

M e m o r a n d u m

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION **CTC Meeting:** May 17-18, 2017

From: NORMA ORTEGA
Chief Financial Officer **Prepared by:** Michael Johnson
State Asset Management
Engineer

Subject: 2017 TEN-YEAR STATE HIGHWAY OPERATION AND PROTECTION PLAN **Reference No.:** 4.8
Information Item

SUMMARY:

In accordance with Streets and Highways (S&H) Code Section 164.6, the California Department of Transportation (Department) prepares a ten-year state rehabilitation plan every two years that identifies the rehabilitation and reconstruction needs of all highways and bridges on the State Highway System. Additionally, S&H Code Section 164.6 requires transmittal to the Governor and the Legislature by May 1 of each odd-numbered year.

This action has been delayed by the Department and will not be submitted until comments received during the California Transportation Commission (Commission) May 2017 meeting are considered and incorporated into the final version.

BACKGROUND:

The Department prepares a ten-year state rehabilitation plan every two years that identifies the rehabilitation and reconstruction needs of all highways and bridges owned by the state. Because the projects to implement the plan are primarily funded through the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), the plan is also referred to as the Ten-Year SHOPP Plan (Plan). The plan provides input for the funding distribution in the fund estimate adopted by the Commission in August of each odd-numbered year. S&H Code Section 164.6 contains specific requirements as to the content of the plan, all of which are included in the attached document. Additionally, S&H Code Section 164.6 requires transmittal to the Governor and the Legislature by May 1 of odd-numbered years.

Attached is a summary of the 2017 SHOPP Plan content that is a subset of the Draft 2017 State Highway System Management Plan (SHSMP). It focuses on SHSMP content that comprises the 2017 Ten-Year SHOPP Plan as required by S&H Code Section 164.6. There is not a separate, stand-alone Draft Ten-Year SHOPP Plan. This summary clarifies which components of the SHSMP are relevant to the Commission in regards to providing comments on the Draft 2017 Ten-Year SHOPP Plan. When finalized, the SHSMP will include the Ten-Year SHOPP Plan and a separate document will not be issued.

Attachments

2017 Ten-Year State Highway Operation and Protection Program Plan Content Summary 2017 State Highway System Management Plan

2017 TEN-YEAR STATE HIGHWAY OPERATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM (SHOPP) PLAN CONTENT SUMMARY

This document is a subset of the Draft 2017 State Highway System Management Plan (SHSMP), which is attached for reference. It focuses on SHSMP content that comprises the Draft 2017 Ten-Year State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) Plan as required by California Streets and Highways Code Section 164.6. There is not a separate, stand-alone Draft Ten-Year SHOPP Plan. This summary clarifies which components of the SHSMP are relevant to the Commission in regards to providing comments on the Draft 2017 Ten-Year SHOPP Plan. When finalized, the SHSMP will include the Ten-Year SHOPP Plan and a separate document will not be issued.

As the State Highway System (SHS) continues to age, the demands of automotive and truck traffic is accelerating the deterioration of these assets. Compounding this deterioration is the lack of adequate funding for rehabilitation and restoration work necessary to bring highway infrastructure to a state of good operating condition. The increased demands and deferred rehabilitation and restoration results in lower operational performance, higher user operating costs and ultimately require a higher overall investment when needed repairs to the system are undertaken.

The ten-year escalated need for the rehabilitation and operation of the State Highway System (SHS) for the period 2017-18 through 2026-27 is \$85.8 billion. Absent additional revenue, the annual funding shortfall to meet SHS rehabilitation and operation needs is estimated at approximately \$6.1 billion.

MAINTENANCE VERSUS SHOPP ACTIVITIES AND PROJECTS

Caltrans strives to preserve the condition of the SHS in the most economical means possible by performing the right treatment at the right time through a three-pronged approach: (1) field maintenance, (2) Highway Maintenance (HM) projects and (3) SHOPP projects.

1. **Field maintenance** activities are the day-to-day demands that Caltrans maintenance staff must regularly react to. Maintenance strategies are important tools for extending the service life of assets in a cost-effective manner. Preventive maintenance is applied to assets in good condition and some fair condition assets when appropriate, with the goal of maintaining their condition. Local crews address minor maintenance, repairs, and preservation work. This typically includes pothole repair, crack sealing, cleaning of drains, servicing lighting and signs, structural painting, minor facility repairs, irrigation repairs and more. Crews also provide rapid response to repair minor accident damage. These field activities are the first line of defense in Caltrans' maintenance of the SHS, and are reactionary in nature. Caltrans employs maintenance crews

that collectively perform many aspects of ongoing maintenance of the highways and assets within the SHS. Every dollar spent on preventive maintenance delays the need for an equivalent \$3 in rehabilitation or \$8 in reconstruction or replacement of pavement in the future.

2. **Highway Maintenance** projects help further prolong the life of existing infrastructure. These projects include preventive and corrective maintenance work that exceeds the scope of what our crews can handle. Corrective maintenance typically applies to assets in fair condition; however, can also be applied to some assets in poor condition in some cases, with the goal of restoration to good condition. Asset deterioration can accelerate the longer the asset is in fair condition. A timely application of corrective maintenance can avoid more costly treatments later. The Maintenance Division utilizes contractors and service providers to execute work designed to extend the life of physical assets and delay rehabilitation or replacement of assets. HM projects are contract work routinely performed on pavements, bridges, culverts, facilities, traffic management systems and more. HM Projects may be preventive or corrective in nature. Examples include thin pavement overlays, bridge joint seals, and culvert repairs. These projects repair, but do not upgrade or replace the facilities.
3. **SHOPP** projects are necessary when field maintenance and more extensive HM project activities are no longer cost-effective or viable, asset rehabilitation or replacement is considered. Rehabilitation or replacement typically applies to assets in both fair and poor condition and is typically funded through the SHOPP. SHOPP projects are more complex capital construction projects that utilize private construction contractors through a competitive bidding process. These projects are overhauls of infrastructure that is nearing the end of its lifespan, and may involve complex upgrades. These projects may involve extensive planning and design, environmental permitting and even right-of-way acquisition. Rehabilitation and replacement activities are performed on pavements, bridges, culverts, buildings, overhead signs, lights, roadside elements and safety roadside rest areas. In addition to managing the condition of the physical infrastructure, Caltrans invests in safety improvements, operational improvements, environmental mitigation, traffic management systems, freight improvements and system resiliency activities. The SHOPP invests available funds to implement safety improvements, rehabilitate or replace physical assets, improve the operation of the highways, improve the system resiliency and mitigate transportation related environmental impacts. The SHOPP includes 34 specific focus areas that are individually described in the Needs Assessment. The Commission has direct responsibility to adopt the projects that constitute the SHOPP and to approve all scope, schedule and costs changes to the adopted projects. Further, the Commission has responsibility to set asset performance targets that help ensure the investments made through the SHOPP are achieving the desired statewide transportation outcomes. SHOPP funding cannot be used to add new highway lanes, though there is limited and narrow authority to use SHOPP funding to add truck climbing lanes and auxiliary lanes.

Utilizing this three-pronged approach to asset preservation, Caltrans crews are able to make timely repairs on minor needs before they grow into major and more expensive problems to fix, contract for highway maintenance activities at the right time to extend the useful life of the assets at the lowest possible long-term cost and delay future rehabilitation or replacement activities, and to then invest in major asset rehabilitation or replacement projects when the useful life of an asset has been reached.

Beyond the asset management objective of taking care of the existing SHS assets, there are additional SHS needs for upgrading and expanding facilities to accommodate increased freight movement, broader economic growth, population increases, new transportation technologies and evolving land use patterns. These needs are beyond the scope of the funding provided through the Maintenance and SHOPP programs and are instead addressed through a variety of other funding programs such as the recently enacted Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), state transportation bond programs, local transportation tax measures and other funding programs. All of these programs invest in the SHS, as well as local roads, and sometimes address SHS preservation needs at the same time. As projects are developed and constructed through these other funding programs, it is essential that the project development process incorporate life cycle and asset management considerations so that when the SHS projects are completed and operational and come under the auspices of the Maintenance and SHOPP programs, the projects are designed and to be as efficient and cost-effective as possible to maintain, preserve, and when the time comes, rehabilitate.

STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The California Streets and Highway Code requires the development of a SHS Needs Assessment that defines the program areas and costs associated with achieving defined condition and performance targets. The Needs Assessment is intended to provide a picture of the total needs of the SHS and is not constrained by available funding. The majority of the needs on the SHS are determined through a gap analysis completed as part of the implementation of performance management. The performance management approach captures all of the needs associated with fair and poor condition gaps. Preventive maintenance needs, associated with activities that focus on keeping good condition assets in good condition as long as possible, are added to the performance management gap analysis needs to determine the total need required for the maintenance, rehabilitation and operation of the existing SHS.

The performance management based Needs Assessment conducted for this document is limited to activities that are consistent with state laws that govern the use of Maintenance and SHOPP funds. Generally, these laws require the available funding to be expended on the safety, maintenance, rehabilitation and operation of the existing system. System expansion is not permitted through Maintenance or SHOPP programs.

The SHOPP needs are determined through performance management gap analysis. The performance management approach involves the following general steps:

1. Establish the asset inventory or deficiency level
2. Establish the current and projected future condition/performance level of each objective
3. Establish goals to achieve desired asset performance levels
4. Perform a gap analysis between the projected condition/performance and the performance goals
5. Estimate the cost to close the performance gaps

These five steps are repeated for each objective being tracked by Caltrans related to the maintenance, rehabilitation and operation of the SHS. There are three distinct performance management models incorporated into the SHSMP: (1) asset, (2) deficiency and (3) reservation.

1. The asset model is used for physical assets such as pavements, bridges, culverts or any other tangible highway item. The asset model defines an inventory such as the number of lane miles of pavement or the square feet of bridge deck area contained in the SHS. The inventory condition is reported as a percentage of the total in good, fair or poor categories. The performance management approach applies a deterioration rate to each asset to account for expected future conditions. Condition goals for the physical assets are defined with key goals

being approved by the Commission. The gap analysis determines the number of lane miles or bridge deck area between projections and the desired performance goal. The performance management analysis has both a system preservation and rehabilitation/replacement goal to ensure a balanced management approach. The existing program of work (active projects) is then deducted from these gaps to determine the unaddressed need. The cost to improve the condition to the established goals is then estimated using historical unit costs. These costs, combined with the existing program of work, represents the total need over the ten-year period.

2. The deficiency model is used for objectives like storm water mitigation, safety or Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) needs. These needs do not have a condition breakdown like the physical assets; they are either deficient or not. A gap analysis between the current deficiency and the goal is conducted similar to the asset model. The program of active projects is again deducted from the gap analysis to determine the unaddressed need. Cost estimates to address this need are calculated similar to the asset model.
3. The final Needs Assessment model is for unplanned needs. Emergency response activities and hazardous waste clean-up use this model. Objectives using the reservation model cannot be predicted in terms of the quantity or location of need as location and scope of needs are not known until an event such as a flood or landslide occurs. To effectively manage the SHS, Caltrans holds a financial reservation for when these needs arise. Reservations do not have an identified inventory, condition breakdown or goal. The reservation levels are established based on historical demand in the respective areas.

These various individual models are aggregated up to develop the statewide need figures shown in Ten-Year SHOPP Needs Table on the following page. In total, there are 34 different objectives being combined together in the Needs Assessment.

Ten-Year SHOPP Needs

Objectives	Sum*
	(in millions)
Safety	\$13,333
Bridge Rail Replacement and Upgrade	\$6,197
Collision Severity Reduction	\$1,324
Roadside Safety Improvements	\$1,602
Safety Improvements	\$4,210
Stewardship	\$35,529
Bridge Health	\$5,485
Drainage Pump Plants	\$165
Drainage System Restoration	\$2,567
Lighting Rehabilitation	\$602
Major Damage (Emergency Opening)	\$1,525
Major Damage (Permanent Restoration)	\$1,335
Office Buildings	\$491
Overhead Sign Structures Rehabilitation	\$481
Pavement Class I	\$12,552
Pavement Class II	\$4,970
Pavement Class III	\$1,185
Relinquishments	\$29
Roadway Protective Betterments	\$467
Safety Roadside Rest Area (SRRRA) Rehabilitation	\$1,192
Transportation Related Facilities	\$2,387
Water and Wastewater Treatment at SRRAs	\$96
Sustainability	\$10,698
ADA Pedestrian Infrastructure	\$972
Advance Mitigation	\$300
Bridge Scour Mitigation	\$847
Bridge Seismic Restoration	\$3,089
Hazardous Waste Mitigation	\$5
Roadside Rehabilitation	\$2,025
Storm Water Mitigation	\$3,444
Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure	\$15
Performance	\$9,859
Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facilities	\$129
Operational Improvements	\$933
Sign Panel Replacement	\$700
Transportation Management Systems	\$1,810
Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades	\$5,907
Weigh-In-Motion Scales	\$379
Subtotal	\$69,418
Asset Management Pilot Program	\$82
Minor Program	\$1,500
PID Program Support	\$1,379
Total	\$72,379
Escalated Total	\$85,771

*Numbers may not add due to rounding

COMMISSION ADOPTED INTEGRATED ASSET CLASS SUMMARY

The California Transportation Commission defined four asset classes as “focus areas” in accordance with California Government Code. The four asset classes: pavement, bridges, culverts and transportation management systems were selected because they represent a significant portion of annual transportation investments in California. Pavements and bridges are also defined under provisions of the MAP-21 and FAST Acts. This section consolidates information presented in the Needs Assessment, Investment Plan and Performance Outcomes sections of this Plan and organizes this information by each of the asset classes.

Pavement

Maintaining the condition of the pavement on California’s highways is the single most costly investment made on an annual basis. The large needs are a function of the size of the system, rapid deterioration caused by heavy use and costs associated with fixing the pavement. Pavement assets are divided into three pavement classes that reflect the varying demands of the different classes of roadways that make up the SHS.

The condition of the pavement inventory is deteriorating at a rate of 9 percent per year from good to fair and at a rate of between 3-4 percent from fair to poor (as shown in Chart 1).

The 2017 SHSMP establishes a goal of treating 1,900 lane miles annually through HM projects, based on existing funding of \$234 million for HM projects. Caltrans anticipates using 10 percent of the HM funding to address the fair performance gap and 90 percent of the funding to keep pavement in good condition. Currently, there are




Chart 1. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for pavement on the SHS. Currently there is between 35-45 percent of pavement in good condition – which ranges by pavement classification. Approximately 9 percent of pavement in good condition deteriorates to fair condition annually. Of the 51-58 percent of pavement in fair condition, approximately 3-4 percent of the pavement inventory declines to poor condition annually. SHOPP projects address pavement in both fair and poor condition and restores the condition of approximately 1,374 lane miles annually, while maintenance focuses on maintaining 1,710 lane miles in good condition as well addressing 190 lane miles of pavement in fair condition. It should be noted the deterioration rates are revised based on proposed MAP-21 condition criteria.

maintenance needs on approximately 12,900 lane miles of pavement. The maintenance need is expected to grow to slightly over 13,000 lane miles at the end of a ten-year period with funding at the current level and the rate of deterioration as shown in Chart 1. The expected modest increase in maintenance needs over the ten-year period would be offset by increased investment in the SHOPP. If pavement rehabilitation is funded in the SHOPP consistent with this report, no additional funding is recommended for the pavement maintenance program, as growth of future maintenance would be reduced. If pavement rehabilitation is not funded in the SHOPP as proposed in this Plan, the pavement maintenance needs will grow over time.

Bridge

Bridge maintenance needs are identified and documented during bridge inspections and through engineering analysis. Identified preventive maintenance needs that are beyond the capacity of Caltrans bridge crews are developed into projects to be completed under HM contracts. Development and construction of a typical bridge maintenance project takes approximately two to three years. While the current project stream is in development, additional HM needs are continuously being identified by the bridge inspectors.

As the bridge inventory ages, the rate of newly identified maintenance needs is growing and is expected to continue that growth in the future. This increase, considering the number of bridges Caltrans is able to address through HM bridge projects and state forces, is tracking with expectations. Through a combination of strategic planning, maintenance field activities, and bridge preservation contracts, Caltrans is working to slow the growth of rehabilitation and replacement needs.

The Bridge Health objective in the SHOPP has a projected performance gap of 5.8 million square feet (approximately 310




Chart 2. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for bridges on the SHS. Currently 75 percent of bridge decks, measured by square feet, are in good condition. Approximately 0.45 percent of bridge decks in good condition deteriorates to fair condition annually. Of the 22 percent of bridge decks in fair condition, approximately 0.75 percent of the bridge deck inventory declines to poor condition annually. SHOPP projects address 2.3 million square feet of bridge decks annually in both fair and poor condition and restores the condition of the asset, while maintenance focuses on maintaining 5.4 million square feet annually of bridge decks in good condition as well addressing some bridge decks in fair condition.

bridges) of deck area in fair condition. It is anticipated that the Maintenance Program will address 40 percent of that performance gap (2.3 million square feet or 124 bridges) through HM projects while continuing to provide preventive maintenance measures on good condition bridges to prevent them from deteriorating into fair condition. If bridge rehabilitation is funded consistent with the SHOPP Investment Plan identified in this Plan, no additional funding is recommended for the bridge maintenance program. If bridge rehabilitation and replacement is not funded as recommended in this Plan, the bridge maintenance needs will grow over time.

Drainage (Culvert)

Caltrans continues to build our inventory of culverts running under or draining the SHS. Ongoing culvert inspections are adding between 8,000-12,000 culverts to the statewide inventory annually. Inspection production rates are dependent on many factors including right-of-way constraints, environmental permits, multiyear mitigation permits, and traffic considerations. Much of the “easier” access locations have been captured leaving locations that are more difficult to access and more time consuming to inspect. Caltrans is actively pursuing various methods to increase the number of inspections performed. Between 2014-15 and 2015-16 an annual average of 8,215 culverts were inspected.

The condition of the culvert inventory is deteriorating at a rate of 2 percent per year – both from good to fair and from fair to poor. Based on historical assessment rates and anticipated rates of deterioration creates an annual increase of approximately 270,000 linear feet (2,760 culverts) in the fair category and an annual increase of 141,000 linear feet (1,440 culverts) to the poor category.

Between 2014-15 and 2015-16 an annual average of 144 culverts were repaired through HM contracts. There are approximately 392,000 linear feet (4,000 culverts) in need




Chart 3. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for drainage systems (culverts) on the SHS. Currently 65 percent of culverts, measured by linear feet, are in good condition. Approximately 2 percent of culverts in good condition deteriorate to fair condition annually. Of the 23 percent of culverts in fair condition, approximately 2 percent of the culvert inventory declines to poor condition annually. SHOPP projects address over 40,375 linear feet of culverts annually in both fair and poor condition and restores the condition of the asset, while maintenance focuses on maintaining 14,000 linear feet of culverts annually in good condition as well addressing culverts in fair condition.

of maintenance on an annual basis. At the current annual maintenance investment of \$23 million, the number of culverts in need of maintenance treatment is anticipated to increase to just short of 6.9 million linear feet (70,000 culverts) in a ten-year period.

The culvert maintenance needs have been recognized in various funding proposals; therefore, no additional changes are recommended to the \$23 million annual level of investment. The 2017 SHSMP Investment Plan calls for an investment of \$845 million for culvert rehabilitation and replacement in the SHOPP. If Drainage System Restoration is funded consistent with the SHOPP Investment Plan identified in this Plan, no additional funding is recommended.

TMS Elements

Preventive maintenance is performed on a regular basis to keep TMS equipment in good working order and achieve maximum service life. TMS elements on the SHS deteriorate at a rate of almost 5 percent per year and require over 80,000 preventive maintenance checks and repairs annually to existing TMS inventory to maintain operating condition. Maintenance utilizes a combination of state forces and on-call service contracts to maintain TMS elements. TMS field elements are maintained with a goal Level of Service score of 90. State forces address preventive maintenance checks and repairs for the majority of field elements such as traffic signals, ramp meters as well as other TMS elements. On-call service contracts are primarily used for maintaining the communications infrastructure associated with TOSNET which include the maintenance of wireless assets, fiber optic cables, copper cable, and communications hubs.

Through a combination of state forces and on-call service contracts, Caltrans is able to address more than 52,000 preventive maintenance




Chart 4. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for TMS elements on the SHS. Currently 59 percent of TMS elements are in good condition. TMS elements are categorized as good or poor condition. As a result, approximately 4.73 percent of TMS elements deteriorate to poor condition annually. 41 percent of TMS assets are currently in poor condition. SHOPP projects address 377 TMS elements annually in poor condition and restores the condition of the asset, while maintenance focuses on maintaining TMS elements in good condition by performing over 52,000 preventive maintenance checks as well as repairs annually.

checks and repairs annually. Some assets reporting in poor condition may be operational but have exceeded the expected service life and are obsolete. As a result, operational readiness may be higher than good condition shown in Chart 4. The operational readiness of TMS elements, except for traffic signals, ranges between 65-85 percent good, varying by district. Caltrans is working diligently to increase the operational readiness of TMS assets. Caltrans Maintenance Program expends an average of \$20 million and 169 positions on the maintenance of these assets and recommends the existing level of funding to maintain TMS elements remain unchanged. If TMS elements are provided funding consistent with the SHOPP Investment Plan, no additional funding is recommended for the TMS in the Maintenance Program. The SHOPP Investment Plan calls for \$864 million investment for TMS elements. Given the combined investments in TMS, the condition is expected to improve markedly in the early portion of the plan period due to a 2016 SHOPP investment in detection and then begin to slowly decline later in the Plan period.

Release Copy

2017

State
Highway
System
Management
Plan



California Department of Transportation



March 8, 2017

Prepared by
California Department of Transportation
in accordance with Streets and Highways Code 164.6

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	5
STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM MANAGEMENT PLAN ORGANIZATION	7
CALIFORNIA STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM.....	8
ASSET MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE	10
STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM FUNDING TRENDS	13
Funding Challenges	14
Split of State Taxes between State and Local	15
Cost Escalation.....	17
NEEDS ASSESSMENT	19
Maintenance Needs	20
State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Needs.....	20
Operational Improvement Needs	23
TEN-YEAR INVESTMENT PLAN.....	24
Maintenance Investment Plan	25
SHOPP Investment Plan	26
PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES	27
TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROPOSALS	29
PROGRAM DEFINITIONS.....	30
Safety	30
Bridge Rail Replacement and Upgrade.....	30
Safety Improvements and Collision Severity Reduction	31
Roadside Safety Improvements	31
Stewardship.....	33
Bridge Health	33
Drainage System Restoration.....	35
Lighting Rehabilitation	37
Major Damage (Emergency Opening).....	37
Major Damage (Permanent Restoration)	38
Office Buildings.....	39
Overhead Sign Structure Rehabilitation	39
Pavement.....	39
Relinquishments.....	43

Roadway Protective Betterments	43
Safety Roadside Rest Area Rehabilitation	44
Transportation Related Facilities	45
Water and Wastewater Treatment at SRRAs	45
Sustainability.....	46
Americans with Disabilities Act Pedestrian Infrastructure	46
Advance Mitigation.....	47
Bridge Scour Mitigation.....	48
Bridge Seismic Restoration.....	49
Hazardous Waste Mitigation.....	49
Roadside Rehabilitation	50
Storm Water Mitigation	51
Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure	53
Complete Streets and Climate Change.....	53
Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facilities	55
Operational Improvements.....	55
Sign Panel Replacement.....	56
Transportation Management Systems	56
Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades.....	58
Weigh-In-Motion Scales	58
Freight	59
Organizational Excellence	60
INTEGRATED ASSET CLASS SUMMARY	61
MAINTENANCE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS.....	66
Cost Effectiveness	66
Maintenance Program Budget.....	68
Highway Maintenance Projects.....	68
Maintenance Program Budget Allocation Tool (State Forces)	68
CONCLUSION	69
APPENDIX A: STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	71
APPENDIX B: PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SUMMARY SHEETS	74
APPENDIX C: GLOSSARY	77

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2017 State Highway System Management Plan (SHSMP) is a new integrated management plan that fulfills the Streets and Highway Code section 164.6 requirements for the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Ten-Year Plan and the Five-Year Maintenance Plan.

The SHSMP integrates the maintenance, rehabilitation and operation into a single management plan that implements a number of key federal asset management requirements. The SHSMP organizes key activity areas into categories that align with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Strategic Management Plan. The SHSMP introduces new national performance measures for pavement and bridges as required by federal law, presents performance targets approved under provisions of California Senate Bill 486, implements the results of the Automated Pavement Condition Survey (APCS) and pavement management system in a plan that has unprecedented transparency.

The Plan fundamentally changes the way Caltrans manages available funding by focusing on measured condition and performance objectives. The historic asset-based funding approach has been replaced by a performance based approach that provides greater local flexibility to achieve multiple objectives within a single project. The new management methodology allows Caltrans to better integrate multimodal transportation options into traditional rehabilitation work to provide a cost-effective way to expand mode choice and reduce transportation related emissions.

The SHSMP includes a Needs Assessment to achieve the established performance targets and an Investment Plan that will guide the management of the State Highway System (SHS) and related infrastructure.

The Needs Assessment is an aggregation of numerous analyses that fully defines our existing inventory or deficiencies, conditions and performance targets, presents existing pipeline of work, a gap analysis and cost estimate to close the gap. Collectively these steps are referred to as Performance Management and are a requirement of our Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) under federal regulations. The ten-year Needs Assessment identified a total need to maintain the existing system as shown in the following table.

Table 1. Program Funding Projected vs. Available

Program	Ten-Year Needs (in billions)	Available Funding (in billions)
Highway Maintenance (Maintenance Program)	\$10.3	\$4.2
Rehabilitation / Operations (SHOPP)	\$85.8	\$26.6
Total	\$96.1	\$30.8

The Needs Assessment identified for the 2017 SHSMP reflects a total increase of approximately \$6 billion over estimates in the 2015 SHOPP Plan. Four billion dollars of the \$6 billion is attributable to

higher cost inflation factors used to project the cost of construction in future years. Addressing transportation funding needs now, has the benefit of accelerating road repair projects that improve facilities and also reduces the impact of future construction cost inflation. In addition to escalation increases, the 2017 Plan reflects an increase of approximately \$2.5 billion in needs relative to the 2015 Plan.

The SHS needs for the existing system exceeds the funding currently available. There are a number of proposals currently being considered that would augment the funding currently available for maintenance and rehabilitation of the existing SHS. The Highway Maintenance program is focusing on four asset classes; pavement, bridges, culverts and transportation management system projects with an identified ten-year funding shortfall of approximately \$6.1 billion. The SHOPP has a \$59.2 billion ten-year funding shortfall that imposes a significant constraint that requires transportation objectives to be prioritized for funding. The constrained funding proposal is presented in the SHSMP as an Investment Plan.

The SHSMP Investment Plan considers many factors including judicial and legislated mandates, consequences of inaction, current condition levels, system performance and environmental stewardship to arrive at the proposed allocation of funding. A breakdown of the recommended Maintenance and SHOPP Investment Plans for the ten-year period is as follows:




Chart 1. Investment Plan by Program

With the available funding and anticipated deterioration over the next ten years, Caltrans expects to be able to complete maintenance and rehabilitation work as shown in the Performance Outcomes section

of this plan. The following table highlights expected accomplishments for the four major asset classes. This table shows the combined performance from the Maintenance and SHOPP programs. Assets in good condition show the quantity of preventive maintenance treatments that can be applied, fair condition assets show a range of corrective maintenance to minor rehabilitation that can be carried out in the Maintenance Program or SHOPP, and the poor asset category reflect rehabilitation or replacement quantities possible with available funding. Quantities have been rounded for presentation.

