volume/Level of Service (LOS)**
  - Each
  - -1,051 / -719 / -737
  - 0 / 2023

#### Reliability

- **Reduction in variability in travel time, typical origin/destination pairs**
  - Minutes
- **Person Minutes Saved During Peak Hour**
  - Minutes

---

7SGSE project is a state of good repair project which will rebuild the existing two-span railroad underpass structures. One of the structures was constructed in the 1930’s while the other was constructed in the 1970’s. Both of which do not meet the current vertical clearance and seismic standards. The project prevents future diversion of the container cargo from rail to truck should the structure fail. Assuming the failure would occur in 2023, the initial disturbance will lead to a major diversion of rail freight operation to trucks and also trucks using 7th Street to other access roadways. After the initial disturbance period (from 2023 to 2025) if the structures are rebuilt in 2025, the volume of diverted trucks will be reduced and consequently the number of truck accidents. Changes in number of crashes are calculated based on changes in vehicle miles traveled for truck and rail and converting them to number of crashes based on Cal-BCA values.

In the table above, current values show the adverse impact of not commissioning the project during the disturbance period for 2023, 2024 and 2025. If the project is undertaken, there will be no diversion and consequently the outcome will be zero in 2025 when the two structures are re-built. As mentioned in the application, above values lead to total safety benefits of $8.3 million.
### Trade Corridor Enhancement Program

#### Benefits Form

**Congestion Reduction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Tons per year</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay</td>
<td>10,497 / 432 / 443</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Annual Truck Miles Traveled (due to mode shift)</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>210,733,987 / 8,669,457 / 8,892,615</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Annual Truck Trips (due to mode shift)</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>211,297 / 144,491 / 148,210</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed congestion reduction outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

**Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Tons per year</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td>5.8 / 0.3 / 0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td>9.4 / 0.4 / 0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2)</td>
<td>357,356 / 18,589 / 19,050</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>17.4 / 1.8 / 1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOx)</td>
<td>2.7 / 0.1 / 0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>5,235 / 13 / 13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)</td>
<td>652 / 40 / 39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Created</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit/Cost Ratio</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed economic development outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

**Economic Development**

Based on an estimate of 18 jobs per $1 million dollars of construction capital, job creation is projected to be 2,880. Also, the project will improve the multi-use path for Port workers, commuters, and recreational users to access the Port, adjacent to the San Francisco Bay and Treasure Island. This will ease the access of the West Oakland residents to jobs at the Port of Oakland and lead to economic development throughout the community. Employment inside the Port Complex, including the Oakland Army Base and the Global Logistics Center is projected to grow by at least 3,500 to 4,000.

The benefit/cost ratio of 3.97 was generated based on the 20-year life-cycle benefit-cost analysis results for the aforementioned scenario.
## Project Information

**Project Title:** Route 34 (Fifth Street)/Rice Avenue Grade Separation  
**Date:** 1/2/2019  
**Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc):** EA TC0001, PPNO 4961, FTIP VEN040401

## Contact Information

**Nominating Agency:** Caltrans  
**Agency Completing Form:** VCTC  
**Contact Person:** Daniel Kopulski  
**Phone:** (213) 897-0227  
**Contact Person:** Peter De Haan  
**Phone:** 805-642-1591  
**Email Address:** dan.kopulsky@dot.ca.gov, pdehaan@goventura.org

## Suggested Measures/Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCEP Indicator</th>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Reduction in truck-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in train-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed safety outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Based on actual 10-year accident data and projected accident rate for the new facility from the TCEP project application and the Cal-B/C model analysis. Reduction in accidents will occur over a 10-year period beginning when the project is operational (project estimated to be completed in year 2022).

| Safety         | Change in a average weekday speed - roadway | MPH | 47 | 55 | 2022 |
|                | Change in a average weekday speed - train | MPH | N/A | N/A | |
|                | Other | | | | |

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed velocity outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Outcomes anticipated to begin when the project becomes operational (project estimated to be completed in year 2022). Future MPH = Posted Speed used in the Cal-B/C analysis. Source: City of Oxnard Train Study at SR-34 and Rice Avenue (National Data & Surveying Services), January 2018.

| Throughput     | Change in highway volume/Level of Service (LOS) | Each | 3,500 | 7,330 | 2042 |
|               | Number of 5+ axle trucks | Each | N/A | N/A | |
|               | Number of trailers | Each | N/A | N/A | |
|               | Number of containers | Each | N/A | N/A | |
|               | Increase in tonnage | Tons per year | N/A | N/A | |
|               | Other | | | | |

| Throughput     | Change in rail volume/Level of Service (LOS) | Each | 0 | 0 | 2022 |
|               | Number of trains | Each | N/A | N/A | |
|               | Number of containers | Each | N/A | N/A | |
|               | Increase in tonnage | Tons per year | N/A | N/A | |
|               | Other | | | | |

| Throughput     | Change in port volume | Each | N/A | N/A | |
|               | Number of containers | Each | N/A | N/A | |
|               | Increase in tonnage | Tons per year | N/A | N/A | |
|               | Increase in value | Dollar | N/A | N/A | |
|               | Other | | | | |

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed throughput outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Current Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 35,000, the future 20-year forecast ADT is 73,300, and 10% of ADT are 5-axle trucks (source: Draft Project Report).

| Reliability    | Reduction in variability in travel time, typical origin/destination pairs | Minutes | 0.68 | 0.23 | 2022 |
|               | Person Minutes Saved During Peak Hour | Minutes | 2.217 | 112 | 2022 |
|               | Other | | | | |

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed reliability outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.
### Benefits Form

### Congestion Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit/Cost Ratio</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Each</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Annual Truck Trips (due to mode shift)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Annual Truck Miles Traveled (due to mode shift)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed congestion reduction outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

The project is expected to reduce 110 Daily Vehicle Hours when the project becomes operational. The estimate is based on 46,190 Person-Hours Saved annually (from the Cal-B/C results), AVO of 1.15. Therefore: 46,190 ÷ 1.15 ÷ 365 days = 110 Daily Vehicle Hours Saved. It is further assumed the project will not reduce annual truck trips or miles.

### Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit/Cost Ratio</th>
<th>Tons per year</th>
<th>Each</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOx)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Assumes annual emission benefits begin when the project becomes operational.

### Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit/Cost Ratio</th>
<th>Each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit/Cost Ratio</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Created</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed economic development outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Total Job-Years = 665 (426 Job-Years from Direct and Indirect effects; and 239 Job-Years from Induced Effects).

This is based on the simple rule for estimating job-years that $92,000 of government spending creates 1 job-year. 64% of the job-years represent Direct and Indirect Effects, and 36% of the job-years are induced effects (source: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009).

Construction total = $61,200,000

665 * .64 = 426 Job-Years from Direct and Indirect effects

665 * .36 = 239 Job-Years from Induced effects
### Project Information

**Project Title:** US 101/SR 25 Interchange - Phase 1  
**Date:** 12/10/2018  
**Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc):** EA 3A160, PPNO 0462G

### Contact Information

**Nominating Agency:** Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
**Agency Completing Form:** Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
**Contact Person:** Gene Gonzalo  
**Phone:** 408-952-4236  
**Email Address:** gene.gonzalo@vta.org

### Benefits Form

#### Project Information

- **Project Title:** US 101/SR 25 Interchange - Phase 1  
- **Date:** 12/10/2018  
- **Project Identifier (EA, PPNO, etc):** EA 3A160, PPNO 0462G

#### Contact Information

- **Nominating Agency:** Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
- **Agency Completing Form:** Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
- **Contact Person:** Gene Gonzalo  
- **Phone:** 408-952-4236  
- **Email Address:** gene.gonzalo@vta.org

#### TCEP Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Measures/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in truck-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in train-involved incidents</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Accident Rates</td>
<td>MVM</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Safety

- **Total Accident Rates from Caltrans listed above are accidents per Million Vehicle Miles (MVM). Current total accident rates are averaged among the 4 ramps at the 101/25 interchange, while projected outcome in build year 2023 anticipate total accident rates that are closer to Statewide average accident rates averaged among the 4 ramps. Available Caltrans accident rates are not separated between trucks and other vehicles.**

#### Velocity

- **Change in a average weekday speed - roadway:** MPH  
  - Current: 42.5  
  - Projected: 43.5  
  - Year: 2023

#### Throughput

- **Change in highway volume/Level of Service (LOS):**  
  - Number of 5+ axle trucks | Each | See below |  |
  - Number of trailers | Each | | |
  - Number of containers | Each | | |
  - Increase in tonnage | Tons per year | | |

- **Change in rail volume/Level of Service (LOS):**  
  - Number of trains | Each | N/A |  |
  - Number of containers | Each | | |
  - Increase in tonnage | Tons per year | | |

- **Change in port volume:**  
  - Number of containers | Each | N/A |  |
  - Increase in tonnage | Tons per year | | |
  - Increase in value | Dollar | | |

- **Change in variability in travel time, typical origin/destination pairs:** Minutes  
  - Current: See below |  |  |  |  |
### Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person Minutes Saved During Peak Hour</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed reliability outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

While this Phase 1 project would improve reliability at the 101/25 interchange, the main reliability improvements would come from the future SR 152 trade corridor project. The Phase 1 project would build a portion of the overall 101/25 interchange reconfiguration and is the first segment of the future SR 152 trade corridor. The trade corridor improvements would increase reliability through capacity and safety increases, resulting in less delays from accidents that can shut down the current 2-lane roadway between US 101 and SR 156.

### Congestion Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Annual Person-Hours of Delay</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Annual Truck Trips (due to mode shift)</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Annual Truck Miles Traveled (due to mode shift)</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed congestion reduction outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

Time benefit is based upon the Benefit/Cost Analysis that was completed in January 2018 using the California Life-Cycle Benefit/Cost Analysis Model (Cal-B/C). Outcome result is time benefit of the project in person-hours/year, the first year the project construction is completed.

### Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO2)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>4,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Sulphur Oxides (SOx)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed emissions reduction outcomes.

Improvements at the interchange would reduce vehicle idling and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions. A Benefit/Cost Analysis was completed in January 2018 using the California Life-Cycle Benefit/Cost Analysis Model (Cal-B/C) taking into account traffic volumes and delays to to quantify these air quality and greenhouse gas reductions.

### Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Created</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>No Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit/Cost Ratio</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, qualitatively explain the assumptions and methodologies used for proposed economic development outcomes. If another measure(s) is entered under "Other" describe the measure and why the suggested measure(s) were not used.

From the Life-Cycle Benefit/Cost Analysis Model, the project generates a positive benefit cost ratio of 9.6, with a NPV of approximately $520.0 million over the course of 20 years of project operation. The expected rate of return from the model is at 43.5% at a payback period of two years.
### Active Transportation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td>14th Street: Safe Routes in the City</td>
<td>Baseline Agreement due six months after environmental completion. Environmental scheduled to be completed early 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td>I-80 Gilman Bike/Ped Overcrossing</td>
<td>Baseline Agreement due six months after environmental completion. Environmental scheduled to be completed by July 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Partnership Program - Competitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase Hybrid Buses</td>
<td>The environmental is scheduled to be completed by December 2019, due to a proposed change in scope. Commission Staff is working with Caltrans and the implementing agency to determine what actions are required. The project is currently in the planning phase, and environmental is scheduled to be completed by December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marina - Salinas Multimodal Corridor: Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>Baseline Agreement is due six months after environmental completion. Environmental is expected to be approved by March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metro Orange Line Bus Rapid Transit Improvements</td>
<td>The the environmental review was completed on September 27, 2018; however, the Baseline Agreement is pending while further analysis of the environmental outcomes is conducted. Commission Staff is working with Caltrans and the implementing agency to determine what actions are required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Solutions for Congested Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County Central Corridor Improvement Project</td>
<td>Baseline Agreement due six months after environmental completion. Environmental scheduled to be completed by August 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trade Corridor Enhancement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Rt 605 / 91 Interchange Improvement: Gateway Cities Freight Crossroads Project</td>
<td>Baseline Agreement due six months after environmental completion. Environmental was completed in November 2018, therefore the Baseline Agreement is due by May 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>National City Marine Terminal Rail Track Extension</td>
<td>Baseline Agreement due six months after environmental completion. Environmental scheduled to be completed by November 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 4.20

Action

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN

Executive Director

Prepared By: Matthew Yosgott

Associate Deputy Director

Subject: STATE ROUTE 99 BOND PROGRAM - APPROVE THE BASELINE AGREEMENT FOR THE NORTHBOUND LIVINGSTON WIDENING PROJECT – RESOLUTION R99-P-1819-03

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the State Route 99 (SR 99) Bond Program Project Baseline Agreement for the Northbound Livingston Widening Project from Hammatt Avenue to Merced/Stanislaus County Line in Merced County?

RECOMMENDATION:

Commission staff recommends that the Commission approve the SR 99 Project Baseline Agreement and establish this agreement as the basis for project delivery and monitoring.

BACKGROUND:

In accordance with the Commission’s SR 99 Bond Program Guidelines, the project’s sponsor agency, the Merced County Association of Governments, has provided an executed Project Baseline Agreement. Commission staff has reviewed the Project Baseline Agreement and determined that the agreement sets forth the proposed project scope, measurable expected performance benefits, delivery schedule, budget and funding plan, is consistent with the Commission’s SR 99 Bond Program Guidelines and includes the required signatures.

RESOLUTION R99-P-1819-03

Be it Resolved, that the Commission does hereby approve the State Route 99 Bond Program Project Baseline Agreement for the Northbound Livingston Widening Project from Hammatt Avenue to Merced/Stanislaus County Line in Merced County.
M e m o r a n d u m

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 4.21
Action

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Prepared By: Teresa Favila
Associate Deputy Director

Subject: PROPOSITION 1A - HIGH-SPEED PASSENGER TRAIN BOND PROGRAM AMENDMENT, RESOLUTION HST1A-P-1819-01

ISSUE:
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) amend the High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Program (Proposition 1A) to reprogram the Sacramento Intermodal Facility Project as two separate projects, the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project and the Sacramento Valley Station and Track Relocation Project?

RECOMMENDATION:
Commission staff recommends that the Commission approve a Proposition 1A Program Amendment to reprogram the Sacramento Intermodal Facility Project as two separate projects as follows: 1) The Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project with $25 million of Proposition 1A funds programmed to the construction component; 2) the Sacramento Valley Station and Track Relocation Project with $1.208 million of Proposition 1A funds programmed to the environmental and design phases.

BACKGROUND:
The Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century (Proposition 1A) was approved by the voters on November 4, 2008. Proposition 1A authorized the Commission, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to allocate funds for capital improvements to intercity rail lines, commuter rail lines and urban rail systems that provide direct connectivity to the high-speed train system or that provide capacity enhancements and safety improvements. The Commission is required to program and allocate the net proceeds received from the sale of $950 million in bonds authorized for the Proposition 1A Connectivity Program.

As required by Streets and Highways Code, Division 3, Chapter 20, Section 2704.095, the Commission adopted Program Guidelines in February 2010. The initial program of projects was approved in May 2010, with various amendments to the Proposition 1A Program subsequently approved by the Commission.

The Sacramento Intermodal Facility Project is composed of two separate projects that will be delivered in two separate contracts. Therefore, the Sacramento Regional Transit District is requesting this amendment to separate the project into the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project and the Sacramento Valley Station and Track Relocation Project.
The total project cost for the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project is estimated at $209.77 million and $16.931 million for the Sacramento Valley Station and Track Relocation Project.

**RESOLUTION HST1A-P-1819-01:**
Be it Resolved, the Commission does hereby amend the Proposition 1A High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Program by reprogramming the existing Sacramento Intermodal Facility Project as two separate projects, the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project and the Sacramento Valley Station Project, as reflected in Attachment A.

Attachments:
- Attachment A: Proposition 1A High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Program
- Attachment B: Programming Request letter from Sacramento Regional Transit District
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Prop 1A</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>PA&amp;ED</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>R/W</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SacRT</td>
<td>Sacramento Valley Station and Track Relocation Project**</td>
<td>Relocate existing light rail track, storage tracks, passenger platform and associated systems, to connect Sac RT service to future High-Speed Rail.</td>
<td>$16,931</td>
<td>$1,208</td>
<td>$1,208</td>
<td>$576</td>
<td>$632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT Programmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCIPB (BART/SCVTA)</td>
<td>Caltrain Advanced Signal System (CBOSS/PTC)**</td>
<td>Design, installation, testing, training and warranty for an intelligent network of signals, sensors, train tracking technology, computers, etc. on the Caltrain Corridor to meet mandated Federal guidelines.</td>
<td>$231,000</td>
<td>$105,445</td>
<td>$105,445</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
<td>$97,245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFMUNI</td>
<td>Central Subway</td>
<td>Construct 1.7 mile extension of light rail line from Caltrain/potential High-Speed Rail station at 4th &amp; King Streets to Chinatown.</td>
<td>$1,578,300</td>
<td>$61,308</td>
<td>$61,308</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td></td>
<td>$61,308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BART Car Purchase</td>
<td>Purchase new BART cars ($140 million).</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCRRRA Car Purchase</td>
<td>SCRRRA PTC Projects</td>
<td>$201,600</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA</td>
<td>Regional Connector Transit Corridor**</td>
<td>Construct 2-mile light rail connection among Metro Gold, Metro Blue and Metro Exposition light rail transit systems through downtown Los Angeles to provide a one-seat ride from throughout the County to Union Station and the High-Speed Rail system.</td>
<td>$1,366,100</td>
<td>$114,874</td>
<td>$114,874</td>
<td></td>
<td>$114,874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRRRA</td>
<td>Metrolink High Speed Readiness Program</td>
<td>Either repower or purchase 20 to 30 higher horsepower locomotives, and recondition and improve passenger cars.</td>
<td>$202,899</td>
<td>$88,707</td>
<td>$88,707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$88,707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJRR/ACE</td>
<td>Stockton Passenger Track Extension (Gap Closure) 2A</td>
<td>Extend existing platform and additional track work to connect new platform for Amtrak access and access to new ACE maintenance facility, including a 90 foot single track bridge over Harding Way.</td>
<td>$24,895</td>
<td>$5,714</td>
<td>$5,714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT Programmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego MTS</td>
<td>Blue Line Light Rail</td>
<td>Rehaiblite grade crossings, track, and switches and ties, add trackwork and signaling, and raise platforms to accommodate low floor vehicles to allow for reduced headway and improved reliability.</td>
<td>$151,754</td>
<td>$57,855</td>
<td>$57,855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$57,855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner PTC</td>
<td>Positive Train Control</td>
<td>$59,982</td>
<td>$17,833</td>
<td>$17,833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>Maintenance Shop and Yard Improvements</td>
<td>Segment of extension to Berryessa, expand Main Shop, construct new Component Repair Shop, retrofit for new M&amp;E Shop, including M&amp;E Material Storage Yard</td>
<td>$432,933</td>
<td>$78,639</td>
<td>$78,639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$78,639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban and Commuter Rail Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>$744,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$576</td>
<td>$8,832</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$722,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HIGH-SPEED PASSENGER TRAIN BOND PROGRAM AMENDMENT

**RESOLUTION HST1A-P-1819-01**

($1,000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Prop 1A</th>
<th>Prior 19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>PA&amp;E</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>R/W</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCRRRA</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner PTC</td>
<td>Positive Train Control</td>
<td>$46,550</td>
<td>$46,550</td>
<td>$46,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>San Joaquin Corridor PTC</td>
<td>Positive Train Control</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCJPA</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor (and ACE)</td>
<td>Travel Time Reduction</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$10,180</td>
<td>$10,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Intercity Rail Formula Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$66,530</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$66,530</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner PTC</td>
<td>Positive Train Control</td>
<td>$34,500</td>
<td>$24,010</td>
<td>$24,010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner PTC</td>
<td>Positive Train Control</td>
<td>$2,940</td>
<td>$2,940</td>
<td>$2,940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$26,950</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$26,950</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>San Joaquin Corridor Merced to Le Grand Double Track, Segment 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,750</td>
<td>$40,750</td>
<td>$40,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCJPA</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor Sacramento to Roseville 3rd Main Track</td>
<td>Increase service frequency, reduce freight train conflicts, accommodate freight train growth, relocate Roseville station and add third track.</td>
<td>$82,276</td>
<td>$51,970</td>
<td>$5,740</td>
<td>$46,230</td>
<td>$5,492</td>
<td>$248</td>
<td>$46,230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$119,670</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$119,670</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposition 1A Program Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$931,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$931,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaded area reflects the change for this Program Amendment

**Project includes less than 5% of Prop 1A funds for pre-construction**
January 3, 2018

Ms. Susan Bransen
Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA  95814

Attention: Ms. Teresa Favila, Mr. Ezequiel Castro

Re: Sacramento Intermodal Facility High Speed Rail Connectivity Improvements Prop 1A Re-programming and Allocation Request

Dear Ms. Bransen:

Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) requests the California Transportation Commission (Commission) to consider the following actions for approval at the January 30-31, 2019, Commission Meeting:

1) Amend the Proposition 1A High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Program to reprogram the two components of the existing Sacramento Intermodal Facility Project as two separate projects, the Downtown/Riverfront Sac-West Sac Streetcar project and the Sacramento Valley Station and Track Relocation project.

2) Accept the environmental findings for the Downtown/Riverfront Sac-West Sac Streetcar project and approve the project for consideration of funding.

3) Allocate $25,000,000 of Proposition 1A – High-Speed Passenger Train Bond funds for the Downtown/Riverfront Sac-West Sac Streetcar project, and allow an additional 6 months for contract award, for a total of 12 months from the date the Commission makes the allocation.

While SacRT is the grantee for Proposition 1A funds, these funds will be provided, through a subrecipient agreement, to the Riverfront Joint Powers Authority ("JPA"), a JPA created by the City of Sacramento and City of West Sacramento. The JPA will own the Streetcar assets acquired with the Proposition 1A funds and operate the Streetcar project. The terms of the State Master Agreement pertaining to the Proposition 1A funds will require state approval to transfer funds/assets from SacRT to the JPA. Receipt of funds by and transfer of assets to the JPA are conditioned upon such approval.

If you have questions or concerns, please contact Ed Scofield at (916) 321-3854 or Joe Paglieroni at (916) 321-2956.

SacRT appreciates your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Henry Li, GM/CEO- SacRT

cc: Teresa Favila, CTC
Ezequiel Castro, Caltrans- DRMT
Scott Kingsbury, Caltrans- DRMT
Todd Rogers, Caltrans District 3
Ed Scofield, SacRT
To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 2.1d.
Action

Published Date: January 18, 2019

From: SUSAN BRANSEN
Executive Director

Prepared By: Teresa Favila
Associate Deputy Director

Subject: PROPOSITION 116 RAIL PROGRAM AMENDMENT
RESOLUTION PA-19-01, AMENDING RESOLUTION PA-14-01

ISSUE:
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an amendment to the
Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act of 1990 (Proposition 116) Program and amend
the Orange County Commuter/Intercity Rail Program of Projects?

RECOMMENDATION:
Commission staff recommends that the Commission approve an amendment to the Proposition
116 Orange County Commuter/Intercity Rail Program of Projects as follows:

• De-program savings from two completed projects: $1,820,566 from the Metrolink Fiber
Optics Installation Project and $429,778 from the Sand Canyon Avenue Grade Separation
Project.

• Program $2,250,344 to the Laguna Niguel to San Juan Capistrano Passing and Siding
Project. This is in addition to the $2,483,000 already programmed to the project.

BACKGROUND:
Proposition 116 approved by California voters authorized $1.99 billion in general obligation
bonds for specific projects, purposes, and geographic jurisdictions, primarily for passenger rail
capital projects. In February 2009, the Commission adopted Resolution PA-09-01, approving an
Orange County Transportation Authority application for the remaining $121,298,778 of the
$125,000,000 in Proposition 116 Bond funds authorized to the Orange County Transportation
Authority under Public Utilities Code Section 99645.