Table 2. Estimated Ten-Year Performance Accomplishments

Asset Class	Good Condition (Preventive Maintenance)	Fair Condition (Maintenance and SHOPP)	Poor Condition (Rehab or Replacement)
Pavement	17,000 Lane Miles	12,000 Lane Miles	3,200 Lane Miles
Bridges	31 million Square Feet	41 million Square Feet	5 million Square Feet
Culverts	N/A	148,000 Linear Feet	396,000 Linear Feet
Transportation Management Systems (TMS)	524,000 Maintenance checks/repairs	N/A	3,700 Replacements 1,600 New Elements

With the current constrained funding, the accomplishments possible over the next ten years will not be adequate to maintain the current condition of the SHS. The following table provides the projected condition for the four asset classes at the end of the Plan period relative to current conditions.

Table 3. End of Plan Condition Estimates

Asset Class	Projected End of Plan Condition Relative to Current
Pavement	The amount of poor condition pavement is expected to increase over the Plan period in all pavement classes. The fair pavement conditions are expected to improve slightly for Classes I and II and be flat for Class III. Inexpensive short-term repairs will be necessary to maintain operation of the highway.
Bridges	The number of bridges in poor condition is expected to increase slightly over the ten-year period due to investments in several larger bridge replacements that limit the count of bridges that can be addressed.
Culverts	The culvert inventory is expected to grow substantially, and the culvert needs will increase proportionately. The condition of the culverts is expected to gradually decline over the Plan period.
Transportation Management Systems (TMS)	The TMS inventory is expected to grow over the plan period and the condition is expected to improve markedly in the early years of the Plan due to increased investments in the 2016 SHOPP, but is expected to begin to decline again by the end of the Plan period if additional investments are not made.

There has been broad recognition of the transportation funding shortfall and the unsustainable transportation revenue structure in general. The Fiscal Year 2017-18 Governor's Budget proposal calls for increased transportation funding that would provide the resources necessary to achieve condition targets approved by the California Transportation Commission (Commission) for the four primary asset

classes. Caltrans has been piloting a road user charge transportation funding structure that may also provide a pathway to more stable transportation funding in the future. If the Governor's transportation funding proposal is passed, the ten-year funding provided would allow the condition of the four major asset classes to be improved to the target levels approved by the Commission over the ten-year period beginning July 2017 as shown below:

Table 4. Funding Proposal Accomplishment Comparison

Asset	Without New Investment	With New Investment
Pavement	Lane miles in poor condition will grow to 9,500	17,000 lane miles of pavement fixed, resulting in 98 percent good or fair condition
Bridges	Bridges in poor condition will grow to 500	500 bridges fixed, resulting in 98.5 percent good or fair condition
Culverts	Culverts in fair or poor condition will grow to 74,000	55,000 culverts fixed, resulting in 90 percent in good or fair condition
Transportation Management Systems (TMS)	8,000 TMS elements that are inoperable representing ramp meters, cameras, changeable message signs, and loop detectors	7,700 TMS elements fixed, resulting in 90 percent in good condition

Until the transportation funding situation is resolved, Caltrans will continue to prioritize investments on the core highway asset classes on the most critical routes. This practice effectively defers addressing identified needs in other areas. The deferment of needs in areas such as facilities presents a growing liability that carries with it the potential for more costly ultimate fixes.

The SHSMP brings together many changes that collectively are designed to improve the management of the system, squarely focus activities on performance in alignment with our Strategic Management Plan and provide structural changes and transparency that improve asset management of the SHS.

INTRODUCTION

The 2017 State Highway System Management Plan (SHSMP) is a new integrated management plan that encompasses the Streets and Highway Code section 164.6 requirements for the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Ten-Year Plan and the Five-Year Maintenance Plan. The Streets and Highway Code requires California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to prepare an update to this Plan every two years. The SHSMP includes both a Needs Assessment and Investment Plan that will guide the management of the State Highway System (SHS) and related infrastructure. The SHSMP includes a number of significant changes that are part of the overall implementation of asset management in California.

The SHSMP reorganizes key activity areas into categories that fully align with the Caltrans Strategic Management Plan. The new structure provides greater clarity on the specific strategic goals Caltrans is working to accomplish, along with more transparency of the level of needs and investments in each of the strategic areas.

Another major change is the integration of the investments made through the SHOPP and Maintenance Programs for pavements, bridges, culverts and transportation management system (TMS) elements. These four asset classes represent a significant portion of the SHS maintenance and rehabilitation investments in California and were designated as focus areas by the California Transportation Commission (Commission) as part of the ongoing implementation of asset management. The integrated presentation provides a clear understanding of how these funding programs work together to a continuum of management of the assets throughout their life cycle.

The SHSMP implements a number of key requirements of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) and Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act for asset management. This Plan implements the federal requirements for performance management required for all states. The principles of performance management are applied at the asset level to develop the total need for the asset subject to defined performance targets. The total needs are reflective of both SHOPP and Maintenance Program contributions to the condition or performance of the assets.

Along with the performance management implementation, the SHSMP implements new national performance measures for pavements and bridges. Under requirements of MAP-21, all states are required to adopt national asset management performance measures to establish nationwide consistency for condition reporting of these major highway assets. The new performance measures utilize a good, fair, and poor scale that reports the area of these assets in each category. To comply with new federal requirements, Caltrans is required to assess the condition of the pavements and bridges in a new way. These new condition assessment requirements have been incorporated by utilizing the Automated Pavement Condition Survey (APCS) for pavements and Element Level Inspection data for bridges.

The SHSMP provides unprecedented transparency in the presentation of the current conditions and performance of the system, project stream, deterioration rates, repair costs, and targets used to develop the Needs Assessment. The Investment Plan clearly presents where available funds are being invested and the expected condition and Performance Outcomes from those investments.

The new SHSMP is more than a new title and look. The Plan is implementing fundamental changes in the way Caltrans manages the available funding by placing the focus on measured condition and performance objectives. The historic silo-based funding approach has been replaced by a performance-based approach that provides greater local flexibility to combine multiple objectives together into a single project. Under the provisions of the new Plan, performance and funding targets are being provided to each Caltrans district which is empowered to combine performance accomplishments together in projects that are cost-effective, less disruptive and better aligned with local partners work. The new management methodology allows Caltrans to better integrate multimodal transportation options into traditional rehabilitation work to provide a cost-effective way to expand mode choice and reduce transportation related emissions.

STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM MANAGEMENT PLAN ORGANIZATION

The State Highway System Management Plan (SHSMP) is organized into five primary sections:

- System Definition, Asset Management Structure and Funding Trends
- Needs Assessment
- Ten-Year Investment Plan
- Performance Outcomes
- Appendices

The initial chapters focus on defining the State Highway System (SHS), explaining the asset management structure used to manage the SHS and describing the sources and trends of highway funding in California. All of these items are statewide in nature and are relevant to all funding programs that maintain or rehabilitate the SHS.

The Needs Assessment presents the total needs of the existing SHS resulting from a performance management analysis conducted for this Plan. This performance management analysis estimates the costs necessary to close all condition and performance gaps. The Needs Assessment is not constrained by funding currently available for the management of the SHS.

The Investment Plan section defines how the available funding is recommended to be allocated. With funding constraints, particularly in the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), tough decisions must be made to prioritize where available resources should be focused to keep highways functioning.

Based on the Investment Plan, the Performance Outcomes are presented for each of the funding programs. This section defines what specific performance metrics are estimated to be achieved given the defined investment plan.

The SHSMP Appendices include the details of the performance management analysis and a listing of statutory requirements that have influence on the SHSMP.

CALIFORNIA STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

The transportation system assets that comprise the SHS include nearly 50,000 lane miles of pavement, 13,160 bridges, 205,000 culverts and drainage facilities, 86 safety roadside rest areas (SRRA), and 30,000 acres of landscaped roadside among others. The vast extent of this transportation system is illustrated in Figure 1. Additional support facilities, such as maintenance stations, equipment shops, and transportation materials laboratories and testing facilities are also included as assets of the SHS. Many of the components of this system were built in 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s and has reached or is reaching the end of their service lives. Asset deterioration is accelerating at a faster rate than in previous decades due to age and traffic demands, often requiring extensive rehabilitation and even full reconstruction.




Figure 1. California State Highway System

Under California statutes, Caltrans is the state agency responsible for planning, developing, maintaining and operating the legislatively designated SHS and a variety of supporting infrastructure such as but not limited to highway maintenance stations, SRRAs and drainage facilities. Similarly, various state highway funding and project approval responsibilities are assigned to the California Transportation Commission (Commission). Together, and working in partnership with a wide variety of local, regional and federal transportation and oversight agencies and with the private sector, Caltrans and the Commission are transitioning highway system preservation activities and projects to a robust asset management approach as required by Senate Bill 486 (2015). This approach also directly responds to federal requirements to implement asset management.

ASSET MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

Caltrans strives to preserve the condition of the SHS in the most economical means possible through carefully planned preservation strategies (preventive maintenance strategies, corrective maintenance strategies, and minor rehabilitation) and rehabilitation or replacement when necessary. Caltrans manages the condition of the SHS by performing the right treatment at the right time through a three-pronged approach: (1) field maintenance, (2) Highway Maintenance (HM) projects and (3) SHOPP projects. Each of the following approaches play key roles in the overall management and preservation of the system:

1. Field maintenance activities are the day-to-day demands that Caltrans maintenance staff must regularly react to. Maintenance strategies are important tools for extending the service life of assets in a cost-effective manner. Preventive maintenance is applied to assets in good condition and some fair condition assets when appropriate, with the goal of maintaining their condition. Local crews address minor maintenance, repairs, and preservation work. This typically includes pothole repair, crack sealing, cleaning of drains, servicing lighting and signs, structural painting, minor facility repairs, irrigation repairs and more. Crews also provide rapid response to repair minor accident damage. These field activities are the first line of defense in Caltrans' maintenance of the SHS, and are reactionary in nature. Caltrans employs maintenance crews that collectively perform many aspects of ongoing maintenance of the highways and assets within the SHS. For example, as shown in Chart 2, every dollar spent on preventive maintenance delays the need for an equivalent \$3 in rehabilitation or \$8 in reconstruction or replacement of pavement in the future.
2. HM projects help further prolong the life of existing infrastructure. These projects include preventive and corrective maintenance work that exceeds the scope of what our crews can handle. Corrective maintenance typically applies to assets in fair condition; however, can also be applied to some assets in poor condition in some cases, with the goal of restoration to good condition. Asset deterioration can accelerate the longer the asset is in fair condition. A timely application of corrective maintenance can avoid more costly treatments later. The Maintenance Division utilizes contractors and service providers to execute work designed to extend the life of physical assets and delay rehabilitation or replacement of assets. HM projects are contract work routinely performed on pavements, bridges, culverts, facilities, traffic management systems and more. HM Projects may be preventive or corrective in nature. Examples include thin pavement overlays, bridge joint seals, and culvert repairs. These projects repair, but do not upgrade or replace the facilities. The Major Maintenance Program invests over \$330 million annually, through HM projects, to extend the life of physical assets through timely repair and preservation activities.
3. When field maintenance and more extensive HM project activities are no longer cost-effective or viable, asset rehabilitation or replacement is considered. Rehabilitation or replacement typically applies to assets in both fair and poor condition and is typically funded through the

SHOPP. SHOPP projects are more complex capital construction projects that utilize private construction contractors through a competitive bidding process. These projects are overhauls of infrastructure that is nearing the end of its lifespan, and may involve complex upgrades. These projects may involve extensive planning and design, environmental permitting and even right-of-way acquisition. Rehabilitation and replacement activities are performed on pavements, bridges, culverts, buildings, overhead signs, lights, roadside elements and safety roadside rest areas. In addition to managing the condition of the physical infrastructure, Caltrans invests in safety improvements, operational improvements, environmental mitigation, transportation management systems, freight improvements and system resiliency activities. The SHOPP invests available funds to implement safety improvements, rehabilitate or replace physical assets, improve the operation of the highways, improve the system resiliency and mitigate transportation related environmental impacts. The SHOPP includes 34 specific focus areas that are individually described in the Needs Assessment. The Commission has direct responsibility to adopt the projects that constitute the SHOPP and to approve all scope, schedule and costs changes to the adopted projects. Further, the Commission has responsibility to set asset performance targets that help ensure the investments made through the SHOPP are achieving the desired statewide transportation outcomes.

Utilizing this three-pronged approach to asset preservation, Caltrans crews are able to make timely repairs on minor needs before they grow into major and more expensive problems to fix, contract for highway maintenance activities at the right time to extend the useful life of the assets at the lowest




Chart 2. Graphical Representation of Benefits of Preventive Maintenance

possible long-term cost and delay future rehabilitation or replacement activities, and to then invest in major asset rehabilitation or replacement projects when the useful life of an asset has been reached.

Beyond the asset management objective of taking care of the existing SHS assets, there are additional SHS needs for upgrading and expanding facilities to accommodate increased freight movement, broader economic growth, population increases, new transportation technologies and evolving land use patterns. These needs are beyond the scope of the funding provided through the Maintenance and SHOPP programs and are instead addressed through a variety of other funding programs such as the recently enacted Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), state transportation bond programs, local transportation tax measures and other funding programs. All of these programs invest in the SHS, as well as local roads, and sometimes address SHS preservation needs at the same time. As projects are developed and constructed through these other funding programs, it is essential that the project development process incorporate life cycle and asset management considerations so that when the SHS projects are completed and operational and come under the auspices of the Maintenance and SHOPP programs, the projects are designed to be as efficient and cost-effective as possible to maintain, preserve, and when the time comes, rehabilitate.

A number of funding programs are utilized by Caltrans to manage the SHS assets. The largest funding program available is the SHOPP. The SHOPP invests approximately \$2.6 billion annually to implement safety improvements, rehabilitate or replace physical assets, improve the operation of the highways, improve the system resiliency and mitigate transportation related environmental impacts. The SHOPP includes 34 specific focus areas that are individually described in this Plan.

The Maintenance Program invests over \$330 million annually, through HM projects, to extend the life of physical assets through timely repair and preservation activities. Caltrans employs maintenance crews that collectively perform many aspects of ongoing maintenance of the highways and assets within the SHS. Crew expenditures statewide are over \$350 million annually for all activities including maintenance of the four asset classes.

Each of the programs mentioned above play key roles and work together in the overall management of the SHS. Utilizing this three-pronged approach to asset preservation, Caltrans is able to make timely repairs at the right time to extend the useful life of the assets at the lowest possible long-term cost and delay future rehabilitation or replacement activities.

STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM FUNDING TRENDS

The Federal Highway Trust Fund (Trust Fund) and the State Highway Account (SHA) are the main funding sources for SHOPP. The majority of SHOPP funding is provided through the federal government via fuel taxes. Each state collects a federal excise tax of 18.4 cents per gallon of gasoline, and 24.4 cents per gallon for diesel fuel, and remits that revenue to the federal government for deposit into the Trust Fund. The Trust Fund then provides funding to states for highway and mass transportation (transit) programs. The uses and distribution of these funds are outlined in federal transportation acts. As the states' needs for transportation revenue have begun to exceed the amount of money held in the Trust Fund in recent years, the Trust Fund has had to rely on infusions of federal general fund revenue. Federal fuel taxes no longer provide sufficient revenue to meet federal funding obligations to the states.

In addition to federal fuel taxes, both Maintenance and the SHOPP receive a portion of their funding from an 18 cents per gallon state excise tax. The SHOPP also receives funding from a 9.8 cents per gallon price-based excise tax on gasoline. The price-based portion of the excise tax is statutorily required to be adjusted annually to maintain revenue neutrality with California's former sales tax on gasoline. Only a small portion of the price-based tax revenue is earmarked for the SHOPP. Both SHOPP and Maintenance receive a portion of the 16 cents per gallon excise tax on diesel fuel, which is adjusted annually as well. As identified in the 2016 STIP Fund Estimate and funding outside of the fund estimate, projected annual funding for the SHOPP currently averages \$2.6 billion per year. Because Maintenance is fully funded before SHOPP funding is determined, reductions in revenue affect the SHOPP to a greater extent than the Maintenance Program. Unfortunately, the fiscal needs for SHS maintenance, preservation, rehabilitation and replacement consistently exceed available federal and state funding by wide margins.




Chart 3. SHOPP Funding Sources

Funding Challenges

California faces aging road and highway infrastructure and related assets that are creating a growing demand for transportation funding. Specific transportation funding challenges include inflation, fuel tax rates that are not adjusted for inflation, a decrease in gasoline consumption per mile traveled, increased per-capita vehicle miles traveled and price-based excise tax volatility. The state base excise tax on gasoline has not been increased in over 22 years and remains at 18 cents per gallon. While the 2006 voter approved Proposition 1B Transportation Bond programs provided a substantial but temporary influx of transportation funding, that funding has been mostly depleted as projects have been completed. Thus, transportation funding is already returning to lower, pre-Bond Program levels.

As available funding declines, legal mandates and public demands to achieve more with every transportation dollar invested in the SHS add to the fiscal challenge. The state's multimodal system, particularly the freight transportation system, is vital to both national and international economies. Consequently, funding issues have a wide-ranging effect not just to the economic health of the state, but to the entire nation's as well. With inflation's growth over time, these factors are putting pressure on transportation funding.


The actual buying power of transportation funding available for the Maintenance and SHOPP programs is steadily eroding due to inflation. As the effective buying power of the dollar goes down, material and equipment costs for rehabilitative projects increase, and Caltrans' ability to respond to the rehabilitative transportation needs is diminished even though the same amount of money is being invested in the system. Chart 4 shows the tax rate at the bottom (green bars) and the tax rate adjusted for inflation (green line). Over time, inflation has eaten away at the value of the tax rate.

The increase in fuel efficiency of vehicles reduces the amount of gasoline and diesel fuel needed per vehicle mile traveled, thus reducing the amount of fuel taxes collected per mile driven. Even though average per-capita vehicle miles traveled has increased in recent years, the improved vehicle mileage exceeds the increased amount of driving. Vehicles are using less gasoline to travel greater distances. Less gasoline consumption leads to a steady decrease in SHOPP funding because gasoline is taxed on a per-gallon basis.

Additionally, when gas prices go down, so does the revenue collected for state and local road improvements. There is a direct correlation between gas prices and the amount of the price-based excise tax revenues available for transportation funding. The funds allotted for the Weight Fee Backfill remain at the same funding level because weight fees are taken off the top from price-based excise tax revenues. However, the remaining programs funded by these revenues, including the SHOPP, continue to decrease. Without a steady revenue stream for state and local road improvements, it becomes difficult for Caltrans to plan and fund projects for programs like the SHOPP. This leads to less rehabilitative measures taken for all California roads, including the SHS.

Inflation Erodes Value of Tax Over Time

History of the Base Gasoline Excise Tax Rate



Source: Board of Equalization. Escalation based on California State Highway Construction Cost Index and Consumer Price Index

Chart 4. Gasoline Excise Tax Rate

Split of State Taxes between State and Local

State funding for both Maintenance and SHOPP is primarily derived from the state excise taxes on gasoline. The base portion of the excise tax is 18 cents per gallon, of which the SHA receives approximately 64 percent of the total revenue generated. A substantial portion of this revenue is used to fund the maintenance and operations of the SHS, research, administrative costs, and other departmental costs. The balance is used for highway rehabilitation through the SHOPP.

In addition, Caltrans receives a portion of the state excise tax on diesel fuel (16 cents per gallon for 2016-17), which is adjusted annually. In accordance with Streets and Highways Code, sections 2104-2108, the local portion is approximately 5.67 cents per gallon while the SHA portion is approximately 10.33 cents per gallon.

Local governments receive 44 percent of the price-based excise tax revenue through the Motor Vehicle Fuel Account (MVFA) after the Weight Fee Backfill. Additionally, local agencies receive 36 percent of the base excise tax revenue through the Highway Users Tax Account (HUTA). Both the decrease in price-based excise tax, and the subsequent decrease to SHOPP funding from that tax, can be seen in Chart 5. As the economy continues to recover from the recent recession, and inflation continues to

rise, it is expected that the deferred maintenance backlog will increase due to further decreases in the value of the collected transportation revenues that are dedicated to SHS infrastructure preservation.

Gasoline Price-Based Excise Tax Revenue Projections




Chart 5. Price-Based Excise Tax Comparison

Cost Escalation

Cost estimates must be escalated to account for expected cost increases in future year projects. Escalation is based on the California Highway Construction Index (CHCI) cost trends over a defined period of time. The cost to address the needs of the SHS are very sensitive to the cost escalation percentages used.

Utilizing the Caltrans Highway Cost Index information shown in the chart below, one can develop the following escalation rates:




Chart 6. California Highway Construction Index Trend

Table 5. Alternative Escalation Rates

Analysis Period	Analysis Method	Escalation Rate	Escalated Total Need (in billions)
10 Years	Compounded	1%	\$76.6
20 Years	Best Fit Curve	3%	\$85.8
20 Years	Compounded	4.5%	\$93.5

The total needs vary by up to \$17 billion depending on the escalation rate used for the calculation. The most recent fund estimate used a 4.5 percent escalation rate and the 2015 Ten-Year Plan used a 2 percent rate. Escalation is applied only to the future needs because the costs for programmed projects or projects in a formal planning work plan are already escalated. For the 2017 SHSMP, the escalation rate used is 3 percent. The “best fit curve” escalation calculation was selected as the most appropriate method because it is based on all previous data points over the past 20 years instead of just the first and last data points used for the compounded method. Costs are escalated to the mid-point of the escalated needs; 7.5 years into the ten-year plan period.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The California Streets and Highway Code requires the development of a SHS Needs Assessment that defines the program areas and costs associated with achieving defined condition and performance targets. The Needs Assessment is intended to provide a picture of the total needs of the SHS and is not constrained by currently available funding. The majority of the needs on the SHS are determined through a gap analysis completed as part of the implementation of performance management. The performance management approach captures all of the needs associated with fair and poor condition gaps. Preventive maintenance needs, associated with activities that focus on keeping good condition assets in good condition as long as possible, are added to the performance management gap analysis needs to determine the total need required for the maintenance, rehabilitation and operation of the existing SHS.

The performance management based Needs Assessment conducted for the SHSMP is limited to activities that are consistent with state laws that govern the use of Maintenance and SHOPP funds. Generally, these laws require the available funding to be expended on the safety, maintenance, rehabilitation and operation of the existing system. System expansion is not permitted through Maintenance or SHOPP programs.

Maintenance Needs

Maintenance needs are identified through the performance management gap analysis for fair condition pavement, bridges, culverts and transportation management system elements. The needs from the gap analysis are then added to the preventive maintenance needs associated with activities primarily focused on good condition assets. Table 6 summarizes the maintenance needs for the four asset classes. The cost presented in Table 6 include costs associated with inspection forces and Caltrans crews efforts and Highway Maintenance contracts.

Table 6. Ten-Year Maintenance Needs by Asset Class

Asset Class	Total Needs (in millions)
Stewardship	
Pavement	
Pavement Class I	\$3,080
Pavement Class II	\$1,990
Pavement Class III	\$800
Pavement Total HM Projects	\$5,870
Maintenance Crews (Crack Sealing)	\$90
Bridge	
Bridge Health HM Projects	\$868
Maintenance Crews	\$442
Drainage	
Drainage System Restoration	\$2,460
Drainage Maintenance Crews	\$160
Performance	
Transportation Management Systems	\$360
Total	\$10,250

State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Needs

The SHOPP needs are determined through the performance management gap analysis. The performance management approach involves the following general steps:

1. Establish the asset inventory or deficiency level
2. Establish the current and projected future condition/performance level of each objective
3. Establish targets to achieve desired asset performance levels
4. Perform a gap analysis between the projected condition/performance and the performance targets
5. Estimate the cost to close the performance gaps

These five steps are repeated for each objective being tracked by Caltrans related to the maintenance, rehabilitation and operation of the SHS. There are three distinct performance management models incorporated into the SHSMP: (1) asset, (2) deficiency and (3) reservation.

1. The asset model is used for physical assets such as pavements, bridges, culverts or any other tangible highway item. The asset model defines an inventory such as the number of lane miles of pavement or the square feet of bridge deck area contained in the SHS. The inventory condition is reported as a percentage of the total in good, fair or poor categories. The performance management approach applies a deterioration rate to each asset to account for expected future conditions. Condition targets for the physical assets are defined with key targets being approved by the Commission. The gap analysis determines the number of lane miles or bridge deck area between projections and the desired performance target. The performance management analysis has both a system preservation and rehabilitation/replacement goal to ensure a balanced management approach. The existing program of work (active projects) is then deducted from these gaps to determine the unaddressed need. The cost to improve the condition to the established targets is then estimated using historical unit costs. These costs, combined with the existing program of work, represents the total need over the ten-year period.
2. The deficiency model is used for objectives like storm water mitigation, safety or Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) needs. These needs do not have a condition breakdown like the physical assets; they are either deficient or not. A gap analysis between the current deficiency and the target is conducted similar to the asset model. The program of active projects is again deducted from the gap analysis to determine the unaddressed need. Cost estimates to address this need are calculated similar to the asset model.
3. The final Needs Assessment model is for unplanned needs. Emergency response activities and hazardous waste clean-up use this model. Objectives using the reservation model cannot be predicted in terms of the quantity or location of need as location and scope of needs are not known until an event such as a flood or landslide occurs. To effectively manage the SHS, Caltrans holds a financial reservation for when these needs arise. Reservations do not have an identified inventory, condition breakdown or goal. The reservation levels are established based on historical demand in the respective areas.

These various individual models are aggregated up to develop the statewide need figures shown in Table 7. In total, there are 34 different objectives being combined together in the Needs Assessment. Each of these are included in the Appendix of this report providing a fully transparent presentation of the needs calculation. These Needs Assessment models are numerically intensive, relying on narratives provided later in this document to plainly describe what each objective strives to accomplish.

Table 7. Ten-Year SHOPP Needs

Objectives	Sum* (in millions)
Safety	\$13,333
Bridge Rail Replacement and Upgrade	\$6,197
Collision Severity Reduction	\$1,324
Roadside Safety Improvements	\$1,602
Safety Improvements	\$4,210
Stewardship	\$35,529
Bridge Health	\$5,485
Drainage Pump Plants	\$165
Drainage System Restoration	\$2,567
Lighting Rehabilitation	\$602
Major Damage (Emergency Opening)	\$1,525
Major Damage (Permanent Restoration)	\$1,335
Office Buildings	\$491
Overhead Sign Structures Rehabilitation	\$481
Pavement Class I	\$12,552
Pavement Class II	\$4,970
Pavement Class III	\$1,185
Relinquishments	\$29
Roadway Protective Betterments	\$467
Safety Roadside Rest Area (SRRAs) Rehabilitation	\$1,192
Transportation Related Facilities	\$2,387
Water and Wastewater Treatment at SRRAs	\$96
Sustainability	\$10,698
ADA Pedestrian Infrastructure	\$972
Advance Mitigation	\$300
Bridge Scour Mitigation	\$847
Bridge Seismic Restoration	\$3,089
Hazardous Waste Mitigation	\$5
Roadside Rehabilitation	\$2,025
Storm Water Mitigation	\$3,444
Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure	\$15
Performance	\$9,859
Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facilities	\$129
Operational Improvements	\$933
Sign Panel Replacement	\$700
Transportation Management Systems	\$1,810
Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades	\$5,907
Weigh-In-Motion Scales	\$379
Subtotal	\$69,418
Asset Management Pilot Program	\$82
Minor Program	\$1,500
PID Program Support	\$1,379
Total	\$72,379
Escalated Total	\$85,771

*Numbers may not add due to rounding

Operational Improvement Needs

Tables 6 and 7 summarize the total needs associated with achieving the defined condition and performance targets associated with the existing SHS. Improvement needs are also identified through the STIP and California Freight Mobility Plan (CFMP) Programs that are focused on making improvements to or expanding the existing SHS. Improvement needs are identified by Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA) and Caltrans in regional and interregional improvement plans funded through the STIP and local transportation funding sources. Given the distributed sources of needs identification, placing a specific dollar value on the needs is difficult but it would easily exceed several hundred billion dollars annually.

For example, the 2014 CFMP presents a list of 707 freight system improvement projects for all freight modes, with an estimated total cost of approximately \$138 billion. The project list uses prioritized corridors, focus areas and overarching strategies and is multi-tiered to address the needs of California's full, multimodal integrated freight system, as well as to respond to each of the CFMP goals and their corresponding federal freight goals. The project list will be updated as needed to include additional freight projects contained in newly adopted or amended Regional Transportation Plans. The FAST Act provides formula and discretionary funding available to address freight system improvements. California is projected to receive approximately \$100 million annually for formula-based state and local freight projects and is eligible to apply for additional discretionary funding. A significant portion of these funds will likely be focused on the SHS. These projects will be approved by the Commission on an annual basis and therefore specific dollar figures for the SHS cannot be determined over the ten-year planning horizon of this Plan.

TEN-YEAR INVESTMENT PLAN

The Needs Assessment identifies the funding necessary to achieve defined condition and performance targets. The identified needs exceed current available funding. Funding for transportation infrastructure comes from a number of sources depending on the asset or deficiency. For example, the condition of the pavement is a function of the activities performed by Caltrans crews, maintenance projects, and rehabilitation or replacement project investments coming from the SHOPP. The Investment Plan defines where the available resources are recommended to be allocated to effectively manage the SHS.

Many factors influence the magnitude of investments. In some cases, investment levels are written into law or are terms of court settlements. In other cases, the investments are mandated based on terms of permits or required to be expended on specific activities. The current conditions of highway system assets and consequences of not funding certain objectives must also be taken into consideration. The Investment Plan should also look at longer term life cycle costs and performance that results from various investment scenarios. The Investment Plan should balance highway safety, asset condition, system performance, and sustainability objectives through the allocation of available funding. All of these factors are considered in the development of the recommended Investment Plan.

The Investment Plan is a combination of investments from three primary sources: (1) Major Maintenance Program, (2) SHOPP, and (3) Fostering Advancements in Shipping and Transportation for the Long-term Achievement of National Efficiencies (FASTLANE) funds. Each of these investment plans are defined within this section for the assets or objectives that are applicable to the funding source.

Maintenance Investment Plan

Preventive maintenance is the most cost-effective means of protecting the state's infrastructure investment. Applying the right maintenance treatment at the right time slows deterioration and extends the life of the pavements, bridges, drainage system assets and transportation management system (TMS) assets at the lowest possible long-term cost.

Table 8. Proposed and Recommended Maintenance Investment Plans

Annual Maintenance Investment Plan						
	Baseline		Achieve Goal in Five Years		Achieve Goal in Ten Years	
	Baseline Funding (Recommended)	SHOPP Cost Avoidance	Projected Funding	SHOPP Cost Avoidance	Projected Funding	SHOPP Cost Avoidance
Asset Class	Annual Cost (\$ millions)	Cost (\$ millions)	Annual Cost (\$ millions)	Cost (\$ millions)	Annual Cost (\$ millions)	Cost (\$ millions)
Stewardship						
Pavement Class I	\$128	\$365	\$486	\$1442	\$314	\$930
Pavement Class II	\$82	\$239	\$312	\$942	\$201	\$608
Pavement Class III	\$33	\$98	\$126	\$388	\$81	\$250
Pavement Total¹	\$243	\$702	\$924	\$2,772	\$596	\$1,788
Bridge Health ²	\$131	\$1,102	\$187	\$1,603	\$131	\$1,102
Drainage System Restoration ³	\$23	\$92	\$442	\$1,578	\$262	\$911
Performance						
Transportation Management Systems ⁴	\$20	**	\$34	**	\$36	**
Total	\$417	\$1,896	\$1,587	\$5,953	\$1,025	\$3,801

1. Pavement costs include state forces services and Major Maintenance contracts. Annual costs include \$234 million in Highway Maintenance contracts and delivery support. This includes approximately \$9 million in crack sealing efforts performed by Caltrans maintenance crews.

2. Bridge costs include state force repair crews, materials, equipment rental, contract dollars, and support. Bridge structural resources include \$63 million in preventive maintenance contracts and \$68 million in support of contract delivery, paint, and inspection.

3. Drainage costs include \$16 million for state maintenance forces for assessments, maintenance, repairs, and associated equipment/materials and \$7 million in Highway Maintenance contract dollars and support costs.

4. TMS costs include PM checks/repairs completed by state forces and repairs completed by on-call service contracts.

**SHOPP Avoidance data for TMS elements is unavailable for the 2017 Plan submittal. It is anticipated it will be available in the 2019 Five-Year Maintenance Plan.

SHOPP Investment Plan

The SHOPP Investment Plan defines the funding levels for each of the objectives. The investment in Strategic categories strives to be consistent with state law, policy directives and Caltrans Strategic Management Plan objectives. The investments reflect a “fix it first” approach that prioritizes maintenance and rehabilitation of the system along with safety improvements.

The magnitude of investment in each of the areas is determined based on many factors. These factors include programmed work, current condition, judicial or legislatively mandated funding levels, consequences of inaction, past investment levels and preservation needs versus rehabilitation consideration. The establishment of investment levels also considers the impact on the system of the investment, the existing pipeline of work, expected deterioration rates, and expected growth in inventory.

Table 9. SHOPP Ten-Year Investment Plan

Objectives	Sum* (in millions)
Safety	\$4,572
Bridge Rail Replacement and Upgrade	\$314
Collision Severity Reduction	\$1,173
Roadside Safety Improvements	\$865
Safety Improvements	\$2,220
Stewardship	\$15,703
Bridge Health	\$2,736
Drainage Pump Plants	\$74
Drainage System Restoration	\$845
Lighting Rehabilitation	\$24
Major Damage (Emergency Opening)	\$1,525
Major Damage (Permanent Restoration)	\$1,181
Office Buildings	\$31
Overhead Sign Structures Rehabilitation	\$24
Pavement Class I	\$5,810
Pavement Class II	\$2,493
Pavement Class III	\$454
Relinquishments	\$29
Roadway Protective Betterments	\$143
Safety Roadside Rest Area (SRRAs) Rehabilitation	\$93
Transportation Related Facilities	\$167
Water and Wastewater Treatment at SRRAs	\$75
Sustainability	\$2,736
ADA Pedestrian Infrastructure	\$415
Advance Mitigation	\$40
Bridge Scour Mitigation	\$266
Bridge Seismic Restoration	\$780
Hazardous Waste Mitigation	\$5
Roadside Rehabilitation	\$121
Storm Water Mitigation	\$1,094
Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure	\$15
Performance	\$1,588
Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facilities	\$70
Operational Improvements	\$390
Sign Panel Replacement	\$76
Transportation Management Systems	\$864
Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades	\$149
Weigh-In-Motion Scales	\$39
Subtotal	\$24,600
Asset Management Pilot Program	\$82
Minor Program	\$1,500
PID Program Support	\$395
Total	\$26,577

*Numbers may not add due to rounding

PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

The Investment Plan allocates available funding to specific transportation objectives. These include safety, physical asset condition, system performance, and sustainability goals. Based on the recommended level of investment in each objective area, the corresponding accomplishments that can be expected for the investment are determined. Investments may be defined for good, fair and poor condition assets depending on the objectives of the funding programs. Having specific investments addressing physical assets at all levels helps to minimize long-term cost by avoiding a worst first asset management approach. The following tables detail the specific quantity and units of performance that is expected from each of the funding programs:

Table 10. Proposed Annual Maintenance Accomplishments at Recommended Funding Level

Annual Maintenance Performance Accomplishments				
Asset Class	Unit	Accomplishment		Total
Stewardship		Good to Good	Fair to Good	
Pavement Class I	Lane Miles	900	100	1,000
Pavement Class II	Lane Miles	576	64	640
Pavement Class III	Lane Miles	234	26	260
Pavement Total¹		1,710	190	1,900
Bridge Health	Square Feet	3,100,000	2,300,000	5,400,000
Drainage System Restoration ²	Linear Feet	-	14,000	14,000
	Assessments	7,800	2,880	12,000
Performance				
Transportation Management Systems	PM Checks/Repairs	52,400	-	52,400

1. The accomplishments listed above do not reflect lane miles that are crack sealed (approximately 3,000) by maintenance forces to maintain fair lane miles as fair, extending the time to when they would become poor.

2. The total 12,000 assessments also include approximately 1,320 assessments of culverts in poor condition.

Table 11. Ten-Year Performance Accomplishments

SHOPP Performance Accomplishments				
Objectives	Unit	Fair to Good	Poor to Good	New
Safety				
Bridge Rail Replacement and Upgrade	Linear Feet	119,968	131,401	-
Collision Severity Reduction	Injuries	-	4,333	-
Roadside Safety Improvements	Locations	-	11,006	-
Safety Improvements	-	-	-	-
Stewardship				
Bridge Health	Square Feet	18,053,180	5,379,176	-
Drainage Pump Plants	Locations	2	78	-
Drainage System Restoration	Linear Feet	7,867	395,890	-
Lighting Rehabilitation	Each	0	1,911	-
Major Damage (Emergency Opening)	-	-	-	-
Major Damage (Permanent Restoration)	-	-	-	-
Office Buildings	Square Feet	Various	41,700	-
Overhead Sign Structures Rehabilitation	Each	0	125	-
Pavement Class I	Lane Miles	6,808	1,595	-
Pavement Class II	Lane Miles	3,238	1,178	-
Pavement Class III	Lane Miles	418	504	-
Relinquishments	-	-	-	-
Roadway Protective Betterments	Locations	-	26	-
Safety Roadside Rest Area Rehabilitation	Locations	0	11	0
Transportation Related Facilities	Square Feet	0	72,455	97,383
Water and Wastewater Treatment at SRRAs	Locations	0	27	-
Sustainability				
ADA Pedestrian Infrastructure	Locations	-	15,148	-
Advance Mitigation	-	-	-	-
Bridge Scour Mitigation	Square Feet	-	1,185,260	-
Bridge Seismic Restoration	Square Feet	-	4,933,322	-
Hazardous Waste Mitigation	-	-	-	-
Roadside Rehabilitation	Acre	0	871	-
Storm Water Mitigation	Acre	-	4,777	-
Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure	Locations	-	30	-
Performance				
Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facilities	Stations	9	9	-
Operational Improvements	Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay	-	24,069	-
Sign Panel Replacement	Each	0	9,392	-
Transportation Management Systems	Each	0	3,772	1,646
Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades	Square Feet	571,024	1,043,940	-
Weigh-In-Motion Scales	Stations	12	11	0

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROPOSALS

Recognizing the ongoing transportation funding shortfall, Governor Brown proposed a transportation funding proposal in the 2017-18 budget that would provide additional funding for maintenance and rehabilitation of the SHS along with funding for freight improvements. Increased funding proposals were also introduced by Senator Beall and Assemblyman Frasier through their respective transportation committees. These proposals vary in total magnitude and specific details, but all recognize the need to find a permanent solution to the current lack of funding for transportation in California.

Governor Brown's funding proposal, for example, provides for the following funding augmentations that would directly benefit the condition and performance of the SHS. The Governor's transportation funding plan, when added to existing funding, would result in total funding for the noted asset classes as shown below:

Table 12. Funding Proposal Comparison

Governor Brown's Transportation Funding Proposal		
Funding Areas	2017 SHSMP Investment Plan (\$ billions)	Ten-Year Funding Increase (\$ billions)
Pavement	\$8.8	\$9.1
Bridges and Culverts	\$3.6	\$5.1
Transportation Management Systems	\$0.9	\$0.9
Highway Maintenance	\$4.2	\$1.2
Total	\$17.5	\$16.3

If the Governor's transportation funding proposal is passed, the additional funding provided would allow the condition of these four major asset classes to be improved to the target levels approved by the Commission over the ten-year period beginning July 2017 as shown below:

Table 13. Funding Proposal Accomplishment Comparison

Asset	Without New Investment	With New Investment
Pavement	Lane miles in poor condition will grow to 9,500	17,000 lane miles of pavement fixed, resulting in 98 percent good or fair condition
Bridges	Bridges in poor condition will grow to 500	500 bridges fixed, resulting in 98.5 percent good or fair condition
Culverts	Culverts in fair or poor condition will grow to 74,000	55,000 culverts fixed, resulting in 90 percent in good or fair condition
Transportation Management Systems	8,000 TMS elements that are inoperable representing ramp meters, cameras, changeable message signs, and loop detectors	7,700 TMS elements fixed, resulting in 90 percent in good condition

PROGRAM DEFINITIONS

Safety

Safety activities are carried out to minimize the number of fatalities and injuries and to minimize the number and severity of accidents for all modes of transportation. Engineered safety activities improve the safety of the transportation system for all modes. Examples of activities carried out to improve the safety of the transportation system include:

- The installation of center dividing rails
- Upgrading bridge rails to meet current standards
- Installing guardrail
- Protection for bicyclists and pedestrians
- Installing crosswalks
- Worker protection activities
- Placement of rumble strips
- Installing signals
- Geometric changes to the SHS
- Construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities

The ongoing commitment to transportation safety requires continual monitoring of the SHS for changing conditions or use patterns that would necessitate engineered safety solutions. As these situations are identified, improvements are carried out through both Maintenance and SHOPP as appropriate for the specific situation.

Bridge Rail Replacement and Upgrade

The Bridge Rail Replacement and Upgrade objective includes improvement or replacement of bridge rails that do not meet federal crash standards for the posted roadway speed or that have deteriorated conditions or damage due to other causes. There are over 13,160 bridges on the SHS containing over 8.2 million linear feet of bridge rail. Approximately 60 percent of the bridge rail is in good condition,



Figure 2. Saratoga Creek Bridge Rail before and after Repair

33 percent is in fair condition and 7 percent is in poor condition. The goal of the Bridge Rail Replacement and Upgrade objective is to eliminate all non-crashworthy bridge rail on the SHS. The assessment for bridge rail needs on the SHS is approximately \$6.2 billion from SHOPP over the next ten years, which includes both needs currently being addressed through the project development process and the existing and projected performance gap.

Safety Improvements and Collision Severity Reduction

The Safety Improvements and Collision Severity Reduction objectives include a variety of different safety improvements meant to reduce the severity and number of collisions on the SHS. Statistical analysis is used to identify locations needing safety improvements based on collision data, with a cost-benefit analysis ensuring that projects produce net savings for the public. Other targeted improvements align with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and focus on an area of improvement, such as pedestrian safety. Other projects repair or replace obsolete or non-functional safety assets such as crash cushions or guard rail. In 2013, there were 1,105 fatal collisions, 51,378 injury collisions, and 98,338 property damage only collisions reported on the SHS. These add up to a total economic impact of almost \$22 billion. The goal for the Safety Improvements program is to fund all identified safety improvements which meet the program criteria or cost-benefit analysis. The goal for the Collision Severity Reduction program is to proactively reduce the severity of 10 percent of fatal and injury collisions over ten years. The need for triggered Safety Improvements and Collision Severity Reduction on the SHS is approximately \$5.5 billion from SHOPP over the next ten years.

Roadside Safety Improvements

The Roadside Safety Improvements primary goals are to reduce roadside worker fatalities to zero, and reduce employee injury rates by minimizing the frequency and duration of highway worker exposure to traffic. Roadside Safety Improvements are an effective means to improve worker safety and reduce fatality and injury rates as determined by site specific factors. Improving highway worker safety also improves safety for travelers on the SHS by eliminating collision hazards. The following are Roadside Safety Improvements activity objectives (S.A.F.E.R):

- Site - improve safety by locating features in safe locations.
- Accessible - provide safe worker access to the roadside and highway features.
- Facilitate - accommodate mechanized maintenance activities and understand equipment constraints.



Figure 3. Vegetation control under guardrails reduce fire risks and pesticide use.

- Eliminate - implement design decisions that eliminate the maintenance activity and the need for workers on foot adjacent to the travel way.
- Relocate - minimize the need for recurrent damage repair by relocating equipment and irrigation systems out of the clear recovery zone and away from traffic.

The need for Roadside Safety Improvements on the SHS is approximately \$1.6 billion from the SHOPP over the next ten years.

Stewardship

Stewardship activities are carried out primarily to minimize the long-term costs of ownership of physical assets. These activities generally maintain or improve the condition of the asset which can often also improve system reliability and safety at the same time. Stewardship needs continue to increase as the transportation system demand grows and the infrastructure ages. Failure to perform timely stewardship investments in the transportation system increases long-term costs of ownership, reduces the system reliability and safety, and will ultimately take even greater investments to restore the condition in the future. Examples of stewardship activities include:

- Emergency restoration of damaged infrastructure
- Maintaining pavement, bridges, and culverts
- Applying protective coatings, protection systems or overlays
- Maintenance and rehabilitation of pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- Maintenance and rehabilitation of SRRA facilities
- Performing maintenance on state-owned maintenance stations, office building, equipment shops, transportation management centers and labs
- Maintaining and replacing signs and lighting
- Rehabilitation or replacement of pavements, bridges, culverts, buildings, etc.

Bridge Health

The Bridge Health objective is to identify and address structural needs of SHS bridges to maintain their structural integrity. Caltrans is responsible for the maintenance of over 13,160 bridges on the SHS totaling over 245 million square feet of bridge deck area. These bridges are an average of 45 years old and have increasing maintenance needs as a result. With the implementation of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) requirements, the performance measure for bridge has changed to total deck area of the structures in good, fair, or poor condition versus the number of distressed bridges (previous performance measure in the SHOPP) or the number of bridges with backlogged preventive maintenance needs (previous performance measure for the Maintenance Program). Caltrans has established a goal for Bridge Health as 83.5 percent of SHS bridge deck inventory in good



Figure 4. Scofield Ave Deck Spall Scofield Avenue Deck before and after Repair

condition, no more than 15 percent in fair condition and no more than 1.5 percent in poor condition. Table 14 identifies the condition target for Bridge Health.

Table 14. Bridge Performance Targets

Bridge Performance Target (Measured by Deck Area Square Feet)		
Good	Fair	Poor
83.5%	15%	1.5%

Bridge maintenance needs are identified and documented during regular, routine bridge inspections and when applicable in specialty investigations which include hydraulics, underwater and fracture critical inspections. When needs are identified, bridge inspectors complete a Bridge Inspection Report documenting the needs and code any changes to the individual structural elements per federal guidelines. The good, fair or poor condition classifications are developed based on these federal coding guidelines. Currently, for Bridge Health, approximately 75 percent of the SHS bridge inventory deck area is in good condition, 22 percent in fair condition, and 3 percent in poor condition.

Caltrans works to manage the bridge inventory safely and efficiently to extend the service life of the structures and limit operational restrictions. Preventive maintenance work accomplished through bridge crew repairs or the HM Program provide significant benefit and extend the service life of the structures by addressing minor defects before they progress to more extensive damage. Maintenance bridge work includes repairs that require immediate attention and other minor maintenance work including joint repairs, spalls, paint needs, as well as deck overlays and repairs. When minor defects are not addressed quickly and efficiently, the resulting damage often requires




Chart 7. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for bridges on the SHS. Currently 75 percent of bridge decks, measured by square feet, are in good condition. Approximately 0.45 percent of bridge decks in good condition deteriorates to fair condition annually. Of the 22 percent of bridge decks in fair condition, approximately 0.75 percent of the bridge deck inventory declines to poor condition annually. SHOPP projects address bridge decks in both fair and poor condition and restore the condition of the asset, while maintenance focuses on maintaining bridge decks in good condition as well addressing some bridge decks in fair condition.

major structural rehabilitation or replacement which is not only more costly than preventive maintenance, but can cause significant long-term disruptions to the traveling public.

The first stage of preventive maintenance is the work performed by bridge maintenance crew forces. These crews address repairs that require immediate attention and other minor maintenance work. Bridge preventive maintenance needs that are beyond the scope of our bridge maintenance crews are combined into maintenance projects completed by contractors. Bridges that have damage or deterioration and can be addressed through preventive maintenance activities, which include bridges in good condition and a portion of the bridges in fair condition, are funded through either the HM Program or the preventive maintenance activities funded through the SHOPP.

Bridges that have deteriorated structurally or have damage due to other causes, which include bridges in poor condition and a portion of the bridges in fair condition, are addressed with major rehabilitation or replacement activities funded through the SHOPP. When bridges require major rehabilitation or replacement, it is sometimes appropriate to make additional geometric or structural improvements. Such improvements are permissible, however, the primary purpose for the work shall be to address the condition of the structural elements of the bridge.

Drainage System Restoration

The SHS includes an estimated 205,000 culverts totaling almost 20.3 million linear feet of culverts that drain rainwater, drainage channels, streams, and rivers away from highways via metal or concrete tubes or structures that direct water flow in a controlled manner under the highways. Culvert damage or failure can seriously damage or close roadways, create the need for extensive repairs and threaten the mobility and safety of the traveling public.

Of the culverts inventoried to date, approximately 65 percent of the culverts are in good condition, 23 percent in fair condition and 12 percent in poor condition. Caltrans has established a goal to bring 90 percent of culverts to good and fair condition, as well as having no more than ten percent culverts in poor condition.



Figure 5. State Route 39 Culvert before and after Repair

The Drainage System Restoration primary objective is to provide for the replacement or in-place rehabilitation of culverts, drainage pumping plants, and highway drainage systems that have lost serviceability because of age, wear, or degradation. Upgrades or modifications of culverts, drainage pumping plants, and highway drainage systems to increase flow or improve drainage alignment are included, however, the priority is in addressing the poor condition culverts and pumping plants. Projects to abandon culverts are also included. The criteria used to define the Drainage goal was to eliminate all known poor condition culverts from the inventory. The goal was set using Commission

and Caltrans program management guidance and engineering judgement taking into account the deterioration rate and the anticipated annual culvert inspection rate. The need for the Drainage System Restoration on the SHS is approximately \$5 billion for the culverts and \$165 million for the pumping plants from the SHOPP and Maintenance Program over the next ten years.

Table 15. Drainage System Performance Target

Drainage System Performance Goal		
Good	Fair	Poor
80%	10%	10%
16,219,598 Linear Feet	2,027,451 Linear Feet	2,027,451 Linear Feet

Culverts exemplify the potentially severe consequences of not caring adequately for components of the transportation system that are out-of-sight but are critically important to the safety and reliability of the SHS. If a culvert becomes clogged, decays, or fails due to rust or other factors, and fails to convey water away from the highway as a result, the water may then flood the highway or erode highway foundations or adjacent slopes resulting in washouts of the road and its closure. Caltrans utilizes a proactive inspection program and has developed management procedures to measure the health of drainage systems, prioritize potential culvert projects based on condition, cost, and traveler delay, and track accomplishments and delivery schedules for maintenance work. Culverts require regular maintenance to avoid costly replacement and possible catastrophic failure in the future. The repairs of catastrophic events are far more expensive than providing adequate funding to maintain and upgrade culverts.

The Maintenance Program is responsible for the inspection and maintenance of culverts on the SHS. Slightly more than 50 percent




Chart 8. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for drainage systems (culverts) on the SHS. Currently 65 percent of culverts, measured by linear feet, are in good condition. Approximately 2 percent of culverts in good condition deteriorate to fair condition annually. Of the 23 percent of culverts in fair condition, approximately 2 percent of the culvert inventory declines to poor condition annually. SHOPP projects primarily address culverts in poor condition and restores the condition of the asset, while maintenance focuses on maintaining culverts in good condition as well addressing culverts in fair condition.

of the drainage system inventory has been inspected to date. As previously identified, 23 percent of culverts are in fair condition and 12 percent are in poor condition. At the beginning of 2014-15, Caltrans identified an estimated 27,166 culverts with preventive maintenance needs. The Maintenance Program utilizes a combination of state forces and HM contracts to address culvert maintenance needs. State forces inspect culverts and perform minor maintenance to ensure culverts are functioning properly. HM projects are utilized to address maintenance needs which are beyond the scope of maintenance forces. Advanced culvert repairs and culvert relining are examples of culvert projects addressed in the HM Program. Rehabilitation projects work to restore the drainage system by providing for the replacement or in-place rehabilitation of culverts, drainage pumping plants, and highway drainage systems that have lost serviceability because of age, wear or degradation. Upgrades or modifications of culverts, drainage pumping plants and highway drainage systems to increase flow or improve drainage alignment are included; however, the priority is in addressing the poor condition culverts and pumping plants. Projects to abandoned culverts are also included.

Lighting Rehabilitation

The lighting objective includes rehabilitation and replacement of roadway lighting systems (poles, foundations, luminaires, etc.) that have damage or deteriorated conditions due to aging, weather or other factors. Lighting systems need to be updated to current technology and/or structural requirements to prevent structural failure, improve operational reliability and reduce the use of electricity. Caltrans has converted significant portions of the SHS to LED lighting already and we continue to look at adaptive lighting solutions to further reduce power demand. The primary factor for this activity is asset age, since many of the points of deterioration are directly associated with age of the system. As lighting systems age, metal fatigue can set in, corrosion weakens the pole or base bolts, and wire can deteriorate to the point of insulation failure which will cause electrical failure. There are approximately 90,000 roadway lights identified. About 46 percent (41,000) are older than 40 years, therefore rated as poor. During this ten-year Plan, an additional 6,600 units will surpass this time threshold and also need rehabilitation. The goal is to have no lighting system in poor condition, convert all lighting to LED technology. The need is \$602 million over the ten years from SHOPP. The Maintenance Program does not replace poles and foundations unless damaged by collision.

Major Damage (Emergency Opening)

The Emergency Opening objective includes emergency repair of assets damaged or imminently threatened by unforeseen events. Qualifying repairs include those needed to maintain essential traffic. To be considered for the program the work must be tied to an identifiable natural event such as storms, floods, fire, earthquake, tsunami, or volcanic action. Human-caused events such as vehicle collision, explosion, theft, civil unrest and acts of war or terrorism are included. The goal of the program is to complete repairs within 180 days of the event. Repair to current design standards is allowed. As expected, the level of repairs needed varies annually depending on the number and severity of damaging events. Funding needs are known in real-time when the event(s) occur based on the damage experienced and cost of repair. The goal is to repair 100 percent of qualifying emergency opening

damage within 180 days of event so that we can maintain 100 percent roadway access. The need based on historical trends is approximately \$1.5 billion from SHOPP over the next ten years.



Figure 6. State Route 3 in Trinity County before emergency opening repair of a major slipout following intense rainfall in March 2016.



Figure 7. Emergency opening included rebuilding the embankment and pavements.

Major Damage (Permanent Restoration)

The Permanent Restoration objective includes full restoration of assets in-kind and follows the emergency opening phase. Qualification for Permanent Restoration is the same as for Emergency Opening. Restoration to current design standards is allowed. Accelerated permanent restoration under Emergency Opening is sometimes allowed if it is more economical to complete the repairs as part of Emergency Opening. It is expected that projects begin construction within three years of the incident date. Funding needs are known in real-time when the event(s) occur based on the damage experienced and cost of repair. The need based on historical trends is approximately \$1.3 billion from SHOPP over the next ten years. This need does not include funding to respond to a major disaster such as a powerful earthquake in a heavily urbanized area.



Figure 8. SR 1 in Monterey County before a slipout.



Figure 9. Permanent Restoration involved building a new viaduct.