Approval of this amendment revises the Proposition 116 Orange County Commuter/Intercity Rail
Program for $121,298,778 in Proposition 116 funds as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metrolink Track Expansion/Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>$30,669,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton Transportation Center Parking Structure</td>
<td>$8,817,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin Rail Station Parking Expansion</td>
<td>$7,181,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon Avenue Grade Separation</td>
<td>$21,574,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolink Fiber Optics Installation</td>
<td>$10,479,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolink Positive Train Control</td>
<td>$32,715,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control Point Stadium Crossover (Anaheim) $3,245,000
North Beach Safety Crossing Improvements $166,000
Fullerton Transportation Center Elevators $1,718,000
Laguna Niguel to San Capistrano Passing Siding $4,733,778
Total $121,298,778

Attachments:
- Attachment A: Resolution PA-19-01
- Attachment B: Orange County Transportation Authority Programming Request
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION AMENDMENT FOR LOCALLY–ADMINISTERED
PROPOSITION 116 TRANSIT PROJECT
RESOLUTION BFA-18-03, AMENDING RESOLUTION BFP-18-01

ISSUE:
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an amendment to increase
of Proposition 116 Bond Funds by $2,250,344, from $2,483,000 to $4,733,344, for the locally-
administered Laguna Niguel to San Juan Capistrano Passing and Siding project (PPNO 2107), in
Orange County?

RECOMMENDATION:
The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends that the Commission
approve an amendment to increase of Proposition 116 Bond Funds by $2,250,344, from $2,483,000
to $4,733,344 for the locally-administered Laguna Niguel to San Juan Capistrano Passing and Siding
project (PPNO 2107), in Orange County, per Public Utilities Code Section 99645, as described on
the attached vote list.

BACKGROUND:
At its October 2018 meeting, the Commission approved an allocation of $2,483,000 in Proposition
116 Bond Funds for the Laguna Niguel to San Juan Capistrano Passing and Siding project (PPNO
2107) under Resolution BFP-18-01. However, after receiving the initial round of bids, the lowest
bid was approximately 21 percent higher than the Engineer’s Estimate. As a result of this cost
increase, the recipient agency, the Orange County Transportation Authority is respectfully
requesting that $2,250,344 in additional Proposition 116 Bond Funds from project savings from two
other Proposition 116 projects, be allocated to the project in order to award the construction contract
and proceed with the project.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:
1.1 WHEREAS, the Commission has adopted an annual program for mass transportation capital
purposes, and the electorate enacted both Proposition 108-the Passenger Rail and Clean Air
Bond Act of 1990, and Proposition 116-the Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Bond
Act of 1990, authorizing the sale of general obligation rail bonds for rail transit purposes; and

“Provide A safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system
To enhance California’s economy and livability.”
1.2 WHEREAS, the Project further detailed on the attached vote list, as component phases or in its entirety, appears on the necessary State capital projects funding list and is entitled to participate in this allocation; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the Commission has established a “Hazardous Waste identification and Clean-up Policy” (Resolution G-91-2) which requires the Recipient to perform, with diligence, the process of identification and remediation of any hazardous waste in the right-of-way, easements and properties.

2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that an allocation of $2,250,344 in additional PROPOSITION 116 CLEAN AIR AND TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT BOND proceeds be allocated to the Recipient for the project detailed on the attached vote list; and

2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the transfer of funds for each project shall be governed by the program supplement, and subsequent amendments to the same if required; and

2.3 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that each recipient shall provide the Department’s Division of Rail and Mass Transportation with an updated expenditure plan on a quarterly basis by category including any proposed changes for the balance of all funded Project allocations commencing with the first quarter; and

2.4 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in any instance of rail bond financing of a project, the Commission, acting on behalf of the State, by this Resolution intends:

A. To cause and approve the issuance of taxable or tax-exempt State general obligation bonds under Proposition 116, as appropriate, to reimburse the Recipient for the Project identified on attached vote list;

B. To reimburse the Recipient for expenditures that shall not have been paid from the proceeds of any other tax-exempt indebtedness unless such prior indebtedness is retired with the proceeds of such State monies;

C. That this Resolution be a declaration of official intent of the State within the meaning of U.S. Treasury Regulations Section 1.103-17(c) with respect to the Project; and

2.5 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in any instance of rail bond financing, an allocation for a project is subject to the following conditions and assurance:

A. Completed bond sales authorized by the Office of State Treasurer;

B. Receive bond certification from the Department, preferably prior to the Commission’s allocation action but, certification must be obtained prior to execution of the fund transfer agreement;

C. The Recipient’s certification that will not adopt new increased current development taxes, fees, exactions or permit fees for the purpose of providing local matching funds; and the certification of this delivered to this Commission, preferably by the time of
Commission allocation action but not later than prior to execution of a fund transfer agreement;

D. A formal resolution by the Recipient’s Board stating that when utilizing State funding for acquisition of property or for capital improvements on the Project, Recipient has exercised all due diligence in the discovery of hazardous wastes; that Recipient will enter into enforceable agreement(s) with any and all owners of to-be acquired properties for clean-up of hazardous wastes pursuant to the requirements of Resolution G-91-2, regarding Hazardous Waste Identification and Clean-up for Rail Right-of-Way;

E. A formal resolution by the Recipient’s Board stating that when utilizing state-provided and other-than-state funding for acquisition of property or for capital improvements on the Project, that no additional State funds will be requested for clean-up, damages, or liability associated with hazardous wastes on or below the acquired property, delivered to this Commission;

F. That in any instance of rail bond financing with Proposition 116 funds, eligible costs may be incurred for project development after the project application approval, and all reimbursements of eligible costs are subject to an executed fund transfer agreement;

G. The Recipient shall provide the Commission with an “Evaluation of Property report” by the time of the Commission allocation action, in compliance with Resolution G-95-09, Rail Right-of-Way Review Policy, to be verified by the Department or its Agent;

H. The Recipient shall post on the Project construction site at least one sign, visible to the public, stating that the Project is partially funded with Proposition 116 Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Bond Act of 1990 proceeds; and

2.6 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Commission shall be entitle to a then present value refund, or credit, at State’s option, equivalent to the proportionate funding participation by the State towards, property acquisition and project construction in the event that Recipient, or successor public entitles, fail or cease to utilize the Project for the intended public passenger rail purposes or sells or transfers title to the Project. The credit for future purchases or condemnation of all or portions of the Project by the State, and the refund or credit due the Commission in each instance, will be measured by the ratio of State and other market value of the Project property; and

2.7 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if the Recipient receives any revenues or profits from any non-governmental use of property allowed pursuant to bond certification (whether approved at this time or hereafter approved by the State), the Recipient agrees that such revenues or profits shall be used exclusively for the public transportation services for which the project was initially approved, either for capital improvements or maintenance and operational costs. If the Recipient does not so dedicate the revenues or profits, a proportionate shall (unless disapproved by the State’s Bond Council) be paid to the State equivalent to the State’s percentage participation in the Project.

“Provide A safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system
To enhance California’s economy and livability.”
2.8 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an allocation for the project is subject to the following conditions and assurances:

A. Reimbursements of eligible costs are subject to the terms and conditions of the executed program supplement;

B. The grant recipient must complete the work to be reimbursed and the actual reimbursement by January 31, 2023, unless the Commission authorizes a waiver that extends, if permitted by statute, the period of availability of the funds.

Attachment
### Allocation Amendment - Proposition 116 - Locally Administered Transit Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>District-County</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,483,000</td>
<td>Orange County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>OCTA 12-Orange</td>
<td>Laguna Niguel to San Juan Capistrano Passing and Siding project</td>
<td>Construct 1.8 miles of new passing siding railroad track adjacent to existing main track in the LOSSAN Rail Corridor.</td>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>624-0703</td>
<td>$2,483,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,733,344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P116/14-15</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>P116</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,733,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome/Output:** 1.8 miles of new track to improve operational capacity and flexibility

(Future Consideration of Funding approved under Resolution E-16-48; June 2016.)


**Amend Resolution BFP-18-01 to increase allocation of Proposition 116 funds by $2,250,344 for a total of $4,733,344.**
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
From: STEVEN KECK
       Chief Financial Officer

Subject: AMENDMENT TO PROPOSITION 1B INTERCITY RAIL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
        RESOLUTION ICR1B-P-1819-03, AMENDING RESOLUTION ICR1B-P-1819-02

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 4.24
Action Item

Prepared by: Ron Sheppard, Chief (Acting)
             Division of Rail and Mass Transportation

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve Resolution ICR1B-P-1819-03, amending Resolution ICR1B-P-1819-02 to reprogram $617,000 of identified savings from two Proposition 1B Intercity Rail Improvements Program (ICR) projects?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends the Commission amend Resolution ICR1B-P-1819-02 to reprogram identified savings from two Proposition 1B ICR Program projects.

The Department has identified savings from the following projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raymer to Bernson Double Track: PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$ 419,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys North Platform: PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$ 198,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Project Savings to be Reprogramed:  | $ 617,000|

The Department further recommends that $617,000 be reprogrammed to the following project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys North Platform CON</td>
<td>$30,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reprogrammed amount for the project will now be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys North Platform</td>
<td>$31,117,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
BACKGROUND:

The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, approved by voters as Proposition 1B, provides $400 million, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to the Department for intercity passenger rail improvement projects.

This $400 million program is part of the $4 billion Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA). This account is to be used to fund public transportation projects. Pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of Section 8879.50 of the Government Code, the Department is the administrative agency for the PTMISEA.

At its December 2007 meeting, the Commission approved the guidelines for intercity passenger rail projects in the PTMISEA. The guidelines allow the Department, if necessary, to return to the Commission to request its consent to modify the project list.

The necessary changes are reflected in strikethrough in the proposed Proposition 1B Intercity Rail Improvement Program Amendment list and are again presented in an amended list.
**PROPOSITION 1B INTERCITY RAIL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT (Proposed)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Description</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Funding Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Locomotives and Railcars: Purchase bi-level intercity railcars and locomotives.</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor, Pacific Surfliner, San Joaquin</td>
<td>$42,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option Locomotives: Purchase locomotives.</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor, Pacific Surfliner, San Joaquin</td>
<td>$103,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-board Information System (OBIS): Install OBIS.</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor, Pacific Surfliner, San Joaquin</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce/Fullerton Triple Track - Segment 6: Construct third main track from MP 154.5 to MP 157.6.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, Metrolink</td>
<td>$31,992,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Station Track at LA Union Station: Build new track, platform and renovate canopies.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, Metrolink</td>
<td>$20,099,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Onofre to Pulgas Double Track Project – Phase 1: PA&amp;ED Project Approval and Environmental Documentation.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$3,146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Onofre to Pulgas Double Track Project – Phase 1: CON Construction.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$25,284,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Onofre to Pulgas Double Track Project – Phase 2: PS&amp;E Design and engineering.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$972,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley to Port Chicago: Construct double track.</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>$23,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Park Track and Signal Improvements: Improve track and signals along San Joaquin Intercity rail line near Hanford in Kings County.</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Network for Northern California IPR Fleet: Install a wireless communication network on the Northern California IPR.</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor, San Joaquin</td>
<td>$2,927,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymer to Bernson Double Track: PS&amp;E Design and engineering for double track from MP 453.1 to MP 446.8 on Ventura subdivision.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, LAMTA</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymer to Bernson Double Track: CON Construct double track from MP 453.1 to MP 446.8 on Ventura subdivision.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, LAMTA</td>
<td>$12,980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys North Platform: PS&amp;E Design and engineering for second platform at the Van Nuys station.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, LAMTA</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys North Platform: CON Construct second platform at the Van Nuys station.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, LAMTA</td>
<td>$3,802,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Margarita Bridge and Double Track: Replace bridge with 2-track bridge and construct additional double track.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$31,117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville Station and Track Improvements: Extend siding track with associated signal and other track.</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor, San Joaquin</td>
<td>$15,748,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahia Benicia Crossover: Construct crossover between two mainline tracks and additional track improvements and upgrades including frog replacement and tie tamping on the Capitol Corridor.</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor</td>
<td>$6,151,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Corridor Track, Bridge, and Signal Upgrade Project: Replace and upgrade certain elements of the track, signal and bridge infrastructure along the Capitol Corridor.</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor</td>
<td>$3,445,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRRRA Sealed Corridor: Enhance safety of grade crossings and Railroad Right of Way.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, Metrolink</td>
<td>$2,782,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County Sealed Corridor: Enhance safety of grade crossings and Railroad Right of Way.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, Metrolink</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Power and Storage: Installation of a wayside power at the Auburn Station and layover site.</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacliff Siding: PA&amp;ED Project approval and environmental documentation for siding extension to improve on-time performance and increase capacity.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability.”
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**“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability.”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Seacliff Siding: CON**  
Construction for siding extension to improve on-time performance and increase capacity. | Pacific Surfliner | $20,526,000 |
| **NCTD Left Hand Turnout at MP 209.2**  
Remove and replace existing left hand turnout. | Pacific Surfliner | $1,000,000 |
| **Capitol Corridor – Sacramento to Roseville 3rd Track Phase 1: PS&E / ROW Engineering, and right-of-way for third main track.** | Capitol Corridor | $2,026,000 |
| **Capitol Corridor – Sacramento to Roseville 3rd Track Phase 1: CON**  
Construction for third main track. | Capitol Corridor | $16,225,000 |
| **Capitalized Maintenance – Southern California Track and Signal Modernization**  
Improved operations | Pacific Surfliner, Metrolink | $2,000,000 |
| **Passing Siding, Laguna Niguel – San Juan Capistrano**  
Construct passing siding, 1B Bond contribution to a STIP project | Pacific Surfliner, OCTA | $2,000,000 |

**SUB-TOTAL ALL PROJECTS**  
$393,376,000

**Unprogrammed Amount**  
$1,624,000

**Bond Issuance Costs - Loan admin costs, arbitrage rebates, etc.**  
$8,000,000

**TOTAL RAIL BOND FUNDS**  
$400,000,000

1. Bond Issuance Cost is 2 percent of the Bond amount
Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system
to enhance California’s economy and livability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Description</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Funding Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Locomotives and Railcars:</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor, Pacific Surfliner, San Joaquin</td>
<td>$42,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase bi-level intercity railcars and locomotives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option Locomotives:</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor, Pacific Surfliner, San Joaquin</td>
<td>$103,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase locomotives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-board Information System (OBIS):</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor, Pacific Surfliner, San Joaquin</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install OBIS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce/Fullerton Triple Track - Segment 6:</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, Metrolink</td>
<td>$31,992,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct third main track from MP 154.5 to MP 157.6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Station Track at LA Union Station:</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, Metrolink</td>
<td>$20,099,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build new track, platform and renovate canopies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Onofre to Pulgas Double Track Project – Phase 1: PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$3,146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Approval and Environmental Documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Onofre to Pulgas Double Track Project – Phase 1: CON</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$25,284,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Onofre to Pulgas Double Track Project – Phase 2: PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$972,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and engineering.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley to Port Chicago:</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>$23,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct double track.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Park Track and Signal Improvements:</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve track and signals along San Joaquin Intercity rail line near Hanford in Kings County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Network for Northern California IPR Fleet:</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor, San Joaquin</td>
<td>$2,927,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install a wireless communication network on the Northern California IPR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymer to Bernson Double Track: PS&amp;E Design and engineering for double track from MP 453.1 to MP 446.8 on Ventura subdivision.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, LAMTA</td>
<td>$6,081,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymer to Bernson Double Track: CON Construct double track from MP 453.1 to MP 446.8 on Ventura subdivision.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, LAMTA</td>
<td>$12,980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys North Platform: PS&amp;E Design and engineering for second platform at the Van Nuys station.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, LAMTA</td>
<td>$3,802,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys North Platform: CON Construct second platform at the Van Nuys station.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, LAMTA</td>
<td>$31,117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Margarita Bridge and Double Track:</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$15,748,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace bridge with 2-track bridge and construct additional double track.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville Station and Track Improvements:</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor, San Joaquin</td>
<td>$6,151,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend siding track with associated signal and other track.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahia Benicía Crossover:</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor</td>
<td>$3,445,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct crossover between two mainline tracks and additional track improvements and upgrades including frog replacement and tie tamping on the Capitol Corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Corridor Track, Bridge, and Signal Upgrade Project:</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor</td>
<td>$1,305,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace and upgrade certain elements of the track, signal and bridge infrastructure along the Capitol Corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRRRA Sealed Corridor:</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, Metrolink</td>
<td>$2,782,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance safety of grade crossings and Railroad Right of Way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County Sealed Corridor:</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, Metrolink</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance safety of grade crossings and Railroad Right of Way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Power and Storage:</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of a wayside power at the Auburn Station and layover site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacliff Siding: PA&amp;ED Project approval and environmental documentation for siding extension to improve on-time performance and increase capacity.</td>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Seacliff Siding: CON
Construction for siding extension to improve on-time performance and increase capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$ 20,526,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NCTD Left Hand Turnout at MP 209.2
Remove and replace existing left hand turnout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Surfliner</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capitol Corridor – Sacramento to Roseville 3rd Track Phase 1: PS&E / ROW
Engineering, and right-of-way for third main track.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Corridor</td>
<td>$ 2,026,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capitol Corridor – Sacramento to Roseville 3rd Track Phase 1: CON
Construction for third main track.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Corridor</td>
<td>$ 16,225,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capitalized Maintenance – Southern California Track and Signal Modernization
Improved operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, Metrolink</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Passing Siding, Laguna Niguel – San Juan Capistrano
Construct passing siding, 1B Bond contribution to a STIP project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Surfliner, OCTA</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB-TOTAL ALL PROJECTS**  $390,376,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unprogrammed Amount</td>
<td>$1,624,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bond Issuance Costs - Loan admin costs, arbitrage rebates, etc.**  $8,000,000

**TOTAL RAIL BOND FUNDS**  $400,000,000

1. Bond Issuance Cost is 2 percent of the Bond amount

Attachment

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability.”
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Commission Advice and Consent
Proposition 1B Intercity Rail Capital Program Amendment

Resolution ICR1B-P-1819-03,
Amending Resolution ICR1B-P-1819-02

1.1 WHEREAS, Proposition 1B, passed by California voters on November 7, 2006, called for $4 billion to be deposited into the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account; and

1.2 WHEREAS, of the $4 billion, $400 million was designated, to be available upon appropriation by the Legislature, for intercity rail capital projects, including at least $125 million for the purchase of additional rail cars and locomotives; and

1.3 WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approved at its December 2007 meeting, the “Guidelines for Intercity Passenger Rail Projects in the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account”, that provide guidance on the implementation of the Proposition 1B Intercity Passenger Rail Program; and

1.4 WHEREAS, the guidelines state the California Department of Transportation (Department) can return to the Commission to request formal approval to modify the project list and project scope; and

1.5 WHEREAS, the initial Intercity Rail Proposition 1B project list was approved at February 2008 Commission meeting; and

1.6 WHEREAS, the amended Intercity Rail Proposition 1B projects list includes $392 million in intercity rail projects and $8 million in bond issuance costs; and

1.7 WHEREAS, all projects on the attached amended Proposition 1B project list are consistent with the guidelines.

2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission does hereby provide its consent to the amended list of Intercity Rail Proposition 1B projects; and

2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Department shall report on a quarterly basis to the Commission on the allocation status of the Proposition 1B intercity passenger rail projects as part of the Department’s quarterly delivery report.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISION

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 2.5g.(8c)

From: STEVEN KECK
   Chief Financial Officer

Prepared by: Ron Sheppard, Chief (Acting)
   Division of Rail and Mass Transportation

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION AMENDMENTS FOR PROPOSITION 1B INTERCITY RAIL IMPROVEMENTS FUND PROGRAM PROJECTS
   RESOLUTION ICR1B-AA-1819-03, AMENDING RESOLUTION ICR1B-AA-1516-02.

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation (Department) request to reallocate savings of $617,000 in Proposition 1B – Intercity Rail (ICR) funds to the Van Nuys North Platform Project (PPNO 2113) for construction cost increases?

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department recommends that the Commission approve its request to allocate an additional $617,000 in Proposition 1B – ICR funding to the Van Nuys North Platform Project (PPNO 2113), due to construction cost increases within the scope of the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICR Project</th>
<th>District-PPNO</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Amending Resolution</th>
<th>Current Project Allocation</th>
<th>Additional Allocation</th>
<th>Revised Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys North Platform: CON Construct second platform at the Van Nuys station.</td>
<td>75-2113</td>
<td>ICR1B-AA-1819-03</td>
<td>ICR1B-AA-1516-02</td>
<td>$30,500,000</td>
<td>$617,000</td>
<td>$31,117,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed changes are reflected in strikethrough and bold in accordance with the attached revised vote boxes.

BACKGROUND:

The United States Department of Justice (DOJ) contacted the Department in June 2018 regarding identified American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance deficiencies at Van Nuys Amtrak Station. The Department found that further remediation efforts were required and is working collaboratively with DOJ and the local agencies to make expeditious repairs.

The work needed to be completed is on the station’s parking lots and adjacent passenger facility waiting areas and will happen in coordination with the current construction of the new platform. The construction is within the scope of work of the existing allocation.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:

Be it Resolved, that savings of $617,000 in Proposition 1B – ICR funds be allocated to the Van Nuys North Platform project (PPNO 2113) due to construction cost increases. The overall allocation will increase from $30,500,000 to $31,117,000, in accordance with the attached revised vote box.

Attachment
### Allocation Amendment - Proposition 1B - Locally Administered Intercity Rail Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prgm'd Amount</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Adv. Phase</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,500,000</td>
<td>Van Nuys North Platform CON</td>
<td>In Los Angeles County at the Van Nuys station on the Pacific Surfliner Corridor, the project includes the construction of a center platform and a pedestrian underpass with additional civil/track improvements.</td>
<td>The project will replace the existing single sided platform with a new center platform to better serve and enhance safety for passengers and improve flow of Amtrak and Metrolink trains. (CEQA - SE, 07/09/2013.) (NEPA - CE, 06/24/2013) (Concurrent Proposition 1B Programming Amendment Resolution ICR1B-P-1819-03; January 2019.)</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>ICR/15-16</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$30,500,000</td>
<td>0012000136</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>304-6059</td>
<td>ICR</td>
<td>$30,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,117,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,117,000</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3046059</td>
<td>ICR</td>
<td>$617,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The additional funding is for construction cost increases associated with federally required ADA construction which is within the scope of the project.

**Amend Resolution ICR1B-AA-1516-02 to allocate an additional $617,000 for construction cost increases within the scope of the project.**
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: SHOPP AMENDMENT 18H-007

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.1a.(1)
Action Item

Prepared by: Bruce De Terra, Chief
Division of Transportation Programming

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation’s (Department) request to amend the 2018 State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) under SHOPP Amendment 18H-007?

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department recommends that the Commission approve SHOPP Amendment 18H-007 that will amend the 2018 SHOPP Program, in accordance with Senate Bill 486 and the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program component of Senate Bill 1, which require the Commission to approve changes to projects in the SHOPP or to adopt new projects being amended into the SHOPP.

The Department recommends 13 new capital projects be amended into the 2018 SHOPP, as detailed in Attachment 1. These amendments, summarized below, would be funded from the Major Damage Restoration, Collision Reduction and 2018 SHOPP programming capacity. These projects are consistent with the 2018 Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 SHOPP Summary of New Projects by Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>FY 2018-19 ($1,000)</th>
<th>FY 2019-20 ($1,000)</th>
<th>FY 2020-21 ($1,000)</th>
<th>FY 2021-22 ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Damage Restoration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$22,195</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,537</td>
<td>$12,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision Reduction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,930</td>
<td>$6,460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Amendments</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$22,195</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,467</td>
<td>$18,583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
The Department also recommends an additional new capital project amended into the 2018 SHOPP, targeted to the four asset classes highlighted in Senate Bill 1, as detailed in Attachment 2 and summarized below. The amendment would be funded from the Roadway Preservation components of Senate Bill 1. This project is consistent with the 2018 TAMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 SHOPP Summary of New Projects by Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>FY 2018-19 ($1,000)</th>
<th>FY 2019-20 ($1,000)</th>
<th>FY 2020-21 ($1,000)</th>
<th>FY 2021-22 ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Preservation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Amendments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department further recommends that the capital projects, detailed in Attachment 3 and Attachment 4, be amended in the 2018 SHOPP to update scope, schedule, cost and make other technical changes. The amended projects are consistent with the Commission-adopted 2018 TAMP.