Office Buildings

The Office Building objective includes major rehabilitation and/or replacement of state office buildings that have deteriorated conditions or critical infrastructure deficiencies, such as fire, life safety, seismic, code, or building deficiencies. Additionally, as office building infrastructure begins to deteriorate or become obsolete, it may require repairs to keep the facility operational so that it achieves its full service lifespan. There are ten state-owned office buildings in Caltrans' portfolio totaling approximately 2.8 million square feet. Approximately 42 percent of that area is in good condition, 32 percent is in fair condition, and 26 percent is in poor condition. It is our goal to have zero office building assets in poor condition, defined as exceeding the useful lifespan of 50 years for fixed buildings, 20 years for modular buildings, and/or with critical infrastructure deficiencies. The goal is to award construction contracts within three years of damaging event for all known needs. All damage locations are considered poor condition and need restoration. The need for the state's office building assets are approximately \$491 million from SHOPP over the next ten years.



Figure 10. Caltrans Headquarters Built In 1936.

Overhead Sign Structure Rehabilitation

The Overhead Sign Structure Rehabilitation objective includes the replacement and upgrade of overhead sign structures (that support overhead sign panels) that have damage or deteriorated due to aging, weather or other factors. Sign structures are susceptible to corrosion and metal fatigue, and these conditions are exacerbated by age. Many older structures which were designed to previous standards are at risk of failure due to metal fatigue from being subjected to constant vibration. Based on a report from the Division of Maintenance, Office of Structures Maintenance and Investigations, of the approximately 16,500 structures, over 600 are in poor condition and 3,600 are in fair condition. The goal is to have no overhead sign structure in poor condition. The need is \$481 million over the next ten years from the SHOPP. The Maintenance Program does not reconstruct these structures.

Pavement

The SHS includes approximately 50,000 lane miles of pavement. Caltrans strives to effectively manage the pavement on the SHS at the lowest possible long-term cost. To maintain the health of the system, Caltrans has invested in Ground Penetration Radar (GPR) and the Automated Pavement Condition Survey (APCS) and developed the Pavement Management System (PaveM). APCS uses high definition images and lasers to gather condition data of every lane on the system. This data, along with GPR, is used to assess the pavement health and predict future performance. The accuracy of the predictions is expected to increase as additional surveys are completed. PaveM is "state of the art" technology that stores the APCS imagery and analyzes every mile of pavement. PaveM analyses is based on a project optimization tool that uses pavement condition, pavement type, climate, traffic

volumes and project history to propose the right repair treatment at the right time. PaveM recommends future repairs that provide the best value for the least amount of money.

Pavement condition is now reported by pavement classification and is assessed based on MAP-21 assessment criteria in the Proposed Rule. MAP-21 assessment criteria requires a different approach than Caltrans has utilized previously. Rather than assessing each condition independently and rating based on a combination of independent conditions, the previous system assessed various elements including ride quality and structural damage to determine pavement condition. Accordingly, only 35-45 percent of all state highway lane miles are in good condition, with 51-58 percent of lane miles in fair condition, and approximately 4-8 percent of lane-miles in poor condition.



Figure 11. APCS working view, which displays aerial, forward, and downward images. (Source: Pathway)

The SHS is broken down by class of route considering usage and other demands such as freight. The following tables provide definitions of the pavement class and breakdown of total system miles. Consistent with the three-pronged approach noted in the introduction, Caltrans addresses pavement maintenance through state forces, HM projects and SHOPP projects.

Table 16. Distribution of Lane Miles on SHS by Pavement Class

Route Class	Lane Miles	Description
Class I (52%)	26,014	Interstates, other principle arterials and urban freeways / expressways
Class II (34%)	16,759	Rural freeways / expressways and minor arterials
Class III (14%)	6,871	Major and minor collector routes owned by the state

Table 17. Current Pavement Condition on SHS, according to preliminary MAP-21 assessment criteria, by Pavement Class

Pavement Condition			
Route Class	Good	Fair	Poor
Class I	45%	51%	4%
Class II	35%	58%	7%
Class III	38%	54%	8%

MAP-21 utilizes four main condition criteria to classify a pavement section (0.1 mile segments) as either good, fair or poor. These condition metrics are cracking, roughness, faulting (concrete) and rutting (asphalt). The International Roughness Index (IRI) is a measure of roughness and is used for both concrete and asphalt pavements. Cracking is also measured for both concrete and asphalt pavements. Faulting and rutting are both signs of distress in concrete and asphalt pavements respectively. Pavements are rated good when all condition criteria are rated good. Pavements are rated as poor when two condition metrics are poor. All other combinations are rated as fair. Using MAP-21 criteria, as shown in the table above, there is a higher percentage of fair pavements, as compared to good or poor pavements. Performance targets for MAP-21 are tailored by route classification and shown in Table 18.

Table 18. Condition Goals by Pavement Class

Pavement MAP-21 Performance Targets			
Route Class	Good	Fair	Poor
Class I	60%	39%	1%
Class II	55%	43%	2%
Class III	45%	53%	2%

The Maintenance Program strives to utilize maintenance resources effectively to slow the deterioration of pavement and maintain the SHS at the lowest possible long-term cost. The SHSMP focuses preservation strategies on pavement conditions which benefit from this philosophy. PaveM is used to identify the best locations and times to perform pavement preservation to minimize future costs in the SHOPP (SHOPP avoidance). Pavements identified in fair condition may be targeted for various preservation, corrective or rehabilitation strategies.

The Maintenance Program works to maximize the service life of pavements through both state forces and HM projects. State forces perform maintenance such as crack sealing as well as pot hole and spall repairs. HM projects are utilized to meet longer-term preventive maintenance needs of the SHS. Preventive treatments completed through the HM Program include seal coats, thin asphalt overlays or, for concrete, joint seal installation or replacement. Corrective and preventive maintenance treatments addressed by Maintenance include digouts, cold in-place recycling, grinding, and isolated slab replacements. By efficiently using preventive treatments, Caltrans can avoid more costly repairs in the

future. For example, the HM projects awarded in 2013-14 had preventive maintenance costs averaging \$123,000 per lane mile.

Capital Preventive Maintenance (CAPM) projects involve lower cost minor rehabilitation strategies for pavements that exhibit surface wear due to weather, aging, and traffic and limited or minor structural damage which is more than what can be addressed with HM projects but less than a full pavement rehabilitation. These projects are intended to extend service life for 5-15 years depending on strategy. CAPM strategies typically include pavement grinding to improve smoothness, isolated slab replacements, and thin asphalt overlays. CAPM projects target pavement work only (thus are less expensive than a rehabilitation project that brings a highway up to current standards) but do include low cost safety/maintenance upgrades such as guardrails, worker safety, sign panels, striping, ADA curb ramps, and other items which do not require widening or realigning the roadway. CAPM projects are more costly than an HM project and often require a longer lead-time to prepare the project, due to the inclusion of other work.




Chart 9. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for pavement on the SHS. Currently there is between 35-45 percent of pavement in good condition – which ranges by pavement classification. Approximately 9 percent of pavement in good condition deteriorates to fair condition annually. Of the 51-58 percent of pavement in fair condition, approximately 3-4 percent of the pavement inventory declines to poor condition annually. SHOPP projects address pavement in both fair and poor condition and restores the condition of the asset, while maintenance focuses on maintaining pavement in good condition as well addressing some pavement in fair condition. It should be noted the deterioration rates are revised based on proposed MAP-21 condition criteria.

Rehabilitation projects include major rehabilitation and replacement of pavements that have significant structural distress (damage impacting the underlying layers of pavement) due to repeated loading and wear from trucks along with impacts from weather and aging of the pavement. A roadway that is rehabilitated should provide at least 20-40 years of service life with relatively low maintenance expenditures (not requiring an additional SHOPP project during its life cycle). When pavements require major rehabilitation or replacement, it may be appropriate to make operational and performance improvements, such as guardrail modifications, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, storm water or other environmental enhancements, shoulder improvements, and other valued transportation

enhancements. These projects may also require expensive environmental and cultural resource mitigation due to impacts.

Relinquishments

The Relinquishment objective provides funding for legislative relinquishments of portions of state highway routes where ownership of the highway segments is transferred to cities and counties when the relinquishments are considered to be “in the best interest of the state”. Benefits to relinquishing facilities that are no longer required to serve regional and statewide needs include:

- The relinquishment of applicable facilities allow local agencies to be more responsive to community interests in the administration, planning, construction and operation of that facility. The result is a cost savings to taxpayers by eliminating the need for state encroachment permits.
- Reduction of ongoing state maintenance costs.
- Reduction in state tort liability.
- Decrease in incidence response efforts.
- Decreased competition for capital funds for regional and statewide improvements.

When relinquishing a state highway route segment, there may be occasions when it is appropriate for Caltrans to perform work or to provide financial contributions to the recipient agency to ensure that the facility is well-maintained and in operable condition. Additional work or financial contributions may be considered if they are in the best interest of the state. The need for the Relinquishments objective on the SHS is approximately \$28.6 million from the SHOPP over the next ten years.

Roadway Protective Betterments

The Roadway Protective Betterments objective is to protect assets from anticipated future catastrophic damage from natural events such as storms and floods. Example projects include rock slope and rock fall protection, installation of larger diameter culverts, catchment basins and retaining walls. The goal is to address 100 percent of known needs. Unmet needs have high potential for cost increase. The Needs Assessment identified approximately \$467 million from the SHOPP over the next ten years.



Figure 12. Catchment Ditch site along Interstate 80 to mitigate future rock slides.



Unstable slopes and narrow shoulders along Route 101 to be cut to mitigate landslide risks.

Safety Roadside Rest Area Rehabilitation

The Safety Roadside Rest Area (SRRA) Rehabilitation objective is to correct deficiencies, restore existing facilities to a safe condition, and improve capacity and operations at the 86 SRRAs in the SHS. The objective includes addressing the following needs:

- Compliance with mandates
- Operational improvements
- On-site capacity expansion (parking and comfort stations)
- Existing comfort station or other structural element rehabilitation or replacement
- Compliance with ADA and Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) regulations
- Maintenance facilities, crew rooms, and office space for California Highway Patrol personnel
- Utility upgrades (such as photovoltaic energy and water/wastewater)
- Ramp upgrades to current design standards
- Relocation of existing safety SRRAs
- Auxiliary facility construction where expansion and upgrading an existing site is not feasible
- Alternative stopping opportunities for freight trucking only

The SRRA objective is to provide new, safe, conveniently spaced stopping opportunities as an integral part of the SHS where the traveler may stop, rest, relax, obtain travel information and return to the highway more alert and driving safely. California law states that SRRA, "*should be provided so that, in combination with other stopping facilities, there shall be facilities available at intervals of approximately one-half hour's normal driving time.*" Cal/OSHA standards, California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) Code, Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) requirements and other applicable regulatory mandates will be met. A total of nine highway segments have been identified in the 2011 SRRA Master Plan as being in need of new rest area services, with 11 high priority locations identified. Funding for new SRRAs and alternate stopping opportunities has not been available for many years, though there have been some unsuccessful attempts to develop public/private partnerships, including the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Interstate Oasis Program and the state Wayside Stop Demonstration Program. The Needs Assessment identified approximately \$1.2 billion from the SHOPP over the next ten years.



Figure 13. Buckman Springs Rest Area before and after Construction (San Diego County near Pine Valley)

Transportation Related Facilities

The Transportation Related Facility (TRF) objective includes correcting building and site deficiencies associated with worker safety, Cal/OSHA and ADA as well as improve operational efficiency at equipment facilities, maintenance facilities, transportation management centers and transportation material and testing laboratories. Approximately 21 percent of the four million TRF building square footage is in good condition, 15 percent is in fair condition and 64 percent is in poor condition. The goal is to have no TRFs in a poor condition. The need to fix facilities graded poor over the next ten years is approximately \$2.4 billion.



El Centro Maintenance Station and Equipment Sub-Shop Constructed In 1935.



Figure 14. El Centro Maintenance Station and Equipment Sub-Shop after Relocation in 2016

Water and Wastewater Treatment at SRRAs

The Water/Waste Water Treatment objective is to maintain the traveler safety benefits provided by the SRRA System by preventing closures due to noncompliance with drinking water quality and waste water treatment standards. All ADA and structural deficiencies at SRRAAs are identified through the SRRA Rehabilitation element. The identified need is approximately \$96 million from the SHOPP over the next ten years.

Sustainability

Sustainability activities cover a broad spectrum of work that is intended to minimize transportation system impacts on the environment and communities, improve transportation system resiliency, improve the livability of California residents and improve economic prosperity associated with freight movement. Example sustainability activities include:

- Make transportation accessible for all Californians
- Integration of bicycle, transit and pedestrian mode choices for transportation
- Minimize transportation impacts on air quality, water quality and wildlife
- Improve the resiliency of the transportation system to extreme events and climate change
- Make freight improvements to improve prosperity

Collectively, the sustainability activities strive to improve the quality of life in California by making responsible transportation decisions that will be sustainable for future generations. A number of the activities included within the sustainability area have specific legal or permit requirements that mandate minimum investment levels. Failure to adhere to mandated requirements could have future legal implications and condition and performance ramifications that could negatively impact transportation in California. Failure to reduce transportation related pollution and biological impacts is not sustainable for future generations of Californians.

Americans with Disabilities Act Pedestrian Infrastructure



Figure 15. ADA-Compliant Sidewalk

Pedestrian facilities include such things as sidewalks, pedestrian overcrossings and undercrossings, park and ride lots, SRRAs, and accessible pedestrian signals. Unlike other assets, with regards to ADA compliance, pedestrian facilities are either compliant or noncompliant. There is no intermediate condition. There are currently approximately 208,000 noncompliant elements within our pedestrian facilities statewide. The goal is to have all pedestrian facilities in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

This objective is not only mandated by state and federal law, but Caltrans is also under requirements of the *Californians for Disability Rights, Inc. v. California Department of Transportation* (2010), Case No.: C 06 5125. This settlement agreement requires \$1.1 billion be spent over a 30-year period beginning in 2010-11 towards the following types of activities:

- Project development and construction costs (including staffing costs) associated with the covered program access improvements.

- Establish and maintain accessibility grievance procedure, including a system to process other access requests.

The annual requirement increases incrementally from \$25 million for the first five years to \$45 million for the last five fiscal years. For each year the required amount is not met, the remained rolls over to the next fiscal year. Funding from SHOPP for these projects has been increasing. As the amount exceeds the required settlement amount, it is anticipated that Caltrans will catch up and exceed the settlement agreement requirements in 2018-19.

Advance Mitigation

The Advance Mitigation objective includes developing stand-alone compensatory mitigation projects that will help ensure that the right type and quantity of environmental mitigation is available for future transportation projects, in advance of funding those transportation projects. The goal is to improve wildlife habitat connectivity and reduce animal vehicle conflict along highways. Currently, the statutory requirement for compensatory mitigation due to unavoidable impacts to jurisdictional resources can significantly increase the uncertainty related to a project's scope, schedule and cost. Having available mitigation reserves in place reduces the risk to a transportation project's cost and schedule associated with securing environmental permits and/or compensatory mitigation. The means to implement advance mitigation include, but are not limited to, conservation banks or mitigation banks (either by creating new banks or through bulk credit purchases from existing banks), in-lieu fee programs, property transfers and permittee responsible mitigation (i.e. mitigation on public or private lands). The goal is based on the acreage of estimated potential compensatory mitigation need for the transportation projects in the SHSMP. The need for Advance Mitigation is approximately \$300 million from SHOPP over the next ten years.




Figure 16. Highway 89 Stewardship Team project is the second in a series of planned mitigation and research efforts. Two concrete box tunnels and 1.3 miles of wildlife fencing guide animals to safely pass under the highway.

Bridge Scour Mitigation

The Bridge Scour Mitigation objective is to prevent catastrophic bridge failures from natural disasters such as floods and storm events. Bridge Scour Mitigation addresses bridges over water whose bridge foundations have been determined to be unstable for potential assessed or calculated scour conditions (scour critical) per federal guidelines. In past SHOPP documents, the performance measure for bridges has been the number of distressed bridges. Similar to MAP-21 Bridge Health requirements, the performance measure for Bridge Scour Mitigation has changed to a deficiency model of total deck area of the structures in poor condition (scour critical).

There are over 13,160 bridges on the SHS totaling over 245 million square feet of bridge deck area. There is an existing scour critical deficiency of 1.4 million square feet of bridge deck area. Ideally, the goal of this objective would be to address all identified scour critical (poor) bridges but due to the dynamic nature of identification of scour critical bridges (major flooding or storm events) and the time required for the project delivery process, it is not realistic to assume that at the end of the ten-year cycle all scour critical bridges would be addressed. Therefore, the Bridge Scour Mitigation target is to reduce scour critical bridges to 10 percent of the projected ten-year scour critical need. The need for Bridge Scour Mitigation is approximately \$847 million, which includes both needs currently being addressed through the project development process and the existing and projected performance gap. This increase from previous SHOPP documents reflects updated scour assessments of bridges following the collapse of the Tex Wash Bridge on Interstate 10 in July 2015.



Capell Creek Critical Scour before and after



Interstate 10 Tex Wash Bridge Damage before Replacement



Figure 17. Interstate 10 Tex Wash Bridge after Replacement

Bridge Seismic Restoration

The Bridge Seismic Restoration objective is to prevent catastrophic bridge failures from seismic events (earthquakes). Bridge Seismic Restoration addresses bridges that have been determined to be vulnerable to potential seismic activity through screening processes implemented by Caltrans' Office of Earthquake Engineering. A rescreening of potentially seismically vulnerable bridges was completed in 2015 to evaluate these bridges based on updated seismic criteria.

In past SHOPP documents, the performance measure for bridges has been the number of distressed bridges. Similar to MAP-21 Bridge Health requirements, the performance measure for Bridge Seismic Restoration has changed to a deficiency model of total deck area of the structures in poor condition (seismically vulnerable). There is an existing seismic vulnerability of approximately 16 million square feet of bridge deck area. Ideally, the goal of the Bridge Seismic Restoration objective would be to address all seismically vulnerable (poor) bridges identified in the preliminary screening process. The screening process is a preliminary review of bridges that may be seismically vulnerable based on the element configuration of the structure and the surrounding soil prior to detailed seismic analyses being completed. Because bridges identified in the screening process may be found to not require seismic restoration during detailed seismic analysis and due to the length of the time required for the project delivery process, it is not realistic to assume that at the end of the ten-year cycle all currently identified seismically vulnerable bridges would be addressed. Therefore, the Bridge Seismic Restoration target is to reduce seismically vulnerable bridges to 30 percent of the projected ten-year seismic need. The need for Bridge Seismic Restoration is over \$3 billion which includes both needs currently being addressed through the project development process and the existing and projected performance gap. This increase from previous SHOPP documents reflects the updated seismic rescreening of vulnerable bridges completed in 2015.



Figure 18. Trinidad Rd Undercrossing before and after Repair

Hazardous Waste Mitigation

The Hazardous Waste Mitigation objective include removal of underground storage tanks at maintenance stations and Caltrans owned properties, placement of above ground tanks, removal and disposal of contaminated soil and materials, construction and removal of remediation systems, and cleanup of hazardous waste contamination on Caltrans owned properties and right of way. This is a SHOPP reservation program used to ensure contaminated Caltrans facilities and rights-of-way are mitigated to achieve compliance with federal and state regulatory requirements. Funds are set aside to address hazardous waste mitigation needs as they arise. Funded activities are mandated owner operator

responsibilities. Projects include stand-alone construction activities addressing the removal and retrofit of maintenance station underground storage tanks, contaminant removal actions and the construction of mitigation and monitoring systems. The requirements for hazardous waste mitigation fluctuate significantly year to year due to new regulatory mandates and directives and newly identified violations of regulatory requirements. Violation of the federal and state hazardous waste control laws and regulations may result in administrative civil penalties, regulatory orders, federal civil penalties, citizens' law suits and potential criminal charges. Violations may lead to the loss of credibility with regulatory agencies, causing project delivery delays and increased project costs. The risk level and financial impact is high and may include penalties of up to \$25,000 per day per violation. No performance assessment was completed because there are no known needs at this time.



Figure 19. Dorris Maintenance Station Soil Vapor Extraction System (State Route 97, Siskiyou County)



Underground Storage Tank Removed During a Remediation Project

Roadside Rehabilitation

The Roadside Rehabilitation objective is to reduce the long-term maintenance costs of highway planting roadside infrastructure, and provide for replacement, restoration, and rehabilitation of almost 30,000 acres of existing highway planting to an economically maintainable state following damage by weather, acts of nature, or deterioration. This element includes improvements for water conservation, worker safety, and aesthetics:

- Upgrade to more water efficient irrigation systems to achieve a reduction in water consumption.
- Improvements for the purpose of water conservation.
- Convert systems to meet departmental goal of 100 percent recycled water use by 2036.
- Erosion control to comply with Caltrans National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit requirements.
- Implement strategies to improve worker and traveler safety by reducing the frequency and duration of maintenance workers' exposure to traffic.
- Improve roadside appearance and coordination with community character.



Figure 20. Recycled water project designed to improve water conservation using SMART controllers that enable efficient water usage to maintain roadside landscaping.

It is also the purpose of this objective to perform roadside protection and restoration objective which means to enhance, preserve or restore scenic and native landscape areas within or near roadsides, improve corridor functionality, reduce highway facility life cycle costs and improve worker safety, and comply with the following regulatory agency mandates:

- Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 and Storm Water Construction General Permit regulations
- Fish passage remediation when not part of bridge or culvert replacement work
- Wildlife preservation and protection
- Biological connectivity
- Relinquishment of environmental mitigation sites
- Restoration of unsuccessful environmental mitigation sites
- Securing environmental resources that are in high demand but short supply
- Roadside ecological viewing areas
- Rehabilitation of vista points
- Scenic enhancements
- Elimination of qualifying junkyards
- Nonconforming outdoor advertising sign removal

The identified need of this objective is approximately \$2 billion from the SHOPP over the next ten years.

Storm Water Mitigation

The goal of this objective is to ensure Caltrans' storm water discharges to California and federal waters meet applicable water quality standards, through construction of control measures to meet the current National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements and other state and federal laws, such as the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, the Clean Water Act (CWA) and evolving storm water requirements. The NPDES permit mandates Caltrans to achieve a minimum of

33,000 compliance units (CUs) over a 20 year window starting from 2014-15 or 1,650 CUs annually¹ within the 84 Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)² as well as Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS). The Caltrans NPDES Permit also requires retrofits (storm water specific projects) for the location specific requirements and ASBS discharge areas. Failure to achieve annual CU requirements could result in NPDES permit noncompliance and increased project delivery costs, including penalties³. In addition, CUs will accumulate and be added to the 1,650 CU requirement in the following year resulting in the risk of subsequent enforcement actions. Violation of the CWA and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act and their implementing permits and regulations may result in substantial administrative civil liabilities, regulatory enforcement actions, and lawsuits. The requirements of the storm water regulations are dynamic in nature. CUs are expected to increase as new TMDLs are adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and incorporated into subsequent Caltrans NPDES Permit cycles (every five years). In consultation with the SWRCB, Caltrans uses the following four methods to achieve CUs:

1. Caltrans SHOPP Storm Water projects (storm water mitigation stand-alone projects).
2. Caltrans SHOPP Storm Water funding contribution only (FCO) projects, in partnership with locals.
3. Other SHOPP projects such as fish passage projects and projects that include post construction storm water best management practices (BMPs).
4. Other Non-SHOPP, Cooperative Implementation Agreements (CIAs) that provide funding for local agency projects.

Caltrans prioritizes its storm water related activities and addresses TMDLs through implementation of source control measures, BMPs and CIAs. Caltrans will utilize asset management principles and multi-objective decision analysis during project planning and programming to optimize the achievement of CUs through the SHOPP program. Caltrans will continue to collaborate with the SWRCB and Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) to achieve maximum water quality benefit economically and efficiently through CIAs and SHOPP program. The identified need of this objective is approximately \$3.4 billion from the SHOPP, CIAs, and all other sources over the next ten years.

¹ One CU is equivalent to one acre of Caltrans right of way treated for a given pollutant or pollutants in a TMDL watershed for which Caltrans has been identified as a stakeholder.

² TMDL is defined as maximum amount of a pollutant that a water body can receive and still meet water quality standards. These are developed by either of the 9 RWQCBs, SWRCB, or United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) pursuant to state and federal requirements to attain the water quality standards for a specific water body.

³ Penalties for violating the CWA may include both fines up to \$50,000 a day for each violation and imprisonment.

Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure

In 2012, Governor Brown issued Executive Order B-16-12 directing state government agencies to help accelerate the consumer market for zero-emission vehicles (ZEV) in California. The Executive Order called for 1.5 million ZEVs in California by 2025 and established several milestones on the pathway toward this target. In October 2016, the Governor's Office released its updated ZEV Action Plan, setting new strategies and targets to help accelerate the adoption of zero-emission technologies in California. Consistent with the actions in the Governors ZEV Action Plan, Caltrans will be installing publically accessible DC fast-charging stations for Electric Vehicles (EV) at a minimum of 30 Caltrans owned locations by December 2018.



Figure 21. Public DC Fast Charging Station at the Del Lago Park and Ride in Escondido, CA

Complete Streets and Climate Change

Executive Order B-30-15 requires all state investments to take greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions and climate change into consideration. In January 2016, Caltrans executive management issued a memo to immediately include project-level performance including complete streets and GHG emissions in the SHOPP. Over the past year, the Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning began quantifying GHG emissions using the Federal Highway Administration Infrastructure Carbon Estimator tool during project initiation document (PID) development. In addition, the Performance Tab of the SHOPP Tool database was modified to enable Caltrans to track the implementation of complete streets and climate change elements, including mitigated and unmitigated GHG emissions. For projects to be programmed in the 2018 and 2020 SHOPP cycles they must now document how complete streets and climate change elements were considered during the development of the Project Initiation Document (PID) with the goal of including complete streets elements in projects where these elements are feasible. For example, we can include complete streets elements on freeway projects that include ramps or projects along sections of freeway where bicyclists are not prohibited. This effort requires additional analysis and extensive collaboration with local and regional agencies to develop projects that consider all modes of travel including bicycles and pedestrians.

The majority of improvements for bicycle and pedestrian access on state facilities are incorporated in bridge, mobility, pavement, and safety SHOPP projects. The most common elements are curb ramps, sidewalk improvements, pedestrian signals, and enhanced crosswalk visibility. Complete street elements, such as a sidewalk or a bike lane, require acquisition of right-of-way and environmental considerations, so it is very important that these elements are considered early-on to determine the level of analysis and funding required for the project. Caltrans Strategic Management Plan calls for the percentage of projects with complete streets features to increase by 20 percent from a 2016 baseline.

Asset management will result in multi-objective SHOPP projects that consistently include complete streets and climate change elements. By moving towards asset management and breaking down SHOPP program silos, Caltrans will be better aligned to work collaboratively across Caltrans functional units, and work with local and regional partners to serve all users of the transportation system and



Figure 22. LA 110 SB Onramp from W. Manchester Avenue

maximize efficiency in the development of SHOPP projects. Complete streets and climate change project features do not have fiscal performance goals and targets because these project aspects are expected to be incorporated within all projects as applicable.