**BACKGROUND:**

In each even-numbered year, the Department prepares a four-year SHOPP which defines major capital improvements necessary to preserve and protect the State Highway System. Periodically, the Department proposes amendments to the SHOPP to address newly identified needs prior to the next programming cycle. Between programming cycles, the Department updates scope, schedule and cost to effectively deliver projects.

Senate Bill 486, approved by the Governor on September 30, 2014, requires Commission approval of projects amended into the SHOPP.

Attachments
## List of New 2018 SHOOPP Capital Project Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major Damage Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01-Men-101</td>
<td>21.0/R22.0</td>
<td>4719</td>
<td>0119000023</td>
<td>0J400</td>
<td>Near Ukiah, from 0.3 mile south to 0.7 mile north of Route 253. Repair failed culverts.</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $0</td>
<td>201.130</td>
<td>Assembly: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $5</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>Congress: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup $275</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap $10</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $625</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>02-Plu-70</td>
<td>0.0/29.9</td>
<td>3723</td>
<td>0218000119</td>
<td>4H440</td>
<td>Near Pulga, from the Butte County line to 3.1 miles west of Route 89 at various locations. Repair Rock Slepe Protection (RSP) and stabilize roadway embankment.</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $1,030</td>
<td>201.131</td>
<td>Assembly: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $1,110</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $70</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>Senate: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup $1,110</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap $347</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>Congress: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $15,870</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>Total $19,537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-Sac-5</td>
<td>0.0/24.7</td>
<td>5873</td>
<td>0319000054</td>
<td>4H810</td>
<td>In the city of Sacramento, from the San Joaquin County line (PM 0.018) to Richards Boulevard; also on Route 50 from Route 5 to the Manlove Pedestrian Overcrossing (PM L0.5/R5.8). Remove and replace failed pavement.</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $0</td>
<td>201.130</td>
<td>Assembly: 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $0</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>Congress: 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup $500</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap $0</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $3,500</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>Total $4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Concurrent COS allocation under Resolution FP-18-47; January 2019.)
## List of New 2018 SHOPP Capital Project Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Leg./Congress. Dists. Perf. Meas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>04-Son-101</td>
<td>R55.8</td>
<td>1462P</td>
<td>0416000409 2K350</td>
<td>Near Cloverdale, at 0.4 mile south of the Mendocino County line. Restore slope, rebuild damaged gutter and install erosion control measures.</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $840 18-19</td>
<td>Assembly: 2</td>
<td>Senate: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $2,620 21-22</td>
<td>Total $4,685</td>
<td>Senate: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Congress: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Location(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Concurrent COS allocation under Resolution FP-18-47; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05-Scr-17</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2852</td>
<td>0518000117 1K070</td>
<td>Near Scotts Valley, south of Sugarleaf Road. Stabilize eroded side cut slope by grading and dewatering.</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $721 18-19</td>
<td>Assembly: 29</td>
<td>Senate: 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA&amp;ED: 3/30/2020 R/W: 7/14/2021 RTL: 12/31/2021 BC: 7/15/2022</td>
<td>Con Sup $1,033 21-22</td>
<td>Senate: 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $4,271 21-22</td>
<td>Total $7,438</td>
<td>Senate: 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Location(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Concurrent COS allocation under Resolution FP-18-47; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>08-Riv-10</td>
<td>R74.0/R121.8</td>
<td>3013E</td>
<td>0819000030 1K390</td>
<td>Near Indio, from 15.0 miles east of Dillon Road to 18.0 miles west of Route 78. Repair roadway washout and erosion.</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $150 18-19</td>
<td>Assembly: 56</td>
<td>Senate: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $6,000 18-19</td>
<td>Total $7,200</td>
<td>Senate: 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Location(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>08-Riv-243</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3012Y</td>
<td>0819000024 1K350</td>
<td>Near Idyllwild, 1.1 miles north of Lake Fulmor Bridge. Replace failed culvert.</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $0 18-19</td>
<td>Assembly: 71</td>
<td>Senate: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA&amp;ED: 3/30/2020 R/W: 7/14/2021 RTL: 12/31/2021 BC: 7/15/2022</td>
<td>Con Sup $300 18-19</td>
<td>Senate: 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $850 18-19</td>
<td>Total $1,370</td>
<td>Senate: 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Location(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of New 2018 SHOPP Capital Project Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No. Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
<th>Program Code Leg./Congress. Dists. Perf. Meas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Damage Restoration, continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Near Vidal, 29.0 miles west of Route 95. Roadway washout and slope repair.</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $40 18-19</td>
<td>201.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $50 18-19</td>
<td>Assembly: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $50 18-19</td>
<td>Senate: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup $200 18-19</td>
<td>Congress: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap $75 18-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $625 18-19</td>
<td>1 Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $1,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Near Gustine, 0.4 mile south of Route 140 at Garzas Creek Bridge No. 39-0181R/L. Repair bridge scour and grade channel.</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $25 18-19</td>
<td>201.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $25 18-19</td>
<td>Assembly: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $10 18-19</td>
<td>Senate: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup $340 18-19</td>
<td>Congress: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap $50 18-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $1,150 18-19</td>
<td>1 Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Near the community of Mariposa, from 13.7 miles east of Triangle Road to 1.0 mile east of Crane Creek Road. Repair fire damaged drainage systems and slopes, replace guardrail and sign, and remove trees and debris.</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $60 18-19</td>
<td>201.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $140 18-19</td>
<td>Assembly: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $20 18-19</td>
<td>Senate: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup $850 18-19</td>
<td>Congress: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap $0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $5,000 18-19</td>
<td>15 Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $6,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collision Reduction</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>In and near the cities of Alameda, Emeryville, Berkeley, Albany, and San Leandro on Routes 61, 123, and 185 at various locations. Install vehicle speed feedback signs and upgrade signal to standard.</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $303 18-19</td>
<td>201.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $300 19-20</td>
<td>Assembly: 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $219 19-20</td>
<td>Senate: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup $400 21-22</td>
<td>Congress: 13, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap $83 20-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $1,472 21-22</td>
<td>13 Collision(s) reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $2,777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(PA&ED: 5/1/2020
R/W: 1/1/2022
RTL: 2/1/2022
BC: 8/1/2022

(Concurrent COS allocation under Resolution FP-18-47; January 2019.)
### List of New 2018 SHOPP Capital Project Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No. Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$566 18-19 201.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$405 19-20 Assembly: 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Near Woodside, from the Santa Clara County line to Route 84 (PM 2.121/10.518). Install curve warning signs, enhanced visibility striping, pavement markings with audible traffic stripe systems, and optical speed bars.</td>
<td>04-SM-35</td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$11 19-20 Senate: 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup</td>
<td>$441 21-22 Congress: 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap</td>
<td>$2,260 21-22 13 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA&amp;ED:</td>
<td>4/1/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W:</td>
<td>7/1/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTL:</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BC:</td>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Concurrent COS allocation under Resolution FP-18-47; January 2019.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No. Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$400 18-19 201.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$700 19-20 Assembly: 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$20 19-20 Senate: 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Near Easton, from Elkhorn Avenue to North Avenue. Construct rumble strips.</td>
<td>06-Fre-41</td>
<td>R/W Cap</td>
<td>$10 19-20 Congress: 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup</td>
<td>$500 20-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap</td>
<td>$1,300 20-21 11 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA&amp;ED:</td>
<td>9/1/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W:</td>
<td>4/20/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTL:</td>
<td>7/8/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BC:</td>
<td>1/19/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Concurrent COS allocation under Resolution FP-18-47; January 2019.)
## List of New 2018 SHOPP Capital Project Amendments for Senate Bill 1 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No. Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
<th>Program Code Leg./Congress. Dists. Perf. Meas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>06-Fre-5</td>
<td>37.2/48.8</td>
<td>Near Mendota, from north of Three Rocks Road to south of Panoche Road. Pavement rehabilitation, repair culverts and upgrade Transportation Management Systems (TMS) field elements.</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $2,000 18-19</td>
<td>201.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6970</td>
<td>0618000048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $1,300 20-21</td>
<td>Assembly: 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0X270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $10 20-21</td>
<td>Senate: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup $5,200 21-22</td>
<td>Congress: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap $300 20-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $35,900 21-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $44,710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED:</td>
<td>1/15/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W:</td>
<td>8/2/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTL:</td>
<td>12/1/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC:</td>
<td>7/1/2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measure: Pavement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Condition</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Condition</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of 2018 SHOPP Amendments
(Cost, Scope, Schedule and Technical Changes. Includes Federal Emergency Relief.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01-DN-199</td>
<td>1.1/36.3</td>
<td>6.3/36.3</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>01440000974</td>
<td>0190000016</td>
<td>48800</td>
<td>48801</td>
<td>In Del Norte County, at various locations from north of Elk Valley Cross Road south of Myrtle Creek Bridge to south of the Oregon State line. Culvert rehabilitation and fish passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.151</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Culvert(s)</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup</td>
<td>$1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap</td>
<td>$656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap</td>
<td>$4,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$8,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Due to environmentally sensitive areas within the state park, split five culvert locations from this project into EA 48802/PPNO 01-1130 and deliver the remaining 12 culvert locations on schedule. One culvert failed and was replaced under an emergency project. Performance and cost adjusted accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure: Culverts (12 each)</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Condition Linear feet</td>
<td>406.0</td>
<td>475.0</td>
<td>589.0</td>
<td>1,470.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Condition Linear feet</td>
<td>1,470.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,470.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2
Near Willow Creek, at the Willow Creek Maintenance Station. Transportation infrastructure improvement for zero-emission vehicle charging. | 18-19 | 201.999 | PA&ED | $267 | Prior | $267 | Prior |
| Performance Measure | PS&E | $250 | Prior | $250 | Prior |
| R/W Sup | $39 | Prior | $39 | Prior |
| Con Sup | $6 |       | $6 | 18-19 |
| R/W Cap | $14 | 17-18 | $14 | 17-18 |
| Const Cap | $6 |       | $381 | 18-19 |
| Total | $570 |       | $1,169 |       |

(Time Extension CONST and CON ENG expires on March 31, 2019.)

Note: Fully program all phases of previously unfunded Zero-Emission Vehicle (ZEV) charging station project.
List of 2018 SHOPP Amendments
(Cost, Scope, Schedule and Technical Changes. Includes Federal Emergency Relief.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>02-Las-299</td>
<td>18.5/25.6</td>
<td>3467</td>
<td>0200020286</td>
<td>Near Adin, from west of Boyd Hill Lookout Road to Butte Creek Bridge; also in Modoc County from Ash Creek Bridge to east of County Road 87 (PM 0.0/0.5 and PM 1.0/1.8); also in Modoc County on Route 139 (PM 0.116/R0.231). Roadway rehabilitation.</td>
<td>16.8 Lane mile(s)</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $1,540, Prior $1,540, 18-19 $1,330, 18-19 $1,330, 19-20 $280, 18-19 $280, 18-19 $280, 19-20 $2,150, 19-20 $2,150, 19-20 $280, 19-20 $280, 19-20 $2,150, 19-20 $2,150, 19-20 $280, 19-20 $280, 19-20 $2,150, 19-20 $2,150, 19-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Change description to correctly identify the original scope of work that includes modifications at the intersection of Route 299 and 139. Increase right of way capital due to higher mitigation costs and construction capital due to change in pavement rehabilitation strategy and higher bid results on similar projects in remote areas. Performance measure has been updated to align with the most recent pavement survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure: Pavement</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lane mile(s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Increase construction capital to reflect recent trend of increasing bid prices based on current bid openings. Increase right of way capital due to the need to compensate property owners for relocation of approximately two miles of fencing that was not originally anticipated.
### List of 2018 SHOPP Amendments

(Cost, Scope, Schedule and Technical Changes. Includes Federal Emergency Relief.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>03-But-70</td>
<td>8.8/11.6</td>
<td>8.8/12.1</td>
<td>2294 0318000053 3H710</td>
<td>Near Oroville, from 0.2 mile south of Palermo Road to 0.2 mile north of Ophir Road. Widen for two-way left-turn lane and standard shoulders, and provide a roadside clear recovery zone.</td>
<td>58 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td>20.010</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $850 Prior $850 Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>Const Cap $23,130 19-20 $23,130 19-20</td>
<td>Total $32,720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Update the project limits to extend the construction zone. The extended project limits facilitate staging and traffic handling will allow the project to finish construction in one season.

| 6           | 03-Pla-49   | 2.2/2.4 | 4785 | 0316000077 1H240 | In Auburn, from 0.2 mile south of Lincoln Way/Bordland Avenue to Lincoln Way/Bordland Avenue. Realign curves roadway and construct roundabout. | 50 Collision(s) reduced | 20.010 | PA&ED $732 Prior $732 Prior |
|             |             |        |      |           | Performance Measure | Const Cap $4,000 19-20 $4,000 19-20 | Total $8,919 |                     |

Note: To improve safety, additional scope of constructing a roundabout added to the original scope of curve realignment. By replacing the signal with a roundabout, right of way capital increased due to increase in acquisition. Construction capital and construction support increased as more working days will be needed to construct roundabout in addition to the curve realignment.

| 7           | 05-Mon-101  | 86.0/95.8 | 9964Q | 4020 0516000016 0N200 | In and near Salinas, from 0.4 mile north of Airport Boulevard Overcrossing to 0.3 mile south of San Miguel Canyon Road Overcrossing. Install vehicle detection systems, Changeable Message Signs (CMS), cameras, and a vehicle pullout. | 11 Field elements(s) | 20.315 | PA&ED $260 Prior $260 Prior |
|             |             |        |      |           | Performance Measure | Const Cap $1,500 18-19 $1,500 18-19 | Total $3,234 |                     |

Note: Technical correction to PPNO to correct an error in previous documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure: TMS Elements</th>
<th>Good (Operational)</th>
<th>Poor (Not Operational)</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Condition Field element(s)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Condition Field element(s)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of 2018 SHOPP Amendments
(Cost, Scope, Schedule and Technical Changes. Includes Federal Emergency Relief.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Victorville, from Amargosa Road to Cobalt Road. Construct raised curb median, <strong>widen roadway and install traffic signal</strong>.</td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>08-SBd-18</td>
<td>97.099.5</td>
<td>3006F</td>
<td>0813000140</td>
<td>1E060</td>
<td>25 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $920 Prior $920 Prior</td>
<td>19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $5,657 19-20 $13,599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $9,574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Increase construction capital and construction support due to the addition of a traffic signal to improve pedestrian safety. Increase right of way capital for acquisition and utility relocation for construction of the traffic signal. Increase in roadway pavement quantities due to additional widening to accommodate the traffic signal. Increase performance measure from 25 to 29 collisions reduced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08-SBd-173</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>3006J</td>
<td>0817000006</td>
<td>1H290</td>
<td>Near Cedar Glen, at 0.1 mile south of Hospital Road. <strong>Widen shoulder Realign roadway, construct soil nail wall, and replace guard rail with concrete barrier mounted on soldier pile wall.</strong></td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Location(s)</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $713 Prior $713 Prior</td>
<td>19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $5,645 19-20 $10,686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $5,647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Increase in construction capital, construction support and right of way capital due to changes in the construction strategy for the soldier pile wall that provides the support for the concrete barrier. Due to safety and terrain concerns, the construction of the soldier pile needs to start from the roadway to the bottom of the slope instead of the bottom of the slope to the top of the wall. This change requires roadway reconstruction, additional traffic control, and utility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08-SBd-215</td>
<td>4.8/5.8</td>
<td>3010E</td>
<td>0817000132</td>
<td>1H770</td>
<td>In the city of San Bernardino, from 0.2 mile south of Orange Show Road/ Auto Center Drive to 0.2 mile north of Inland Center Drive. Lane reconfiguration and pavement widening.</td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $1,065 Prior $1,065 Prior</td>
<td>19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $6,448 19-20 $6,448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $11,119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Update the project limits to extend the construction zone. The extended limits will accommodate temporary transition lane striping. There are no changes to cost, schedule, or scope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of 2018 SHOPP Amendments

(Cost, Scope, Schedule and Technical Changes. Includes Federal Emergency Relief.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11          | 09-Iny-395  | Var | 2643 | 0917000054 | 37270 | In Inyo County and Mono Counties at various locations; also in Kern County on Route 58. Transportation infrastructure improvement for zero-emission vehicle charging. | 6 Location(s) | 18-19 | PA&ED $300 Prior $300 Prior  
PS&E $500 Prior $500 Prior  
R/W Sup $100 Prior $100 Prior  
Con Sup $900 Prior $900 Prior  
Const Cap $1,767 Prior $1,767 Prior  
Total $3,172 Prior $3,172 Prior |
|             |             |     |      |            |     | (Time Extension CONST and CON ENG expires on March 31, 2019.) |
|             |             |     |      |            |     | Note: Fully program all phases of previously unfunded Zero-Emission Vehicle (ZEV) charging station project. Remove one location from project as the location is closed in the winter months. |
| 12          | 10-Mer-99   |     | 20.1/24.3 | 5431Y | 1019000020 | 3A721 | In and near Atwater, from 0.4 mile south of Buhach Road to south of Westside Boulevard. Landscape mitigation for roadway rehabilitation project EA 3A720. | 0 Lane mile(s) | 21-22 | PA&ED $400 19-20  
PS&E $690 20-21  
R/W Sup $10 20-21  
Con Sup $1,100 21-22  
R/W Cap $5 21-22  
Const Cap $1,000 21-22  
Total $3,205 21-22 |
|             |             |     |      |            |     | Note: Split off landscape mitigation work for EA 3A720/PPNO 10-5431. |
List of 2018 SHOPP Amendments
(Cost, Scope, Schedule and Technical Changes. Includes Federal Emergency Relief.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10-SJ-5</td>
<td>R21.4/27.9</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>1016000053</td>
<td>1F400</td>
<td>In and near Stockton, on Routes 4 (PM 14.6/21.2), 5 and 99 (PM 15.0/10.5) Route 5 at various locations; also on Route 4 (PM 14.6/26.0) and Route 99 (PM 15.8/18.5) at various locations. Install Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Transportation Management System (TMS) elements.</td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$820 Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$2,550 Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$380 Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup</td>
<td>$1,805 21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap</td>
<td>$8,960 21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$14,595 21-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Increase in construction capital and right of way capital costs based on the latest cost estimates for utilities, railroad, structures, electrical, and environmental mitigation. Update the project description with the correct project limits due to a change in location for a changeable message sign.

Performance Measure: TMS Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition Field element(s)</th>
<th>Poor (Not Operational)</th>
<th>Good (Operational)</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Condition Field element(s)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure: Culverts (30 each)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Condition Linear feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Condition Linear feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Hydraulic analysis determined that a larger drainage retention basin is needed which requires additional construction capital and right of way capital costs. Also update project description with correct post mile limits.
List of 2018 SHOPP Amendments
(Cost, Scope, Schedule and Technical Changes. Includes Federal Emergency Relief.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11-SD-5</td>
<td>In the city of San Diego, from Camino de la Plaza Overcrossing to Otay River Bridge; also on Route 805, from Route 805/5 Separation to San Ysidro Boulevard Undercrossing. Convert potable irrigation system to recycled water, replace deteriorated water supply lines, and plant landscaping for erosion control.</td>
<td>432 Acre(s)</td>
<td>20-21 PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>384 Prior $384 Prior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|             | 1245 R0.3/R5.0 PPNO 111700039 42999 43067 | | | PS&E $1,249 19-20 $1,687 19-20 R/W Sup $3 19-20 $3 19-20
|             |             | | | Con Sup $4,364 20-21 $1,895 20-21 R/W Cap $40 19-20 $40 19-20 Const Cap $10,670 20-21 $11,990 20-21 Total $13,760 20-21 |

Note: For construction efficiency and cost savings, combine projects EA 41880/PPNO 11-1205 and EA 42890/PPNO 11-1245 under EA 43067/PPNO 11-1245.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11-SD-5</td>
<td>In the city of San Diego, from Iris Street Overcrossing to Otay River Bridge. Replace deteriorated water supply lines and plant landscaping for erosion control.</td>
<td>4.6 Acre(s)</td>
<td>20-24 PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>384 Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4/5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $664 19-20 $1,320 19-20 R/W Sup $0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4295 4114000416 41880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup $534 20-21 $1,320 20-21 R/W Cap $0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap $1,320 20-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $2,722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For construction efficiency and cost savings, combine projects EA 41880/PPNO 11-1205 and EA 42890/PPNO 11-1245 under EA 43067/PPNO 11-1245.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11-SD-8</td>
<td>In the cities of San Diego and La Mesa, from 0.3 mile west of Mission Gorge Road Fairmount Avenue to 0.3 mile west of Route 125 Jackson Drive. Roadside safety improvements.</td>
<td>64 Location(s)</td>
<td>19-20 PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$565 Prior $565 Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0/11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $1,500 Prior $1,500 Prior R/W Sup $3 Prior $3 Prior Con Sup $925 19-20 $900 19-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap $0 19-20 $0 19-20 Const Cap $4,359 19-20 $3,855 19-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1115000133 41133</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $7,855 19-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Consultation with maintenance staff led to the removal of 41 locations that were not necessary or feasible, and the identification of 19 new features that would increase worker safety, resulting in a net reduction of 22 locations. The postmile limits and description reflect these changes. These changes led to a reduction in construction capital, construction support and right of way capital costs.
## List of 2018 SHOpt Amendments

(Cost, Scope, Schedule and Technical Changes. Includes Federal Emergency Relief.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-SD-78</td>
<td>N17.6/R21.4</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1115000042</td>
<td>41930</td>
<td>In and near Escondido, from west of North Broadway to Teepee Drive. Pavement rehabilitation.</td>
<td>13.3 Lane Mile(s)</td>
<td>201.121</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED: $1,180 Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con Sup: $2,043 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Const Cap: $17,731 19-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Construction capital and construction support is increased due to a change in rehabilitation strategy. An updated pavement survey has resulted in a strategy change in some areas, from cold plane and overlay, to a more costly full structural section replacement. Performance is updated, reflecting changes. Right of way capital is decreasing due to more accurate mapping, eliminating the need for some parcels.

### Performance Measure: Pavement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane mile(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Post Condition     | Lane mile(s) | 13.3 | 0.0  | 0.0  | 13.3     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-Ora-1</td>
<td>7.9/10.5</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>1214000041</td>
<td>0M820</td>
<td>In Laguna Beach, from south of Ruby Street to Ledroit Street. Upgrade pedestrian facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act standards.</td>
<td>187 Curb ramp(s)</td>
<td>201.378</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED: $1,225 Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup: $2,715 Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Cap: $2,466 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $47,795 $19,205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Preliminary engineering and updated cost estimates have identified an increased number of required temporary construction easements and increases in unit costs for key construction contract bid items which have resulted in increased estimated costs for construction capital and right of way capital respectively.
## List of 2018 SHOPP Amendments

(Cost, Scope, Schedule and Technical Changes. Includes Federal Emergency Relief.) for Senate Bill 1 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Location and Description of Work</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY Program Code</th>
<th>Project Costs ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 01-DN-199 1.1/2.6 1130 0119000028 48802</td>
<td>Near Crescent City, at various locations from north of Elk Valley Cross Road to south of Walker Road. Culvert rehabilitation and fish passage.</td>
<td>5 Culvert(s)</td>
<td>20-21 201.151</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $300 19-20; PS&amp;E $480 19-20; R/W Sup $30 20-21; Con Sup $407 20-21; R/W Cap $88 20-21; Const Cap $2,605 20-21; Total $3,910 20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Due to environmentally sensitive areas within the state park, split five culvert locations from project EA 48801/PPNO 01-1055 into project EA 48802/PPNO 01-1130.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measure: Culverts (5 each)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Linear feet</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>180.0</td>
<td>387.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>667.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linear feet</th>
<th>667.0</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>667.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 4.17
Action Item
Prepared by: Dennis T. Agar, Chief
Division of Maintenance

Subject: AMENDMENT TO THE MAJOR DAMAGE RESTORATION RESERVATION FOR
FISCAL YEAR 2018-19
RESOLUTION G-19-03, AMENDING RESOLUTION G-18-46

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the California Department of Transportation (Department) request to amend Resolution G-18-46 to increase the adopted 2018 State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Major Damage Restoration Reservation (Reservation) by an additional $200,000,000, above the current $340,000,000 reservation amount, to a new total of $540,000,000 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-19.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department recommends that the Commission approve Resolution G-19-03 which will increase the SHOPP Reservation by an additional $200,000,000 from $340,000,000 to $540,000,000 effective immediately.

DISCUSSION:

In FY 2018-19, the Commission adopted $140,000,000 for the Reservation fund in the 2018 SHOPP. At the October 17-18, 2018 Commission meeting, an additional $200,000,000 was requested and made available increasing the Reservation fund to $340,000,000.

The Department has approved a total of $285,040,405 for Major Damage Restoration emergency contracts as of December 26, 2018. An additional funding capacity of $200,000,000 is needed to meet the current level of emergency contracts being received. Thereafter, the Department will determine if any additional funding is necessary for the remainder of FY 2018-19.

The work done under emergency contracts does not necessarily restore facilities to pre-disaster conditions; the emergency work is focused on getting the facilities reopened as safely and quickly as possible. When a follow-up permanent restoration project is needed, reservation funds from the SHOPP Major Damage (Permanent Restoration) program are used. The Department will not be able to determine the scope, schedule and cost of permanent restoration projects until proper site evaluations and project development activities can be conducted. These activities will take place in future years.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability.”
BACKGROUND:

On August 17, 2016, the Commission approved Resolution G-11-16, which amended Resolution G-00-11, and requires the Department to request an amendment to the adopted SHOPP if the annual Major Damage Restoration Reservation is not sufficient to fund emergency projects. As part of the conditions set forth in G-11-16, the Department must request additional funding at the next regularly scheduled Commission meeting following the need for an increase to the Major Damage Restoration Reservation. Federally funded emergencies are not included in SHOPP programming capacity because the specific need for the funds cannot be predicted. Therefore, a reservation amount is set-aside each year to respond to emergencies as they occur and the Department seeks reimbursement for projects included in federally approved emergency declarations. Such projects are granted additional federal obligation authority.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: STIP AMENDMENT 18S-11
SAN MATEO/SANTA CLARA COUNTIES – PPNO 0658D

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the requested State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Amendment 18S-11?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) requests that the Commission approve the requested STIP Amendment 18S-11. This item was noticed at the Commission’s December 2018 meeting.

The Department, San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) and the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) propose to amend the San Mateo and Santa Clara US 101 Managed Lanes Project (PPNO 0658D) in San Mateo/Santa Clara Counties, to split-out a portion of the scope of work into a new segment for early delivery.

BACKGROUND:

At its May 2018 meeting, the Commission approved $233.2 million in Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP) funds for the San Mateo and Santa Clara US 101 Managed Lanes Corridor project. The project is comprised of two segments – the US 101 Managed Lanes project (PPNO 0658D), which includes $200 million in SB 1 SCCP funding; and the Silicon Valley Express Lanes – Phase 3 project (PPNO 2015E), which includes $33.2 million in SB 1 SCCP funding. The Silicon Valley Express Lanes – Phase 3 project received an allocation at the August 2018 Commission meeting. The contract was awarded on December 6, 2018, and construction is expected to start in January 2019.

The US 101 Managed Lanes project (PPNO 0658D) consists of constructing 44 lane-miles of managed lanes in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties and is programmed for delivery in fiscal year 2019-20. The project is planned for delivery using the Construction Manager/General Contractor method of delivery.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system
to enhance California’s economy and livability”
The Department, SMCTA and C/CAG propose to accelerate the overall delivery commitment of the US 101 Managed Lanes project by delivering a portion of the project scope early. Of the 44 lane-miles of managed lanes to be constructed, 15.6 lane-miles involves mostly reconstruction of the median and restriping of the existing lanes, along with installing infrastructure needed for operation of the express lanes; no roadway widening or utility relocation efforts are needed in this section. Early delivery of this segment (15.6 lane-miles), combined with the delivery of the adjacent Silicon Valley Express Lanes project (19.3 lane-miles), will provide much needed relief to the travelling public by providing a combined total of 34.9 lane-miles of express lanes between these two contracts.

In accordance with the STIP Guidelines requiring a 30 day public notice, this STIP amendment proposes to split the overall US 101 Managed Lanes project into two segments:

- **US 101 Managed Lanes project – Northern Segment (PPNO 0658D)**
  Construct 28.4 lane-miles of managed lanes on US 101, from Whipple Avenue Interchange to just north of I-380. Delivery is planned for FY 2019-20. SCCP funding: $125,190,000.

- **US 101 Managed Lanes project – Southern Segment (PPNO 0658H)**
  Construct 15.6 lane-miles of managed lanes (express lanes) on US 101, from approximately two miles south of the San Mateo/Santa Clara County line to Whipple Avenue Interchange. This segment is proposed for early delivery in 2018-19. SCCP funding: $74,810,000.

The proposed funding plan for each project segment is as follows:
### REVISE: US 101 Managed Lanes Project (PPNO 0658D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Project Totals by Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Project Totals by Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State SB1 SCCP</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125,190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State SB1 LPP - Competitive</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State SB1 LPP - Formulaic</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Disc.</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds - Locally Generated Funds</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds - Private Funds</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds - Measure A Funds</td>
<td>30,755</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,755</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds - Bridge Tolls - Regional Measure1</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Construct 28.4 lane-miles of managed lanes, 22 miles of continuous managed lane in the northbound and southbound directions of U.S. 101 from Whipple Avenue Interchange to Just north of I-380, including signs, electrical and communication systems for the entire 44 lane-mile corridor.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
NEW: US 101 Managed Lanes Project – Southern Segment – (PPNO 0658H)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Const. Year</th>
<th>PM Back</th>
<th>PM Ahead</th>
<th>Route/Corridor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>0658</td>
<td>1J56I</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementing Agency:**
- PA&ED: Caltrans
- PS&E: Caltrans
- R/W: Caltrans
- CON: Caltrans

**RTPA/CTC:** Metropolitan Transportation Commission

**Project Title:** US 101 Managed Lanes Project - Southern Segment

**Location:** In Palo Alto from 2 miles south of the Santa Clara Line to Whipple Avenue Interchange.

**Description:** Convert 15.6 line-miles of existing HOV lanes to express lanes.

(See table below for project totals by fiscal year and component.)

**State SB1 SCCP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Project Totals by Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Project Totals by Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State SB1 SCCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>74,810</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>74,810</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>74,810</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>74,810</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
December 14, 2018

Tony Tavares, District Director
California Department of Transportation District 4
111 Grand Ave.
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Re: MTC Concurrence for 2018 STIP Amendment Request in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties: Changes Approved by Executive Director Authority

Dear Mr. Tavares:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) and the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) have requested MTC’s concurrence for the following amendment to the 2018 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP):

- Caltrans, SMCTA, and C/CAG request amending the 2018 STIP to revise the project description, title, and limits of the US 101 Managed Lanes Project. MTC’s 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) includes $33.5 million in Regional STIP funds for the project, and the sponsors propose to split the project into a northern and southern segment to accelerate overall delivery. The RTIP funds are to remain on the northern segment, while Senate Bill 1 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funds are delivering the southern segment.

The current and proposed 2018 STIP programming is shown below.

### Existing 2018 STIP Programming:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Amount FY</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0658D</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
<td>US 101 Managed Lanes Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0658D</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>CON-CE</td>
<td>$17,500,000</td>
<td>US 101 Managed Lanes Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed 2018 STIP Programming:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Amount FY</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0658D</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
<td>US 101 Managed Lanes Project - Northern Segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0658D</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>CON-CE</td>
<td>$17,500,000</td>
<td>US 101 Managed Lanes Project - Northern Segment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTC staff has determined this programming change to be minor, as the same scope will be delivered and the changes refine the project description, title, and limits. Therefore, this minor change does not require MTC’s Programming and Allocations Committee concurrence. This action is in accordance with the 2018 RTIP Policies and Procedures (MTC Resolution No. 4308), available at [http://mtc.ca.gov/stip](http://mtc.ca.gov/stip).
Therefore, please accept this letter as MTC's concurrence on the amendment listed above to the 2018 STIP. The STIP amendment was noticed at the December 2018 CTC meeting. Staff expects CTC's action on the amendment in January 2019.

Please contact Karl Anderson of my staff at (415) 778-6645 if you need further information. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Attachments

cc:  Doanh Nguyen, Caltrans District 4 Project Management  
Rambabu Bavirisetty, Caltrans HQ Office of Capital Improvement Programming  
Surjit Dhillon, Caltrans HQ Office of Capital Improvement Programming  
Greg Wong, Caltrans HQ Office of CTC Liaison  
Teresa Favila, California Transportation Commission  
Joseph Hurley, San Mateo County Transportation Authority  
Sandy Wong, City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
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Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019

Reference No.: 2.1b.(2)
   Information Item

From: STEVEN KECK
   Chief Financial Officer

Prepared by: Bruce De Terra, Chief
   Division of Transportation Programming

Subject: STIP AMENDMENT 18S-15
   RIVERSIDE COUNTY – PPNOS 3009X AND 3009Y

SUMMARY:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) will request that the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the requested State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) amendment and authorize the project to proceed as an Assembly Bill (AB) 3090 replacement arrangement at the next scheduled Commission meeting following the notice period.

The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) and the City of Lake Elsinore propose to amend the 2018 STIP to program an AB 3090 replacement project (PPNO 3009Y) to advance the start of the Project Approval and Environmental Document (Environmental) phase of the Interstate 15 (I-15) Express Lanes – Southern Extension project (PPNO 3009X) by using local measure funds.

BACKGROUND:

The I-15 Express Lanes – Southern Extension project (PPNO 3009X) will construct approximately 14.5 miles of express lanes from Cajaico Road in the city of Corona to State Route 74 in the city of Elsinore. Currently $50,000,000 in Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funding is programmed in fiscal year 2022-23 to the Environmental phase of the project. During the 2018 STIP cycle, RCTC had requested these RIP funds to be programmed in 2018-19. However, due to constraints on the available STIP capacity in the 2018 STIP cycle, the Commission delayed the programming of these funds to 2022-23.

This is a high priority project for the region. As such, RCTC is proposing to advance the start of the Environmental phase by using its Local Measure A local funds.

This request follows AB 3090 Guidelines, which allows a local agency to use its own funds to early deliver a project component programmed in the current STIP for a future year delivery.

The requested changes are described above are tabulated on the following pages.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
## REVISE: I-15 Express Lanes Project – Southern Extension (PPNO 3009X)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Const. Year</th>
<th>PM Back</th>
<th>PM Ahead</th>
<th>Route/Corridor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>3009X</td>
<td>0J082</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementing Agency:** (by component)  
- **PA&ED**: Riverside County Trans Commission  
- **R/W**: Riverside County Trans Commission  
- **PS&E**: Riverside County Trans Commission  
- **CON**: Riverside County Trans Commission

**RTPA/CTC:** Riverside County Transportation Commission

**Project Title:** I-15 Express Lanes Project - Southern Extension

**Location:** In Riverside County, from Cajaico Road (Corona) to State Route 74 (Lake Elsinore)

**Description:** Construct express lanes

### (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Project Totals by Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Project Totals by Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Local funds - Measure A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Existing** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Change**   | 50,000 | 0 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Proposed** | 50,000 | 0 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| **Future Need** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Existing** | 494,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 494,000 | 0 | 8,435 | 470,418 | 0 | 15,147 | 0 | 0 |
| **Change**   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Proposed** | 494,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 494,000 | 0 | 8,435 | 470,418 | 0 | 15,147 | 0 | 0 |

| **Total** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Existing** | 544,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 494,000 | 50,000 | 8,435 | 470,418 | 50,000 | 15,147 | 0 | 0 |
| **Change**   | 0 | 0 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (50,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Proposed** | 544,000 | 0 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 494,000 | 0 | 8,435 | 470,418 | 50,000 | 15,147 | 0 | 0 |

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”

**ADD: AB 3090 Replacement Project (PPNO 3009Y)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Const. Year</th>
<th>PM Back</th>
<th>PM Ahead</th>
<th>Route/Corridor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>3009Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementing Agency:** Riverside County Trans Commission

**Project Title:** AB 3090 Replacement Project

**Location:** AB 3090 Replacement Project

**Description:** AB 3090 Replacement Project

### (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Project Totals by Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Project Totals by Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | Existing | 0    | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0   | 0   | 0     | 0     | 0        | 0        |
|       | Change   | 50,000 | 0    | 0     | 0     | 0     | 50,000 | 0   | 0   | 50,000 | 0     | 0        | 0        |
|       | Proposed | 50,000 | 0    | 0     | 0     | 0     | 50,000 | 0   | 0   | 50,000 | 0     | 0        | 0        |
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR SHOPP DISTRICT MINOR PROJECTS
        RESOLUTION FP-18-45

issue:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $5,211,000 for four State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOOP) District Minor projects?

recommendation:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $5,211,000 for four SHOOP District Minor projects.

background:

The attached vote list describes four SHOOP projects totaling $5,211,000. The Department is ready to proceed with these projects, and is requesting an allocation at this time.

financial resolution:

Resolved, that $3,851,000 be allocated from the Budget Act of 2018, Budget Act Items 2660-302-0042, 2660-303-0042 and 2660-302-0890 for construction and $1,360,000 for construction engineering for four SHOOP District Minor projects described on the attached vote list.

Attachment
### 2.5a Minor Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location/Program</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Near Ukiah, at the Ukiah Maintenance Station. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Pave maintenance facility.</td>
<td>Mendocino 01-Men-101 24.7</td>
<td>0J330 019000010</td>
<td>SHOPP 2018-19 302-0042 SHA</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Near Rich Bar, at Rush Creek Bridge. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Install fish passage.</td>
<td>Plumas 02-Plu-70 23.7</td>
<td>0H960 0219000031</td>
<td>SHOPP 2018-19 302-0042 SHA</td>
<td>$1,214,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Near Keddie, at 1.2 miles west of Route 89. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Install fish passage.</td>
<td>Plumas 02-Plu-70 31.8</td>
<td>0H800 0215000068</td>
<td>SHOPP 2018-19 302-0042 SHA</td>
<td>$999,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In Redding, on Route 44 at intersection of Market Street and Eureka Way (PM 0.001R); also on Route 273 at intersection of South Market Street and Trinity Street (PM 16.91). <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Signal upgrade.</td>
<td>Shasta 02-Sha-Var Var</td>
<td>3H570 0217000142</td>
<td>SHOPP 2018-19 302-0042 SHA</td>
<td>$738,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
    CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR SHOPPP PROJECTS
          RESOLUTION FP-18-46

ISSUE:
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $241,513,000 for 22 projects programmed in the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPPP)?

RECOMMENDATION:
The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $241,513,000 for 22 SHOPPP projects.

BACKGROUND:
The attached vote list describes 22 SHOPPP projects totaling $241,513,000. The Department is ready to proceed with these projects, and is requesting an allocation at this time.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:
Resolved that $215,402,000 be allocated from the Budget Act of 2018, Budget Act Items 2660-302-0042, 2660-302-0890, 2660-302-3290 and Non-Budget Act Item 2660-802-3290 for construction and $26,111,000 for construction engineering for 22 SHOPPP projects described on the attached vote list.

Attachment
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Support Expenditures</th>
<th>Resolution FP-18-46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$24,470,000</td>
<td>In Plumas and Lassen Counties, near Chilcoot, from 1.8 miles west of Route 49 to Route 395 (Plumas PM 90.3/95.964, Lassen PM 0.0/3.889). <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Rehabilitate 18.0 lane miles of pavement to extend pavement service life and improve ride quality. Also improve drainage systems, shoulder width, and clear recovery zone.</td>
<td>02-3599</td>
<td>0215000068 4 0H760</td>
<td>$194,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$24,470,000</td>
<td>Plumas 02-Plu-70 90.3/96.0</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $1,200,000 $989,492</td>
<td>$1,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $900,000 $608,551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $170,000 $99,722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CEQA - CE, 12/20/2017; Re-validation 12/3/2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(NEPA - CE, 12/20/2017; Re-validation 12/3/2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SB 1 Baseline Agreement approval under Resolution SHOPP-P-1819-04B; October 2018.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure: Pavement</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Condition</td>
<td>Lane mile(s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Condition</td>
<td>Lane mile(s)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,245,000</td>
<td>In El Dorado County, from Red Hawk Parkway to 1.9 miles west of Route 89. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Upgrade guardrail to current standards and install concrete anchor blocks at bridge rail connections. This project will reduce the number and severity of collisions.</td>
<td>03-3311</td>
<td>0315000200 4 0H500</td>
<td>$558,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,245,000</td>
<td>El Dorado 03-ED-50 R11.2/68.7</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $330,000 $305,541</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $740,000 $697,328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $60,000 $19,297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CEQA - CE, 3/29/2017; Re-validation 10/31/2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(NEPA - CE, 3/29/2017; Re-validation 10/31/2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

#### 2.5b. (1) SHOPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Support Expenditures</th>
<th>Preliminary Engineering Budget Expended</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>In and near Truckee, from 1.3 miles west of Soda Springs Overcrossing to 0.4 mile east of Donner Lake Undercrossing. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Replace guardrail with concrete barrier at various locations. This project will reduce the number and severity of collisions and also minimize the frequency of highway worker exposure to traffic.</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $540,000</td>
<td>$385,268</td>
<td><strong>Planned:</strong> 24, Actual: 94 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $900,000</td>
<td>$701,349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $60,000</td>
<td>$8,858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CEQA - CE, 5/17/2017; Re-validation 10/12/2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(NEPA - CE, 5/17/2017; Re-validation 10/12/2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>Near Weimar, from 0.2 mile west of Crother Road to 0.1 mile west of Weimar Road at various locations. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Rehabilitate deteriorated and damaged culverts.</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $220,000</td>
<td>$191,149</td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure:</strong> Culverts (30 each)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $430,000</td>
<td>$395,745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $140,000</td>
<td>$39,997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Measure:

**Unit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition Linear feet</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>473.0</td>
<td>2,701.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3,243.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post Condition Linear feet**

- **Planned:** 3,243.0
- **Actual:** 3,243.0

### Performance Measure:

Planned: 8, Actual: 17 Collision(s) reduced

**Preliminary Engineering Budget Expended**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA&amp;ED</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>R/W Sup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$171,678</td>
<td>$437,722</td>
<td>$5,809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA - CE, 5/31/2017; Re-validation 11/26/2018)
(NEPA - CE, 5/31/2017; Re-validation 11/26/2018)
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prgm’d Amount</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item # Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$4,075,000</td>
<td>In the city of Sacramento, from 65th Street to east of Howe Avenue. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Construct westbound auxiliary lane to reduce congestion and improve operations and mobility. Also realign and widen southbound Howe Avenue onramp to add a ramp metering lane.</td>
<td>SHOPP Projects</td>
<td>03-6200</td>
<td>001-0042 SHA</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>001-0890 FTF</td>
<td>20.10.201.310</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$28,417,000</td>
<td>In the city of Sacramento, at Sacramento River Bridge No. 24-0053 (PM 20.872) and North Sacramento Undercrossing No. 24-0111L (PM R45.02); also in San Joaquin County on Route 5, at Mokelumne River Bridge No. 29-0197R/L (PM 49.78). <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Seismic retrofit of four bridges at three locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>03-5832</td>
<td>505-3290 RMRA</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>001-0890 FTF</td>
<td>20.10.201.113</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,103,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measure:**

**Existing Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square feet</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>124,528.0</td>
<td>124,528.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square feet</td>
<td>124,528.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>124,528.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Performance Measure:

**Planned:** 88.0, **Actual:** 108.0 Daily vehicle hour(s) of delay (DVHD)

**Preliminary Engineering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$305,000</td>
<td>$264,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>$498,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>$62,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA - CE, 5/8/2017; Re-validation 9/26/2018)
(NEPA - CE, 5/8/2017; Re-validation 9/26/2018)

---

**Preliminary Engineering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$4,381,000</td>
<td>$4,088,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$3,035,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$141,263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA - MND, 12/29/2016; Re-validation 6/16/2017)
(NEPA - CE, 12/29/2016; Re-validation 6/16/2017)

(Concurrent consideration of funding under Resolution E-19-03; January 2019.)

(Time Extension FY 17-18 CONST and CON ENG expires on May 31, 2019.)
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>Preliminary Engineering</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item # Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,580,000</td>
<td>In and near Woodland, from the Sacramento County line to the Colusa County line. Improve highway worker safety by paving areas beyond the gore, replace signs, and modify electrical equipment.</td>
<td>03-8572</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>001-0042 SHA</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$6,390,000</td>
<td>Near Linda and Marysville, from 0.3 mile south of Feather River Boulevard to Yuba River Bridge. Replace existing barrier with concrete median barrier, pave median, and improve drainage along southbound Feather River Boulevard onramp. This project will reduce the number and severity of collisions.</td>
<td>03-9821</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>001-0890 FTF</td>
<td>$590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA&amp;ED $400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E $600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup $50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA - CE, 5/23/2017; Re-validation 12/10/2018)
(NEPA - CE, 5/23/2017; Re-validation 12/10/2018)
2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>Project Support Expenditures</th>
<th>Performance Measure: Bridges (1 bridge(s))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$77,200,000</td>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>03-Yub-70</td>
<td>15.5/16.5</td>
<td>Near Marysville, from 0.1 mile north of Binney Junction to underpass to 0.3 mile north of Laurellen Road, at Simmerly Slough Bridge No. 16-0019.</td>
<td>Replace existing bridge to address scour and seismic deficiencies, and upgrade bridge railing.</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$1,960,000 PA&amp;ED $3,555,000 PS&amp;E $750,000 R/W Sup</td>
<td>Unit Good 92,020.0 Square feet Fair 0.0 Poor 0.0 Quantity 18,632.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,666,000</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>04-Mrn-1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>Near Point Reyes Station, at Millerton Gulch Bridge No. 27-0114.</td>
<td>Environmental mitigation for emergency project EA 4K500.</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$1,620,000 PA&amp;ED $1,080,000 PS&amp;E $180,000 R/W Sup</td>
<td>Unit Good 92,020.0 Square feet Fair 0.0 Poor 0.0 Quantity 18,632.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA - MND, 6/9/2017; Re-validation 12/6/2018)
(NEPA - CE, 6/15/2017; Re-validation 12/6/2018)

(Future consideration of funding approved under Resolution E-17-70; December 2017.)

(As part of this allocation request, the Department is requesting to extend the completion of CONST and CON ENG an additional 24 months beyond the 36 month deadline.)

_Resolution FP-18-46_
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

### 2.5b. (1) SHOPELL Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output:</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$10,626,000</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>In San Jose and Milpitas, from Route 101 to Scott Creek Road at various locations. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Pave areas beyond the gore and unpaved area between mainline and collector-distributor road. This project will reduce maintenance and improve highway worker safety.</td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure:</strong> Planned: 160, Actual: 160</td>
<td>Resolution FP-18-46</td>
<td></td>
<td>001-00481T</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>001-00482 SHA</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preliminary Engineering Budget Expended**
- PA&ED $440,000 $417,240
- PS&E $1,420,000 $1,275,466
- R/W Sup $110,000 $8,401

(CEQA - CE, 8/16/2017; Re-validation 11/6/2018)
(NEPA - CE, 8/16/2017; Re-validation 11/6/2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output:</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$28,976,000</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>In and near Salinas, from 0.5 mile north of North Gonzales Overcrossing to East Market Street. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Rehabilitate roadway by grinding and resurfacing existing asphalt pavement, replace failed concrete slabs and grind concrete pavement to provide a smooth ride. This project will improve ride quality and extend service life of the pavement.</td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure:</strong></td>
<td>Resolution SHOPP-P-1819-04B</td>
<td></td>
<td>05-2540</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>001-00890 FTF</td>
<td>2,036,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preliminary Engineering Budget Expended**
- PA&ED $0 $0
- PS&E $6,000,000 $1,975,949
- R/W Sup $1,200,000 $14,186

(CEQA - CE, 6/29/2016; Re-validation 3/22/2018)

(SB 1 Baseline Agreement approval under Resolution SHOPP-P-1819-04B; October 2018.)