System Performance and Operation

System performance activities focus on increasing mode choice, providing reliable travel times, improving goods movement and minimizing delay associated with congestion. Activities that improve the transportation system performance include:

- Maintain adequate signage
- Improve highway system traffic flow using transportation management systems
- Installation of cameras and monitoring system to help minimize non-recurrent delay
- Construction of truck climbing lanes, acceleration and deceleration lane and interchange weave lanes
- Installation of ramp meters and connected corridors

The noted activities are all designed to maximize the capacity of the existing transportation system footprint because available funding programs for the maintenance, rehabilitation and replacement of transportation assets prohibit the expansion of the highway system lanes and the state's priorities have shifted away from adding new highway lanes to making the most efficient use of the existing system and diversifying mode choice. Many of the system performance activities also help to improve freight movement that benefits California's businesses and consumers and provides increased employment opportunities. Failure to adequately invest in system performance activities would result in greater congestion, less reliable travel and a less favorable business climate.

Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facilities

The Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facilities (CVEF) objective includes truck weight and inspection stations where the California Highway Patrol monitors and inspects trucks using the SHS to ensure that they are operating safely, licensed properly, and have legal size and weight, which ensures that bridge and pavement assets are not damaged prematurely by overloaded trucks. These facilities are owned by Caltrans and operated by California Highway Patrol personnel. By agreement, both agencies work cooperatively to ensure that the facilities are safe and functional for the staff and public. There are 54 enforcement stations in California, and 85 percent are currently in fair condition, meaning that there are identified needs which must be met to bring the facilities up to good operational condition. The goal for the Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facility objective is to have no facilities in poor condition. The need for CVEF is \$129 million from SHOPP over the next ten years.

Operational Improvements

The Operational Improvement objective includes projects which reduce highway user delay by building improvements which alleviate localized congestion on the SHS. Typical improvements include intersection improvements, acceleration or deceleration lanes, shoulder widening, truck climbing lanes and auxiliary lanes which facilitate traffic merging or weaving. All improvements use a cost-benefit analysis to verify that the delay benefits are justified by the project cost. Delay is calculated by adding up the amount of time vehicles spend below 35mph on the SHS, (totaling more than one million hours

daily in the fourth quarter of 2015 with an economic impact of almost \$17 million per day). The goal for this objective is to mitigate or reduce 10 percent of vehicle delay over ten years. The need for Operational Improvements on the SHS is approximately \$933 million from SHOPP over the next ten years.

Sign Panel Replacement

The Sign Panel Replacement objective is to replace all large overhead and roadside signs to meet federal requirements for retro-reflectivity which reduces the need for overhead sign lighting. Federal requirements for retro-reflectivity are in place to ensure that signs are visible even during night and in inclement weather. The goal is to replace all signs with the current standard for high performance retro-reflective sheeting. The use of this type of sheeting will increase sign service life to between 15-20 years. This will reduce annual replacement needs. Removal of the catwalks should reduce the potential for graffiti and the need for graffiti mitigation. In addition, the elimination of overhead sign lighting will reduce Caltrans' maintenance and utility costs and contribute to Caltrans' goal for reduced GHG footprint. There are approximately 87,000 large sign panels on the state's highways. Current rehabilitation efforts are replacing about 8,000 of those panels. There is a need to replace the other 79,000. The goal is to replace all of these sign panels. Since the service life of the panels currently being installed will exceed the duration of this ten-year Plan, there will be no additional needs based on sign panel age and deterioration. The need is \$700 million over the ten years from SHOPP. The Maintenance Program replaces signs as they get damaged. The rate of damage is not a significant factor in sign replacement for these larger signs.

Transportation Management Systems

Transportation Management System (TMS) assets work together to reduce highway user delay, provide traveler information and collect information on traffic behavior. These assets are an integral part of the SHS, performing critical functions that keep people, vehicles and goods moving. TMS assets also support Integrated Corridor Management (ICM). TMS elements include elements such as changeable message signs, traffic signals, ramp meters, highway advisory radios, video cameras, traffic detectors, roadway weather information systems, and the associated communication infrastructure and software systems to support their operation – including infrastructure connecting these devices to the district transportation management centers (TMCs). Assets such as traffic signals and ramp meters control the flow of traffic on the system to optimize efficiency. Other assets allow system operators to detect highway incidents and dispatch assistance or provide information about detours. In addition to providing real-time data for system operators and travelers, TMS elements also provide historic data to help system planners and engineers forecast and plan projects. There are almost 19,000 TMS elements on the SHS. Approximately 59 percent of them are in good condition. The remaining 41 percent are obsolete or in poor operating condition and are in need of rehabilitation or replacement. TMS elements represent a significant investment for Caltrans and its partners. Many of these elements are over ten years old approaching their operational life cycles and may require rehabilitation in the next five to ten years. Technological improvements are likely to make future elements more reliable

and potentially increase equipment life expectancies. Increased operational readiness of TMS elements will increase performance of the SHS and reduce congestion. TMS elements also require continuous maintenance to realize the operational benefits they are designed to achieve.

The Maintenance Program is responsible for maintaining these devices and communication links that ensure safety and provide real-time information to improve mobility throughout California. Preventive Maintenance is performed on a regular basis to keep equipment in good working order and reach maximum service life. TMS elements on the SHS require over 80,000 preventive maintenance checks and repairs annually to ensure maximum operability. Maintenance utilizes a combination of state forces and on-call service contracts to maintain TMS elements. State forces address preventive maintenance checks and repairs for the majority of field elements such as traffic signals and ramp meters as well as other TMS elements. On-call service contracts are used for overflow repairs beyond the scope of our maintenance crews and are also used for the field elements associated with the Traffic Operations Systems Network (TOSNET) which include the maintenance of wireless assets, fiber optic cables, copper cable, and communications hubs. Without preventive maintenance, TMS elements may not function properly, and may not provide reliable data to the TMCs or be able to provide accurate and reliable information to the motoring public. TMS projects completed in the SHOPP are larger in scale and typically address assets which are at end of life, obsolete, or otherwise non-functional. These projects could include system failures, systemic repairs, replacements, or upgrades. The goal of this objective is to leave no more than 10% of the TMS elements in a poor or obsolete condition. The identified need is approximately \$1.8 billion from the SHOPP over the next ten years.




Chart 10. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for TMS elements on the SHS. Currently 59 percent of TMS elements are in good condition. TMS elements are categorized as good or poor condition. As a result, approximately 4.73 percent of TMS elements deteriorate to poor condition annually. 41 percent of TMS assets are currently in poor condition. SHOPP projects address TMS elements in poor condition and restores the condition of the asset, while maintenance focuses on maintaining TMS elements in good condition by performing preventive maintenance checks as well as repairs.

Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades

The Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades objective is to identify and address geometric restrictions to permit vehicle traffic on the SHS. Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades address restrictions from reduced vertical clearance as established in the Caltrans' Highway Design Manual and load capacity restrictions as identified in federal guidelines. In past SHOPP documents, the performance measure for bridges has been the number of distressed bridges. Similar to MAP-21 Bridge Health requirements, the performance measure for Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades has changed to total deck area of the structures in good, fair, or poor condition.

For Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades, approximately 79 percent of the deck area does not require upgrade (good condition), 8 percent in fair condition, and 13 percent in poor condition. The emphasis of this objective is to address poor condition bridges impacting Interstate mainline traffic. As this is the first time restrictions to permit vehicle traffic have been fully identified, the need substantially exceeds what could be realistically funded or delivered for this objective. The established target is to reduce the inventory to 10 percent of bridges in poor condition for goods movement restrictions. The for Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades is approximately \$5.9 billion which includes both needs currently being addressed through the project development process and the existing and projected performance gap. This increase from previous SHOPP documents reflects a proactive system wide approach to goods movement restrictions.



Figure 23. Walters Road Overcrossing before and after Repair
For Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades, approximately 79 percent of the deck area does not require upgrade (good condition), 8 percent in fair condition, and 13 percent in poor condition. The emphasis of this objective is to address poor condition bridges impacting Interstate mainline traffic. As this is the first time restrictions to permit vehicle traffic have been fully identified, the need substantially exceeds what could be realistically funded or delivered for this objective. The established target is to reduce the inventory to 10 percent of bridges in poor condition for goods movement restrictions. The for Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades is approximately \$5.9 billion which includes both needs currently being addressed through the project development process and the existing and projected performance gap. This increase from previous SHOPP documents reflects a proactive system wide approach to goods movement restrictions.

Weigh-In-Motion Scales

Weigh-In-Motion (WIM) devices are scales in the pavement which weigh vehicles at highway speeds on the mainline highway. These systems are able to calculate the gross vehicle weight of any car or truck, as well as measure the individual axle weights and spacing to determine the vehicle classification. This information is used to fulfil federal mandates, determine enforcement needs, to collect data needed to calculate bridge and pavement needs, and to better perform safety analysis and meet the special needs of trucks. There are 176 WIM stations on the SHS which includes 642 lanes of instrumentation and associated WIM pavement. The goal for the Weigh-In-Motion objective is to have 90 percent of the units in good condition. The identified need for WIM is \$379 million from SHOPP over the next ten years.

Freight

Caltrans' freight transportation vision is reflected in the CFMP, completed in December 2014. This vision is reflected in the following six strategic goals:

Economic Competitiveness

Improve the contribution of the California freight transportation system to economic efficiency, productivity, and competitiveness

Safety and Security

Improve the safety, security, and resilience of the freight transportation system

Freight System Infrastructure Preservation

Improve the state of good repair of the freight transportation system

Environmental Stewardship

Avoid and reduce adverse environmental and community impacts of the freight transportation system

Congestion Relief

Reduce costs to users by minimizing congestion on the freight transportation system

Innovative Technology and Practices

Use innovative technology and practices to operate, maintain, and optimize the efficiency of the freight transportation system while reducing its environmental and community impacts

The FAST Act transforms the National Freight Policy provisions of MAP-21 into a new program that funds freight related projects. It authorizes a five-year total of \$6.2 billion for the program nationwide. The FAST Act created two new freight programs: (1) National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) called FASTLANE Grants and (2) the discretionary funded National Significant Highway and Freight Projects Program (NSHFP). Working with the Commission and freight stakeholders, Caltrans is currently developing a freight investment plan that will include a list of priority projects and a description of how the state will invest and match NHFP funds. These projects need to align with the federally designated National Highway Freight Network (including the Critical Urban and Rural Freight Corridors to be cooperatively designated by Caltrans and MPOs). The freight investment plan will aid Caltrans in meeting the goals laid out in the CFMP.

Complementing the CFMP is the interagency California Sustainable Freight Action Plan (CSFAP), which was published in July 2016. The CSFAP includes a long-term 2050 vision and guiding principles for California's future freight transport system along with targets for 2030. The objectives of the plan are laid out in the Governor's Executive Order B-32-15, which seeks to improve freight efficiency, transition to zero-emission technologies, and increase competitiveness of California's freight system. This transition of California's freight transport system is essential to supporting the state's economic development in coming decades while reducing harmful pollution that affects many California communities.

Organizational Excellence

The Organizational Excellence goal's influence on the SHSMP is in how Caltrans carries out its work regardless of the type of work. These overarching principles will result in better project planning and development regardless of the type of work being performed. The following concepts may be applied individually or in combination as applicable to the project:

Communication

Caltrans shall communicate our planned and programmed projects publically. This communication allows interested parties to understand our plans and initiate communication related to specific projects as appropriate. Communication often means listening to input from differing perspectives related to proposed transportation solutions. This communication also provides a means of explaining the various transportation investments being made on behalf of the people of California.

Partnering

The SHS is a portion of a larger network of transportation that must work together to efficiently meet the transportation needs of all Californians. Caltrans shall partner with local transportation providers to maximize the benefit to the system users. This activity focuses on understanding shared objectives and working together to realize the coordinated delivery of transportation services to the public.

Innovation

Caltrans strives to be innovative in our work. Innovation may take the form of new procurement methods, improved safety ideas, incorporation of state of the art practices, use of innovative construction methods or materials, creative design approaches or creative coordination. Regardless of the form, innovation helps to make Caltrans a world leader in transportation and a premier transportation employer.

Risk Management

Transportation projects have many risks that must be appropriately considered during the project development process. Risks take many forms including design and construction risks, environmental permitting risks, schedule risks, cost risks and many more. Caltrans shall consider project risks and mitigate or manage the risk during the planning and development of our projects.

Collectively, the Organizational Excellence objectives help to make Caltrans a better organization for the public and our employees.

INTEGRATED ASSET CLASS SUMMARY

The California Transportation Commission defined four asset classes as “focus areas” in accordance with California Government Code. The four asset classes: pavement, bridges, culverts and transportation management systems were selected because they represent a significant portion of annual transportation investments in California. Pavements and bridges are also defined under provisions of MAP-21 and FAST Acts. This section consolidates information presented in the Needs Assessment, Investment Plan and Performance Outcomes sections of this Plan and organizes this information by each of the asset classes.

Pavement

Maintaining the condition of the pavement on California’s highways is the single most costly investment made on an annual basis. The large needs are a function of the size of the system, rapid deterioration caused by heavy use and costs associated with fixing the pavement. Pavement assets are divided into three pavement classes that reflect the varying demands of the different classes of roadways that make up the SHS.

The condition of the pavement inventory is deteriorating at a rate of 9 percent per year from good to fair and at a rate of between 3-4 percent from fair to poor (as shown in Chart 11).

The 2017 SHSMP establishes a goal of treating 1,900 lane miles annually through HM projects, based on existing funding of \$234 million for HM projects. Caltrans anticipates using 10 percent of the HM funding to address the fair performance gap and 90 percent of the funding to keep pavement in good condition. Currently, there are




Chart 11. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for pavement on the SHS. Currently there is between 35-45 percent of pavement in good condition – which ranges by pavement classification. Approximately 9 percent of pavement in good condition deteriorates to fair condition annually. Of the 51-58 percent of pavement in fair condition, approximately 3-4 percent of the pavement inventory declines to poor condition annually. SHOPP projects address pavement in both fair and poor condition and restores the condition of approximately 1,374 lane miles annually, while maintenance focuses on maintaining 1,710 lane miles in good condition as well addressing 190 lane miles of pavement in fair condition. It should be noted the deterioration rates are revised based on proposed MAP-21 condition criteria.

maintenance needs on approximately 12,900 lane miles of pavement. The maintenance need is expected to grow to slightly over 13,000 lane miles at the end of a ten-year period with funding at the current level and the rate of deterioration as shown in Chart 11. The expected modest increase in maintenance needs over the ten-year period would be offset by increased investment in the SHOPP. If pavement rehabilitation is funded in the SHOPP consistent with this report, no additional funding is recommended for the pavement maintenance program, as growth of future maintenance would be reduced. If pavement rehabilitation is not funded in the SHOPP as proposed in this Plan, the pavement maintenance needs will grow over time.

Bridge

Bridge maintenance needs are identified and documented during bridge inspections and through engineering analysis. Identified preventive maintenance needs that are beyond the capacity of Caltrans bridge crews are developed into projects to be completed under HM contracts. Development and construction of a typical bridge maintenance project takes approximately two to three years. While the current project stream is in development, additional HM needs are continuously being identified by the bridge inspectors.

As the bridge inventory ages, the rate of newly identified maintenance needs is growing and is expected to continue that growth in the future. This increase, considering the number of bridges Caltrans is able to address through HM bridge projects and state forces, is tracking with expectations. Through a combination of strategic planning, maintenance field activities, and bridge preservation contracts, Caltrans is working to slow the growth of rehabilitation and replacement needs.

The Bridge Health objective in the SHOPP has a projected performance gap of 5.8 million square feet (approximately 310




Chart 12. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for bridges on the SHS. Currently 75 percent of bridge decks, measured by square feet, are in good condition. Approximately 0.45 percent of bridge decks in good condition deteriorates to fair condition annually. Of the 22 percent of bridge decks in fair condition, approximately 0.75 percent of the bridge deck inventory declines to poor condition annually. SHOPP projects address 2.3 million square feet of bridge decks annually in both fair and poor condition and restores the condition of the asset, while maintenance focuses on maintaining 5.4 million square feet annually of bridge decks in good condition as well addressing some bridge decks in fair condition.

bridges) of deck area in fair condition. It is anticipated that the Maintenance Program will address 40 percent of that performance gap (2.3 million square feet or 124 bridges) through HM projects while continuing to provide preventive maintenance measures on good condition bridges to prevent them from deteriorating into fair condition. If bridge rehabilitation is funded consistent with the SHOPP Investment Plan identified in this Plan, no additional funding is recommended for the bridge maintenance program. If bridge rehabilitation and replacement is not funded as recommended in this Plan, the bridge maintenance needs will grow over time.

Drainage (Culvert)

Caltrans continues to build our inventory of culverts running under or draining the SHS. Ongoing culvert inspections are adding between 8-12,000 culverts to the statewide inventory annually. Inspection production rates are dependent on many factors including right-of-way constraints, environmental permits, multiyear mitigation permits, and traffic considerations. Much of the “easier” access locations have been captured leaving locations that are more difficult to access and more time consuming to inspect. Caltrans is actively pursuing various methods to increase the number of inspections performed. Between 2014-15 and 2015-16 an annual average of 8,215 culverts were inspected.

The condition of the culvert inventory is deteriorating at a rate of 2 percent per year – both from good to fair and from fair to poor. Based on historical assessment rates and anticipated rates of deterioration creates an annual increase of approximately 270,000 linear feet (2,760 culverts) in the fair category and an annual increase of 141,000 linear feet (1,440 culverts) to the poor category.

Between 2014-15 and 2015-16 an annual average of 144 culverts were repaired through HM contracts. There are approximately 392,000 linear feet (4,000 culverts) in need




Chart 13. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for drainage systems (culverts) on the SHS. Currently 65 percent of culverts, measured by linear feet, are in good condition. Approximately 2 percent of culverts in good condition deteriorate to fair condition annually. Of the 23 percent of culverts in fair condition, approximately 2 percent of the culvert inventory declines to poor condition annually. SHOPP projects address over 40,375 linear feet of culverts annually in both fair and poor condition and restores the condition of the asset, while maintenance focuses on maintaining 14,000 linear feet of culverts annually in good condition as well addressing culverts in fair condition.

of maintenance on an annual basis. At the current annual maintenance investment of \$23 million, the number of culverts in need of maintenance treatment is anticipated to increase to just short of 6.9 million linear feet (70,000 culverts) in a ten-year period.

The culvert maintenance needs have been recognized in various funding proposals; therefore, no additional changes are recommended to the \$23 million annual level of investment. The 2017 SHSMP Investment Plan calls for an investment of \$845 million for culvert rehabilitation and replacement in the SHOPP. If Drainage System Restoration is funded consistent with the SHOPP Investment Plan identified in this Plan, no additional funding is recommended.

TMS Elements

Preventive maintenance is performed on a regular basis to keep TMS equipment in good working order and achieve maximum service life. TMS elements on the SHS deteriorate at a rate of almost 5 percent per year and require over 80,000 preventive maintenance checks and repairs annually to existing TMS inventory to maintain operating condition. Maintenance utilizes a combination of state forces and on-call service contracts to maintain TMS elements. TMS field elements are maintained with a goal Level of Service score of 90. State forces address preventive maintenance checks and repairs for the majority of field elements such as traffic signals, ramp meters as well as other TMS elements. On-call service contracts are primarily used for maintaining the communications infrastructure associated with TOSNET which include the maintenance of wireless assets, fiber optic cables, copper cable, and communications hubs.

Through a combination of state forces and on-call service contracts, Caltrans is able to address more than 52,000 preventive maintenance




Chart 14. Displays the deterioration and repair cycle for TMS elements on the SHS. Currently 59 percent of TMS elements are in good condition. TMS elements are categorized as good or poor condition. As a result, approximately 4.73 percent of TMS elements deteriorate to poor condition annually. 41 percent of TMS assets are currently in poor condition. SHOPP projects address 377 TMS elements annually in poor condition and restores the condition of the asset, while maintenance focuses on maintaining TMS elements in good condition by performing over 52,000 preventive maintenance checks as well as repairs annually.

checks and repairs annually. Some assets reporting in poor condition may be operational but have exceeded the expected service life and are obsolete. As a result, operational readiness may be higher than good condition shown in Chart 14. The operational readiness of TMS elements, except for traffic signals, ranges between 65-85 percent good, varying by district. Caltrans is working diligently to increase the operational readiness of TMS assets. Caltrans Maintenance Program expends an average of \$20 million and 169 positions on the maintenance of these assets and recommends the existing level of funding to maintain TMS elements remain unchanged. If TMS elements are provided funding consistent with the SHOPP Investment Plan, no additional funding is recommended for the TMS in the Maintenance Program. The SHOPP Investment Plan calls for \$864 million investment for TMS elements. Given the combined investments in TMS, the condition is expected to improve markedly in the early portion of the plan period due to a 2016 SHOPP investment in detection and then begin to slowly decline later in the Plan period.

MAINTENANCE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

Cost Effectiveness

California Government Code requires Caltrans to identify strategies to control costs associated with the maintenance of the SHS. The following sections identifies a number of strategies being used for each asset class:

Pavement

- Apply life cycle cost analysis in design. Caltrans has doubled the rehabilitation design life of pavement from 20-40 years by using more effective pavement design and life cycle cost analysis. This design analysis, applied during the planning and development of pavement capital projects, ensures the most cost-effective project is constructed at the lowest cost. Maintenance treatments (including Highway Maintenance projects and state forces) are still required to reach the designed service life.
- Follow an appropriate 3-20 year cycle of preventive maintenance treatments on the SHS.
- Using recycled materials in pavement reduces the impact on new materials and the environment while maintaining the same or better pavement performance. Caltrans uses recycled tires in some pavement, reducing the pressure on landfills. According to the “2014 Crumb Rubber Report,” approximately 27 percent of all flexible pavement on the SHS was designed with rubberized asphalt.

Bridges

- Caltrans continues to maximize the use of limited maintenance funding and to control bridge maintenance costs by using new materials that last longer and are easier to apply, such as epoxy paint, polyester concrete, corrosion resistant rebar and other design details.
- Caltrans is implementing policies to ensure that new projects are built with cost-effective and easily maintained elements. Caltrans is also studying best practices of other state departments of transportation to ensure the best business practices are employed in California.

Culverts

- Caltrans is using remote controlled cameras to complete culvert inspections which reduces worker exposure and completes difficult culvert inspections more efficiently.
- Caltrans is using remote controlled equipment where practical to perform drain cleaning activities more efficiently.
- Caltrans is utilizing trenchless culvert replacement techniques, where appropriate, which minimize disruptions to the ground surface and the infrastructure above it. This practice decreases the need for full replacement/rehabilitation.

- Caltrans is utilizing lining replacement techniques which allow the repair of existing culverts without having to remove and replace the existing deteriorated culvert. Some of the technology considered include paved invert, cured-in-place pipe liner, slip lining, and centrifugally cast liner.
- Preventive maintenance is performed to the extent practical to provide waterway adequacy, such as ditch cleaning and culvert cleaning on an annual basis at some locations, even more frequently at some locations to prolong the service life of the culverts.
- In improving efficiency, Maintenance staff check culverts annually, as well as during and after each major storm and perform preventative maintenance as needed (flushing sediment in the pipe, cleaning the inlets and outlets).

TMS Elements

- Caltrans utilizes on-call service contracts to supplement state forces and continues to integrate on-call service contracts to the extent possible. Caltrans has consolidated on-call contracts over multiple Districts (where feasible) to minimize administrative costs.
- Over the last two years, Maintenance and Traffic Operations have begun using one Trouble Ticket system to effect TOSNET system repairs. Once a problem is identified and entered into the Ticket system, the ticket is automatically relayed to the appropriate Maintenance staff. Maintenance then has the option of completing the repairs through state forces or by utilizing the on-call service contracts if state forces do not have the manpower or expertise. This method ensures consistent trouble reporting; ensures that problems are reported as expeditiously as possible; minimizes inaccurate trouble reporting, and duplications of effort.

Maintenance Program Budget

Highway Maintenance Projects

Highway Maintenance projects are selected by evaluating the asset condition at a route-specific level. This approach is needs-based and considers key factors including: asset age, climate and geographic location, Average Daily Traffic, and projected deterioration. HM projects provide the greatest value and extend service life of assets at the lowest possible long-term cost.

Highway Maintenance project selection balances the short-term needs of the system, long-term goals and available resources. HM projects extend the service life of assets and are our primary SHOPP cost avoidance mechanism in the Maintenance Program. The needs of the SHS are assessed in a systematic manner (e.g. PaveM) which includes analysis of these highway deficiencies and their potential solutions. Program advisors review proposed projects, and select those which maximize maintenance investments.

Maintenance Program Budget Allocation Tool (State Forces)

The Maintenance Program has examined its practices on how it allocates resources for field maintenance activities. This is especially valuable given the present and expected future funding, which could place considerable constraints on maintaining the system. Development is under way to improve these practices, and will be shaped by considering Level of Service (LOS), condition of assets, and performance while balancing mandated activities and historic demands on maintenance resources (snow, emergency response, maintenance service requests, etc.) with a commitment to system preservation.

The Maintenance Program Budget Allocation Tool (BAT) is under development and is expected to enhance budget management capabilities. The BAT uses a combination of climate and geographic location, Average Daily Traffic, LOS performance, and inventory data to project future resource needs with performance-level expectations. This tool will be used to develop 2017-18 allocations for the ten high-priority maintenance activities identified below:

- Pavement (potholes/cracks/spalls)
- Bridge field maintenance activities
- Guardrail
- Striping
- Signs
- Traffic signals
- Roadway lighting
- Tree/brush encroachment
- Litter/debris
- Graffiti

CONCLUSION

As the SHS continues to age, the demands of vehicle and truck traffic is accelerating the deterioration of these assets. Compounding this deterioration is the lack of adequate funding necessary for rehabilitation and restoration work necessary to bring all of the transportation infrastructure to a state of good operating condition. The increased demands and deferred rehabilitation and restoration results in lower operational performance, higher user operating costs and ultimately require a higher overall investment when needed repairs to the system are undertaken. The shortfall of available funding for infrastructure repair needs such as signs, lighting, drainage, planting, mandate compliance and transportation related facilities has resulted in increased worker exposure to traffic due to the need for more frequent maintenance and an increased level of urgent repair expenditures. In addition, the ever increasing cost of meeting legal, statutory, and regulatory mandates is a significant contributor to the ten-year needs.

The SHSMP presented a performance management based Needs Assessment that first defined the needs on the assets and subsequently divided the need into available funding sources. This Needs Assessment incorporated new performance measures proposed by federal regulation and goals established by the Commission. The SHOPP ten-year escalated need for the rehabilitation and operation of the SHS for the period from 2017-18 through 2026-27 is \$85.8 billion. Major Maintenance Program needs are an additional \$10.3 billion over the ten-year period.

The SHSMP presents an Investment Plan that defines the distribution of available funding from the SHOPP, Maintenance and the new FASTLANE Freight Program to address the identified needs. The SHOPP is the single largest funding source available to address rehabilitation needs on the SHS. The Projected funding available for the SHOPP is approximately \$2.6 billion a year over the ten-year Plan period. Comparing the Needs Assessment to the Investment Plan identified annual funding shortfall for the SHS of approximately \$6.2 billion across all objectives. Major Maintenance Programs are directed primarily at preventive and minor corrective repairs that delay the need for rehabilitation in the SHOPP. Maintenance contract funding is approximately \$2.6 billion over the ten-year Plan period. The passage of the FAST Act has provided up to \$900 million for freight improvements on the SHS over ten years.

The Needs Assessment identified needs that surpass available funding by almost four times. Caltrans will continue to prioritize the available resources to the most pressing areas. Maintenance contract funds are fully committed to treatments and strategies that extend the service life of existing assets and delay future rehabilitation needs. In the 2017 SHSMP approximately 67 percent of available SHOPP funding is focused on fixing the existing transportation system, 17 percent for safety improvement and 10 percent for sustainability initiatives and 6 percent for system performance improvements. The FAST Act freight funds will provide an estimated additional \$90 million annually for system performance improvements on the SHS.