### Performance Measure: Pavement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Condition</td>
<td>Lane mile(s)</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Condition</td>
<td>Lane mile(s)</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

### 2.5b.(1) SHOPPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Support Expenditures</th>
<th>PPNO Program/Year</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Item # Fund Type</th>
<th>Item # Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>$7,874,000</td>
<td>In Fresno, at the South Fresno Viaduct No. 42 -0226L/R</td>
<td>Outcome/Output: Rehabilitate worn bridge deck with polyester concrete overlay and replace failed joint seals.</td>
<td>Preliminary</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$307,000</td>
<td>$281,103</td>
<td>006-6771</td>
<td>Resolution FP-18-46</td>
<td>$880,000</td>
<td>0615000310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19 CON ENG</td>
<td>$1,574,000</td>
<td>20.10.201.119</td>
<td>302-3290 RMRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,994,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>$912,000</td>
<td>Near Porterville, from west of Route 65 to S. Plano Road.</td>
<td>Outcome/Output: The project will replace planting along the outside shoulders as landscape mitigation for EA 06-0S310.</td>
<td>Preliminary</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>06-3032A</td>
<td>Resolution FP-18-46</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>0618000088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19 CON ENG</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>20.10.201.010</td>
<td>302-0042 SHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$422,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measure: Bridges (2 bridge(s))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>113,021.0</td>
<td>107,714.0</td>
<td>220,735.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measure:

Planned: 0, Actual: 0 Collision(s) reduced

Preliminary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$181,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW Sup</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA - MND, 5/31/2018)
(NEPA - CE, 6/1/2016; Re-validation 8/6/2018)

(Future consideration of funding approved under Resolution E-16-71; October 2016.)
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

### SHOPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Support Expenditures</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prgm’d Amount</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
<th>Item Fund Type</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$1,667,000</td>
<td>Riverside 08-Riv-10</td>
<td>In Riverside County, on Routes 10 and 91, at various locations; also in San Bernardino County, on Routes 10 and 15, at various locations. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Repair bridge decks. This project will ensure the integrity of these structures by preventing further deterioration of the deck, substructure and joints.</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Expended</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$313,109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>$571,436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$16,295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(CEQA - CE, 11/2/2017; Re-validation 11/1/2018) (NEPA - CE, 11/1/2017; Re-validation 11/1/2018)</strong></td>
<td>08-3002G</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>$1,007,000</td>
<td>$1,472,000</td>
<td>0814000087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$1,466,000</td>
<td>Riverside 08-Riv-74</td>
<td>Near Lake Elsinore, at 0.8 mile west of Grand Avenue. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Stabilize slope to prevent soil, rock, and debris from washing or falling onto the roadway. This project will improve safety and protect existing highway assets.</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Expended</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$312,076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$488,000</td>
<td>$438,151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$8,645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(CEQA - CE, 10/19/2017; Re-validation 10/15/2018) (NEPA - CE, 10/19/2017; Re-validation 10/15/2018)</strong></td>
<td>08-3002J</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>$1,004,000</td>
<td>$1,082,000</td>
<td>0814000102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>Riverside 08-Riv-91</td>
<td>In the cities of Corona and Riverside, from Route 15 to 0.3 mile east of Madison Street. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Convert existing limited access High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes to continuous access HOV lanes to allow safer ingress and egress movements for HOV. This project will reduce congestion and improve safety.</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Expended</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$109,018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>$192,047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$7,589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(CEQA - CE, 3/5/2018; Re-validation 9/14/2018) (NEPA - CE, 3/5/2018; Re-validation 9/14/2018)</strong></td>
<td>08-3005X</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>$388,000</td>
<td>$463,000</td>
<td>0816000194</td>
<td>1G192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measure:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Condition</strong></td>
<td>Square feet</td>
<td>59,987.0</td>
<td>127,132.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Condition</strong></td>
<td>Square feet</td>
<td>187,119.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measure:**

- Planned: 1, Actual: 1 Location(s)
- Planned: 126.0, Actual: 126.0 Daily vehicle hour(s) of delay (DVHD)
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

#### 2.5b.(1) SHOOP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$1,414,000</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>08-SBd-15</td>
<td>40.3/40.7</td>
<td>In Victorville, at Route 18 (Palmdale Road).</td>
<td>Restore vegetation and irrigation system damaged by fire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08-3006T</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$577,000</td>
<td>$219,823</td>
<td>$8,355</td>
<td></td>
<td>(CEQA - CE, 4/3/2018; Re-validation 10/22/2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>001-0042 SHA</td>
<td>$544,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3,629,000</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>08-SBd-330</td>
<td>37.1/39.8</td>
<td>Near Running Springs, from 3.4 miles north of Fork City Creek Bridge to 2.0 miles south of Live Oak Drive.</td>
<td>Construct rockfall barrier to stabilize hillside slopes. This project will improve public safety and minimize exposure by maintenance personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08-3002H</td>
<td>SHOPP/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$2,955,000</td>
<td>$337,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(CEQA - CE, 1/16/2018; Re-validation 11/21/2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Project Code/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Program Budget</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$9,555,000</td>
<td>Near Bridgeport, from north of Devils Gate Summit to Burcham Flat Road. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Widen shoulders and construct rumble strip. This project will reduce the number and severity of collisions.</td>
<td>09-2600</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>001-0042 SHA</td>
<td>01-0890 FTF</td>
<td>$1,729,000</td>
<td>$2,033,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Mno-395</td>
<td>88.4/91.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$4,958,000</td>
<td>In and near Tracy, from Hansen Road to Paradise Road. <strong>Outcome/Output:</strong> Improve highway worker safety by paving areas beyond the gore, slope paving and constructing Maintenance Vehicle Pullouts (MVPs).</td>
<td>10-3111</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>001-0042 SHA</td>
<td>01-0890 FTF</td>
<td>$861,000</td>
<td>$617,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>10-SJ-205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3/R9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measure:**
- Planned: 50, Actual: 50
- Collision(s) reduced
- Planned: 41, Actual: 41
- Location(s)

**Preliminary Engineering Budget Expended:**
- PA&ED: $2,170,000 / $2,033,963
- PS&E: $1,280,000 / $617,296
- R/W Sup: $350,000 / $101,974

(CEQA - EIR, 5/3/2017; Re-validation 12/7/2018)
(NEPA - FONSI, 5/3/2017; Re-validation 12/7/2018)

(Future consideration of funding approved under Resolution E-17-54; August 2017.)

(CEQA - CE, 6/5/2017; Re-validation 10/25/2018)
(NEPA - CE, 6/5/2017; Re-validation 10/25/2018)
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR SHOPP PROJECTS
         PA&ED, PS&E AND R/W SUPPORT
         RESOLUTION FP-18-47

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $54.8 million for Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED), Plans, Specifications and Estimate (PS&E) and Right-of-Way (R/W) support for 70 phases programmed in the 2018 State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $54.8 million for 70 support phases in the SHOPP, as follows:

- $23.7 million for 34 SHOPP support phases and
- $31.1 million for 36 SHOPP (SB 1) support phases.

The attached lists describe 70 SHOPP phases totaling $54.8 million for PA&ED, PS&E and R/W support costs that are ready now.

BACKGROUND:

The 2018 SHOPP details both support and construction capital for rehabilitation projects on the State Highway System. The passage of the Road Repair and Accountability Act (SB 1) necessitates that the Department and the Commission establish baseline budgets for each phase of each project in the 2018 SHOPP, and requires an allocation of each support phase on or after July 1, 2017.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:

Resolved, that $54.8 million be allocated for PA&ED, PS&E and R/W support for SHOPP projects described on the attached lists.

Attachments
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5b.(2a) Support Allocations for SHOOP Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4650</td>
<td>Near Willits, from 1.0 mile to 0.8 mile west of Three Chop Road. Widen eastbound shoulders, construct guard railing, place High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST), and extend an existing culvert.</td>
<td>0G430</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$843,000</td>
<td>$843,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0116000188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3723</td>
<td>Near Pulga, from the Butte County line to 3.1 miles west of Route 89 at various locations. Repair Rock Slope Protection (RSP) and stabilize roadway embankment.</td>
<td>4H440</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$1,030,000</td>
<td>$1,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0218000119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3673</td>
<td>Near Viola, from 0.4 mile east to 1.1 miles east of Bridge Creek Road. Curve improvement.</td>
<td>2H990</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0217000045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3726</td>
<td>Near Forest Ranch, west of Slate Creek Bridge. Replace damaged concrete sack retaining wall with Cased Secant Piling (CSP) retaining wall.</td>
<td>4H460</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0218000162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5b.(2a)</td>
<td>Support Allocations for SHOPP Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>03-ED-193</td>
<td>3636</td>
<td>Near Placerville, at 0.3 mile west of Route 49 junction. Stabilize slope by installing drainage system and Rock Slope Protection (RSP) over the landslide area.</td>
<td>3H980</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.131 - Permanent Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Location(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>03-Pla-80</td>
<td>5026</td>
<td>In and near various cities, at various locations, from 0.3 mile west of Douglas Boulevard to 0.2 mile east of Hampshire Rocks Undercrossing. Upgrade guardrail to current standards.</td>
<td>0H720</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$523,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6/R66.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.015 - Collision Severity Reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>03-Pla-80</td>
<td>4309</td>
<td>Near Soda Springs, from east of South Yuba River Bridge to the Nevada County line; also in Nevada County from the Placer County line to east of Soda Springs Overcrossing (PM 0.0/R3.0). Install concrete gutter to repair shoulder damage at various locations.</td>
<td>4H110</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,510,000</td>
<td>$1,510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R62.9/69.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.131 - Permanent Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Location(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>03-Sie-49</td>
<td>7807</td>
<td>Near Sierraville, from 2.9 miles to 3.2 miles north of Yuba Pass Campground. Improve roadway cross slope and widen shoulders.</td>
<td>3H400</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.1/44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.010 - Safety Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.5b.(2a) Support Allocations for SHOPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>04-Ala-61</td>
<td>1464A</td>
<td>In and near the cities of Alameda, Emeryville, Berkeley, Albany, and San Leandro on Routes 61, 123, and 185 at various locations. Install vehicle speed feedback signs, and upgrade signal to standard.</td>
<td>4K400</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$303,000</td>
<td>$303,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.0/21.0</td>
<td>0417000306</td>
<td>(Concurrent amendment under SHOPP Amendment 18H-007; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.010 - Safety Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1496A</td>
<td>In Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, on various routes, at various locations. Upgrade advance warning signs to make standard.</td>
<td>0K770</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04-Ala-580</td>
<td>0416000137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0480K</td>
<td>Near Gilroy, from east of Dunne Street/San Felipe Road to the Merced County line. Place median barrier.</td>
<td>0J800</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,227,000</td>
<td>$1,277,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04-SCI-152</td>
<td>0414000067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1463A</td>
<td>Near Woodside, from the Santa Clara County line to Route 84 (PM 2.121/10.518). Install curve warning signs, enhanced visibility striping, pavement markings with audible traffic stripe systems and optical speed bars.</td>
<td>OP580</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$566,000</td>
<td>$566,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04-SM-35</td>
<td>0417000473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1/10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Concurrent amendment under SHOPP Amendment 18H-007; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.010 - Safety Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Program Code**
- **Performance Measure**
- **Phase**
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### Support Allocations for SHOPPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>04-SM-280</td>
<td>1487G</td>
<td>Near Redwood City, north of Edgewood Road; also on Route 84, from Hildebrand Road to north of La Honda Creek Bridge (PM 9.4/10.0). Stabilize soil and erosion control to mitigate for storm water quality. (The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.) Program Code 201.335 - Storm Water Mitigation Performance Measure 7.8 Acre(s) treated/pollutant</td>
<td>0J720</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$763,000</td>
<td>$763,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>04-Son-101</td>
<td>1462P</td>
<td>Near Cloverdale, at 0.4 mile south of the Mendocino County line. Restore slope, rebuild damaged gutter, and install erosion control measures. (Concurrent amendment under SHOPP Amendment 18H-007; January 2019.) Program Code 201.131 - Permanent Restoration Performance Measure 1 Location(s)</td>
<td>2K350</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$840,000</td>
<td>$840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>05-Scr-17</td>
<td>2852</td>
<td>Near Scotts Valley, south of Sugarleaf Road. Stabilize eroded side cut slope by grading and dewatering. (Concurrent amendment under SHOPP Amendment 18H-007; January 2019.) Program Code 201.131 - Permanent Restoration Performance Measure 1 Location(s)</td>
<td>1K070</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$721,000</td>
<td>$721,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>06-Fre-41</td>
<td>6962</td>
<td>Near Easton, from Elkhorn Avenue to North Avenue. Construct rumble strips. (Concurrent amendment under SHOPP Amendment 18H-007; January 2019.) Program Code 201.010 - Safety Improvements Performance Measure 11 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td>0Y030</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Support Allocations for SHOPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5b.(2a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>07-LA-60</td>
<td>4906</td>
<td>In various cities, from Route 5 to the San Bernardino County line; also on Route 710,</td>
<td>31730</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,081,000</td>
<td>$1,081,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0/R30.5</td>
<td>0715000237</td>
<td>from Ocean Boulevard to Valley Boulevard (PM 5.6/T27.4). Replace existing signs with retro-reflective sheeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.170 - Signs and Lighting Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96 Lighting fixture(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>07-LA-138</td>
<td>5155</td>
<td>In Palmdale, at the intersection of Avenue R-8. Upgrade traffic signal system, curb ramps and install drainage inlets.</td>
<td>33290</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$988,000</td>
<td>$988,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>0716000297</td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.010 - Safety Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 Collision(s) reduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>09-Mno-395</td>
<td>2621</td>
<td>In Mono County, at various locations. Advance mitigation banking credits.</td>
<td>36670</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0916000009</td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.240 - Roadside Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 Location(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10-Mer-5</td>
<td>3215</td>
<td>Near Los Banos and Firebaugh, at the John &quot;Chuck&quot; Erreca Safety Roadside Rest Area (SRRA). Upgrade northbound and southbound SRRA facilities.</td>
<td>1C790</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$2,970,000</td>
<td>$2,970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4/0.8</td>
<td>1016000046</td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.250 - Safety Roadside Rest Area Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Location(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.5b.(2a) Support Allocations for SHOPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3417</td>
<td>In Los Banos, at South 11th Street. Improve safety by installing new traffic signal.</td>
<td>1J300</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,045,000</td>
<td>$1,045,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Mer-152</td>
<td>1018000101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3177</td>
<td>Near Holt, from 0.3 mile west to 0.5 mile east of Middle River Bridge. Realign curve,</td>
<td>1F460</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,453,000</td>
<td>$1,453,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-SJ-4</td>
<td>1016000139</td>
<td>widen shoulders, upgrade guard rail, and install flashing beacons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$274,000</td>
<td>$274,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1/4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3190</td>
<td>In San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties, on Route 5 at various locations; also in</td>
<td>1C970</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,104,000</td>
<td>$1,104,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-SJ-5</td>
<td>1016000021</td>
<td>Merced County, on Route 152 at various locations. Install new or upgrade existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>safety devices to shield objects from errant vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3189</td>
<td>In and near Modesto, at various locations from 0.1 mile south of Modesto Undercrossing</td>
<td>0X670</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,232,000</td>
<td>$1,232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Sta-99</td>
<td>1016000027</td>
<td>to Woodland Avenue. Pave areas behind the gore and at slopes, upgrade guardrail and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13.8/R17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>place vegetative control and construct Maintenance Vehicle Pullouts (MVPs) to reduce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maintenance and improve highway worker safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measure**
- 10 Collision(s) reduced
- 50 Collision(s) reduced
- 13 Collision(s) reduced
- 13 Location(s)
### 2.5b.(2a) Support Allocations for SHOPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12-Ora-405</td>
<td>4984</td>
<td>In Irvine, at northbound onramp from southbound Culver Drive and at southbound offramp to Culver Drive. Improve safety by replacing traffic signals and lighting systems, and reconfigure the onramp entrance.</td>
<td>0P400</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$834,000</td>
<td>$834,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7/5.9</td>
<td>1215000093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)

**Program Code**

201.010 - Safety Improvements

**Performance Measure**

43 Collision(s) reduced

### Component Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>No. of Phases</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$4,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$17,733,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,369,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,662,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5b.(2b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Allocations for SHOPP SB 1 Projects of Primary Asset Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01-Hum-96</td>
<td>2302</td>
<td>In Humboldt County, on Routes 96 and 101 at various locations. Seismic retrofit three bridges.</td>
<td>0A120</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$171,000</td>
<td>$171,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0113000109</td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Code</td>
<td>201.113 - Bridge Seismic Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>3 Bridge(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>01-Lak-20</td>
<td>3107</td>
<td>Near Upper Lake, at Bachelor Creek Bridge No. 14-0001. Replace multi-plate steel culvert bridge with precast concrete box culverts and wingwalls.</td>
<td>0F490</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$708,000</td>
<td>$708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0116000013</td>
<td>(Concurrent consideration of funding under Resolution E-19-01; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Code</td>
<td>201.110 - Bridge Major Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>1 Bridge(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>02-Sis-96</td>
<td>3601</td>
<td>Near Happy Camp, from 0.3 miles west of Swillup Creek Bridge to Route 263. Drainage system restoration.</td>
<td>1H090</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.0/103.4</td>
<td>0215000105</td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Code</td>
<td>201.151 - Drainage System Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>20 Culvert(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>02-Teh-Var</td>
<td>3549</td>
<td>In Tehama County, on Routes 5, 32, and 36 at various locations; also in Shasta County on Routes 5 and 44; also in Lassen County on Route 299 at various locations. Bridge scour prevention at nine bridges.</td>
<td>4G530</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0214000023</td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Code</td>
<td>201.119 - Bridge Preventative Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>9 Bridge(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>02-Tri-3</td>
<td>38.7/61.9</td>
<td>3485</td>
<td>0211000073</td>
<td>Near Trinity Center, from north of Preacher Meadows Road to north of El Dorado Way. Replace Swift Creek Bridge No. 05-0059. (Concurrent consideration of funding under Resolution E-19-02; January 2019.)</td>
<td>4F220</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,680,000</td>
<td>$1,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>04-SM-1</td>
<td>0.0/10.6</td>
<td>0622B</td>
<td>0411000094</td>
<td>Near Pescadero, from the Santa Cruz County line to south of Bean Hollow Road. Pavement rehabilitation. (The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td>0C930</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,081,000</td>
<td>$1,081,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>05-Mon-1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>0500020288</td>
<td>Near Lucia, at 0.6 mile south of Limekiln Creek Bridge. Replace culvert. (Concurrent consideration of funding under Resolution E-19-04; January 2019.)</td>
<td>0Q500</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,124,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>05-Mon-68</td>
<td>1.1/L4.3</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>0516000011</td>
<td>In and near Pacific Grove, from Forest Avenue to Route 1. Upgrade Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) curb ramps, cold plane pavement and place Rubberized Hot Mix Asphalt (RHMA) pavement. (The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.) (As part of this allocation request, the Department is requesting to extend the completion of the R/W Sup phase an additional 4 months beyond the 36 month deadline.)</td>
<td>1H000</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,638,000</td>
<td>$1,638,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$312,000</td>
<td>$312,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5b.(2b) Support Allocations for SHOPP SB 1 Projects of Primary Asset Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-SLO-1</td>
<td>0516000009</td>
<td>In and near Pismo Beach, from Gracia Way to North Pismo (Route 101/Route 1) Separation. Upgrade Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) curb ramps, cold plane pavement and place Rubberized Hot Mix Asphalt (RHMA) pavement. (The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.) (As part of this allocation request, the Department is requesting to extend the completion of the R/W Sup phase an additional 18 months beyond the 36 month deadline.) Program Code 201.121 - Pavement Rehabilitation (CAPM) Performance Measure 13.5 Lane mile(s)</td>
<td>1G980</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,751,000</td>
<td>$1,751,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-SLO-101</td>
<td>0516000007</td>
<td>In San Luis Obispo County, from 0.3 mile north of Reservoir Canyon Road to 0.3 mile north of North Paso Robles Overhead at various locations. Install vehicle detection systems, Changeable Message Signs (CMS), cameras, and loop detectors. (The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.) Program Code 201.315 - Transportation Management Systems Performance Measure 107 Field element(s)</td>
<td>0N220</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,095,000</td>
<td>$1,095,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-Fre-5</td>
<td>0618000048</td>
<td>Near Mendota, from north of Three Rocks Road to south of Panoche Road. Pavement rehabilitation, repair culverts, and upgrade Transportation Management Systems (TMS) field elements. (Concurrent amendment under SHOPP Amendment 18H-007; January 2019.) Program Code 201.121 - Pavement Rehabilitation (CAPM) Performance Measure 46.3 Lane Mile(s)</td>
<td>0X270</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5b.(2b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Allocations for SHOPP SB 1 Projects of Primary Asset Classes</td>
<td>Resolution FP-18-47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>06-Fre-41</td>
<td>6881</td>
<td>In and near the city of Fresno, from 0.1 mile south of North Avenue to the Madera County line; also on Route 99 (PM 19.36 to PM 21.9), Route 168 (PM R0.2L/R to PM R9.7), and Route 180 (PM R58.55 to PM R59.85). Replace and upgrade existing communication elements for the Traffic Management System (TMS).</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,809,000</td>
<td>$1,809,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R20.0/33.4</td>
<td>0616000234</td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>06-Fre-99</td>
<td>6883</td>
<td>In Fresno County, on Routes 99, 41, 168, and 180 at various locations; also in Madera County, on Route 99 at various locations. Repair vehicle detection systems.</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,017,000</td>
<td>$1,017,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0617000067</td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>06-Fre-99</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>In and near Selma and Fowler, from 0.1 mile south of Rose Avenue Undercrossing to Merced Street Undercrossing. Replace pavement with Continuous Reinforced Concrete Pavement (CRCP). Update curb ramps to meet current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards. (G13 Contingency)</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5.7/11.1</td>
<td>0616000004</td>
<td>(Concurrent consideration of funding under Resolution E-19-05; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Concurrent SB 1 Baseline Agreement approval under Resolution SHOPP-P-1819-10B; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Code</td>
<td>201.315 - Transportation Management Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>89 Field element(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Code</td>
<td>201.315 - Transportation Management Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>20 Field element(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Code</td>
<td>201.315 - Transportation Management Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>32.4 Lane mile(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte Postmile</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5b.(2b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Support Allocations for SHOPP SB 1 Projects of Primary Asset Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte Postmile</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>07-LA-405 8.8</td>
<td>4721 0714000084</td>
<td>In Carson, at Dolores Yard Overhead No. 53 -1168. Upgrade bridge drainage system.</td>
<td>30480</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>$624,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.119 - Bridge Preventative Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bridge(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>07-Ven-33 16.1</td>
<td>5008 0716000060</td>
<td>Near Ojai, at North Fork Matilija Creek No. 52 -0173. Paint steel portion of bridge and replace missing rivets of bottom flanges for preventative maintenance to preserve and extend the life of bridge.</td>
<td>32300</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.119 - Bridge Preventative Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bridge(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>08-SBd-215 4.0/17.8</td>
<td>3007S 0816000186</td>
<td>In and near the city of San Bernardino, from Route 215/10 Connector to Route 215/15 Junction; also on Route 259, from Route 259/215 Separation to Route 259/210 Junction. Install wireless Vehicle Detection Stations (VDS), Changeable Message Signs (CMS), Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) and Fiber Optic elements.</td>
<td>47642</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$842,000</td>
<td>$968,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.315 - Transportation Management Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32 Field element(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project No. Dist-Co-Rte Postmile  
**Support Allocations for SHOPP SB 1 Projects of Primary Asset Classes**  
**Resolution FP-18-47**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3233</td>
<td>Near the community of Mariposa, from the Madera County line to the south junction with Route 140. Pavement rehabilitation.</td>
<td>1C040</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,032,000</td>
<td>$1,032,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Mpa-49</td>
<td>1017000034</td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3/18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Concurrent SB 1 Baseline Agreement approval under Resolution SHOPP-P-1819-10B; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>Near Lockeford, from 0.1 mile south of East Jack Tone Road to north of North Tully Road intersection; also near Kirkwood, in Alpine County (PM 0.3/2.4). Replace culverts.</td>
<td>0S740</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-SJ-88</td>
<td>1013000260</td>
<td>(Concurrent consideration of funding under Resolution E-19-08; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5/14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Concurrent amendment under SHOPP Amendment 18H-007; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>In San Diego County, at various locations, from 0.5 mile west of Midway Drive Undercrossing to 0.6 mile west of Flinn Springs Road Undercrossing. Repair, rehabilitate and replace culvert systems.</td>
<td>42810</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,590,000</td>
<td>$1,590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-SD-8</td>
<td>1117000028</td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L0.7/R23.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Code 201.151 - Drainage System Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure 30 Culvert(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.5b.(2b) Support Allocations for SHOPP SB 1 Projects of Primary Asset Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Prog Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>In and near Escondido, from west of North Broadway to Teepee Drive. Pavement rehabilitation.</td>
<td>41930</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$2,790,000</td>
<td>$3,153,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1115000042</td>
<td>(The Department has determined this project is Categorically Exempt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Concurrent SB 1 Baseline Agreement approval under Resolution SHOPP-P-1819-10B; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Concurrent amendment under SHOPP Amendment 18H-007; January 2019.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201.121 - Pavement Rehabilitation (CAPM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.9 Lane mile(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>No. of Phases</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$24,276,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Sup</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$4,831,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$31,107,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR SEISMIC RETROFIT PROGRAM - PHASE II – PROPOSITION 192 PROJECTS
        RESOLUTION FP-18-50

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No: 2.5g.(15) Action Item

PREPARED BY: Clark Paulsen, Chief Division of Budgets

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $1,163,000 for three State-Administered Seismic Retrofit Program - Phase II - Proposition 192 projects, on the State Highway System for mitigation?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $1,163,000 for three State-Administered Seismic Retrofit Program - Phase II - Proposition 192 projects, on the State Highway System for mitigation.