The 2017 SHSMP fully implemented the performance management requirements of MAP-21/FAST Acts. This strategic way of looking at performance based infrastructure management has resulted in a plan that is consistent in approach across assets and deficiencies in addition to being fully transparent in its analysis. Coupled with the implementation of performance management is a fundamental shift in how the SHOPP is being managed. Beginning with the 2017 SHSMP, SHOPP funding targets will be established at the district level instead of by asset in headquarters. The change in the funding allocation structure will provide greater flexibility for the Caltrans districts to better combine various types of work together to make the projects as efficient as possible with a minimum disruption to the traveling public.

Caltrans continues to refine our Multi-Objective Decision Analysis (MODA) project selection and decision methodologies. A pilot program initiated in 2016 has further informed this effort. Academic decision analysis experts are currently reviewing the pilot program work and making suggested improvements. By summer of 2017, we expect to have improved models that will provide a more transparent and objective project selection framework. The performance management approach implemented with this Plan is consistent with the ongoing project prioritization work. Together these pieces along with others are building the structure for sound asset management of the highway system in California.

APPENDIX A: STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

Federal Endangered Species Act

Governs conservation of threatened and endangered ecosystems that species of fish, wildlife, and plants depend.

16 U.S.C. section 1531 et seq.

<http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title16-section1531&num=0&edition=prelim>

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act)

Governs surface water pollution as enforced by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

33 U.S.C. section 1251

<http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title33-section1251&num=0&edition=prelim>

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

Governs construction and maintenance activities that impact storm water quality.

33 U.S.C. section 1342

[http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=\(title:33%20section:1342%20edition:prelim\)%20OR%20\(granuleid:USC-prelim-title33-section1342\)&f=treesort&edition=prelim&num=0&jumpTo=true](http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=(title:33%20section:1342%20edition:prelim)%20OR%20(granuleid:USC-prelim-title33-section1342)&f=treesort&edition=prelim&num=0&jumpTo=true)

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)

Governs hazardous and non-hazardous solid waste management.

42 U.S.C. section 6901 et seq.

<http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title42-section6901&num=0&edition=prelim>

Federal Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA)

Governs hazardous waste site cleanup resulting from accidents, spills, and other emergency releases of pollutants and contaminants into the environment.

42 U.S.C. section 9601 et seq.

<http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title42-section9601&num=0&edition=prelim>

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

Governs accessibility services and facility requirements for individuals with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. section 12101 et seq.

<http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title42-section12101&num=0&edition=prelim>

Statewide Potable Urban Water Usage Reduction

Requires State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to reduce statewide water usage by 25 percent.

Executive Order B-29-15

https://www.gov.ca.gov/docs/4.1.15_Executive_Order.pdf

Senate Bill 857

Requires Caltrans to prepare an annual report to the Legislature regarding department's progress in locating, assessing, and remediating barriers to fish passage.

Fish and Game Code section 1602

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=200520060SB857

Fish and Wildlife Protection and Conservation

Requires written notification when an activity/project may substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of any river, stream, or lake.

Fish and Game Code section 1602

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=1602.&lawCode=FGC

California Endangered Species Act (CESA)

Protects and preserves all native species threatened by extinction or experiencing a significant decline which, if not halted, would lead to a threatened or endangered designation.

Fish and Game Code sections 2050-2069

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=fhc&group=02001-03000&file=2050-2069>

California Transportation Commission

Requires Caltrans to prepare an asset management plan to CTC for approval no later than January 31 of each even-numbered year.

Government Code section 14526.5

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=14526.5.&lawCode=GOV

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Requires state and local agencies to identify the significant environmental impacts associated with their activities and to mitigate those impacts.

Public Resources Code sections 21000-21177

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayexpandedbranch.xhtml?tocCode=PRC&division=13.&title=&part=&chapter=&article=

Transportation Funding Plan

Requires Caltrans to prepare a ten-year state rehabilitation plan and a five-year maintenance plan that addresses rehabilitation and maintenance needs of the state highway system.

Streets and Highways Code section 164.6

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=164.6.&lawCode=SHC

Safety Roadside Rests

Requires CTC and Caltrans to plan, design, and construct safety roadside rests outside the state park system units. In addition, Caltrans must maintain safety roadside rests on the state highway system.

Streets and Highways Code section 218 et seq.

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=SHC&division=1.&title=&part=&chapter=1.&article=7.

Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA)

Establishes surface mining and reclamation policy to regulate surface mining operations to minimize adverse environmental impacts and reclaimed mined lands are in a usable condition.

Public Resources Code section 2710 et. seq.

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=PRC&division=2.&title=&part=&chapter=9.&article=1.

Highway Users Tax Account (HUTA)

Explains fuel tax revenue uses and establishes county apportionment amounts in accordance with various tax laws.

Streets and Highways Code sections 2104-2108

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=SHC&division=3.&title=&part=&chapter=3.&article=

Railroad Crossings

Outlines construction practices surrounding railroad crossings, including policy development by CTC in consultation with Caltrans.

Public Utilities Code sections 1201-1220

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=PUC&division=1.&title=&part=1.&chapter=6.&article=

Railway-Highway Crossings

Requires states to make safety improvements at public railroad-highway crossings and submit an annual progress report to FHWA.

23 U.S.C. section 130

[http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=\(title:23%20section:130%20edition:prelim\)%20OR%20\(granuleid:USC-prelim-title23-section130\)&f=treesort&edition=prelim&num=0&jumpTo=true](http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=(title:23%20section:130%20edition:prelim)%20OR%20(granuleid:USC-prelim-title23-section130)&f=treesort&edition=prelim&num=0&jumpTo=true)

Assembly Bill 2289

Amends Government Code section 14526.5 to include capital improvement projects relative to the operation of state highways and bridges.

Chapter 76 , Statutes of 2016

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB2289

APPENDIX B: PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SUMMARY SHEETS

Objectives	Page Number
Bridge Rail Replacement and Upgrade	1
Collision Severity Reduction	2
Roadside Safety Improvements	3
Safety Improvements	4
Bridge Health	5
Drainage Pump Plants	6
Drainage System Restoration	7
Lighting Rehabilitation	8
Major Damage (Emergency Opening)	9
Major Damage (Permanent Restoration)	10
Office Buildings	11
Overhead Sign Structures Rehabilitation	12
Pavement Class I	13
Pavement Class II	14
Pavement Class III	15
Relinquishments	16
Roadway Protective Betterments	17
Safety Roadside Rest Area (SRRAs) Rehabilitation	18
Transportation Related Facilities	19
Water and Wastewater Treatment at SRRAs	20
ADA Pedestrian Infrastructure	21
Advance Mitigation	22
Bridge Scour Mitigation	23
Bridge Seismic Restoration	24
Hazardous Waste Mitigation	25
Roadside Rehabilitation	26
Storm Water Mitigation	27
Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure	28
Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facilities	29
Operational Improvements	30
Sign Panel Replacement	31
Transportation Management Systems	32
Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades	33
Weigh-In-Motion Scales	34

ASSET MANAGEMENT FACTS

The Performance Management Summary Sheets are included in the appendix of the State Highway System Management Plan. These sheets summarize the inventory, condition breakdown, deterioration rates, pipelined work, targets, unit cost to address the needs and a statewide and district level cost summary. The summary sheets include sections A - M as shown below. A description of each section is provided for each lettered section below:

Drainage System Restoration										
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)					
A	10,647,970	Linear Feet					B	20,274,500	Linear Feet	
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate										
C	Into Fair	2.00	% per Year							
	Into Poor	2.00	% per Year							
Current Condition					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario					
D	Good	6,923,197	65.02%			E	Good	10,545,813	52.02%	
	Fair	2,499,915	23.48%				Fair	6,444,466	31.79%	
	Poor	1,224,858	11.50%				Poor	3,284,221	16.30%	
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal					
F	Fix Fair to Good	7,867	0.07%			G	Good or New	16,625,090	82.00%	
	Fix Poor to Good	124,033	1.16%				Fair	2,027,450	10.00%	
	Add New	0	0.00%				Poor	1,621,960	8.00%	
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost					
H	Fix Fair to Good	4,409,149	41.41%			I	Fix Fair to Good	\$300	80.00%	
	Fix Poor to Good	1,538,228	14.45%				Fix Poor to Good	\$1,300	53.85%	
	Add New	0	0.00%				Add New	\$1,300	53.85%	
Estimated Costs										
J	Pipelined Maintenance Projects	50	Maintenance Performance Gap			K	\$2,380,940,460	Total	L	\$5,719,178,460
	Pipelined SHOPP Projects	\$261,782,000	SHOPP Performance Gap				\$3,076,456,000			
District Breakdown										
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost	Goal Constrained Need
D1	1,180,715	\$2,000	\$2,361,429,916	0	\$2,000	287,642	\$540	134,210	\$2,000	\$423,746,680
D2	1,756,533	\$2,000	\$3,513,065,888	0	\$2,000	349,713	\$540	60,010	\$2,000	\$308,865,020
D3	1,444,956	\$2,000	\$2,889,912,676	0	\$2,000	362,362	\$540	223,061	\$2,000	\$641,797,480
D4	1,784,772	\$2,000	\$3,569,544,468	0	\$2,000	386,436	\$540	77,859	\$2,000	\$364,393,440
D5	2,443,680	\$2,000	\$4,887,360,215	0	\$2,000	511,855	\$540	206,051	\$2,000	\$688,503,700
D6	2,991,424	\$2,000	\$5,982,848,917	0	\$2,000	774,052	\$540	369,318	\$2,000	\$1,156,624,080
D7	920,689	\$2,000	\$1,841,378,886	0	\$2,000	180,257	\$540	70,123	\$2,000	\$237,584,780
D8	1,876,811	\$2,000	\$3,753,622,518	0	\$2,000	360,810	\$540	95,441	\$2,000	\$385,719,400
D9	969,197	\$2,000	\$1,938,394,655	0	\$2,000	183,318	\$540	32,303	\$2,000	\$163,597,720
D10	1,215,005	\$2,000	\$2,430,010,776	0	\$2,000	271,525	\$540	88,012	\$2,000	\$322,647,500
D11	2,935,378	\$2,000	\$5,870,756,207	0	\$2,000	599,545	\$540	144,848	\$2,000	\$613,450,300
D12	755,338	\$2,000	\$1,510,675,378	0	\$2,000	141,634	\$540	36,992	\$2,000	\$150,466,360
HQ	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Statewide Totals	20,274,500	NA	\$40,549,000,000	0	NA	4,409,149	NA	1,538,228	NA	\$5,457,396,460

- A. Current inventory for physical assets or magnitude of deficiency.
- B. Projected inventory or deficiency at the end of the period. Typically equals current numbers.
- C. Average annual deterioration rates used in the calculation of the projected condition.
- D. The current breakdown of the condition of physical assets. Deficiencies are typically poor.
- E. Projected future condition based on a do nothing scenario. Uses projected future inventory.
- F. Pipeline of quantities from the SHOPP, PID work plan commitments, and other sources.
- G. Established performance targets. These are not constrained targets.
- H. The summation of the district level non-negative performance gaps for fair and poor.
- I. The average unit costs for repair and associated support ratio.
- J. The dollar value of the Maintenance and SHOPP unfunded future commitments.
- K. The dollar value necessary to close the performance gap. Split between SHOPP and Maintenance.

L. The total need to achieve the performance target. Includes HM and SHOPP funding.

M. District level breakdown of the inventory, gaps and SHOPP and Maintenance needs.

Notes

A negative gap means that the projected condition and planned pipeline will result in the district surpassing the statewide performance target in a ten-year period.

Bridge Rail Replacement and Upgrade									
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)				
8,226,434					8,226,434				
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Linear Feet				
Into Fair					0.00 % per Year				
Into Poor					0.00 % per Year				
Current Condition					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario				
Good					4,919,050				
Fair					33.29%				
Poor					568,798				
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal				
Fix Fair to Good					8,226,434				
Fix Poor to Good					0				
Add New					0				
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*				
Fix Fair to Good					\$1,375				
Fix Poor to Good					\$1,375				
Add New					\$1,375				
Estimated Costs									
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work					\$0				
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects					\$314,194,000				
Maintenance Performance Gap					\$0				
SHOPP Performance Gap					\$5,882,828,875				
District Breakdown									
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need
D1	290,438	\$1,925	\$559,093,150	0	\$1,925	89,832	\$1,925	31,117	\$1,925 \$232,826,825
D2	261,471	\$1,925	\$503,331,675	0	\$1,925	84,499	\$1,925	12,212	\$1,925 \$186,168,675
D3	795,380	\$1,925	\$1,531,106,500	0	\$1,925	313,880	\$1,925	47,624	\$1,925 \$695,895,200
D4	1,645,604	\$1,925	\$3,167,787,700	0	\$1,925	446,459	\$1,925	92,783	\$1,925 \$1,038,040,850
D5	350,405	\$1,925	\$674,529,625	0	\$1,925	110,679	\$1,925	42,827	\$1,925 \$295,499,050
D6	408,027	\$1,925	\$785,451,975	0	\$1,925	100,997	\$1,925	22,345	\$1,925 \$237,433,350
D7	1,774,798	\$1,925	\$3,416,486,150	0	\$1,925	553,741	\$1,925	138,146	\$1,925 \$1,331,882,475
D8	771,528	\$1,925	\$1,485,191,400	0	\$1,925	264,781	\$1,925	13,397	\$1,925 \$535,492,650
D9	46,550	\$1,925	\$89,608,750	0	\$1,925	11,685	\$1,925	1,871	\$1,925 \$26,095,300
D10	371,347	\$1,925	\$714,842,975	0	\$1,925	167,809	\$1,925	15,980	\$1,925 \$353,793,825
D11	945,635	\$1,925	\$1,820,347,375	0	\$1,925	317,172	\$1,925	7,612	\$1,925 \$625,209,200
D12	565,251	\$1,925	\$1,088,108,175	0	\$1,925	157,084	\$1,925	11,483	\$1,925 \$324,491,475
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A
Statewide Totals	8,226,434	N/A	\$15,835,885,450	0	N/A	2,618,618	N/A	437,397	N/A \$5,882,828,875

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Collision Severity Reduction												
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)							
Injuries					Injuries							
52,483					52,483							
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate												
Into Fair		N/A		% per Year								
Into Poor		N/A		% per Year								
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario							
Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A				
Fair		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A				
Poor		52,483		100.00%		52,483		100.00%				
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)												
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A				
Fix Poor to Good		1,410		2.69%								
Add New		N/A		N/A								
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years												
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A				
Fix Poor to Good		3,896		7.42%								
Add New		N/A		N/A				N/A				
Estimated Costs												
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0			Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0			
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$718,968,000			SHOPP Performance Gap			\$605,438,400			
District Breakdown												
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need		
D1	793	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-11	\$155,400	\$0		
D2	718	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30	\$155,400	\$4,662,000		
D3	3,286	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	204	\$155,400	\$31,701,600		
D4	10,080	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	876	\$155,400	\$136,130,400		
D5	2,241	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	114	\$155,400	\$17,715,600		
D6	2,866	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	274	\$155,400	\$42,579,600		
D7	14,645	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,287	\$155,400	\$199,999,800		
D8	6,081	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	207	\$155,400	\$32,167,800		
D9	130	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-46	\$155,400	\$0		
D10	2,330	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	144	\$155,400	\$22,377,600		
D11	4,827	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	436	\$155,400	\$67,754,400		
D12	4,486	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	324	\$155,400	\$50,349,600		
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Statewide Totals	52,483	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,896	N/A	\$605,438,400		

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Roadside Safety Improvements																
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)											
21,706 Locations					21,706 Locations											
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate																
Into Fair		N/A	% per Year													
Into Poor		N/A	% per Year													
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario											
Good		N/A	N/A			Good		N/A	N/A							
Fair		N/A	N/A			Fair		N/A	N/A							
Poor		21,706	100.00%			Poor		21,706	100.00%							
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal											
Fix Fair to Good		N/A	N/A			Good or New		21,706	100.00%							
Fix Poor to Good		5,665	26.10%			Fair		N/A	N/A							
Add New		N/A	N/A			Poor		0	0.00%							
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*											
Fix Fair to Good		N/A	N/A			Fix Fair to Good		N/A	N/A							
Fix Poor to Good		16,041	73.90%			Fix Poor to Good		\$46,090	49.43%							
Add New		N/A	N/A			Add New		N/A	N/A							
Estimated Costs																
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0			Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0							
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$496,886,100			SHOPP Performance Gap			\$1,104,743,670							
Total										\$1,601,629,770						
District Breakdown																
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need						
D1	214	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	191	\$68,870	\$13,154,170						
D2	647	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	610	\$68,870	\$42,010,700						
D3	1,138	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	827	\$68,870	\$56,955,490						
D4	3,158	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,571	\$68,870	\$177,064,770						
D5	1,010	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	758	\$68,870	\$52,203,460						
D6	1,568	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,363	\$68,870	\$93,869,810						
D7	6,190	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,910	\$68,870	\$338,151,700						
D8	2,814	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,000	\$68,870	\$68,870,000						
D9	110	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	96	\$68,870	\$6,611,520						
D10	664	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	281	\$68,870	\$19,352,470						
D11	2,263	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,830	\$68,870	\$126,032,100						
D12	1,930	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,604	\$68,870	\$110,467,480						
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
Statewide Totals	21,706	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16,041	N/A	\$1,104,743,670						

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Safety Improvements																		
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)													
N/A					N/A													
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate																		
Into Fair		N/A		% per Year														
Into Poor		N/A		% per Year														
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario													
Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A										
Fair		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A										
Poor		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A										
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal													
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A										
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A										
Add New		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A										
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*													
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A										
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A										
Add New		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A										
Estimated Costs																		
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0		Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0										
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$1,570,089,800		SHOPP Performance Gap			\$2,639,910,200										
Total																		
\$4,210,000,000																		
District Breakdown																		
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need									
D1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
D2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
D3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
D4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
D5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
D6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
D7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
D8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
D9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
D10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
D11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
D12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
Statewide Totals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Bridge Health										
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)					
245,756,328					245,756,328					
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario					
Into Fair		0.45 % per Year		Good 175,812,240 71.54%		Fair 57,827,565 23.53%		Poor 12,116,523 4.93%		
Into Poor		0.75 % per Year								
Current Condition					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal					
Good		184,096,588 74.91%		Good or New 205,206,534 83.50%		Fair 36,863,449 15.00%		Fair 36,863,449 15.00%		
Fair		53,560,236 21.79%		Poor 3,686,345 1.50%						
Poor		8,099,504 3.30%								
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Average Unit Cost*					
Fix Fair to Good		17,563,465 7.15%		Fix Fair to Good \$260 32.31%						
Fix Poor to Good		4,901,702 1.99%		Fix Poor to Good \$380 27.11%						
Add New		0 0.00%		Add New \$500 27.00%						
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Estimated Costs					
Fix Fair to Good		5,829,933 2.37%		Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work \$102,279,000		Maintenance Performance Gap \$559,673,568		Total \$6,146,660,966		
Fix Poor to Good		3,590,027 1.46%		Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects \$2,302,570,000		SHOPP Performance Gap \$3,182,138,398				
District Breakdown					District Breakdown					
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need
D1	5,472,154	\$635	\$3,474,817,790	0	\$635	-210,677	\$344	-3,086	\$483	\$0
D2	5,657,505	\$635	\$3,592,515,675	0	\$635	200,791	\$344	116,294	\$483	\$125,242,106
D3	23,052,228	\$635	\$14,638,164,780	0	\$635	141,017	\$344	177,547	\$483	\$134,265,049
D4	53,117,342	\$635	\$33,729,512,170	0	\$635	4,329,213	\$344	967,548	\$483	\$1,956,574,956
D5	7,567,834	\$635	\$4,805,574,590	0	\$635	-30,521	\$344	30,807	\$483	\$14,879,781
D6	10,932,062	\$635	\$6,941,859,370	0	\$635	-5,025	\$344	203,038	\$483	\$98,067,354
D7	63,052,408	\$635	\$40,038,279,080	0	\$635	-683,632	\$344	458,977	\$483	\$221,685,891
D8	21,442,324	\$635	\$13,615,875,740	0	\$635	-247,015	\$344	-54,466	\$483	\$0
D9	984,611	\$635	\$625,227,985	0	\$635	-52,865	\$344	-3,999	\$483	\$0
D10	9,398,629	\$635	\$5,968,129,415	0	\$635	355,640	\$344	926,457	\$483	\$569,818,891
D11	25,492,125	\$635	\$16,187,499,375	0	\$635	803,272	\$344	312,820	\$483	\$427,417,628
D12	19,587,106	\$635	\$12,437,812,310	0	\$635	-1,199,547	\$344	396,539	\$483	\$191,528,337
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Statewide Totals	245,756,328	N/A	\$156,055,268,280	0	N/A	5,829,933	N/A	3,590,027	N/A	\$3,739,479,993

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Drainage Pump Plants												
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)							
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario							
290	Locations				290	Locations						
Current Condition			Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario			Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal						
Good	70	24.14%	Good	52	17.93%	Good or New	232	80.00%	Fair	80	27.59%	
Fair	85	29.31%	Fair	80	27.59%	Fair	58	20.00%	Poor	158	54.48%	
Poor	135	46.55%	Poor	158	54.48%	Poor	0	0.00%				
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)			Average Unit Cost*			Support Ratio**						
Fix Fair to Good	2	0.69%	Fix Fair to Good	\$580,000	50.00%	Fix Fair to Good	\$580,000	50.00%	Fix Poor to Good	\$580,000	50.00%	
Fix Poor to Good	44	15.17%	Fix Poor to Good	\$580,000	50.00%	Add New	\$580,000	50.00%	Add New	\$580,000	50.00%	
Add New	0	0.00%										
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years			Estimated Costs			Total						
Fix Fair to Good	25	8.62%	Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work	\$0	Maintenance Performance Gap	\$0	Total	\$164,925,000	Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects	\$43,995,000	SHOPP Performance Gap	\$120,930,000
Fix Poor to Good	114	39.31%										
Add New	0	0.00%										
District Breakdown												
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need		
D1	0	\$870,000	\$0	0	\$870,000	0	\$870,000	0	\$870,000	\$0		
D2	0	\$870,000	\$0	0	\$870,000	0	\$870,000	0	\$870,000	\$0		
D3	43	\$870,000	\$37,410,000	0	\$870,000	9	\$870,000	20	\$870,000	\$25,230,000		
D4	71	\$870,000	\$61,770,000	0	\$870,000	3	\$870,000	31	\$870,000	\$29,580,000		
D5	10	\$870,000	\$8,700,000	0	\$870,000	1	\$870,000	6	\$870,000	\$6,090,000		
D6	73	\$870,000	\$63,510,000	0	\$870,000	10	\$870,000	13	\$870,000	\$20,010,000		
D7	52	\$870,000	\$45,240,000	0	\$870,000	-4	\$870,000	34	\$870,000	\$29,580,000		
D8	2	\$870,000	\$1,740,000	0	\$870,000	1	\$870,000	0	\$870,000	\$870,000		
D9	0	\$870,000	\$0	0	\$870,000	0	\$870,000	0	\$870,000	\$0		
D10	21	\$870,000	\$18,270,000	0	\$870,000	-1	\$870,000	2	\$870,000	\$1,740,000		
D11	5	\$870,000	\$4,350,000	0	\$870,000	1	\$870,000	0	\$870,000	\$870,000		
D12	13	\$870,000	\$11,310,000	0	\$870,000	0	\$870,000	8	\$870,000	\$6,960,000		
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Statewide Totals	290	N/A	N/A	\$252,300,000	0	N/A	25	N/A	114	N/A	\$120,930,000	

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Drainage System Restoration									
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)				
10,647,970					Linear Feet				
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Inventory (in 2027)				
Into Fair 2.00 % per Year					Linear Feet				
Into Poor 2.00 % per Year									
Current Condition					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario				
Good 6,923,197 65.02%					Good 10,545,812 52.02%				
Fair 2,499,915 23.48%					Fair 6,444,466 31.79%				
Poor 1,224,858 11.50%					Poor 3,284,222 16.20%				
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)									
Fix Fair to Good 7,867 0.07%					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal				
Fix Poor to Good 124,033 1.16%					Good or New 16,219,598 80.00%				
Add New 0 0.00%					Fair 2,027,451 10.00%				
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Poor 2,027,451 10.00%				
Fix Fair to Good 4,409,148 41.41%					Average Unit Cost*				
Fix Poor to Good 1,132,738 10.64%					Fix Fair to Good \$300 86.00%				
Add New 0 0.00%					Fix Poor to Good \$1,300 53.85%				
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work \$0					Add New \$1,300 53.85%				
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects \$301,421,000					Estimated Costs				
Maintenance Performance Gap \$2,460,304,584					Total \$5,027,201,584				
SHOPP Performance Gap \$2,265,476,000					District Breakdown				
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need
D1	1,180,715	\$2,000	\$2,361,430,000	0	\$2,000	287,641	\$558	110,595	\$2,000 \$381,693,678
D2	1,756,533	\$2,000	\$3,513,066,000	0	\$2,000	349,712	\$558	24,881	\$2,000 \$244,901,296
D3	1,444,956	\$2,000	\$2,889,912,000	0	\$2,000	362,362	\$558	194,162	\$2,000 \$590,521,996
D4	1,784,772	\$2,000	\$3,569,544,000	0	\$2,000	386,437	\$558	42,164	\$2,000 \$299,959,846
D5	2,443,680	\$2,000	\$4,887,360,000	0	\$2,000	511,855	\$558	157,177	\$2,000 \$599,969,090
D6	2,991,424	\$2,000	\$5,982,848,000	0	\$2,000	774,052	\$558	309,490	\$2,000 \$1,050,901,016
D7	920,689	\$2,000	\$1,841,378,000	0	\$2,000	180,257	\$558	51,709	\$2,000 \$204,001,406
D8	1,876,811	\$2,000	\$3,753,622,000	0	\$2,000	360,810	\$558	57,905	\$2,000 \$317,141,980
D9	969,197	\$2,000	\$1,938,394,000	0	\$2,000	183,318	\$558	12,919	\$2,000 \$128,129,444
D10	1,215,005	\$2,000	\$2,430,010,000	0	\$2,000	271,524	\$558	63,712	\$2,000 \$278,934,392
D11	2,935,378	\$2,000	\$5,870,756,000	0	\$2,000	599,546	\$558	86,140	\$2,000 \$506,826,668
D12	755,338	\$2,000	\$1,510,676,000	0	\$2,000	141,634	\$558	21,884	\$2,000 \$122,799,772
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A
Statewide Totals	20,274,500	N/A	\$40,548,996,000	0	N/A	4,409,148	N/A	1,132,738	N/A \$4,725,780,584

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Lighting Rehabilitation												
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)							
89,829					89,829							
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario							
Into Fair		1.79		% per Year		Good		29,653				
Into Poor		5.26		% per Year		Fair		12,380				
Current Condition					Poor		47,796		53.21%			
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal							
Fix Fair to Good		0		0.00%		Good or New		0				
Fix Poor to Good		0		0.00%		Fair		89,829				
Add New		0		0.00%		Poor		0				
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*							
Fix Fair to Good		0		0.00%		Fix Fair to Good		\$8,400				
Fix Poor to Good		47,796		53.21%		Fix Poor to Good		\$8,400				
Add New		0		0.00%		Add New		\$8,400				
Estimated Costs												
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0	Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0	Total				
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$0	SHOPP Performance Gap			\$602,229,600	\$602,229,600				
District Breakdown												
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need			
D1	1,339	\$12,600	\$16,871,400	0	\$12,600	-1,205	\$12,600	804	\$12,600 \$10,130,400			
D2	2,087	\$12,600	\$26,296,200	0	\$12,600	-1,736	\$12,600	702	\$12,600 \$8,845,200			
D3	6,719	\$12,600	\$84,659,400	0	\$12,600	-5,661	\$12,600	2,606	\$12,600 \$32,835,600			
D4	21,662	\$12,600	\$272,941,200	0	\$12,600	-19,062	\$12,600	13,047	\$12,600 \$164,392,200			
D5	2,864	\$12,600	\$36,086,400	0	\$12,600	-2,497	\$12,600	1,572	\$12,600 \$19,807,200			
D6	5,140	\$12,600	\$64,764,000	0	\$12,600	-4,447	\$12,600	2,121	\$12,600 \$26,724,600			
D7	24,542	\$12,600	\$309,229,200	0	\$12,600	-22,242	\$12,600	16,802	\$12,600 \$211,705,200			
D8	6,951	\$12,600	\$87,582,600	0	\$12,600	-5,916	\$12,600	2,682	\$12,600 \$33,793,200			
D9	441	\$12,600	\$5,556,600	0	\$12,600	-375	\$12,600	207	\$12,600 \$2,608,200			
D10	2,635	\$12,600	\$33,201,000	0	\$12,600	-2,370	\$12,600	1,535	\$12,600 \$19,341,000			
D11	6,574	\$12,600	\$82,832,400	0	\$12,600	-4,600	\$12,600	1,746	\$12,600 \$21,999,600			
D12	8,875	\$12,600	\$111,825,000	0	\$12,600	-7,338	\$12,600	3,972	\$12,600 \$50,047,200			
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A			
Statewide Totals	89,829	N/A	\$1,131,845,400	0	N/A	0	N/A	47,796	N/A \$602,229,600			

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Major Damage (Emergency Opening)											
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)						
N/A					N/A						
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Need (in 2027)						
Into Fair		N/A		% per Year		N/A		N/A			
Into Poor		N/A		% per Year							
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario						
Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fair		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Poor		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal						
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Add New		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*				Support Ratio**		
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Add New		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Estimated Costs											
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0		Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0			
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$420,000,000		SHOPP Performance Gap			\$1,105,000,000			
District Breakdown											
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need		
D1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Statewide Totals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Major Damage (Permanent Restoration)											
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)						
N/A					N/A						
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Need (in 2027)						
Into Fair		N/A		% per Year		N/A		N/A			
Into Poor		N/A		% per Year							
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario						
Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fair		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Poor		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal						
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Add New		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*				Support Ratio**		
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Add New		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Estimated Costs											
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0		Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0			
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$530,930,000		SHOPP Performance Gap			\$804,000,000			
District Breakdown											
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need		
D1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Statewide Totals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Office Buildings													
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)								
2,778,299					2,778,299								
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario								
Into Fair		3.09		% per Year		Good		803,480					
Into Poor		0.29		% per Year		Fair		1,212,174					
Current Condition					Poor		762,645		27.45%				
Good					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal								
Fair		1,163,096		41.86%		Good or New		1,666,980					
Poor		877,944		31.60%		Fair		1,111,319					
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)		737,259		26.54%		Poor		0					
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*								
Fix Fair to Good		0		0.00%		Fix Fair to Good		\$13					
Fix Poor to Good		0		0.00%		Fix Poor to Good		\$633					
Add New		0		0.00%		Add New		\$633					
Estimated Costs													
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work				\$0	Maintenance Performance Gap				\$0				
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects				\$0	SHOPP Performance Gap				\$491,225,085				
District Breakdown													
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need				
D1	91,456	\$769	\$70,329,664	0	\$769	-32,406	\$60	0	\$769 \$0				
D2	47,851	\$769	\$36,797,419	0	\$769	-19,140	\$60	47,851	\$769 \$36,797,419				
D3	0	\$769	\$0	0	\$769	0	\$60	0	\$769 \$0				
D4	750,000	\$652	\$489,000,000	0	\$652	450,000	\$13	0	\$652 \$5,850,000				
D5	41,700	\$918	\$38,280,600	0	\$918	-16,680	\$13	41,700	\$918 \$38,280,600				
D6	78,000	\$996	\$77,688,000	0	\$996	-31,200	\$13	78,000	\$996 \$77,688,000				
D7	716,200	\$652	\$466,962,400	0	\$652	-286,480	\$13	0	\$652 \$0				
D8	336,000	\$652	\$219,072,000	0	\$652	201,600	\$13	0	\$652 \$2,620,800				
D9	37,496	\$1,736	\$65,093,056	0	\$1,736	-14,998	\$13	37,496	\$1,736 \$65,093,056				
D10	91,174	\$716	\$65,280,584	0	\$716	-36,470	\$13	91,174	\$716 \$65,280,584				
D11	0	\$652	\$0	0	\$652	0	\$13	0	\$652 \$0				
D12	0	\$652	\$0	0	\$652	0	\$13	0	\$652 \$0				
HQ	588,422	\$428	\$251,844,616	0	\$428	-113,371	\$9	466,424	\$428 \$199,629,472				
Statewide Totals	2,778,299	N/A	\$1,780,348,339	0	N/A	651,600	N/A	762,645	N/A \$491,239,931				

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Overhead Sign Structures Rehabilitation															
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)										
16,470					16,470										
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate															
Into Fair		1.79		% per Year											
Into Poor		5.26		% per Year											
Current Condition					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario										
Good		12,266		74.47%		Good		10,069		61.14%					
Fair		3,584		21.76%		Fair		3,896		23.66%					
Poor		620		3.76%		Poor		2,505		15.21%					
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal										
Fix Fair to Good		0		0.00%		Good or New		0		0.00%					
Fix Poor to Good		0		0.00%		Fair		16,470		100.00%					
Add New		0		0.00%		Poor		0		0.00%					
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*					Support Ratio**					
Fix Fair to Good		0		0.00%		Fix Fair to Good		\$120,000		60.00%					
Fix Poor to Good		2,505		15.21%		Fix Poor to Good		\$120,000		60.00%					
Add New		0		0.00%		Add New		\$120,000		60.00%					
Estimated Costs															
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work				\$0	Maintenance Performance Gap				\$0	Total					
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects				\$0	SHOPP Performance Gap				\$480,960,000	\$480,960,000					
District Breakdown															
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need					
D1	74	\$192,000	\$14,208,000	0	\$192,000	-61	\$192,000	0	\$192,000	\$0					
D2	117	\$192,000	\$22,464,000	0	\$192,000	-96	\$192,000	0	\$192,000	\$0					
D3	1,259	\$192,000	\$241,728,000	0	\$192,000	-1,008	\$192,000	62	\$192,000	\$11,904,000					
D4	3,121	\$192,000	\$599,232,000	0	\$192,000	-2,454	\$192,000	231	\$192,000	\$44,352,000					
D5	236	\$192,000	\$45,312,000	0	\$192,000	-182	\$192,000	24	\$192,000	\$4,608,000					
D6	1,095	\$192,000	\$210,240,000	0	\$192,000	-861	\$192,000	78	\$192,000	\$14,976,000					
D7	4,559	\$192,000	\$875,328,000	0	\$192,000	-3,385	\$192,000	1,264	\$192,000	\$242,688,000					
D8	1,730	\$192,000	\$332,160,000	0	\$192,000	-1,281	\$192,000	308	\$192,000	\$59,136,000					
D9	10	\$192,000	\$1,920,000	0	\$192,000	-8	\$192,000	0	\$192,000	\$0					
D10	482	\$192,000	\$92,544,000	0	\$192,000	-377	\$192,000	44	\$192,000	\$8,448,000					
D11	2,228	\$192,000	\$427,776,000	0	\$192,000	-1,691	\$192,000	280	\$192,000	\$53,760,000					
D12	1,559	\$192,000	\$299,328,000	0	\$192,000	-1,170	\$192,000	214	\$192,000	\$41,088,000					
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Statewide Totals	16,470	N/A	\$3,162,240,000	0	N/A	0	N/A	2,505	N/A	\$480,960,000					

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Pavement Class I														
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)									
26,014					26,014									
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Lane Miles									
Into Fair					% per Year									
Into Poor					2.68									
Current Condition					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario									
Good					Good									
Fair					1,178									
Poor					45.08%									
13,148					Fair									
1,140					20,175									
4.38%					Poor									
4,661					17.92%									
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal									
Fix Fair to Good					Good or New									
669					15,609									
Fix Poor to Good					Fair									
0					10,145									
Add New					Poor									
0					260									
0.00%					1.00%									
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*									
Fix Fair to Good					\$707,872									
3,732					Fix Poor to Good									
17.68%					\$1,167,412									
Fix Poor to Good					Add New									
0					\$1,103,000									
0.00%					20.00%									
Estimated Costs														
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work					\$67,866,480									
\$0					Total									
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects					\$12,619,824,725									
SHOPP Performance Gap														
\$8,904,525,795														
District Breakdown														
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need					
D1	1,063	\$1,323,600	\$1,406,986,800	0	\$1,323,600	415	\$891,152	68	\$1,155,600 \$448,408,880					
D2	934	\$1,323,600	\$1,236,242,400	0	\$1,323,600	343	\$990,328	91	\$1,016,400 \$432,174,904					
D3	1,792	\$1,323,600	\$2,371,891,200	0	\$1,323,600	652	\$994,376	75	\$1,274,400 \$743,913,152					
D4	3,470	\$1,323,600	\$4,592,892,000	0	\$1,323,600	73	\$481,292	1,004	\$1,363,200 \$1,403,787,116					
D5	1,170	\$1,323,600	\$1,548,612,000	0	\$1,323,600	440	\$868,888	43	\$1,188,000 \$433,394,720					
D6	2,100	\$1,323,600	\$2,779,560,000	0	\$1,323,600	370	\$824,360	327	\$1,236,000 \$709,185,200					
D7	4,424	\$1,323,600	\$5,855,606,400	0	\$1,323,600	-423	\$412,476	759	\$1,662,000 \$1,261,458,000					
D8	4,212	\$1,323,600	\$5,575,003,200	0	\$1,323,600	368	\$714,052	747	\$1,254,000 \$1,199,509,136					
D9	1,435	\$1,323,600	\$1,899,366,000	0	\$1,323,600	705	\$699,884	51	\$1,178,400 \$553,516,620					
D10	1,303	\$1,323,600	\$1,724,650,800	0	\$1,323,600	273	\$915,440	110	\$1,257,600 \$388,251,120					
D11	2,741	\$1,323,600	\$3,627,987,600	0	\$1,323,600	718	\$684,704	171	\$1,758,000 \$792,235,472					
D12	1,370	\$1,323,600	\$1,813,332,000	0	\$1,323,600	241	\$689,764	286	\$1,539,600 \$606,558,724					
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Statewide Totals	26,014	N/A	\$34,432,130,400	0	N/A	4,598	N/A	3,732	N/A \$8,972,393,044					

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Pavement Class II										
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)					
16,759					16,759					
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Lane Miles					
Into Fair					% per Year					
3.37					% per Year					
Current Condition					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario					
Good					Good					
Fair					730					
Poor					4.36%					
9,657					Fair					
1,135					11,635					
5,967					Poor					
6.77%					4,394					
Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario					26.22%					
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal					
Fix Fair to Good					Good or New					
2,809					9,215					
Fix Poor to Good					55.00%					
290					Fair					
Add New					7,207					
0					43.00%					
0.00%					Poor					
0.00%					337					
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*					
Fix Fair to Good					\$253,274					
2,118					15.31%					
Fix Poor to Good					\$612,184					
3,767					20.00%					
Add New					\$595,000					
0					20.00%					
Estimated Costs					Support Ratio**					
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work					Fix Fair to Good					
\$0					\$253,274					
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects					Fix Poor to Good					
\$1,675,788,481					\$612,184					
Maintenance Performance Gap					Add New					
\$91,179,900					\$595,000					
SHOPP Performance Gap					Total					
\$3,294,704,920					\$5,061,673,301					
District Breakdown										
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need
D1	732	\$714,000	\$522,648,000	0	\$714,000	160	\$282,250	129	\$600,000	\$122,560,000
D2	1,886	\$714,000	\$1,346,604,000	0	\$714,000	420	\$282,250	243	\$600,000	\$264,345,000
D3	1,848	\$714,000	\$1,319,472,000	0	\$714,000	366	\$301,237	299	\$904,800	\$380,787,942
D4	2,078	\$714,000	\$1,483,692,000	0	\$714,000	-179	\$291,519	876	\$748,800	\$655,948,800
D5	1,374	\$714,000	\$981,036,000	0	\$714,000	77	\$284,642	273	\$638,400	\$196,200,634
D6	1,536	\$714,000	\$1,096,704,000	0	\$714,000	405	\$308,712	264	\$1,024,800	\$395,575,560
D7	1,586	\$714,000	\$1,132,404,000	0	\$714,000	-280	\$290,398	512	\$730,800	\$374,169,600
D8	1,947	\$714,000	\$1,390,158,000	0	\$714,000	103	\$283,446	407	\$619,200	\$281,209,338
D9	627	\$714,000	\$447,678,000	0	\$714,000	252	\$282,250	13	\$600,000	\$78,927,000
D10	1,589	\$714,000	\$1,134,546,000	0	\$714,000	123	\$292,939	348	\$771,600	\$304,548,297
D11	1,041	\$714,000	\$743,274,000	0	\$714,000	212	\$289,202	247	\$711,600	\$237,076,024
D12	515	\$714,000	\$367,710,000	0	\$714,000	-40	\$282,624	156	\$606,000	\$94,536,000
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Statewide Totals	16,759	N/A	\$11,965,926,000	0	N/A	2,118	N/A	3,767	N/A	\$3,385,884,195

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Pavement Class III													
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)								
6,871 Lane Miles					6,871 Lane Miles								
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate													
Into Fair		9.00 % per Year											
Into Poor		4.34 % per Year											
Current Condition					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario								
Good		2,580		37.55%		Good		259 3.77%					
Fair		3,734		54.34%		Fair		4,435 64.55%					
Poor		557		8.11%		Poor		2,177 31.68%					
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal								
Fix Fair to Good		228		3.32%		Good or New		3,092 45.00%					
Fix Poor to Good		22		0.32%		Fair		3,641 53.00%					
Add New		0		0.00%		Poor		138 2.00%					
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*								
Fix Fair to Good		754		10.97%		Fix Fair to Good		\$107,000 16.68%					
Fix Poor to Good		2,017		29.36%		Fix Poor to Good		\$400,000 20.00%					
Add New		0		0.00%		Add New		\$400,000 20.00%					
Estimated Costs													
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work \$0			Maintenance Performance Gap \$74,193,600			Total \$1,259,455,970							
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects \$197,159,070			SHOPP Performance Gap \$988,103,300										
District Breakdown													
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need				
D1	546	\$480,000	\$262,080,000	0	\$480,000	7	\$124,850	223	\$480,000 \$107,913,950				
D2	1,181	\$480,000	\$566,880,000	0	\$480,000	200	\$124,850	219	\$480,000 \$130,090,000				
D3	699	\$480,000	\$335,520,000	0	\$480,000	19	\$124,850	272	\$480,000 \$132,932,150				
D4	366	\$480,000	\$175,680,000	0	\$480,000	-98	\$124,850	246	\$480,000 \$118,080,000				
D5	646	\$480,000	\$310,080,000	0	\$480,000	23	\$124,850	251	\$480,000 \$123,351,550				
D6	1,399	\$480,000	\$671,520,000	0	\$480,000	146	\$124,850	407	\$480,000 \$213,588,100				
D7	247	\$480,000	\$118,560,000	0	\$480,000	-90	\$124,850	158	\$480,000 \$75,840,000				
D8	411	\$480,000	\$197,280,000	0	\$480,000	55	\$124,850	71	\$480,000 \$40,946,750				
D9	420	\$480,000	\$201,600,000	0	\$480,000	148	\$124,850	19	\$480,000 \$27,597,800				
D10	581	\$480,000	\$278,880,000	0	\$480,000	45	\$124,850	116	\$480,000 \$61,298,250				
D11	375	\$480,000	\$180,000,000	0	\$480,000	111	\$124,850	35	\$480,000 \$30,658,350				
D12	0	\$480,000	\$0	0	\$480,000	0	\$124,850	0	\$480,000 \$0				
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Statewide Totals	6,871	N/A	\$3,298,080,000	0	N/A	754	N/A	2,017	N/A				
(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.													
(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.													

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Relinquishments											
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)						
N/A					N/A						
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Need (in 2027)						
Into Fair		N/A		% per Year		N/A		N/A			
Into Poor		N/A		% per Year							
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario						
Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fair		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Poor		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal						
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Add New		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*				Support Ratio**		
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Add New		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Estimated Costs											
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0		Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0			
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$15,600,000		SHOPP Performance Gap			\$13,000,000			
District Breakdown											
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need		
D1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Statewide Totals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Roadway Protective Betterments																
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)											
91 Locations					91 Locations											
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario											
Into Fair		N/A	% per Year			Good		N/A	N/A							
Into Poor		N/A	% per Year			Fair		N/A	N/A							
Current Need					Poor											
Good		N/A	N/A			91		100.00%	100.00%							
Fair		N/A	N/A													
Poor		91	100.00%													
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)																
Fix Fair to Good		N/A	N/A			Good or New		91	100.00%							
Fix Poor to Good		19	20.88%			Fair		N/A	N/A							
Add New		N/A	N/A			Poor		0	0.00%							
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years																
Fix Fair to Good		N/A	N/A			Average Unit Cost*		Support Ratio**								
Fix Poor to Good		72	79.12%			Fix Fair to Good		N/A	N/A							
Add New		N/A	N/A			Fix Poor to Good		\$3,369,000	47.82%							
						Add New		N/A	N/A							
Estimated Costs																
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0			Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0							
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$108,068,000			SHOPP Performance Gap			\$358,560,000							
Total										\$466,628,000						
District Breakdown																
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need						
D1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$4,980,000	\$0						
D2	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	\$4,980,000	\$9,960,000						
D3	7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	\$4,980,000	\$9,960,000						
D4	43	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	43	\$4,980,000	\$214,140,000						
D5	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	\$4,980,000	\$29,880,000						
D6	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	\$4,980,000	\$4,980,000						
D7	9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	\$4,980,000	\$39,840,000						
D8	11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	\$4,980,000	\$49,800,000						
D9	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$4,980,000	\$0						
D10	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$4,980,000	\$0						
D11	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$4,980,000	\$0						
D12	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$4,980,000	\$0						
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
Statewide Totals	91	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	72	N/A	\$358,560,000						

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Safety Roadside Rest Area (SRRA) Rehabilitation												
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)							
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario		Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal					
Into Fair		6.79 % per Year			Good 9 10.47%		Good or New 77 80.00%					
Into Poor		20.00 % per Year			Fair 19 22.09%		Fair 20 20.00%					
Good		28 32.56%			Poor 58 67.44%		Poor 0 0.00%					
Fair		33 38.37%										
Poor		25 29.07%										
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Average Unit Cost*							
Fix Fair to Good		0 0.00%			Fix Fair to Good \$7,840,000 104.08%		Fix Fair to Good \$7,840,000 104.08%					
Fix Poor to Good		8 9.30%			Fix Poor to Good \$7,840,000 104.08%		Fix Poor to Good \$7,840,000 104.08%					
Add New		0 0.00%			Add New \$18,000,000 43.00%		Add New \$18,000,000 43.00%					
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Support Ratio**							
Fix Fair to Good		4 4.65%										
Fix Poor to Good		50 58.14%										
Add New		11 12.79%										
Estimated Costs					Total \$1,192,140,000							
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work \$0			Maintenance Performance Gap \$0			Total \$1,147,140,000						
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects \$45,000,000			SHOPP Performance Gap \$1,147,140,000									
District Breakdown												
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need			
D1	6	\$25,740,000	\$154,440,000	0	\$25,740,000	-1	\$16,000,000	6	\$16,000,000 \$96,000,000			
D2	20	\$25,740,000	\$514,800,000	0	\$25,740,000	0	\$16,000,000	14	\$16,000,000 \$224,000,000			
D3	11	\$25,740,000	\$283,140,000	0	\$25,740,000	1	\$16,000,000	7	\$16,000,000 \$128,000,000			
D4	3	\$25,740,000	\$77,220,000	0	\$25,740,000	1	\$16,000,000	0	\$16,000,000 \$16,000,000			
D5	5	\$25,740,000	\$128,700,000	0	\$25,740,000	1	\$16,000,000	2	\$16,000,000 \$48,000,000			
D6	10	\$25,740,000	\$257,400,000	4	\$25,740,000	0	\$16,000,000	5	\$16,000,000 \$182,960,000			
D7	0	\$25,740,000	\$0	0	\$25,740,000	0	\$16,000,000	0	\$16,000,000 \$0			
D8	15	\$25,740,000	\$386,100,000	4	\$25,740,000	-2	\$16,000,000	8	\$16,000,000 \$230,960,000			
D9	4	\$25,740,000	\$102,960,000	0	\$25,740,000	-1	\$16,000,000	4	\$16,000,000 \$64,000,000			
D10	6	\$25,740,000	\$154,440,000	1	\$25,740,000	-1	\$16,000,000	2	\$16,000,000 \$57,740,000			
D11	6	\$25,740,000	\$154,440,000	2	\$25,740,000	1	\$16,000,000	2	\$16,000,000 \$99,480,000			
D12	0	\$25,740,000	\$0	0	\$25,740,000	0	\$16,000,000	0	\$16,000,000 \$0			
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Statewide Totals	86	N/A	N/A	\$2,213,640,000	11	N/A	4	N/A	50 N/A \$1,147,140,000			

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Transportation Related Facilities												
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)							
3,986,339					4,083,722							
SF					SF							
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario							
Into Fair		5.00		% per Year		Good		519,187				
Into Poor		5.00		% per Year		Fair		722,196				
Current Condition					Poor		2,842,339		69.60%			
Good					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal							
Fair		843,614		21.16%		Good or New		2,450,232				
Poor		600,776		15.07%		Fair		1,633,490				
2,541,949		63.77%		Poor		0		0.00%				
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Average Unit Cost*							
Fix Fair to Good		0		0.00%		Fix Fair to Good		\$450				
Fix Poor to Good		15,927		0.40%		Fix Poor to Good		\$450				
Add New		97,383		2.44%		Add New		\$450				
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Support Ratio**							
Fix Fair to Good		1,134		0.03%		Fix Fair to Good		78.00%				
Fix Poor to Good		2,826,412		70.90%		Fix Poor to Good		78.00%				
Add New		0		0.00%		Add New		78.00%				
Estimated Costs					Total							
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0		Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0				
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$122,178,000		SHOPP Performance Gap			\$2,264,864,346				
District Breakdown												
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need			
D1	200,772	\$801	\$160,818,372	0	\$801	-69,938	\$801	190,401	\$801 \$152,511,201			
D2	364,294	\$801	\$291,799,494	0	\$801	-94,731	\$801	277,040	\$801 \$221,909,040			
D3	491,952	\$801	\$394,053,552	0	\$801	-146,810	\$801	414,255	\$801 \$331,818,255			
D4	485,907	\$801	\$389,211,507	0	\$801	-133,296	\$801	389,470	\$801 \$311,965,470			
D5	173,263	\$801	\$138,783,663	0	\$801	-51,517	\$801	150,893	\$801 \$120,865,293			
D6	284,717	\$801	\$228,058,317	0	\$801	-68,351	\$801	204,999	\$801 \$164,204,199			
D7	596,261	\$801	\$477,605,061	0	\$801	-69,952	\$801	235,632	\$801 \$188,741,232			
D8	398,480	\$801	\$319,182,480	0	\$801	-76,826	\$801	212,948	\$801 \$170,571,348			
D9	156,429	\$801	\$125,299,629	0	\$801	-29,332	\$801	120,539	\$801 \$96,551,739			
D10	246,213	\$801	\$197,216,613	0	\$801	-67,335	\$801	202,865	\$801 \$162,494,865			
D11	216,712	\$801	\$173,586,312	0	\$801	-6,851	\$801	136,878	\$801 \$109,639,278			
D12	212,500	\$801	\$170,212,500	0	\$801	1,134	\$801	44,270	\$801 \$36,368,604			
HQ	256,222	\$801	\$205,233,822	0	\$801	-97,489	\$801	246,222	\$801 \$197,223,822			
Statewide Totals	4,083,722	N/A	\$3,271,061,322	0	N/A	1,134	N/A	2,826,412	N/A \$2,264,864,346			

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Water and Wastewater Treatment at SRRAs												
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)							
45		Locations			45		Locations					
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate												
Into Fair		6.92 % per Year										
Into Poor		20.00 % per Year										
Current Condition					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario							
Good		13 28.89%			Good		4 8.89%					
Fair		6 13.33%			Fair		9 20.00%					
Poor		26 57.78%			Poor		32 71.11%					
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal							
Fix Fair to Good		0 0.00%			Good or New		35 80.00%					
Fix Poor to Good		24 53.33%			Fair		10 20.00%					
Add New		0 0.00%			Poor		0 0.00%					
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*							
Fix Fair to Good		2 4.44%			Fix Fair to Good		\$1,826,510 60.00%					
Fix Poor to Good		8 17.78%			Fix Poor to Good		\$1,826,510 60.00%					
Add New		0 0.00%			Add New		\$1,826,510 60.00%					
Estimated Costs												
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work				\$0	Maintenance Performance Gap				\$0			
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects				\$66,353,000	SHOPP Performance Gap				\$29,224,160			
District Breakdown												
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need			
D1	3	\$2,922,416	\$8,767,248	0	\$2,922,416	-1	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416 \$0			
D2	15	\$2,922,416	\$43,836,240	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416	3	\$2,922,416 \$8,767,248			
D3	4	\$2,922,416	\$11,689,664	0	\$2,922,416	-1	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416 \$0			
D4	0	\$2,922,416	\$0	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416 \$0			
D5	4	\$2,922,416	\$11,689,664	0	\$2,922,416	-1	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416 \$0			
D6	6	\$2,922,416	\$17,534,496	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416 \$0			
D7	0	\$2,922,416	\$0	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416 \$0			
D8	9	\$2,922,416	\$26,301,744	0	\$2,922,416	1	\$2,922,416	4	\$2,922,416 \$14,612,080			
D9	3	\$2,922,416	\$8,767,248	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416	1	\$2,922,416 \$2,922,416			
D10	0	\$2,922,416	\$0	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416 \$0			
D11	1	\$2,922,416	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416	1	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416 \$2,922,416			
D12	0	\$2,922,416	\$0	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416	0	\$2,922,416 \$0			
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A			
Statewide Totals	45	N/A	\$131,508,720	0	N/A	2	N/A	8	N/A \$29,224,160			

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

ADA Pedestrian Infrastructure													
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)								
208,216		Locations			208,216		Locations						
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate													
Into Fair		N/A		% per Year									
Into Poor		N/A		% per Year									
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario								
Good		N/A		N/A		Good		N/A					
Fair		N/A		N/A		Fair		N/A					
Poor		208,216		100.00%		Poor		208,216					
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal								
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Good or New		52,054					
Fix Poor to Good		11,209		5.38%		Fair		N/A					
Add New		N/A		N/A		Poor		156,162					
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*								
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Fix Fair to Good		N/A					
Fix Poor to Good		41,043		19.71%		Fix Poor to Good		\$7,500					
Add New		N/A		N/A		Add New		N/A					
Estimated Costs													
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0			Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0				
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$356,299,000			SHOPP Performance Gap			\$615,645,000				
District Breakdown													
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need			
D1	5,460	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,228	\$15,000	\$18,420,000			
D2	8,180	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,787	\$15,000	\$26,805,000			
D3	18,140	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-198	\$15,000	\$0			
D4	48,720	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11,359	\$15,000	\$170,385,000			
D5	12,127	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,659	\$15,000	\$39,885,000			
D6	19,494	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,427	\$15,000	\$51,405,000			
D7	36,900	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,248	\$15,000	\$123,720,000			
D8	21,044	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,606	\$15,000	\$69,090,000			
D9	1,741	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	196	\$15,000	\$2,940,000			
D10	10,600	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,842	\$15,000	\$27,630,000			
D11	12,567	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,679	\$15,000	\$40,185,000			
D12	13,243	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,012	\$15,000	\$45,180,000			
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Statewide Totals	208,216	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	41,043	N/A	\$615,645,000			