BACKGROUND:

The attached vote list describes three State-Administered Seismic Retrofit Program - Phase II - Proposition 192 projects totaling $1,163,000. The Department is ready to proceed with these projects, and is requesting an allocation at this time.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:

Resolved that $491,000 be allocated from Non-Budget Act Item 2660-801-0653 and $672,000 for construction engineering for three State-Administered Seismic Retrofit Program - Phase II - Proposition 192 projects described on the attached vote list.

Attachment

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

### 2.5g.(15) Seismic Retrofit Program Allocation - Phase II - Proposition 192

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>US 101 Mad River Bridges - Long Term Mitigation. The Mad River Bridges were constructed under the Toll Seismic Retrofit Program - Phase II and completed 02/27/2014. As part of the Coastal Commission permit requirement, mitigation measures were required along with a 5-year long-term monitoring program. As part of this long term monitoring, reports are due to the Coastal Commission, Water Board, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife, in years 1, 3, and 5. Reports for years 1 and 3 will be finished by end of March. The final monitoring and report are due in year 5 by 12/31/2019.</td>
<td>01-0073N</td>
<td>PRP192/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>20.10.202.381</td>
<td>501-0653 PRP192</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Humboldt Bay Bridges Seismic Retrofit - Replacement Mitigation. The Humboldt Bay Bridges were constructed under the Toll Seismic Retrofit Program - Phase II and completed 4/24/2006. As part of the Coastal Commission permit requirement, mitigation measures were required along with a 10 year long-term monitoring program. This program will take place until 1/13/2022. As part of this Long Term monitoring, it has been found that the eel grass mitigation needs to be addressed since the original attempt failed to establish eel grass in the required project footprint. The Department is developing a new plan that will be proposed to the Coastal Commission this year.</td>
<td>01-0100C</td>
<td>PRP192/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>20.10.202.381</td>
<td>501-0653 PRP192</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$488,000</td>
<td>Ten Mile River Bridge - Mitigation. The Ten Mile River Bridge was constructed under the Toll Seismic Retrofit Program - Phase II and completed 8/17/2010. As part of the Coastal Commission permit requirement, mitigation measures were required along with a 10-year long-term monitoring program. As part of this Long Term monitoring, reports are due to the Coastal Commission, Water Board, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife, in years 1, 3, 5, and 10. Reports for years 3 and 5 will be finished by end of March. The final monitoring and report are due in year 10 (by 12/31/2021).</td>
<td>01-0155T</td>
<td>PRP192/18-19</td>
<td>CON ENG</td>
<td>$297,000</td>
<td>20.10.202.381</td>
<td>501-0653 PRP192</td>
<td>$297,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome/Output:** Long term mitigation monitoring status report.

---
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR LOCALLY-ADMINISTERED STIP PROJECTS ON THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM
RESOLUTION FP-18-48

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $4,051,000 for two locally-administered State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects, on the State Highway System?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $4,051,000 for two locally-administered STIP projects, on the State Highway System.

BACKGROUND:

The attached vote list describes two locally-administered STIP projects totaling $4,051,000. The local agencies are ready to proceed with these projects, and are requesting an allocation at this time.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:

Resolved that $4,051,000 be allocated from the Budget Act of 2017, Budget Act Items 2660-301-0042 and 2660-301-0890 for two locally-administered STIP projects described on the attached vote list.

Attachment

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Support Expenditures</th>
<th>Item # Fund Type</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$731,000</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>04-SCL-680 M1.4/M2.3</td>
<td>I-680 Sound Walls - Capitol Expressway to Mueller. In the city of San Jose. Construct soundwalls at various locations between Capitol Expressway and Mueller Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,320,000</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>05-SCR-1 13.8/14.9</td>
<td>41st Avenue to Soquel Avenue Auxiliary Lanes. Near the city of Santa Cruz and Capitola, from 41st Avenue to Soquel Avenue. Construct auxiliary lanes and construct bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing near Chanticleer Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outputs/Outcomes

- **Sound wall mile(s) constructed**: 0.67 miles
- **Auxiliary lane mile(s) constructed**: 1 mile
- **Pedestrian/Bicycle facilities mile(s) constructed**: 0.02 miles

### Resolution FP-18-48

- **Project Title**: Locally-Administered STIP Projects On the State Highway System
- **Project ID**: 04-0521C
- **Program/Year**: 2017-18
- **Phase**: RIP/17-18
- **Prgm'd Amount**: $62,000
- **Budget Year**: 301-0042 SHA
- **Adv Phase**: PS&E
- **Item # Fund Type**: 301-0890 FTF
- **Amount by Fund Type**: $669,000
- **Amount by Fund Type**: $731,000

- **Project Title**: Locally-Administered STIP Projects On the State Highway System
- **Project ID**: 05-0073A
- **Program/Year**: 2017-18
- **Phase**: RIP/18-19
- **Prgm'd Amount**: $295,000
- **Budget Year**: 301-0042 SHA
- **Adv Phase**: PS&E
- **Item # Fund Type**: 301-0890 FTF
- **Amount by Fund Type**: $2,275,000
- **Amount by Fund Type**: $2,570,000

- **Project Title**: Locally-Administered STIP Projects On the State Highway System
- **Project ID**: 0512000228
- **Program/Year**: 2017-18
- **Phase**: RIP/18-19
- **Prgm'd Amount**: $87,000
- **Budget Year**: 301-0042 SHA
- **Adv Phase**: PS&E
- **Item # Fund Type**: 301-0890 FTF
- **Amount by Fund Type**: $663,000
- **Amount by Fund Type**: $750,000

### Concurrent Consideration of Funding under Resolution E-19-14, January 2019

- **Project Title**: Locally-Administered STIP Projects On the State Highway System
- **Project ID**: 0512000228
- **Program/Year**: 2017-18
- **Phase**: RIP/18-19
- **Prgm'd Amount**: $1,509,000
- **Budget Year**: 301-0042 SHA
- **Adv Phase**: PS&E
- **Item # Fund Type**: 301-0890 FTF
- **Amount by Fund Type**: $87,000
- **Amount by Fund Type**: $750,000

### Contributions

- **Contribution from other sources**: $98,000
- **R/W savings of $759,000 to be returned to Santa Cruz County regional shares.**
- **CEQA - EIR, 12/14/2018.**
- **NEPA - FONSI, 12/17/2018**

### Time extension for FY 17-18 PS&E funds expires on June 30, 2019.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR LOCALLY-ADMINISTERED STIP PROJECTS OFF THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM
RESOLUTION FP-18-49

ISSUE:
Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $3,502,000 for four State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects, off the State Highway System?

RECOMMENDATION:
The California Department of Transportation recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $3,502,000 for four STIP projects, as follows:
- $3,378,000 for two STIP projects and
- $124,000 for two STIP Planning, Programming, and Monitoring project.

BACKGROUND:
The attached vote list describes four STIP projects totaling $3,502,000. The local agencies are ready to proceed with these projects, and are requesting an allocation at this time.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:
Resolved that $3,502,000 be allocated from the Budget Act of 2017, Budget Act Items 2660-101-0042 and 2660-101-0890 for four locally-administered STIP projects described on the attached vote list.

Attachment
### Locally-Administered STIP Projects Off the State Highway System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Vehicle, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Improvements in Garberville on Redwood Drive</td>
<td>On Redwood Drive between the southern terminus with Route 101 and the northern terminus with Route 101. Improvements for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>101-0042</td>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>20.30.600.620</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,328,000</td>
<td>Old Florin Town Streetscape, Phase 2. On Florin Road -</td>
<td>This Phase 2 project will &quot;bookend&quot; the Phase 1 project and continue from Pritchard Road to Power Inn Road to the west and from McComber Street to Florin Perkins Road/French Road to the east. Construct sidewalks, curb and gutter, bike lanes transit facilities, median channelization with landscaping, lighting and traffic signals.</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>101-0890</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>20.30.600.620</td>
<td>$3,328,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outputs/Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turn pocket(s) constructed</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk mile(s)</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection(s) modified</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle lane mile(s)</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA - ND, 12/14/2015.)
(NEPA - CE, 04/11/2016)

(Future Consideration of Funding approved under Resolution E-13-23; December 2015.)

(Contribution from other sources: $2,240,000.)

Right of Way Certification: 10/24/2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prgm'd Amount</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Adv. Phase</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>Shasta Regional Transportation Agency</td>
<td>Planning, Programming and Monitoring</td>
<td>(SB184 in effect December 6, 2018.</td>
<td>SRTA 02-Shasta</td>
<td>02-2368</td>
<td>RIP/18-19</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>0219000042</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>101-0042</td>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>20.30.600.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>Amador County Transportation Commission</td>
<td>Planning, Programming and Monitoring</td>
<td>ACTC 10-Amador</td>
<td>10-B1950</td>
<td>RIP/18-19</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>1019000038</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>101-0042</td>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>20.30.600.670</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
    CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
    Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR THE STATE-ADMINISTERED SENATE BILL 1 LOCAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM PROJECT (FORMULAIC) ON THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM
    RESOLUTION LPP-A-1819-15

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.5s.(1)
Action Item

I N S T R U C T I O N:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $2,027,000 for the State-Administered US 101 Managed Lanes Project – Northern Segment Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) Local Partnership Program (LPP) – Formulaic project (PPNO 0658D), on the State Highway System, in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties?

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $2,027,000 for the State-Administered US 101 Managed Lanes Project – Northern Segment SB 1 LPP – Formulaic project (PPNO 0658D), on the State Highway System, in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.

B A C K G R O U N D:

The attached vote list describes one State-Administered SB 1 LPP – Formulaic project totaling $2,027,000. The Department is ready to proceed with this project, and is requesting an allocation at this time.

F I N A N C I A L R E S O L U T I O N:

Resolved that $2,027,000 be allocated from Non-Budget Act Item 2660-505-3290 for the State-Administered SB 1 LPP – Formulaic project described on the attached vote list.

Attachment

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Support Expenditures</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Adv Phase</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item # Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,027,000</td>
<td>RTPA/CTC</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Dist-Co-Rte</td>
<td>Postmile</td>
<td>US 101 Managed Lanes Project - Northern Segment</td>
<td>In the cities of San Carlos, Millbrae, Burlingame, San Mateo and Belmont in San Mateo County, and Menlo Park and East Palo Alto in Santa Clara County, from Matadero Creek to just North of I-380. Construct Express Lanes, from Whipple Avenue to just North of I-380 and install necessary Express Lanes infrastructure for both northern and southern segments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program/Year</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Adv Phase</td>
<td>Budget Year</td>
<td>Item # Fund Type</td>
<td>Amount by Fund Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.5s.(1a) State-Administered Senate Bill 1 - LPP Projects On the State Highway System

**Formulatic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item # Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-0658D</td>
<td>LPP-F/18-19</td>
<td>505-3290 RMRA</td>
<td>20.10.724.000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,556,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outputs/Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- HOV/HOT lane-mile(s) constructed: 28.4

- (CEQA - EIR, 10/31/2018.)
- (NEPA - CE, 10/31/2018.)
- (Future Consideration of Funding approved under Resolution E-18-166; December 2018.)
- (Contribution from other sources: $37,450,000.)
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
   Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR THE LOCALLY-ADMINISTERED SENATE BILL 1 LOCAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM PROJECT (FORMULAIC AND COMPETITIVE) ON THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM RESOLUTION LPP-A-1819-16

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.5s.2
Action Item

Prepared by: Clark Paulsen, Chief
Division of Budgets

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $5,510,000 for the locally-administered State Route 99/Fulkerth Road Interchange Improvements Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) Local Partnership Program (LPP) – Formulaic and Competitive project (PPNO 3414), on the State Highway System, in Stanislaus County?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $5,510,000 for the locally-administered State Route 99/Fulkerth Road Interchange Improvements SB 1 LPP – Formulaic and Competitive project (PPNO 3414), on the State Highway System, in Stanislaus County.

BACKGROUND:

The attached vote list describes one locally-administered SB 1 LPP – Formulaic and Competitive project totaling $5,510,000. The local agency is ready to proceed with this project, and is requesting an allocation at this time.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:

Resolved that $5,510,000 be allocated from Non-Budget Act Item 2660-801-3290 for the locally-administered SB 1 LPP – Formulaic and Competitive project described on the attached vote list.

Attachment

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>RTPA/CTC</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Dist-Co-Rte</th>
<th>Postmile</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Support Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,510,000</td>
<td>City of Turlock</td>
<td>StanCOG</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>10-STA-99</td>
<td>R4.1/R4.9</td>
<td>State Route 99/ Fulkerth Road Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>In Stanislaus County at the interchange of State Route 99 and Fulkerth Road in the City of Turlock, ramp widening, modifications, and signalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outputs/Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modified/Improved interchange(s)</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Modified/Improved interchange(s) constructed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian/Bicycle facilities mile(s) constructed</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA - CE, 12/06/2013.)

(Contribution from other sources: $8,513,000)
M e m o r a n d u m

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
    CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
    Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR LOCALLY-ADMINISTERED SENATE BILL 1 LOCAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM PROJECTS (FORMULAIC) OFF THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM RESOLUTION LPP-A-1819-17

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.5s.(3) Action Item

Prepared by: Clark Paulsen, Chief Division of Budgets

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $4,142,000 for two locally-administered Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) Local Partnership Program (LPP) – Formulaic projects, off the State Highway System?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $4,142,000 for two locally-administered SB 1 LPP – Formulaic projects, off the State Highway System as follows:
   o $4,142,000 for two LPP – Formulaic projects

BACKGROUND:

The attached vote list describes two locally-administered SB 1 LPP – Formulaic projects totaling $4,142,000. The local agencies are ready to proceed with these projects, and are requesting an allocation at this time.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:

Resolved that $4,142,000 be allocated from Non-Budget Act Item 2660-601-3290 for two locally-administered SB 1 LPP – Formulaic projects described on the attached vote list.

Attachment

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
### Project # Allocation Amount Recipient RTPA/CTC District-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prgm'd Amount</th>
<th>Adv. Phase</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Bragg - 2019 Street Rehabilitation Project.</td>
<td>Various locations, rehabilitate 14-17 City street segment in very poor condition.</td>
<td>Outputs/Outcomes</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>01-4713</td>
<td>LPP-F/18-19</td>
<td>601-3290</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Bragg</td>
<td>MCOG 01-Mendocino</td>
<td>Local road lane-mile(s) rehabilitated</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601-3290</td>
<td></td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>20.30.210.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CEQA - NOE, 11/06/2018.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Contribution from other sources: $212,000.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The I-5/Voigt Drive Street Improvements. Re-align/widen Voigt Drive, re-align Campus Point Drive, pedestrian/bike improvements. Reconstruct sidewalks/barriers at Voigt Drive overcrossing, parking lot improvements at Preuss School, and relocate/improve bus shelter.</td>
<td>Outputs/Outcomes</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>$4,130,000</td>
<td>11-1354</td>
<td>LPP-F/18-19</td>
<td>601-3290</td>
<td>$4,130,000</td>
<td>Const</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>20.30.210.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments SANDAG 11-San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local road operational improvement(s)</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CEQA - EIR, 10/23/2013.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Future Consideration of Funding approved under Resolution E-14-11; March 2014.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Right of Way Certification: 08/27/2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Contributions from other sources: $12,639,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS  
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION 

C TC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019 
Reference No.: 2.5s.(4) 
Action Item 

From: STEVEN KECK  
Chief Financial Officer 

Prepared by: Clark Paulsen, Chief 
Division of Budgets 

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR LOCALLY-ADMINISTERED SENATE BILL 1 LOCAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM (FORMULAIC) PROJECTS OFF THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM (ADVANCEMENTS) RESOLUTION LPP-A-1819-18 

ISSUE: 

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $4,597,000 for two locally-administered Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) Local Partnership Program (LPP) - Formulaic projects, off the State Highway System, programmed Fiscal Year 2019-20? 

RECOMMENDATION: 

The California Department of Transportation recommends that the Commission defer an allocation of $4,597,000 for two locally-administered SB 1 LPP - Formulaic projects, off the State Highway System, programmed 2019-20 because these projects are advanced from a future program year. 

BACKGROUND: 

The attached vote list describes two locally-administered SB 1 LPP – Formulaic projects totaling $4,597,000. Although the local agencies are ready to proceed with these projects, it is recommended that the Commission defer these allocations. 

Attachment 

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

### 2.5s.(4a) Locally-Administered Senate Bill 1 - LPP Projects Off the State Highway System (Advancements - Formulaic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>District-County</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outputs/Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>RTPA/CTC</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Orinda 2019 Annual Pavement Rehabilitation Project</td>
<td>Within the City of Orinda on the following streets/roads: El Toyonal from Camino Pablo to Loma Vista; Las Vegas from Via Los Cruces to St. Stephens Drive; Loma Vista Drive from El Dorado Lane to El Dorado Lane; Lombardy Lane from Miner Road to Tarry Lane; Via Los Cruces from Honey Hill Road to Las Vegas Road; and southwood Drive from Oraga Way to Tara Road.</td>
<td>Local road lane-mile(s) rehabilitated</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CEQA - NOE, 11/14/2018.)

(Right of Way Certification: 11/13/2018)

(Contribution from other sources: $244,000.)

THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDS THIS ITEM BE DEFERRED AT THIS TIME.

| 2         | $4,497,000        | Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority | 04-Santa Clara | Montague Expressway Ped Bridge at Milpitas BART (AKA: Montague Ped Overcrossing or Montague POC). In the City of Milpitas at Montague Expressway approximately 1000 east of the intersection of Montague/Great Mall Parkway/East Capitol Avenue - The Project would provide a safe and convenient elevated and enclosed pedestrian, bicycle, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) connection between Milpitas BART Station and destinations north of Montague Expressway. The POC would span the expressway and connect in the south with the Milpitas BART/VTA Transit Station via the stations parking structure. The northern landing would be located on property in the center of the Milpitas Transit Area Specific Plan (TASP), a plan for the redevelopment of an approximately 437-acre area in the southern portion of Milpitas. | Sidewalk mile(s) | Miles | 0.05 |
| 2         | $4,497,000        | MTC      | 04-Contra Costa | Montague Expressway Ped Bridge at Milpitas BART (AKA: Montague Ped Overcrossing or Montague POC). In the City of Milpitas at Montague Expressway approximately 1000 east of the intersection of Montague/Great Mall Parkway/East Capitol Avenue - The Project would provide a safe and convenient elevated and enclosed pedestrian, bicycle, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) connection between Milpitas BART Station and destinations north of Montague Expressway. The POC would span the expressway and connect in the south with the Milpitas BART/VTA Transit Station via the stations parking structure. The northern landing would be located on property in the center of the Milpitas Transit Area Specific Plan (TASP), a plan for the redevelopment of an approximately 437-acre area in the southern portion of Milpitas. | Bicycle lane mile(s) | Miles | 0.05 |
| 2         |                   | MTC      | 04-Contra Costa | Montague Expressway Ped Bridge at Milpitas BART (AKA: Montague Ped Overcrossing or Montague POC). In the City of Milpitas at Montague Expressway approximately 1000 east of the intersection of Montague/Great Mall Parkway/East Capitol Avenue - The Project would provide a safe and convenient elevated and enclosed pedestrian, bicycle, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) connection between Milpitas BART Station and destinations north of Montague Expressway. The POC would span the expressway and connect in the south with the Milpitas BART/VTA Transit Station via the stations parking structure. The northern landing would be located on property in the center of the Milpitas Transit Area Specific Plan (TASP), a plan for the redevelopment of an approximately 437-acre area in the southern portion of Milpitas. | At-Grade crossing(s) eliminated | Each | 2    |
| 2         |                   | MTC      | 04-Contra Costa | Montague Expressway Ped Bridge at Milpitas BART (AKA: Montague Ped Overcrossing or Montague POC). In the City of Milpitas at Montague Expressway approximately 1000 east of the intersection of Montague/Great Mall Parkway/East Capitol Avenue - The Project would provide a safe and convenient elevated and enclosed pedestrian, bicycle, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) connection between Milpitas BART Station and destinations north of Montague Expressway. The POC would span the expressway and connect in the south with the Milpitas BART/VTA Transit Station via the stations parking structure. The northern landing would be located on property in the center of the Milpitas Transit Area Specific Plan (TASP), a plan for the redevelopment of an approximately 437-acre area in the southern portion of Milpitas. | Station improvement(s) | Each | 2    |

(CEQA - CE, 07/06/2017.)

(Right of Way Certification: 10/17/2017)

(Contribution from other sources: $12,433,000.)

THE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDS THIS ITEM BE DEFERRED AT THIS TIME.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.6g.(1) Action Item

From: STEVEN KECK
       Chief Financial Officer

Prepared by: Clark Paulsen, Chief
Division of Budgets

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR TRANSIT AND INTERCITY RAIL CAPITAL PROGRAM PROJECTS
         RESOLUTION TIRCP-1819-06

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $1,815,000 for three Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) projects?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $1,815,000 for three TIRCP projects as follows:
- $1,815,000 for three TIRCP projects (SB1 Augmentation for PTA).

BACKGROUND:

The attached vote list describes three TIRCP projects totaling $1,815,000. The local agencies are ready to proceed with these projects, and are requesting an allocation at this time.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:

Resolved that $1,815,000 be allocated from the Budget Act of 2017, Budget Act Items 2660-101-0046 and 2660-301-0046R for three TIRCP projects described on the attached vote list.