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Advance Mitigation												
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)							
N/A					N/A							
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate												
Into Fair		N/A		% per Year								
Into Poor		N/A		% per Year								
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario							
Good		N/A		N/A		Good		N/A		N/A		
Fair		N/A		N/A		Fair		N/A		N/A		
Poor		N/A		N/A		Poor		N/A		N/A		
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal							
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Good or New		N/A		N/A		
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		Fair		N/A		N/A		
Add New		N/A		N/A		Poor		N/A		N/A		
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*					Support Ratio**		
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		
Add New		N/A		N/A		Add New		N/A		N/A		
Estimated Costs												
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0		Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0		Total		
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$40,000,000		SHOPP Performance Gap			\$260,000,000		\$300,000,000		
District Breakdown												
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need		
D1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Statewide Totals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Bridge Scour Mitigation												
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)							
1,396,094					2,423,621							
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate												
Into Fair		N/A		% per Year								
Into Poor		N/A		% per Year								
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario							
Good		N/A		N/A		Good		N/A				
Fair		N/A		N/A		Fair		N/A				
Poor		1,396,094		100.00%		Poor		2,423,621				
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal							
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Good or New		2,181,259				
Fix Poor to Good		1,074,593		76.97%		Fair		N/A				
Add New		N/A		N/A		Poor		242,362				
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*							
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Fix Fair to Good		N/A				
Fix Poor to Good		1,106,666		79.27%		Fix Poor to Good		\$400				
Add New		N/A		N/A		Add New		N/A				
Estimated Costs												
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0			Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0			
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$201,143,000			SHOPP Performance Gap			\$646,292,944			
District Breakdown												
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need		
D1	166,431	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	116,474	\$584	\$68,020,816		
D2	47,503	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	42,753	\$584	\$24,967,752		
D3	753,353	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	303,122	\$584	\$177,023,248		
D4	125,873	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	92,802	\$584	\$54,196,368		
D5	215,680	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	125,438	\$584	\$73,255,792		
D6	91,071	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14,377	\$584	\$8,396,168		
D7	284,999	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	164,468	\$584	\$96,049,312		
D8	476,397	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	77,047	\$584	\$44,995,448		
D9	10,507	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9,456	\$584	\$5,522,304		
D10	52,559	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	44,483	\$584	\$25,978,072		
D11	20,681	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16,815	\$584	\$9,819,960		
D12	178,567	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	99,431	\$584	\$58,067,704		
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Statewide Totals	2,423,621	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,106,666	N/A	\$646,292,944		

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Bridge Seismic Restoration																		
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)													
15,813,181					18,369,006													
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate																		
Into Fair		N/A		% per Year														
Into Poor		N/A		% per Year														
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario													
Good		N/A		N/A		Good		N/A										
Fair		N/A		N/A		Fair		N/A										
Poor		15,813,181		100.00%		Poor		18,369,006										
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal													
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Good or New		12,858,302										
Fix Poor to Good		3,832,374		24.24%		Fair		N/A										
Add New		N/A		N/A		Poor		5,510,704										
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*													
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Fix Fair to Good		N/A										
Fix Poor to Good		9,174,565		58.02%		Fix Poor to Good		\$200										
Add New		N/A		N/A		Add New		N/A										
Estimated Costs																		
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0			Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0									
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$465,295,100			SHOPP Performance Gap			\$2,623,925,590									
Total										\$3,089,220,690								
District Breakdown																		
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need								
D1	976,895	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	208,783	\$286	\$59,711,938								
D2	689,309	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	482,516	\$286	\$137,999,576								
D3	733,283	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	155,915	\$286	\$44,591,690								
D4	5,136,395	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,401,736	\$286	\$972,896,496								
D5	441,349	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	74,872	\$286	\$21,413,392								
D6	217,223	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-39,229	\$286	\$0								
D7	6,930,259	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,004,960	\$286	\$1,145,418,560								
D8	1,294,146	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	605,536	\$286	\$173,183,296								
D9	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$286	\$0								
D10	1,049,231	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-107,275	\$286	\$0								
D11	480,911	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	240,247	\$286	\$68,710,642								
D12	420,005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-2,133	\$286	\$0								
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
Statewide Totals	18,369,006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9,174,565	N/A	\$2,623,925,590								

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Hazardous Waste Mitigation											
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)						
N/A					N/A						
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Need (in 2027)						
Into Fair		N/A		% per Year		N/A		N/A			
Into Poor		N/A		% per Year							
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario						
Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fair		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Poor		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal						
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Add New		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*				Support Ratio**		
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Fix Poor to Good		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Add New		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
Estimated Costs											
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0		Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0			
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$5,074,000		SHOPP Performance Gap			\$0			
District Breakdown											
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need		
D1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
D12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Statewide Totals	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Roadside Rehabilitation													
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)								
29,817 Acre					30,417 Acre								
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate													
Into Fair		3.87 % per Year											
Into Poor		5.83 % per Year											
Current Condition					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario								
Good		6,256		20.98%		Good		3,838 12.62%					
Fair		10,273		34.45%		Fair		7,297 23.99%					
Poor		13,288		44.57%		Poor		19,282 63.39%					
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal								
Fix Fair to Good		0		0.00%		Good or New		18,248 60.00%					
Fix Poor to Good		589		1.98%		Fair		9,126 30.00%					
Add New		0		0.00%		Poor		3,043 10.00%					
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*								
Fix Fair to Good		324		1.09%		Fix Fair to Good		\$82,000 48.00%					
Fix Poor to Good		15,651		52.49%		Fix Poor to Good		\$82,000 48.00%					
Add New		0		0.00%		Add New		\$82,000 48.00%					
Estimated Costs													
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work \$0			Maintenance Performance Gap \$0			Total \$2,025,242,000							
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects \$86,516,000			SHOPP Performance Gap \$1,938,726,000										
District Breakdown													
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need				
D1	85	\$121,360	\$10,315,600	0	\$121,360	-26	\$121,360	8	\$121,360 \$970,880				
D2	371	\$121,360	\$45,024,560	0	\$121,360	-111	\$121,360	54	\$121,360 \$6,553,440				
D3	1,423	\$121,360	\$172,695,280	0	\$121,360	61	\$121,360	672	\$121,360 \$88,956,880				
D4	4,446	\$121,360	\$539,566,560	0	\$121,360	189	\$121,360	1,757	\$121,360 \$236,166,560				
D5	1,020	\$121,360	\$123,787,200	0	\$121,360	-7	\$121,360	499	\$121,360 \$60,558,640				
D6	2,116	\$121,360	\$256,797,760	0	\$121,360	-14	\$121,360	1,056	\$121,360 \$128,156,160				
D7	9,669	\$121,360	\$1,173,429,840	0	\$121,360	-1,485	\$121,360	6,518	\$121,360 \$791,024,480				
D8	3,100	\$121,360	\$376,216,000	0	\$121,360	-21	\$121,360	1,041	\$121,360 \$126,335,760				
D9	11	\$121,360	\$1,334,960	0	\$121,360	8	\$121,360	-1	\$121,360 \$970,880				
D10	726	\$121,360	\$88,107,360	0	\$121,360	66	\$121,360	248	\$121,360 \$38,107,040				
D11	4,496	\$121,360	\$545,634,560	0	\$121,360	-470	\$121,360	2,641	\$121,360 \$320,511,760				
D12	2,954	\$121,360	\$358,497,440	0	\$121,360	-19	\$121,360	1,157	\$121,360 \$140,413,520				
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A				
Statewide Totals	30,417	N/A	\$3,691,407,120	0	N/A	324	N/A	15,651	N/A \$1,938,726,000				

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Storm Water Mitigation										
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)					
16,500 Acre					16,500 Acre					
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate										
Into Fair		N/A % per Year								
Into Poor		N/A % per Year								
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario					
Good		N/A N/A				Good N/A N/A				
Fair		N/A N/A				Fair N/A N/A				
Poor		16,500 100.00%				Poor 16,500 100.00%				
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal					
Fix Fair to Good		N/A N/A				Good or New 16,500 100.00%				
Fix Poor to Good		1,782 10.80%				Fair N/A N/A				
Add New		N/A N/A				Poor 0 0.00%				
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*					
Fix Fair to Good		N/A N/A				Fix Fair to Good N/A N/A				
Fix Poor to Good		14,718 89.20%				Fix Poor to Good \$135,439 48.00%				
Add New		N/A N/A				Add New N/A N/A				
Estimated Costs					Support Ratio**					
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work \$0			Maintenance Performance Gap \$0			Total \$3,443,689,100				
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects \$493,466,000			SHOPP Performance Gap \$2,950,223,100							
District Breakdown										
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need	
D1	750	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	725	\$200,450 \$145,326,250	
D2	1,080	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,049	\$200,450 \$210,272,050	
D3	780	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	773	\$200,450 \$154,947,850	
D4	2,700	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,663	\$200,450 \$533,798,350	
D5	130	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	103	\$200,450 \$20,646,350	
D6	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$200,450 \$0	
D7	7,780	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6,356	\$200,450 \$1,274,060,200	
D8	630	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	526	\$200,450 \$105,436,700	
D9	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$200,450 \$0	
D10	220	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	220	\$200,450 \$44,099,000	
D11	1,760	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,649	\$200,450 \$330,542,050	
D12	670	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	654	\$200,450 \$131,094,300	
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	
Statewide Totals	16,500	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14,718	N/A \$2,950,223,100	

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure									
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)				
30 Locations					30 Locations				
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario				
Into Fair		N/A	% per Year			Good	N/A	N/A	N/A
Into Poor		N/A	% per Year			Fair	N/A	N/A	N/A
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario				
Good		N/A	N/A		Good	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fair		N/A	N/A		Fair	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Poor		30	100.00%		Poor	30	100.00%	30	100.00%
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)									
Fix Fair to Good		N/A	N/A		Good or New	30	100.00%	30	100.00%
Fix Poor to Good		0	0.00%		Fair	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Add New		N/A	N/A		Poor	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*				
Fix Fair to Good		N/A	N/A		Fix Fair to Good	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fix Poor to Good		30	100.00%		Fix Poor to Good	\$357,000	40.06%	\$357,000	40.06%
Add New		N/A	N/A		Add New	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Estimated Costs									
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work		\$0	Maintenance Performance Gap		\$0	Total			
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects		\$0	SHOPP Performance Gap		\$15,000,000				\$15,000,000
District Breakdown									
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need
D1	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	\$500,000 \$2,500,000
D2	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	\$500,000 \$2,500,000
D3	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	\$500,000 \$500,000
D4	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	\$500,000 \$1,500,000
D5	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	\$500,000 \$1,500,000
D6	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$500,000 \$0
D7	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	\$500,000 \$500,000
D8	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	\$500,000 \$2,500,000
D9	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	\$500,000 \$1,500,000
D10	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	\$500,000 \$500,000
D11	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	\$500,000 \$1,000,000
D12	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	\$500,000 \$500,000
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Statewide Totals	30	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30	N/A \$15,000,000

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facilities												
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)							
54 Stations					54 Stations							
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario							
Into Fair		6.25 % per Year		Good 3 5.56%		Fair 25 46.30%		Poor 26 48.15%				
Into Poor		5.65 % per Year										
Current Condition					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal							
Good		8 14.81%		Good or New 33 60.00%		Fair 21 40.00%		Poor 0 0.00%				
Fair		46 85.19%										
Poor		0 0.00%										
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Average Unit Cost*							
Fix Fair to Good		9 16.67%		Fix Fair to Good \$1,562,667 100.00%		Fix Poor to Good \$1,562,667 100.00%		Add New \$1,562,667 100.00%				
Fix Poor to Good		0 0.00%										
Add New		0 0.00%										
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Support Ratio**							
Fix Fair to Good		2 3.70%		Fix Fair to Good \$1,562,667 100.00%		Fix Poor to Good \$1,562,667 100.00%		Add New \$1,562,667 100.00%				
Fix Poor to Good		26 48.15%										
Add New		0 0.00%										
Estimated Costs												
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work \$0			Maintenance Performance Gap \$0			Total \$129,281,352						
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects \$41,772,000			SHOPP Performance Gap \$87,509,352									
District Breakdown												
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need		
D1	3	\$3,125,334	\$9,376,002	0	\$3,125,334	0	\$3,125,334	2	\$3,125,334	\$6,250,668		
D2	4	\$3,125,334	\$12,501,336	0	\$3,125,334	0	\$3,125,334	2	\$3,125,334	\$6,250,668		
D3	5	\$3,125,334	\$15,626,670	0	\$3,125,334	-1	\$3,125,334	3	\$3,125,334	\$9,376,002		
D4	13	\$3,125,334	\$40,629,342	0	\$3,125,334	2	\$3,125,334	4	\$3,125,334	\$18,752,004		
D5	0	\$3,125,334	\$0	0	\$3,125,334	0	\$3,125,334	0	\$3,125,334	\$0		
D6	3	\$3,125,334	\$9,376,002	0	\$3,125,334	-1	\$3,125,334	2	\$3,125,334	\$6,250,668		
D7	6	\$3,125,334	\$18,752,004	0	\$3,125,334	-3	\$3,125,334	3	\$3,125,334	\$9,376,002		
D8	6	\$3,125,334	\$18,752,004	0	\$3,125,334	0	\$3,125,334	2	\$3,125,334	\$6,250,668		
D9	0	\$3,125,334	\$0	0	\$3,125,334	0	\$3,125,334	0	\$3,125,334	\$0		
D10	5	\$3,125,334	\$15,626,670	0	\$3,125,334	0	\$3,125,334	3	\$3,125,334	\$9,376,002		
D11	7	\$3,125,334	\$21,877,338	0	\$3,125,334	0	\$3,125,334	4	\$3,125,334	\$12,501,336		
D12	2	\$3,125,334	\$6,250,668	0	\$3,125,334	-2	\$3,125,334	1	\$3,125,334	\$3,125,334		
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Statewide Totals	54	N/A	\$168,768,036	0	N/A	2	N/A	26	N/A	\$87,509,352		

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Operational Improvements																
Current Need					Projected Need (in 2027)											
1,010,962					1,010,962					Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay						
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Need (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario											
Into Fair		N/A		% per Year		Good		N/A		N/A						
Into Poor		N/A		% per Year		Fair		N/A		N/A						
Current Need					Poor					1,010,962 100.00%						
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Need (in 2027) - Goal											
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Good or New		101,096		10.00%						
Fix Poor to Good		10,303		1.02%		Fair		N/A		N/A						
Add New		N/A		N/A		Poor		909,866		90.00%						
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*					Support Ratio**						
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A						
Fix Poor to Good		91,776		9.08%		Fix Poor to Good		\$4,968		40.00%						
Add New		N/A		N/A		Add New		N/A		N/A						
Estimated Costs																
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work				\$0	Maintenance Performance Gap				\$0	Total						
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects				\$294,700,000	SHOPP Performance Gap				\$638,302,080	\$933,002,080						
District Breakdown																
District	Projected Need	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need						
D1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$6,955	\$0						
D2	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$6,955	\$0						
D3	40,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,351	\$6,955	\$9,396,205						
D4	215,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20,432	\$6,955	\$142,104,560						
D5	5,564	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	209	\$6,955	\$1,453,595						
D6	8,136	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	814	\$6,955	\$5,661,370						
D7	460,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	44,539	\$6,955	\$309,768,745						
D8	77,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5,201	\$6,955	\$36,172,955						
D9	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	\$6,955	\$0						
D10	5,262	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-983	\$6,955	\$0						
D11	90,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,388	\$6,955	\$58,338,540						
D12	110,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10,842	\$6,955	\$75,406,110						
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
Statewide Totals	1,010,962	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	91,776	N/A	\$638,302,080						

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Sign Panel Replacement											
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)						
86,877					86,877						
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario						
Into Fair		6.67		% per Year		Good		0			
Into Poor		20.00		% per Year		Fair		0			
Current Condition					Poor		86,877		100.00%		
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal						
Fix Fair to Good		0		0.00%		Good or New		0			
Fix Poor to Good		7,811		8.99%		Fair		86,877			
Add New		0		0.00%		Poor		0			
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*				Support Ratio**		
Fix Fair to Good		0		0.00%		Fix Fair to Good					
Fix Poor to Good		79,066		91.01%		Fix Poor to Good					
Add New		0		0.00%		Add New					
Estimated Costs											
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0	Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0	Total			
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$63,201,000	SHOPP Performance Gap			\$637,271,960	\$700,472,960			
District Breakdown											
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost* Goal Constrained Need		
D1	4,185	\$8,060	\$33,731,100	0	\$8,060	-4,185	\$8,060	4,185	\$8,060 \$33,731,100		
D2	7,407	\$8,060	\$59,700,420	0	\$8,060	-7,407	\$8,060	7,087	\$8,060 \$57,121,220		
D3	6,864	\$8,060	\$55,323,840	0	\$8,060	-6,864	\$8,060	6,253	\$8,060 \$50,399,180		
D4	13,894	\$8,060	\$111,985,640	0	\$8,060	-13,894	\$8,060	12,670	\$8,060 \$102,120,200		
D5	4,607	\$8,060	\$37,132,420	0	\$8,060	-4,607	\$8,060	3,443	\$8,060 \$27,750,580		
D6	7,702	\$8,060	\$62,078,120	0	\$8,060	-7,702	\$8,060	7,192	\$8,060 \$57,967,520		
D7	17,373	\$8,060	\$140,026,380	0	\$8,060	-17,373	\$8,060	16,703	\$8,060 \$134,626,180		
D8	8,533	\$8,060	\$68,775,980	0	\$8,060	-8,533	\$8,060	7,432	\$8,060 \$59,901,920		
D9	917	\$8,060	\$7,391,020	0	\$8,060	-917	\$8,060	917	\$8,060 \$7,391,020		
D10	4,608	\$8,060	\$37,140,480	0	\$8,060	-4,608	\$8,060	4,468	\$8,060 \$36,012,080		
D11	6,878	\$8,060	\$55,436,680	0	\$8,060	-6,878	\$8,060	4,915	\$8,060 \$39,614,900		
D12	3,909	\$8,060	\$31,506,540	0	\$8,060	-3,909	\$8,060	3,801	\$8,060 \$30,636,060		
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A		
Statewide Totals	86,877	N/A	\$700,228,620	0	N/A	0	N/A	79,066	N/A \$637,271,960		

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Transportation Management Systems															
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)										
18,837					20,483										
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate															
Into Fair		NA		% per Year											
Into Poor		4.73		% per Year											
Current Condition					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario										
Good		11,081		58.83%		Good		7,486		36.55%					
Fair		N/A		N/A		Fair		N/A		N/A					
Poor		7,756		41.17%		Poor		12,997		63.45%					
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal										
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Good or New		19,364		90.00%					
Fix Poor to Good		2,300		12.21%		Fair		N/A		N/A					
Add New		1,646		8.74%		Poor		2,153		10.00%					
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*					Support Ratio**					
Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A		Fix Fair to Good		N/A		N/A					
Fix Poor to Good		8,544		45.36%		Fix Poor to Good		\$85,176		37.00%					
Add New		1,034		5.49%		Add New		\$85,176		37.00%					
Estimated Costs															
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work				\$0	Maintenance Performance Gap				\$0	Total					
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects				\$692,328,000	SHOPP Performance Gap				\$1,117,666,398	\$1,809,994,398					
District Breakdown															
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need					
D1	284	\$116,691	\$33,140,244	21	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	98	\$116,691	\$13,886,229					
D2	400	\$116,691	\$46,676,400	19	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	200	\$116,691	\$25,555,329					
D3	2,252	\$116,691	\$262,788,132	82	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	364	\$116,691	\$52,044,186					
D4	4,451	\$116,691	\$519,391,641	225	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	1,581	\$116,691	\$210,743,946					
D5	1,134	\$116,691	\$132,327,594	55	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	393	\$116,691	\$52,277,568					
D6	1,002	\$116,691	\$116,924,382	84	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	541	\$116,691	\$72,931,875					
D7	4,174	\$116,691	\$487,068,234	195	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	2,115	\$116,691	\$269,556,210					
D8	2,080	\$116,691	\$242,717,280	129	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	992	\$116,691	\$130,810,611					
D9	183	\$116,691	\$21,354,453	9	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	82	\$116,691	\$10,618,881					
D10	1,324	\$116,691	\$154,498,884	67	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	504	\$116,691	\$66,630,561					
D11	1,598	\$116,691	\$186,472,218	74	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	832	\$116,691	\$105,722,046					
D12	1,601	\$116,691	\$186,822,291	74	\$116,691	N/A	N/A	842	\$116,691	\$106,888,956					
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Statewide Totals	20,483	N/A	\$2,390,181,753	1,034	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,544	N/A	\$1,117,666,398					

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades										
Current Inventory					Projected Inventory (in 2027)					
245,756,328					245,756,328					
Effective Annual Deterioration Rate										
Into Fair		0.00		% per Year						
Into Poor		0.00		% per Year						
Current Condition					Projected Condition (in 2027) - Do Nothing Scenario					
Good		193,664,987		78.80%		Good		193,664,987		78.80%
Fair		20,757,365		8.45%		Fair		20,757,365		8.45%
Poor		31,333,976		12.75%		Poor		31,333,976		12.75%
Pipelined Projects (in any SHOPP or 2018 PID Workplan)					Target Condition (in 2027) - Goal					
Fix Fair to Good		571,024		0.23%		Good or New		184,317,245		75.00%
Fix Poor to Good		1,008,440		0.41%		Fair		36,863,449		15.00%
Add New		0		0.00%		Poor		24,575,634		10.00%
Performance Gap for the Last 5 Years					Average Unit Cost*					
Fix Fair to Good		233,202		0.09%		Fix Fair to Good		\$300		40.00%
Fix Poor to Good		10,142,453		4.13%		Fix Poor to Good		\$400		40.00%
Add New		0		0.00%		Add New		\$400		40.00%
Estimated Costs										
Unfunded Pipelined Maintenance Work			\$0	Maintenance Performance Gap			\$0	Total		\$5,907,195,320
Unfunded Pipelined SHOPP Projects			\$129,476,800	SHOPP Performance Gap			\$5,777,718,520			
District Breakdown										
District	Projected Quantity	Replacement Total Unit Cost*	Estimated Value	New Gap	"Add New" Total Unit Cost*	Fair Gap	"Fix Fair" Total Unit Cost*	Poor Gap	"Fix Poor" Total Unit Cost*	Goal Constrained Need
D1	5,472,154	\$560	\$3,064,406,240	0	\$560	-510,047	\$420	35,327	\$560	\$19,783,120
D2	5,657,506	\$560	\$3,168,203,360	0	\$560	-596,320	\$420	-211,909	\$560	\$0
D3	23,052,229	\$560	\$12,909,248,240	0	\$560	233,202	\$420	586,477	\$560	\$426,371,960
D4	53,117,342	\$560	\$29,745,711,520	0	\$560	-3,765,127	\$420	4,337,012	\$560	\$2,428,726,720
D5	7,567,833	\$560	\$4,237,986,480	0	\$560	-605,365	\$420	42,813	\$560	\$23,975,280
D6	10,932,061	\$560	\$6,121,954,160	0	\$560	-950,769	\$420	489,534	\$560	\$274,139,040
D7	63,052,408	\$560	\$35,309,348,480	0	\$560	-3,279,742	\$420	4,651,290	\$560	\$2,604,722,400
D8	21,442,325	\$560	\$12,007,702,000	0	\$560	-2,137,376	\$420	-1,657,241	\$560	\$0
D9	984,610	\$560	\$551,381,600	0	\$560	-84,519	\$420	-71,810	\$560	\$0
D10	9,398,628	\$560	\$5,263,231,680	0	\$560	-546,165	\$420	-256,980	\$560	\$0
D11	25,492,126	\$560	\$14,275,590,560	0	\$560	-2,457,955	\$420	-861,896	\$560	\$0
D12	19,587,106	\$560	\$10,968,779,360	0	\$560	-1,976,925	\$420	-1,332,715	\$560	\$0
HQ	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Statewide Totals	245,756,328	N/A	\$137,623,543,680	0	N/A	233,202	N/A	10,142,453	N/A	\$5,777,718,520

(*) The unit costs represent a multi-year programmatic average of a number of activities included within this objective. These costs should not be used for project level estimates.

(**) The support ratios represent a multi-year cost-weighted average of a number of activities included within this objective. These ratios should not be used for project level estimates.

APPENDIX C: GLOSSARY

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
BMP	Best Management Practice
BAT	Budget Allocation Tool
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CFMP	California Freight Mobility Plan
CHCI	California Highway Construction Index
CSFAP	California Sustainable Freight Action Plan
Commission	California Transportation Commission
CAPM	Capital Preventive Maintenance
CVEF	Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Station
CUs	Compliance Units
CIAAs	Cooperative Implementation Agreements
EV	Electric Vehicles
CWA	Clean Water Act
Trust Fund	Federal Highway Trust Fund
FAST	Fixing America's Surface Transportation
FASTLANE	Fostering Advancements in Shipping and Transportation for the Long-term Achievement of National Efficiencies
FCO	Funding Contribution Only
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GPR	Ground Penetration Radar
HM	Highway Maintenance
HUTA	Highway Users Tax Account
ICM	Integrated Corridor Management
IRI	International Roughness Index
LOS	Level of Service
MVFA	Motor Vehicle Fuel Account
MAP-21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century
MODA	Multi-Objective Decision Analysis
NHFP	National Highway Freight Program
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NSHFP	National Significant Highway and Freight Projects
PaveM	Pavement Management System
PID	Project Initiation Document
RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agency
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SRRA	Safety Roadside Rest Area
SHA	State Highway Account

SHOPP	State Highway Operation and Protection Program
SHS	State Highway System
SHSMP	State Highway System Management Plan
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TMS	Transportation Management System
TOSNET	Traffic Operations Systems Network
TAMP	Transportation Asset Management Plan
TMC	Transportation Management Center
TRF	Transportation Related Facility
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
WIM	Weigh-In-Motion
ZEV	Zero-Emission Vehicle



Our Mission

Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability.

Safety and Health

Provide a safe transportation system for workers and users, and promote health through active transportation and reduced pollution in communities.

Stewardship and Efficiency

Money counts. Responsibly manage California's transportation-related assets.

Sustainability, Livability and Economy

Make long-lasting, smart mobility decisions that improve the environment, support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl.

System Performance

Utilize leadership, collaboration and strategic partnerships to develop an integrated transportation system that provides reliable and accessible mobility for travelers.

Organizational Excellence

Be a national leader in delivering quality service through excellent employee performance, public communication, and accountability.

Our Vision

A performance-driven, transparent and accountable organization that values its people, resources and partners, and meets new challenges through leadership, innovation and teamwork.

Integrity

■ Commitment

■ Teamwork

■ Innovation

SLOW FOR THE CONE ZONE

C A L T R A N S

California Department of Transportation

1120 N Street, MS 49

Sacramento, CA 95814

www.dot.ca.gov