Attachment
### 2.6g.(1b) Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program Projects (SB 1 Augmentation for PTA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>Prgm'd Amount</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>(2018: 25) Solano Regional Transit Improvements (Network Integration)</td>
<td>04-CP046N</td>
<td>TIRCP/18-19</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>101-0046</td>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0019000239 S</td>
<td>30.10.030.200</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solano Transportation Authority</td>
<td>MTC 04-Solano</td>
<td>Network Integration implementation for development of improved connections to other transit services.</td>
<td>Increased ridership, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, improved safety, improved regional connectivity, and enhanced integration.</td>
<td>Lead Agency has determined this project component to be Exempt from CEQA.</td>
<td>The current allocation includes $250,000 from SB1 Augmentation for PTA.</td>
<td>(SB 1 Augmentation for PTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,315,000</td>
<td>(2018: 17) Blue Line Rail Corridor Enhancements</td>
<td>11-CP032</td>
<td>TIRCP/18-19</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>301-0046R</td>
<td>GGRF</td>
<td>$586,000</td>
<td>0019000237 S</td>
<td>30.20.301.100</td>
<td>$586,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>SANDAG 11-San Diego</td>
<td>Design of Beech Street Double Crossover, American Plaza Pedestrian Enhancements, and Green Line Double Tracking.</td>
<td>Increased ridership, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, enhanced network integration, and improved safety.</td>
<td>(CEQA - NOE, 9/12/2018.)</td>
<td>The current allocation includes the following funding split: $586,000 GGRF and $729,000 SB1 Augmentation for PTA.</td>
<td>(SB 1 Augmentation for PTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>(2018: 17) Blue Line Rail Corridor Enhancements (Network Integration)</td>
<td>11-CP032N</td>
<td>TIRCP/18-19</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>101-0046</td>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0019000238 S</td>
<td>30.10.030.200</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>SANDAG 11-San Diego</td>
<td>Network integration implementation for development of improved connections to other rail and transit services.</td>
<td>Increased ridership, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, improved regional connectivity, and enhanced integration.</td>
<td>Lead Agency has determined that this project component to be Exempt from CEQA.</td>
<td>The current allocation includes $250,000 from SB1 Augmentation for PTA.</td>
<td>(SB 1 Augmentation for PTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
       Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FINANCIAL ALLOCATION FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM PROJECTS
         RESOLUTION FATP-1819-07

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.5w.(1)
Action Item

Prepared by: Clark Paulsen, Chief
             Division of Budgets

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve an allocation of $13,720,000 for 21 Active Transportation Program (ATP) projects?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation recommends that the Commission approve an allocation of $13,720,000 for 21 ATP projects as follows:
   o $7,046,000 for eight ATP projects and
   o $6,674,000 for 13 ATP projects (SB1 Augmentation).

BACKGROUND:

The attached vote list describes 21 ATP projects totaling $13,720,000. The local agencies are ready to proceed with these projects and are requesting an allocation at this time; however, the allocation is contingent on the approval of a budget revision by the Department of Finance.

FINANCIAL RESOLUTION:


Attachment

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
### 2.5w.(1a) Active Transportation Program Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output:</th>
<th>Resolution FATP-1819-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>Hoopa Valley Tribe</td>
<td>Hoopa Valley Safe Routes To School Project</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Enhance walking and biking safety to schools, community and senior centers and social service destinations, with infrastructure improvements.</td>
<td>Provide a safe multi-modal transportation facility for safe routes to school for the Hoopa Valley Community along SR 96.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Time extension for FY 16-17 PA&amp;ED expires on February 28, 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PPNO 2440A is the Infrastructure component to PPNO 2440B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALLOCATION IS CONTINGENT UPON APPROVAL OF A BUDGET REVISION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>Upper Lake Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Small Urban and Rural</td>
<td>Construction of approximately 915 lineal feet of curb, gutter and sidewalk along the west side of Government Street between Melody Lane and First Street, along the south side of First Street between Government Street and Clover Valley Road and along the south side of Second Street between Main Street and Middle Creek Road.</td>
<td>Safe pedestrian facility for students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CEQA - NOE, 04/16/2018.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Right of Way Certification: 08/16/2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Time extension for FY 17-18 CONST expires on January 31, 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output:</th>
<th>Contribution from other sources:</th>
<th>Right of Way Certification:</th>
<th>Time extension for FY 17-18 CONST expires on June 30, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northwestern Pacific Rail Trail Phase II.</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Construction of the second phase of a multi-use bicycle and pedestrian paved trail, including trail fencing, lighting, and safety enhanced crosswalks.</td>
<td>Project will increase walking and biking trips and improve safety, while enhancing community connectivity between schools, retail facilities and residential neighborhoods.</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>6/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CEQA - NOE, 06/29/2016.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Contribution from other sources: $16,000.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Right of Way Certification: 11/29/2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Time extension for FY 17-18 CONST expires on June 30, 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seventh Avenue Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Route Improvements.</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Construction of curb, gutter, sidewalk, bicycle lanes, curb ramps, striping, traffic control devices, raised crosswalk, curb extensions, pedestrian refuge islands, rapid flash beacons, and improved pedestrian lighting.</td>
<td>Bicycle lanes and sidewalk will provide safer areas for bicyclists and pedestrians to travel separated from vehicles. Pedestrian islands, raised crosswalk, flashing beacons, and lighting will increase the safety of school children.</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>11/13/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project # 3

**Project Title:** Northwestern Pacific Rail Trail Phase II

**Location:** Statewide

**Project Description:** Construction of the second phase of a multi-use bicycle and pedestrian paved trail, including trail fencing, lighting, and safety enhanced crosswalks.

**Outcome/Output:** Project will increase walking and biking trips and improve safety, while enhancing community connectivity between schools, retail facilities and residential neighborhoods.

- **Contribution from other sources:** $16,000
- **Right of Way Certification:** 11/29/2018
- **Time extension for FY 17-18 CONST expires on June 30, 2019**

#### Project # 4

**Project Title:** Seventh Avenue Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Route Improvements

**Location:** Statewide

**Project Description:** Construction of curb, gutter, sidewalk, bicycle lanes, curb ramps, striping, traffic control devices, raised crosswalk, curb extensions, pedestrian refuge islands, rapid flash beacons, and improved pedestrian lighting.

**Outcome/Output:** Bicycle lanes and sidewalk will provide safer areas for bicyclists and pedestrians to travel separated from vehicles. Pedestrian islands, raised crosswalk, flashing beacons, and lighting will increase the safety of school children.

- **Contribution from other sources:** $470,000
- **Right of Way Certification:** 11/13/2018
### 2.5w.(1a) Active Transportation Program Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$713,000</td>
<td>City of South San Francisco MTC</td>
<td>04-San Mateo</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Enhanced pedestrian accesses.</td>
<td>04-2140Y</td>
<td>ATP/16-19</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>108-0890</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>$713,000</td>
<td>04170001117 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$493,000</td>
<td>Fresno County FCOG</td>
<td>06-Fresno</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Increased safety and ADA compliance of sidewalks and pedestrian pathways.</td>
<td>06-6833</td>
<td>ATP/16-19</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>108-0890</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>$493,000</td>
<td>0616000233 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Port of Long Beach LACMTA</td>
<td>07-Los Angeles</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>3,250 foot Class I bike path; 1,100 foot Class II bike lane; 1,800 foot Class III sharrow bike route; 10 curb ramps; 34,100 SF of new sidewalks; street lighting upgrades at 30 locations.</td>
<td>07-5131</td>
<td>ATP/16-17</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>108-0890</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>0718000185 S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Active Transportation Program Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,190,000</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
<td><strong>Active Transportation Resource Center (ATRC)</strong>. Statewide Technical Assistance Resource Center for Active Transportation Program. (Non-infrastructure)</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Outcome/Output: The project will provide active transportation support, training resource materials and continue safe route to school and active transportation health issue education through throughout the State. (CEQA - CE, 10/21/2014.)</td>
<td>50-0774</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>ATP/18-19</td>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>108-0042</td>
<td>$1,190,000</td>
<td>20.36.720.100</td>
<td>5017000034</td>
<td>FATP-1819-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-Various</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of this allocation, the local agency is requesting to extend the completion of construction an additional 12 months beyond the 36 month deadline.
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

### Active Transportation Program Projects (SB1 Augmentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>RTPA/CTC</th>
<th>District-County</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prgm'd Amount</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>City of Blue Lake</td>
<td>HCAOG</td>
<td>01-Humboldt</td>
<td>20.30.720.100</td>
<td>Blue Lake Annie &amp; Mary Trail, Phase 1</td>
<td>Construct a paved walking and biking trail through the City of Blue Lake to connect neighborhoods and destinations. First phase of the Annie &amp; Mary Rail-Trail to connect Blue Lake to Arcata. Small Urban and Rural</td>
<td>Outcome/Output: Increase walking and biking between Arcata and Blue Lake</td>
<td>(CEQA - ND 11/09/2018)</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>ATP/18-19</td>
<td>01-2505A</td>
<td>108-3290</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01-Humboldt</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>0118000121</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.30.720.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,374,000</td>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>EDLTC</td>
<td>03-El Dorado</td>
<td>20.30.720.100</td>
<td>El Dorado Trail - Missouri Flat Road to El Dorado</td>
<td>The multi-use trail segment is proposed for construction on the Sacramento Placerville Transportation Corridor, which was purchased by the County under the Rails-to-Trails Act. The proposed segment connects the community of Diamond Springs with the community of El Dorado in the vicinity of the City of Placerville. Extend an existing Class I multi-use trail from Missouri Flat Road to the Town of El Dorado (2.2 miles) along the SPTC railroad corridor. This project will be shovel ready for construction when ATP funding is awarded. Statewide</td>
<td>Outcome/Output: Construction of a 2.2 mile Class I Trail and non-infrastructure education and public outreach program.</td>
<td>(CEQA - MND, 10/04/2017.)</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>ATP/17-18</td>
<td>03-1224A</td>
<td>108-3290</td>
<td>3,374,000</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CEQA - MND, 10/04/2017.)</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>3,374,000</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>0314000311</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.30.720.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Concurrent Consideration of Funding under Resolution E-19-10; January 2019.)

(PPNO 2505A is the infrastructure component to PPNO 2505B)

(SB 1 Augmentation)

(PPNO 1224A is the infrastructure component to PPNO 1224B.)

(SB 1 Augmentation)
## 2.5w.(1b) Active Transportation Program Projects (SB1 Augmentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>District-County</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>EDLTC</td>
<td>El Dorado Trail - Missouri Flat Road to El Dorado</td>
<td>The multi-use trail segment is proposed for construction on the Sacramento Placerville Transportation Corridor, which was purchased by the County under the Rails-to-Trails Act. The proposed segment connects the community of Diamond Springs with the community of El Dorado in the vicinity of the City of Placerville. Infrastructure improvements include an existing Class I multi-use El Dorado Trail from Missouri Flat Road to the Town of El Dorado (2.2 miles) along the SPTC railroad corridor. Included in the project are workshops at local schools, a community presentation, distribution of maps/materials and bicycle/pedestrian audits/counts. (Non-infrastructure).</td>
<td>FATP-1819-07</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>ATP/17-18</td>
<td>CONST</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome/Output: Construction of a 2.2 mile Class I Trail and non-infrastructure education and public outreach program.

(CEQA - MND, 10/04/2017.)
(NEPA - CE, 12/07/2018)

(Concurrent Consideration of Funding under Resolution E-19-11 January 2019.)

Right of Way Certification: 12/12/2018

Time extension for FY 17-18 Construction expires on 06/30/2019,

(PPNO 1224B is the non-infrastructure component to PPNO 1224A.)

(SB 1 Augmentation)
### 2.5w.(1b) Active Transportation Program Projects (SB1 Augmentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prgm’ed Amount</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Prgm’d Amount</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td>Mariposa Safe Routes to School (Phase IV)</td>
<td>Mariposa Avenue in the City of Citrus Heights. The project connects Northeast Circle to Madison Avenue including Skycrest Elementary and San Juan Park. The project is the final phase of a 1.2 mile Safe Route to School Project. The Project will complete the bicycle and pedestrian network south of Skycrest Elementary including sidewalks, bikelanes, and associated improvements.</td>
<td>03-1694A</td>
<td>ATP/18-19</td>
<td>$242,000</td>
<td>0318000191</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$242,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03-Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome/Output:** Provide missing pedestrian sidewalk and bicycle lanes, increase personal and traffic safety. Reduce vehicle trips and greenhouse gas emissions. Increase the number of non-motorized users accessing schools, park and retail.

(CEQA - CE, 11/29/2018.)

(Contribution from other sources: $82,000.)

(PPNO 1694A is the infrastructure component to PPNO 1694B)

(SB 1 Augmentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prgm’d Amount</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Prgm’d Amount</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$708,000</td>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>Folsom Boulevard Complete Street Improvements, Phase 1</td>
<td>On the southerly side of Folsom Boulevard between Mayhew Road and Bradshaw Road. Construct safe and unobstructed sidewalks, pedestrian safety lighting, functional landscaping, accessible curb ramps and pedestrian signal improvements. Existing utility poles will be relocated at the expense of the utility providers to provide space for these much needed safety improvements to encourage active modes of travel along this important corridor.</td>
<td>03-1695</td>
<td>ATP/17-18</td>
<td>$532,000</td>
<td>0318000296</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$532,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03-Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome/Output:** Safety improvements to encourage active modes of travel along this busy travel corridor.

(CEQA - MND, 12/04/2018.)

(NEPA - CE, 12/10/2018)

(Concurrent Consideration of Funding under Resolution E-19-12; January 2019.)

(Contribution from other sources: $97,000.)

(Time extension for FY 17-18 PS&E expires on 12/31/2018.)

(SB 1 Augmentation)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>RTPA/CTC District-County</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>City of Emeryville MTC</td>
<td>04-Alameda</td>
<td><strong>Emeryville Bicycle and Pedestrian Greenway Safety and Mobility Improvement Project.</strong> In Emeryville: Along Existing Emeryville Greenway from Doyle Drive to Folger Avenue. Improve existing Greenway Trail crossings at 65th Street, 66th Street, and 67th Street with raised crosswalks, RRFBs, parking adjustments and signage, add bike share station.</td>
<td>04-2306</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>108-3290</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>20.30.720.100</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
<td>City of Oakland MTC</td>
<td>04-Alameda</td>
<td><strong>Oakland Safe Routes to School - Crossing to Safety.</strong> The project includes the intersections of Park Boulevard/Excelsior Avenue-Grosvenor Place, Park Boulevard/13th Avenue-East 38th Street, 98th Avenue/Sunnyside Street, and the segment of Fruitvale Avenue from Foothill Boulevard to International Boulevard, in the City of Oakland. This project will provide sidewalks, shorter crossings, and a HAWK beacon at the Park Boulevard intersections; a HAWK beacon on 98th Avenue; and a road diet to create bike lanes and enhanced pedestrian crossings on Fruitvale Avenue including an RRFB. All of these locations are high-volume, high-speed corridors.</td>
<td>04-2324</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>108-3290</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>20.30.720.100</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.5w.(1b) Active Transportation Program Projects (SB1 Augmentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Statewide Outcome/Output:</th>
<th>Resolution FATP-1819-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>Sunnyvale Safe Routes to School Improvements</td>
<td>Sunnyvale Avenue and the intersections of Maude Avenue at Mathilda Avenue, Borregas Avenue, and Sunnyvale Avenue.</td>
<td>Install bike lanes, high visibility crosswalks, infrared bike detection system, ADA pedestrian countdown signals, raised crosswalk, and curb extensions.</td>
<td>New bike lanes will expand the City's bicycle network. The removal of slip lanes and adding high visibility crosswalks will eliminate collisions and provide a pedestrian friendly facility.</td>
<td>(PPNO) 2147A is the Infrastructure component to (PPNO) 2147B (SB 1 Augmentation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$528,000</td>
<td>Woodside Elementary School Student Pathway Project Phase III</td>
<td>In Woodside along the south side of State Route 84 between the east limits of Woodside Elementary School and Robert's Market (3015 Woodside Road) at Mountain Home Road/Canada Road.</td>
<td>The project creates a separated, 6-foot-wide pathway, paves the road shoulder for cyclists and extends an improvement project currently underway.</td>
<td>Project will connect residents with the school, library, church and commercial center.</td>
<td>(SB 1 Augmentation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sunnyvale Safe Routes to School Improvements

- **Project ID:** 04-2147A
- **Program/Year:** ATP/18-19
- **Phase:** P&ED
- **Prgm'd Amount:** $56,000
- **Project Title:** Sunnyvale Safe Routes to School Improvements
- **Location:** Sunnyvale Avenue and the intersections of Maude Avenue at Mathilda Avenue, Borregas Avenue, and Sunnyvale Avenue.
- **Project Description:** Install bike lanes, high visibility crosswalks, infrared bike detection system, ADA pedestrian countdown signals, raised crosswalk, and curb extensions.
- **Outcome/Output:** New bike lanes will expand the City's bicycle network. The removal of slip lanes and adding high visibility crosswalks will eliminate collisions and provide a pedestrian friendly facility.
- **(PPNO 2147A is the Infrastructure component to PPNO 2147B) (SB 1 Augmentation)***

#### Woodside Elementary School Student Pathway Project Phase III

- **Project ID:** 04-2314
- **Program/Year:** ATP/18-19
- **Phase:** CONST
- **Prgm'd Amount:** $528,000
- **Project Title:** Woodside Elementary School Student Pathway Project Phase III
- **Location:** In Woodside along the south side of State Route 84 between the east limits of Woodside Elementary School and Robert's Market (3015 Woodside Road) at Mountain Home Road/Canada Road.
- **Project Description:** The project creates a separated, 6-foot-wide pathway, paves the road shoulder for cyclists and extends an improvement project currently underway.
- **Outcome/Output:** Project will connect residents with the school, library, church and commercial center.
### 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>District-County</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prgm'd Amount</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Adv. Phase</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by Fund Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Fresno PARCS</td>
<td>FCOG 06-Fresno</td>
<td>Fresno Pedestrian and Bike Safety Education Program</td>
<td>(Non Infrastructure)</td>
<td>The 30 targeted school sites, and City of Fresno neighborhood and community centers are located in low and very low-income neighborhoods. The CenCalVia Open Streets project will be conducted on Ventura and Kings Canyon Avenues, a major arterial corridor located in a disadvantaged community in South Fresno. Fresno PARCS will conduct a non-infrastructure program at schools, City neighborhood and community centers to promote and encourage pedestrian and bicycle safety. PARCS will also expand a CenCalVia Open Streets project in Fresno to attract residents from throughout Fresno County and encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation.</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>ATP/18-19</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0619000062</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>20.30.720.100</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>City of Angels Camp</td>
<td>CCOG 10-Calaveras</td>
<td>Route 49 Sidewalk Infill and Bike Lanes, Angels Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widening of Route 49 for new bicycle lanes and sidewalks. The widening includes the construction of a narrow section of new pavement; construction of new curb, gutter, and sidewalk; and the roadway will be signed and striped for a new bike lane.</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>ATP/17-18</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>10160000045</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>20.30.720.100</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome/Output:**
- **Pedestrian and bicycle education program conducted at 30 school sites and city centers will benefit over 1,500 children and youth.**

(CEQA - NOE, 11/25/2014.)

(SB 1 Augmentation)
## 2.5 Highway Financial Matters

### 2.5w.(1b) Active Transportation Program Projects (SB1 Augmentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Allocation Amount</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Program/Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prgm'd Amount</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Amount by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$359,000</td>
<td><strong>Active Safe Routes to Schools</strong></td>
<td>City of Stockton</td>
<td>Based in four key school districts, comprised of an initial 12 elementary schools throughout the Stockton area. Through sustainability the project will expand to other schools. The program looks to bring an innovative sustainable approach by teaching school representatives to engage with students and certify other representatives in schools while providing an encouraging and safe training on walking, biking, or skating to school for students and parents. (Non-Infrastructure)</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>108-3290</td>
<td>$359,000</td>
<td>10-3289</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$359,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MPO**

**Outcome/Output:** Increased walking, biking and skating to school, decreased traffic congestion, fuel use, road maintenance and greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution.

(CEQA - CE, 1/10/2019)

---

| 13        | $180,000          | **Rock Springs Road Safe Routes to School Sidewalks and Bike Lanes** | San Diego County | Construct continuous sidewalks and bike lanes along a 0.65 mile segment of Rock Springs Road on one side of the road to establish a pedestrian and bicyclist friendly corridor between residents and the Rock Springs Elementary school. | 2017-18 | 108-3290 | $180,000 | 11-1324 | 2017-18 | RMRA | $180,000 |

**MPO**

**Outcome/Output:** Increased pedestrian safety, mobility and accessibility.

(CEQA - NOE, 11/7/2018.)

(Time extension for FY 17-18 PS&E expires on June, 30, 2019)

---

### Resolution FATP-1819-07
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS  
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK  
Chief Financial Officer

Subject: REQUEST TO EXTEND THE PERIOD OF CONTRACT AWARD FOR STATE ADMINISTERED PROJECTS ON THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM, PER INTERIM SHOPP GUIDELINES WAIVER 19-01

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.8b.(1) Action Item

Prepared by: Bruce De Terra, Chief  
Division of Transportation Programming

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve a time extension for the nine State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) projects, for the period indicated, as described in the attachment?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends that the Commission approve a time extension, for the period indicated, for the nine SHOPP projects described in the attachment.

BACKGROUND:

On June 27, 2018, the Commission allocated $72,701,000 for Construction Capital for nine SHOPP projects.

In accordance with the Guidelines, the deadline to award contracts for projects allocated in June 27, 2018 is December 31, 2018. The Department will not be able to meet the deadlines for these projects and is requesting time extensions for the period of contract award. The attachment shows the details of each project and the delays that have resulted in the time extension request.

Current Interim SHOPP Guidelines (Guidelines), stipulate that the agency implementing a project request a time extension if the project will not be awarded within six months of the allocation. The Commission may approve waivers to the timely use of funds deadline one time only for up to 20 months.

Attachment

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability."
### 2.8b.(1) Time Extension / Waiver - Contract Award

**Waiver 19-01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project Dist-CA</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>County-Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Allocated Amount (≥ $1,000)</th>
<th>Allocation Date</th>
<th>Reason For Delay</th>
<th>Department’s Request Months until end of (month-yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>04-0G221</td>
<td>ALA-13</td>
<td>In Alameda and Contra Costa Counties on Routes 13, 160, 580, and 680 at various locations. Construct curb ramps and sidewalks.</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>$ 2,390</td>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>Additional time is needed to determine non-responsive bid, and evaluate and award to the next qualified bidder. Bidder 1 did not meet DVBE goals and they were non-responsive. The Department is proceeding to award to Bidder 2. Bidder 2 is still below the Engineer’s Estimate. Target award date is 01/31/19. Therefore, the Department requests a three-month time extension. <strong>The Department is also requesting a concurrent three-month time for Phase 3 Construction Support.</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>04-2A32A</td>
<td>O380N</td>
<td>NAP-121 Near Napa, at Sarco Creek Bridge No. 21-0008. Plant establishment for bridge replacement project.</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>$ 450</td>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>Delay to award is due to receipt of only one bid and it was above the programmed amount. This project has been repackaged and re-advertised on 12/06/18. Additional contractor outreach will be performed. Target award date is 01/18/19. Therefore, the Department requests a six-month time extension. <strong>The Department is also requesting a concurrent six-month time for Phase 3 Construction Support.</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jun-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>04-2J100</td>
<td>1488P</td>
<td>NAP-29 In Napa, at northbound ramps and 1st Street. Construct roundabout. This project is combined with PPNO 2130F.</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>$ 6,950</td>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>This is a cooperative project with the City of Napa where Caltrans is the implementing agency for construction of the roundabouts in partnership with the City of Napa. Due to the proximity of the three roundabouts, efficiencies can be realized and traffic impacts minimized during construction by combining the work under one construction contract administered by Caltrans. After RTL, the City and County of Napa considered alternative funding sources for their roundabouts. This caused a delay in approval of the Authority to Advertise. Target award date is 01/18/19 and in case of unexpected bid protests or other award-related delays, an extension is requested. Therefore, the Department requests a six-month time extension. <strong>The Department is also requesting a concurrent six-month time for Phase 3 Construction Support.</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jun-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>04-2J100</td>
<td>2130F</td>
<td>NAP-29 In the city of Napa. Construct roundabouts on California Boulevard at First and Second Streets and on First Street/State Route 29 northbound on- and off-ramps intersection. This project is combined with PPNO 1488P.</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>$ 2,571</td>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>This is a cooperative project with the City of Napa where Caltrans is the implementing agency for construction of the roundabouts in partnership with the City of Napa. Due to the proximity of the three roundabouts, efficiencies can be realized and traffic impacts minimized during construction by combining the work under one construction contract administered by Caltrans. After RTL, the City and County of Napa considered alternative funding sources for their roundabouts. This caused a delay in approval of the Authority to Advertise. Target award date is 01/18/19 and in case of unexpected bid protests or other award-related delays, an extension is requested. Therefore, the Department requests a six-month time extension. <strong>The Department is also requesting a concurrent six-month time for Phase 3 Construction Support.</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jun-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>04-2J440</td>
<td>1482K</td>
<td>ALA-92 In Hayward, from 0.4 mile west of Clawiter Road to 0.3 mile west of Hesperian Boulevard. Install safety lighting and upgrade lighting.</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>$ 5,527</td>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>The low bidder was $3,329,788 and the Engineer’s Estimate was $3,764,236. A recommendation to award was submitted on 10/11/18. However, on 10/25/18, the low bidder was disqualified because they were non-responsive. The current funding is not adequate to award to the 2nd low bidder. Supplemental funds of $1,081,000 are needed to award the contract to the 2nd low bidder. After evaluation of bids and discussing factors resulting in the high bids with bidders, the Department has decided to reject all bids. Re-advertisement will require repackaging to include a modified electrical trench detail, updating the project to 2018 standards, additional project reviews, listing, advertisement, and award. There may also be delays due to bid protests. Therefore, the Department requests a nine-month time extension. <strong>The Department is also requesting a concurrent nine-month time for Phase 3 Construction Support.</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sep-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>04-3K320</td>
<td>1488V</td>
<td>CC-var In Contra Costa County, on Routes 4, 24, 80, 242, 580, and 680 at various locations. Repair and replace existing Transportation Management System elements.</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>$ 4,740</td>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>The Department’s Procurement division is reviewing this service contract to award by 11/30/18. However, bid protests could result in delaying the award which may include a reconsideration hearing. If the contract cannot be awarded, the Department would need more time to repackage the service contract, review, advertise, and award. Therefore, the Department requests a six-month time extension. <strong>The Department is also requesting a concurrent six-month time for Phase 3 Construction Support.</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jun-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project #</td>
<td>Project Dist-EA</td>
<td>PPNO</td>
<td>County-Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Allocated Amount (x $1,000)</td>
<td>Allocation Date</td>
<td>Reason For Delay</td>
<td>Department’s Request Months until end of (month-yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>08-0N670</td>
<td>0056H</td>
<td>Riv-74</td>
<td>In and near Hemet, from 0.6 mile east of Route 215 to 0.3 mile west of Acacia Avenue. Construct raised curb median.</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>$ 35,495</td>
<td>Jul-2018</td>
<td>In mid July 2018, after RTL, Southern California Gas Company (SCGC) contacted the Department and stated a need to re-investigate the site and possibly relocate 2 lines. The Department had already agreed to protect utilities in place as per signed Utility Agreement before RTL. On 10/08/18, SCGC conducted potholing and confirmed the validity of the Utility Agreement for construction. That delay also necessitated the need to update the project specifications to 2018 specifications. The project bid opening is February 2019 and the Department expects to award by April 2019. Therefore, the Department requests a three-month time extension. The Department is also requesting a concurrent three-month time for Phase 3 Construction Support.</td>
<td>3 Apr-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>08-0Q120</td>
<td>0191J</td>
<td>SBD-18</td>
<td>In Victorville, from Cobalt Road to Route 395. Construct raised curb median.</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>$ 11,306</td>
<td>Jul-2018</td>
<td>The permits in question resulted in detailed elaborate species specifications (both standard and non-standard) whose approvals took a lot longer to obtain from the Regulatory Agencies, which delayed the advertisement. Target Bid opening is 01/23/19, and target award is 03/01/19. Therefore, the Department requests a two-month time extension. The Department is also requesting a concurrent two-month time for Phase 3 Construction Support.</td>
<td>2 Feb-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>02-4C150</td>
<td>3314</td>
<td>Sis-96</td>
<td>In and near Happy Camp, from 0.1 mile east of Swillup Creek Bridge to 2.1 miles east of Thompson Creek Bridge at various locations in Siskiyou County. Drainage System Restoration.</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>$ 3,272</td>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>The Commission approved supplemental funds to award at the December 2018 meeting bringing the total CTC allocation to $3,272,000. On October 12, 2018, the Department submitted a Bid Extension request to the Contractor which was subsequently signed. But within a few days of receiving and signing the Bid Extension Request, the Contractor received a second Bid Extension Request in error. The second bid extension was not signed or returned to the Department. After the Supplemental allocation approval by the Commission, the Department submitted award documents to the Contractor. The Contractor explained since they did not sign the 2nd Bid Extension request, they did not accept the project. The Department is looking at legal options to deal with this issue. It is possible that the Department will not only need to proceed through the legal process, but also repackage, re-advertise and then re-award the project. The Department is also requesting a concurrent twelve-month time for Phase 3 Construction Support.</td>
<td>8 Jun-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 projects $ 72,701 (amount x1000)
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.8b.(2)

From: STEVEN KECK
      Chief Financial Officer

Prepared by: Rihui Zhang, Chief
              Division of Local Assistance

Subject: REQUEST TO EXTEND THE PERIOD OF CONTRACT AWARD FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM PROJECTS, PER ATP GUIDELINES WAIVER 19-02

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) extend the period of contract award for eight projects listed on the attached document, for the time periods shown, in the Active Transportation Program (ATP)?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends the Commission extend the period of contract award for eight projects listed on the attached document, for the time periods shown, in the ATP.

BACKGROUND:

The Commission allocated $4,643,000 for the construction of nine ATP projects identified on the attachment. The responsible agencies have been unable to award the contract within six months of allocation. The attachment describes the details of the projects and the explanation for the delays. The respective agencies request extensions, and the planning agencies concur.

Current ATP Guidelines stipulate that the agency implementing a project, request a time extension if the project will not be awarded within six months of the allocation. The Commission may approve waivers to the timely use of funds deadline, one time only, for up to 12 months.

Attachment
Time Extension/Waiver – Project Contract Award Deadline
Active Transportation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Applicant County</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Reason for Project Delay</th>
<th>Extension Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Initial Request</th>
<th>Extended Deadline</th>
<th>Department Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Downey</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>City of Downey Pedestrian Plan</td>
<td>Metro Bike Share University of Southern California/South Los Angeles/Exposition Line Communities Expansion project</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>06/28/2018</td>
<td>FATP-1718-19</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
<td>03/31/2019</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Downey (City) requests a three-month time extension to the period of contract award for the construction (CON) phase of the City of Downey Pedestrian Plan. The City experienced an unexpected delay during bidding of the project.

The City received their CON allocation in June 2018 and proceeded with readying the project for advertisement. The City’s efforts in preparing the Request for Proposal (RFP) took three months longer than anticipated due to their extensive research of sample RFP’s from other agencies. The City has since completed the RFP with the project now in advertisement. The City is requesting additional time to hold bid opening and award the project by March 2019.

Therefore, the City requests a three-month extension to the CON phase by March 31, 2019.

| 2         | City of Oxnard   | Ventura County | New Traffic Signal project | | $495,000          | 06/28/2018       | FATP-1718-19     | 6 Months       | 06/30/2019       | Support                      |

The City of Oxnard (City) requests a six-month time extension to the period of contract award for the construction (CON) phase of the New Traffic Signal project. The City experienced an unexpected delay during bidding of the project.

The City received their CON allocation in June 2018 and proceeded with readying the project for advertisement. The Design of the project was substantially complete when the request for construction allocation was received. However, shortly after the allocation was received, the City hired a new traffic consultant and new engineering staff. Changes to the plans and specs were identified by the new staff. As a result, the package required additional reviews and revisions before the package could be finalized. This delayed the advertisement and award of the project by 4 months. The advertisement is scheduled to begin the first week of January 2019. Recent City bids have resulted in single bidders. Consequently, to allow time to re-advertise and award the project, should the project receive low bidder response, the City is requesting an additional 2 months.

Therefore, the City requests a six-month extension to the CON phase by June 30, 2019.

| 3         | Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority | Los Angeles County | Metro Bike Share University of Southern California/South Los Angeles/Exposition Line Communities Expansion project | | $2,287,000          | 06/28/2018       | FATP-1718-19     | 6 Months       | 06/30/2019       | Support                      |

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) requests a six-month time extension to the period of contract award for the construction (CON) phase of the Metro Bike Share University of Southern California/South Los Angeles/Exposition Line Communities Expansion project. Metro experienced an unexpected delay in awarding the project.

Metro received their CON allocation in June 2018. However, the Pasadena Metro Bike Share area ceased operation in August 2018 resulting in the immediate availability of station equipment. To re-deploy bike share equipment quickly and provide the greatest public benefit, Metro has partnered with the City of Los Angeles (City) to relocate the Pasadena stations to the communities adjacent to the Downtown Los Angeles service area, including areas within Metro’s project limits. The City has expressed strong interest in expanding Metro Bike Share in these neighborhoods adjacent to the Downtown Los Angeles service area because of their high bike share suitability and the desire for contiguous expansion. Concurrently, Metro is seeking to expand the project limits slightly north to include the additional disadvantaged communities of Echo Park, Silverlake, and portions of East Hollywood. These communities currently lack convenient access to transit and would benefit from the first-last mile connectivity provided by Metro Bike Share. Metro is requesting additional time to allow for refined station siting and, leveraging the immediate redeployment of Pasadena equipment within the project limits. Once the redeployment is completed, Metro can finalize the package and move towards advertisement and award of the project.

Therefore, Metro requests a six-month extension to the CON phase by June 30, 2019.
Riverside County (County) requests a three-month time extension to the period of contract award for the construction (CON) phase of the Camino Aventura Sidewalk Safety Improvement program. The County experienced an unexpected delay in awarding the project.

The County received their CON allocation in June 2018. The ATP program is for proposed California Highway Patrol (CHP) activities after construction of the ATP project PPNO 1199A. The CHP has recently indicated that they have changed their procedures for small projects and programs, specifically whether local field offices or CHP headquarters have contract signing authority. The local CHP office is willing to perform the work but cannot receive the contract until the issue is resolved. The County is requesting additional time to allow the CHP to finish coordinating their procedures and award the contract. The County is confident this will occur in the next three months.

Therefore, the County requests a three-month extension to the CON phase by March 31, 2019.

Riverside County (County) requests a three-month time extension to the period of contract award for the construction (CON) phase of the Thousand Palms Sidewalk Safety Improvements program. The County experienced an unexpected delay in awarding the project.

The County received their CON allocation in June 2018. The ATP program is for proposed California Highway Patrol (CHP) activities after construction of the ATP project PPNO 1200A. The CHP has recently indicated that they have changed their procedures for small projects and programs, specifically whether local field offices or CHP headquarters have contract signing authority. The local CHP office is willing to perform the work but cannot receive the contract until the issue is resolved. The County is requesting additional time to allow the CHP to finish coordinating their procedures and award the contract. The County is confident this will occur in the next three months.

Therefore, the County requests a three-month extension to the CON phase by March 31, 2019.

The City of San Jacinto (City) requests a six-month time extension to the period of contract award for the construction (CON) phase of the San Jacinto Valley Connect project. The City experienced an unexpected delay in awarding the project.

The City received their CON allocation in June 2018 and proceeded to advertise the project. The City Council authorized the bid advertisement of the ATP project and five bids were received. One bid was slightly below the Engineer’s Estimate and the others significantly above. The lowest bidder withdrew their bid after reconsideration of the bid proposal. The next lowest bidder is also above the Engineer’s Estimate and the City does not have the funding capacity to make up the shortfall. The City’s Engineering Department is currently analyzing the plans and estimates to determine if there are any issues with the quantities and unit costs. The City is repackaging the project and anticipates re-advertising in January 2019 and awarding within six months.

Therefore, the City requests a six-month extension to the CON phase by June 30, 2019.
### Time Extension/Waiver – Project Contract Award Deadline
#### Active Transportation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Extension Amount</th>
<th>Allocation Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Initial Request</th>
<th>Extended Deadline</th>
<th>Department Recommendation</th>
<th>Reason for Project Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>City of Plymouth</td>
<td>$770,000</td>
<td>06/28/2018</td>
<td>FATP-1718-19</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>06/30/2019</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Plymouth Main Street/Shenandoah Road Safe Routes to School Project. The City experienced an unexpected delay in awarding the project. The City received their construction allocation in June 2018 and proceeded with readying the package for advertisement. The Engineer’s Estimate was approximately $50,000 more than the City expected. The City secured additional local funding to make up the difference and proceeded with the advertisement. The City received two bids, with the lowest bid $200,000 above the Engineer’s Estimate. The City cannot fund the additional increase required to award the project. The City is also analyzing the project to reduce the overall cost without impacting the scope of the project. The City anticipates re-advertising the project by March 2019 and awarding by June 30, 2019. This additional time will allow the City sufficient time to respond to bidding inquiries, review bids, and award the project. Therefore, the City requests a six-month extension to the CON phase by June 30, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>City of Turlock</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>06/28/2018</td>
<td>FATP-1718-19</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>06/30/2019</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Christoffersen Parkway Pedestrian and Bike Improvements with Connectors project. The City experienced an unexpected delay in awarding the project. The City received their construction allocation in June 2018 and proceeded with advertising the project. Near the conclusion of the advertisement period, the City realized the project was receiving very little interest. The advertisement yielded zero bids and as a result, the City consulted with the Department on reviewing the package and the current bidding environment. The City re-advertised the project in December 2018. The City anticipates increased interest from contractors at the start of the year and expects awarding the project within six months. Therefore, the City requests a six-month extension to the CON phase by June 30, 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CEQA - California Environmental Quality Act
NEPA - National Environmental Policy Act
ATP - Active Transportation Program

FHWAs Federal Highway Administration
The Department-California Department of Transportation
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
   CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
   Chief Financial Officer

Subject: REQUEST TO EXTEND THE PERIOD OF CONTRACT AWARD FOR PROPOSITION 1A
   HIGH-SPEED PASSENGER TRAIN BOND (HSPTB) PROGRAM PROJECTS, PER
   HSPTBP GUIDELINES
   WAIVER 19-04

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.8b.(4)
Action Item

Prepared by: Ron Sheppard, Chief (Acting)
   Division of Rail and Mass Transportation

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve a six-month extension for the period of contract award to June 28, 2019, for the locally-administered Proposition 1A High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Program – Urban/Commuter (HSPTBP) Metrolink High Speed Readiness Program (PPNO CP002) project, in Los Angeles County?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation recommends that the Commission approve a six-month extension for the period of contract award, to June 28, 2019, for the locally-administered Proposition 1A HSPTBP Metrolink High Speed Readiness Program (PPNO CP002) project, in Los Angeles County.

BACKGROUND:

In June 2018, the Commission approved Resolution HST1A-A-1718-02, allocating a total of $20,207,000 in in Proposition 1A High-Speed Passenger Train Bond (HSPTB) funds for the Metrolink High Speed Readiness Program project. The award of a construction contract was expected by December 2018; however, due to delays experienced during the negotiation process as additional grant funding was identified, the recipient agency, the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCARRA), is requesting additional time as proposals will need to be revised and resubmitted accordingly.

Therefore, in accordance with Proposition 1A HSPTB Guidelines, the SCARRA respectfully requests a six-month extension for the period of contract award to June 30, 2019.
Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
    CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

From: STEVEN KECK
    Chief Financial Officer

Subject: REQUEST TO EXTEND THE PERIOD OF PROJECT COMPLETION FOR LOCALLY-ADMINISTERED ATP PROJECTS, PER ATP GUIDELINES WAIVER 19-05

CTC Meeting: January 30-31, 2019
Reference No.: 2.8c.
Action Item

Prepared by: Rihui Zhang, Chief
Division of Local Assistance

ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) extend the period of project completion for three projects listed on the attached document, for the time periods shown, in the Active Transportation Program (ATP)?

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) recommends the Commission extend the period of project completion for three projects listed on the attached document, for the time periods shown, in the ATP.

BACKGROUND:

The Commission allocated $2,440,000 for the construction of three ATP projects identified on the attachment. The responsible agencies will be unable to complete the projects as programmed. The attachment describes the details of the projects and the explanations for the delays. The respective agencies request extensions in accordance with program guidelines.

Current STIP Guidelines stipulate that a local agency has up to 36 months from the time of contract award to accept the contract. The local agency has 180 days after the contract acceptance to prepare and submit the final invoices and reports to the Department. The Guidelines further stipulate that the Commission may approve a waiver to the project completion deadline, one time only, for up to 12 months, in accordance with Section 14529.8 of the Government Code.

Attachment
Time Extension/Waiver – Project Completion Deadline
Active Transportation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Extension Amount</th>
<th>Award Date</th>
<th>Allocation Resolution Number</th>
<th>Number of Months Requested</th>
<th>CT Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Monterey</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>FATP-1516-12</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPNO: 05-2676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Monterey Active Transportation/Demand Management Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>$1,445,000</td>
<td>02/01/2016</td>
<td>FATP-1516-01</td>
<td>4 Months</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPNO: 07-4909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unincorporated Los Angeles County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Plans and Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City of Irvine</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>03/01/2016</td>
<td>FATP-1516-03</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPNO: 12-2170G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citywide Bicycle, Pedestrian Motorist Safety Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Monterey (City) requests a 12-month time extension to complete construction (CON) of the City of Monterey Active Transportation/Demand Management Program (Program). The City has experienced an unexpected delay in completing the Program.

The City received the construction allocation in June 2016 and began work on implementing the Program immediately. As part of the Program, the City performed extensive outreach and is creating a mobility toolkit web-based application that can help incentivize and qualify active transportation efforts with the different organizations within the City. However, the outreach and development of the toolkit required more time than originally anticipated, and the City is asking for additional time to implement the Program and introduce the toolkit to different groups and organizations to promote active transportation.

Therefore, the City is requesting a 12-month completion time extension to June 30, 2020.

Los Angeles (County) requests a four-month time extension to complete construction (CON) of the Unincorporated Los Angeles County Pedestrian Plans and Programs. The County has experienced an unexpected delay in completing the project.

The project includes non-infrastructure pedestrian plans and programs in the unincorporated communities in Los Angeles County. The scope of the project includes data collection and analysis, community-driven pedestrian planning, public awareness campaigns and education and encouragement programs to specific communities. As part of the outreach efforts, Tribal Consultation, as required under Senate Bill 18 and Assembly Bill 52, took longer than anticipated. The project and CEQA document could not have been introduced or adopted by the Regional Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors until the Tribal Consultation process was completed. The Tribal Consultation is now complete and is pending public notice and hearing to adopt the project and CEQA documents. The County is asking for additional time to allow the project and CEQA document be heard and approved.

Therefore, the County is requesting a four-month completion time extension to June 30, 2019.

The City of Irvine (City) requests a 12-month time extension to complete construction (CON) of the Citywide Bicycle, Pedestrian Motorist Safety Program. The City has experienced an unexpected delay during the completion of the program.

The City’s program was delayed due to the development of a new Transportation Commission (TC) and new Transportation Department (TD) in the City of Irvine. The creation of the TC and TD were unforeseen at the time of the ATP application. The City began working on the program in February 2016, before the creation of the TC and TD, however, the program was stalled 13 months until the completion of the new TC and TD in July 2017. The City required input from the new TC and TD staffing before permitting the re-start of the program. The development of the new TC and TD resulted in a 13-month delay, however, the City is anticipates completing the program within the maximum allowable extension of 12-months.

Therefore, the City is requesting a 12-month completion time extension March 31, 2020.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Extension Type</th>
<th>Proj #</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Agency Request</th>
<th>Caltrans Extension Request</th>
<th>CTC Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.8b(1) SHOPP - Contract Award and Construction Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04-0142F</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caltrans requests additional time to advertise and award the project by March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.8b(1) SHOPP - Contract Award and Construction Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>04-08380N</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Caltrans requests additional time to advertise and award the project by June 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.8b(1) SHOPP - Contract Award and Construction Support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>04-1488P</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Caltrans requests additional time to advertise and award the project by June 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.8b(1) SHOPP - Contract Award and Construction Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>04-2130F</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Caltrans requests additional time to advertise and award the project by June 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.8b(1) SHOPP - Contract Award and Construction Support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>04-1482K</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Caltrans requests additional time to advertise and award the project by September 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.8b(1) SHOPP - Contract Award and Construction Support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>04-1488V</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Project was awarded prior to the CTC meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.8b(1) SHOPP - Contract Award and Construction Support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>08-0056H</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caltrans requests additional time to advertise and award the project by April 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.8b(1) SHOPP - Contract Award and Construction Support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>08-0199J</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caltrans requests additional time to advertise and award the project by April 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.8b(1) SHOPP - Contract Award and Construction Support</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>02-3314</td>
<td>Siskiyou</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Caltrans requests additional time to advertise and award the project by June 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.8b(2) Active Transportation Program - Contract Award</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>07-5141</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>City of Downey</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>The City experienced an unexpected delay during the bidding of the project due to extensive review of sample RFP’s. The City requests additional time to hold bid opening and award the project by March 30, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.8b(2) Active Transportation Program - Contract Award</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>07-5143</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>City of Oxnard</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>The City experienced an unexpected delay during the bidding of the project due to additional reviews and revisions to the package by new staff. The City requests additional time to advertise and award the project by June 30, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.8b(2) Active Transportation Program - Contract Award</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>07-53844</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) experienced an unexpected delay in awarding the project due to acquisition of additional equipment which will expand the project limits. Metro requests to refine the package, advertise and award by June 30, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.8b(2) Active Transportation Program - Contract Award</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>08-1199B</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>The County experienced an unexpected delay in awarding this non-infrastructure project due to changes in the California Highway Patrol’s (CHP) contract procedures. The local CHP office is willing to perform the work, so the County requests an extension to award the contract by March 31, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.8b(2) Active Transportation Program - Contract Award</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>08-1200B</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>The County experienced an unexpected delay in awarding this non-infrastructure project due to changes in the California Highway Patrol’s (CHP) contract procedures. The local CHP office is willing to perform the work, so the County requests an extension to award the contract by March 31, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.8b(2) Active Transportation Program - Contract Award</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>08-1203</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>City of San Jacinto</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>The City experienced an unexpected delay in awarding the project because the bids received were above the engineer’s estimate and the City cannot make up the shortfall. The City will repackage and re-advertise and award the project by June 30, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.8b(2) Active Transportation Program - Contract Award</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10-3178</td>
<td>Amador</td>
<td>City of Plymouth</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>The City experienced an unexpected delay in awarding the project because the bids received were above the engineer’s estimate and the City cannot make up the shortfall. The City will repackage and re-advertise and award the project by June 30, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.8b(2) Active Transportation Program - Contract Award</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10-3184A</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>City of Turlock</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>The City experienced an unexpected delay in awarding the project because the City received zero bids. The City has re-advertised and expects to award the project by June 30, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item #</td>
<td>Ref #</td>
<td>Extension Type</td>
<td>Proj #</td>
<td>PPNO</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Agency Request</td>
<td>Caltrans Extension Request</td>
<td>CTC Staff Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.8b(4)</td>
<td>Proposition 1A High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Program-Contract Award</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CP002</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Southern California Regional Rail Authority</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.8c.</td>
<td>Active Transportation Program - Project Completion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05-2676</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>City of Monterey</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.8c.</td>
<td>Active Transportation Program - Project Completion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>07-4909</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.8c.</td>
<td>Active Transportation Program - Project Completion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12-2170G</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>City of Irvine</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>